1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared with relevant provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the CEQA Guidelines, as revised. This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) evaluates the environmental effects for the proposed project located at 299 E. Foothill Blvd., which involves the demolition of two vacant mobile homes, one small office building and abandoned accessory structures that were used by the equestrian facility that ceased operation in 2015.

The IS/MND includes the following components:

- A Draft MND and finding made by the City of San Dimas (City) that the project would not result in any significant environmental impacts from the project, as identified in the CEQA IS Checklist.

- A detailed project description.

- The CEQA IS Checklist, which provides standards to evaluate the potential for significant environmental impacts from the project, and is adapted from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The project is evaluated in 20 environmental issue categories to determine whether the project’s environmental impacts would be significant in any category. Brief discussions are provided that further substantiate the project’s anticipated environmental impacts in each category.

Because the project fits into the definition of a “project” under the Public Resources Code Section 21065 requiring discretionary approvals by the City, and because it could result in a significant effect on the environment, the project is subject to CEQA review. The IS Checklist was prepared to determine the appropriate environmental document to satisfy CEQA requirements: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or Negative Declaration (ND). The analysis is this IS Checklist supports the conclusion that the project would not result in significant environmental impacts; therefore, an MND has been prepared.

This IS/MND will be circulated for 20 days for public and agency review, during which time individuals and agencies may submit comments on the adequacy of the environmental review. Following the public review period, the City will consider any comments received on the IS/MND when deciding whether to adopt the MND.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Project File:
299 E. Foothill Blvd. San Dimas CA., 91773

3. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:
San Dimas Foothill Partners, LLC
c/o Hagop Sargisian
2913 El Camino Real
Tustin, CA 92782

4. General Plan Designation:
Open Space

5. Zoning:
Light Agriculture (AL) and Open Space (OS)

6. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of San Dimas
Community Development Department
245 East Bonita Avenue
San Dimas, CA 91773

7. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
mespinoza@ci.san-dimas.ca.us

8. Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses:
299 E. Foothill Blvd., San Dimas, California 91773 (Assessor Parcel Numbers: 8665-008-017 & -016). The project site is approximately 1.7 miles northeast of Interstate 210 (Foothill Freeway). The site is generally situated north of the intersection of East Foothill Boulevard and North Walnut Avenue and is bordered by residential developments to the west, Horsethief Canyon Park to the north, the San Dimas Wash to the east and southeast.
Figure 1 - Regional Vicinity
9. **Description of Project:**

The site comprises approximately 6.25 acres of land that was formerly occupied by an equestrian center and it is comprised of two noncontiguous parcels. Improvements within the site include several buildings, two mobile homes, stables, corrals, an asphalt-paved drive entrance, gravel-covered driveways, interior fencing, and other related equestrian improvements. A water tank/wireless facility is also located on site near the main entrance within the southwesterly portion of the property. The site is currently on a private sewage disposal system consisting of both leach fields and a seepage pit. Other underground utilities include a 42-inch reinforced concrete storm drain pipe that is also located beneath portions of the site.

The site contains a total of mature 59 trees that include different tree species such as Ash, California Pepper, Carrotwood, Mulberry and Coast Live Oak. An arborist report has been prepared that analysis the condition of each tree.

The proposed project includes the demolition of all existing structures, the removal of 59 trees and sewage disposing system, and the construction of 20 single-family homes and a retention basin that can hold up to 3,020 cubic yards of debris flow from the hills to the north.

The site is comprised of two parcels as shown in **Figure 2**. The larger parcel is 261,652 square feet (6.01 Acres) and the smaller parcel is 10,324 square feet (0.24 Acres). The two parcels are separated by City owned land. The developer is requesting a land exchange to acquire the piece of land that is separating the two parcels under the applicant’s ownership and a strip of land north of the project site that consist of approximately 16,380 square feet of parkland. The small triangular parcel would then be added to the City’s parkland.

The site will be developed with 20 single-family residential lots as shown on **Figure 3** and **Figure 4**. The houses will all be two-stories ranging in size from 2,893 square feet to 3,312 square feet. There are three (3) house plans, two (2) of the plans will offer three bedrooms
with the option to convert the den into a fourth bedroom. Plan No. 3 also offers three bedrooms with the option to convert the den and the retreat room into two additional bedrooms for a total of five bedrooms. The homes will have three and four restrooms depending on the house plan. House Plan No. 1 and 2 will have attached two-car garages House Plan No. 3 will have an attached three car-garage, the third space will be tandem.

Figure 3 – Site Plan
The other three remaining lots will be developed for different uses; park land, debris retention basin and common use area with an existing wireless facility. Lot No. 22 will be developed as park land to be granted to the City as an extension of the play fields at Horsethief Canyon Park. The applicant will develop with lot to the City’s park standards. The lot will be graded to the same elevation of the existing park and landscaped with grass and trees. Lot No. 23 will be developed as a debris retention basin that will accommodate water and burn and bulk flows from the hills to the north of the project site. The retention basin will be maintained by the Homeowner’s Association. Lot No. 21 will be developed as leisure use lot. There will be a few benches a small walking path. The site currently has a wireless facility that has been design as a water tower. The water tower and the associated equipment building will remain on the site.

Construction of on-site residences is anticipated to occur over an approximately 18–month period. All the existing structures that exist on the project site from the previous equestrian use would be demolished. Demolition activities would be required to accommodate construction of the subdivision, as would removal of existing vegetation and trees, an excavation and grading to accommodate building foundations.

Access to the project would be provided through a new street off Foothill Blvd., at the western boundary of the project site. Two 56 feet wide public streets are proposed that would include two cul-de-sacs at the end of Street A and B. A 5-foot wide sidewalk and 4.5-foot parkway would be provided on both streets.

Landscaping would be designed in accordance to the City’s Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance and Guidelines Chapter 18.14. Trees and shrubs will be organized by primary function (i.e., street tree, streetscape, entry specimen trees, accent trees, screening trees, etc.)
Drought tolerant plant material will be utilized. Irrigation systems for private landscapes and
the open space (e.g., the park) will be controlled using automatic controllers, and will have
automatic rain shut off devices. Spray systems shall have low-volume, matched-precipitation
nozzles fitted on pop-up bodies that are outfitted with pressure compensating devices and
integral check valves. Hydrozones \(^1\) will be developed to control the water to specific plant
material and adhere to environmental conditions.

Describe the retention basin and why is needed, responsible party for maintenance, and
whether the approval of the project would require the City of San Dimas to accept the design
of the retention basin as adequate and accept the maintenance responsibility.

The project requires the granting of the following requests:

1. General Plan Amendment to the current land use designation from Open Space to
   Single-Family Very Low (0.2-3 DU/Acre)
2. A Zone Change to change the land use classification from Light Agriculture (AL) and
   Open Space (OS) to Single-Family 7,500 (SF-7500)
3. Tentative Tract Map approval No. 72368 to subdivide the parcel into 23 lots, twenty
   (20) lots to be developed with homes and three (3) lots to accommodate proposed
   retention basin, open space area with an existing wireless facility and open space to be
   incorporated into the existing Horsethief Canyon Park.
4. Development Plan Review and Precise Plan for the review of the site layout and the
   architectural review of the proposed homes.
5. Tree Removal Permit to remove 59 mature trees.
6. Development Agreement with the City to exchange approximately 19,500 square feet
   of excess park land of Horsethief Canyon Park.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation
    agreement):
    
    - Los Angeles County Flood Control District

11. Other reviewing agencies may include, but are not limited to:
    
    - South Coast Air Quality Management District
    - Regional Water Quality Control Board

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

This project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, involving at
least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation
Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. The environmental factors
analyzed in the following sections have varying levels of background discussion. More
extensive background discussion is provided for some factors to explain the basis of the
methodologies used in the analysis, such as found in the Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and

\(^1\) A hydrozone is a portion of the landscape area where plants with similar water needs are grouped together.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions sections. However, this level of information is not needed for all environmental factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazard and Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

☒ 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" 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

February 21, 2019

Date

Marco Espinoza

City of San Dimas

Printed Name
3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

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

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, tress, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses:

a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic easement?**

Impacts would be less than significant. Scenic vistas are panoramic public views that are found to be locally or regionally attractive. The General Plan identifies a number of “scenic
highways” as the major means in which one experiences the rural environment of the City of San Dimas. The site is within a scenic highway according to General Plan Open Space Element Exhibit V-4. The Foothill Boulevard is especially important because the boulevard is highly travelled and in need of improving its streetscape image. In areas like this it is highly desirable to improve the streetscape image as a major public commitment to revitalizing and improving this area with medians and land use control. Additional local views include views of the open foothills and canyons and views to the San Gabriel Mountains, Way Hill, San Dimas Canyon, Sycamore Canyon, Walnut Creek, Cinnamon Creek, and other associated canyons.

The project site is located approximately one-half mile south from the closest of these scenic resources. The closest park to the project site is Horsethief Canyon Park. However, the project would not be visible from these resources as mature trees in the area would screen the proposed project as well as other residential development in the area.

The proposed project would include subdivision of four parcel encompassing 6.69 acres (two privately own and two City own) into 20 residential lots. The future residential development would be 26'-7” in height, which will be compatible with other commercial and residential development along Foothill Boulevard. The required 20 feet front yard setback will be provided on the portion of the site that fronts Foothill Boulevard. The project is not anticipated to block the views of the San Gabriel Mountains or the Canyons located to the north of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic public resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcropping, and historic building within a state scenic highway?

Impacts would be less than significant. The project site is located in a suburban residential area surrounded by single-family residences. The project site does not contain any scenic resources such as natural habitats or rock outcroppings, nor is it in proximity to any such resources. The project site is not on or near any National Register of Historic Places, California State Historical Landmarks, or California Historical Resources or Points of Interest (California State Parks 2017a). The project site is not visible from or in proximity to a state scenic highway (Caltrans 2011) or a city-designated scenic highway within San Dimas (City of San Dimas 1991a). Although the I-210 freeway is designated as an eligible state scenic highway in some areas, the portion of the freeway closest to the project site does not have this designation.

The site is within a scenic highway according to General Plan Open Space Element Exhibit V-4. The Foothill Boulevard is especially important because the boulevard is highly travelled and in need of improving its streetscape image. In areas like this it is highly desirable to improve the streetscape image as a major public commitment to revitalizing and improving this area with medians and land use control. Additional local views include views of the open foothills and canyons and views to the San Gabriel Mountains, Way Hill, San Dimas Canyon, Sycamore Canyon, Walnut Creek, Cinnamon Creek, and other associated canyons.

The project site is located approximately one-half mile south from the closest of these scenic resources. The closest park to the project site is Horsethief Canyon Park. However, the project would not be visible from these resources as mature trees in the area would screen the proposed project as well as other residential development in the area.

Grading activities required to accommodate development of the proposed project would also involve removal of all the trees and other vegetation on site. A total of 59 trees would be
removed. Although these resources are not visible from a scenic highway, they are visible from Walnut Avenue, and their removal would alter views from the scenic corridor. However, as discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, part a, the applicant would be required to comply with Section 18.162.060 of the San Dimas Municipal Code which requires all trees removed from a project site to be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. Mike Parker who prepared the tree assessment and is a certified arborist recommend that a 10:1 replacement ratio be applied to the removal of tree No. 34 because of its large size. The replacement trees would be planted along the hillsides of the project. Further details regarding tree removal and replacement are discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*. Therefore, upon completion of the proposed project, trees would be replaced within the project site and views of trees from Foothill Boulevard would be restored. Therefore, development of single family residences within the project site would not generate long-term changes of views of scenic resources from Foothill Boulevard and project site, and would also not substantially degrade views of mature trees, rock outcroppings, or any other scenic resources along or visible from a scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Impacts would be less than significant impact.** The new single-family residence would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the neighborhood, since the area surrounding the project is already developed with residential uses and commercial land uses to the east and south of the project site. The project will require review from the Development Plan Review Board, Planning Commission and approval from City Council. The Planning Commission will review the site planning, massing, architecture, materials and landscaping to ensure the project design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. The City will be the final review body of the proposed project. An effort will be made to match the architectural style of the existing structure at the site. Thus, the project would be consistent with existing character of the site and surrounding area and impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is necessary.

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

**No impact.** The project would replace the existing structure on-site with a similar residential structure and would not introduce new sources of light and glare beyond what already exists on the property. Any exterior lighting used in the project would use lighting sources that would shield light downwards to limit night lighting from extending outwards. No impact would occur.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, 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?  

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 Public Resources Code section 1220 [g], timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as denoted by Government Code section 51104[g])?  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses:

a) **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** The property was formerly an equestrian facility that was developed with a number of horse stall/corals, caretaker unit and ancillary buildings to serve the use. The site is not zoned for agricultural uses and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Similarly, the project site and surrounding properties are not zoned as forest land or timberland and do not include any forest land or timberland. In addition, the site and surrounding properties are not identified as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Protection, lists Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance under the general category of “Important Farmland.” The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the project site is not included in the Important Farmland category\(^2\). Therefore, the project would have no impact on agricultural resources, forest land, or timberland.

b) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?**

**No Impact.** There are seven areas of agriculturally zoned land within the City of San Dimas, mostly landscape plant nurseries of approximately 5 acres each. The project site is zoned Light Agriculture (AL) and Open Space. The AL zone allows horticulture and agriculture, single-family homes with not more than one residence per lot, cattle and horse grazing, chickens for eggs, goats, calves, etc.\(^3\). Horsethief Canyon Park north of the site is zoned AL and includes an horse stables and equestrian facilities and events. The project would not impact the existing uses and equestrian events at Horsethief Canyon Park. There are no Williamson Act contracts within the City. Therefore, the projects will not have any agricultural or Williamson Act impacts.

c) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 122220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?**

---
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No Impact. There are no forest lands, timberlands, or timberlands zoned Timberland Production within the City of San Dimas, except for the Angeles National Forest north of the project. As a result, there are no forest lands or timberlands adjacent to or within the immediate vicinity of the site. The project does not propose to change the zoning of the site to allow timberland production. The project will not impact any forest.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. There are no forest lands on the site. The project does not propose to change the zoning of the site to allow timberland or forest production. The project will not result in the loss of any existing forest land or convert forest land to non-forest land. The project will not impact any forest.

e) Would the project result in the loss forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The proposed project would involve a 23 parcel subdivision for the development of 20 single-family residences, one open space parcel, one parcel to be occupied by a retention basin and one parcel to be improved as city park land. According to the California Department of Conservation’s (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the project site would be located on land mapped as “other land” under the FMMP (DOC 2016a). Lands designated as “other land” by the FMMP are considered as non-agricultural and are not in proximity to any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Further, the project site would not be on land enrolled under the Williamson Act or zoned for agricultural use (DOC 2016b). The project site and surrounding areas are not zoned as forest land or timberland. As discussed in Section 1, Aesthetics, the 59 trees currently on the project site all will be removed. However, these trees are not on land that is designated as forest land or timberland. Due to the absence of agricultural use, forest land, and timberland on the project site or in the surrounding area, the project would not involve changes to the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland or forest land to another use. No impact to agricultural or forest resources would occur.
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Result in other emission (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (the Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, and all of Orange County.

As the local air quality management agency, the SCAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that State and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Depending on whether or not the standards are met or exceeded, the Basin is classified as being in “attainment” or “nonattainment.” The primary criteria air pollutants regulated by state and federal standards include ozone, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and lead.

Existing Air Quality

The Basin is a non-attainment area for federal standards for ozone, PM_{2.5}, and lead, as well the State standards for ozone, PM_{10}, and PM_{2.5}. This non-attainment status in the basin is a result of several factors, the primary ones being the naturally adverse meteorological conditions that limit the dispersion and diffusion of pollutants; the limited capacity of the local airshed to eliminate air pollutants; and the number, type, and density of emission sources in the Basin. Thus, the Basin currently exceeds several State and federal ambient air quality standards and is required to implement strategies to reduce pollutant levels to recognized acceptable standards.
The SCAQMD operates a network of air quality monitoring stations throughout the SCAB. The purpose of the monitoring stations is to measure ambient concentrations of pollutants and determine whether ambient air quality meets the California and federal standards. The monitoring station located closest to the project site is the Glendora-Laurel station, located approximately 4.4 miles northwest of the project site. However, this station only provides data for ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and PM$_{10}$. Therefore, data for PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations was taken from the closest station with PM$_{2.5}$ monitoring data, the Azusa station approximately 7.5 miles west of the project site. Error! Reference source not found. indicates the number of days that each standard has been exceeded at the Glendora-Laurel and Pomona stations.

Table 1  Ambient Air Quality at the Monitoring Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Hour Ozone (ppm), 8-Hr Average [2015]</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of Federal exceedances (&gt;0.070)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (ppm), Worst Hour</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of State exceedances (&gt;0.09 ppm)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of Federal exceedances (&gt;0.112 ppm)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (ppm) - Worst Hour (Federal Measurements)</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of State exceedances (&gt;0.18 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of Federal exceedances (0.10 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter 10 microns, µg/m$^3$, Worst 24 Hours</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days above Federal standard (&gt;150 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;2.5 microns, µg/m$^3$, Worst 24 Hours$^1$</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days above Federal standard (&gt;35 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^1$ Data from the Azusa monitoring station.

Despite the current non-attainment status, air quality in the Basin has generally improved since the inception of air pollutant monitoring in 1976. This improvement is mainly due to lower-polluting on-road motor vehicles, more stringent regulation of industrial sources, and the implementation of emission reduction strategies by the SCAQMD. This trend toward cleaner air has occurred in spite of continued population growth.$^4$ As discussed in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB as a whole:

Despite this growth, air quality has improved significantly over the years, primarily due to the impacts of the region’s air quality control program... PM$_{10}$ levels have declined almost 50% since 1990, and PM$_{2.5}$ levels have also declined 50% since measurements began in 1999... the only air monitoring station that is currently exceeding or projected to exceed the 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ standard

from 2011 forward is the Mira Loma station in Western Riverside County. Similar improvements are observed with ozone, although the rate of ozone decline has slowed in recent years (SCAQMD 2013).

As also discussed in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan for the SCAB:

Since the end of World War II, the Basin has experienced faster population growth than the rest of the nation. The annual average percent growth has slowed but the overall population of the region is expected to continue to increase through 2023 and beyond... Despite this population growth, air quality has improved significantly over the years, primarily due to the impacts of air quality control programs at the local, state and federal levels.... PM$_{2.5}$ levels in the Basin have improved significantly in recent years. By 2013 and again in 2014 and 2015, there were no stations measuring PM$_{2.5}$ in the Basin violating the former 1997 annual PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS (15.0 μg/m$^3$) for the 3-year design value period with the filter-based federal reference method (FRM). On July 25, 2016 U.S. EPA finalized a determination that the Basin attained the 1997 annual (15.0 μg/m$^3$) and 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ (65 μg/m$^3$) NAAQS, effective August 24, 2016.

Criteria Air Pollutants

SCAQMD attains and maintains air quality conditions in the Basin through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The clean air strategy of SCAQMD includes preparation of plans for attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, and issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution. SCAQMD also inspects stationary sources of air pollution and responds to citizen complaints; monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions; and implements programs and regulations required by the CAA, CAAA, and CCAA.

Sensitive Receptors

Certain population groups are more sensitive to air pollution than others. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, and acutely ill and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases. Sensitive land uses would include those locations where such individuals are concentrated, such as hospitals, schools, residences, and parks with active recreational uses. The sensitive receptors closest to the project site are the single-family residences that immediately surround the site. The proposed project would include development of 20 single family residences, which would also be sensitive receptors.

Methodology and Thresholds

Project construction would generate short-term emissions and project operation would generate long-term emissions. Construction and operational project emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.1. Based on information provided by the project applicant, emissions were modeled assuming the following:

Land Use 1: Single-Family Residential
- 20 residences, 7,500 sf gross lot size

Land Use 2: Residential Access Street
- 24,862 SF

Demolition: 2 mobile homes, 1 office, 1 bathroom, 2 barns, small miscellaneous buildings.
Demolition duration: 20 days (CalEEMod default)
Construction activities facilitated by the proposed project would generate diesel emissions and dust. Construction equipment that would generate criteria air pollutants includes excavators, graders, dump trucks, and tractors. Some of this equipment would be used during grading activities as well as when structures are constructed. It is assumed that all construction equipment used would be diesel-powered. The construction emissions associated with development of the proposed project were calculated using the CalEEMod 2016.3.1 computer program by estimating the types and number of pieces of equipment that would be used onsite during each of the construction phases. Construction emissions are analyzed using the regional thresholds established by the SCAQMD and published in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

The project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which identifies measures to reduce fugitive dust and is required by enforcement authority SCAQMD, to be implemented at all construction sites located within the Basin. Therefore, the following conditions would be required to reduce fugitive dust in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403. These are also required in the project’s Conditions of Approval.

**Minimization of Disturbance.** Construction contractors shall minimize the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations to the maximum extent feasible to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

**Soil Treatment.** Construction contractors should treat all graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas, and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways to minimize fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, watering at least 3 times a day, application of environmentally safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll compaction. Watering shall be done as often as necessary, and at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.

**Soil Stabilization.** Construction contractors should monitor all graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll compaction, and environmentally safe dust control materials, shall be applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area shall be seeded and watered until landscape growth is evident, or periodically (at least once daily) treated with environmentally safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.

**No Grading During High Winds.** Construction contractors should stop all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations during periods of high winds (20 miles per hour or greater, as measured continuously over a one-hour period).

**Street Sweeping.** Construction contractors should sweep all onsite driveways and adjacent streets and roads at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.

The project would also need to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1113 regarding the use of low-volatile organic compound (VOC) architectural coatings.5

The project would also need to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 which states that a person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The

---

5 SCAQMD rules are enforced by SCAQMD and citizens can report non-compliance. Jurisdictions can also reinstate compliance in their conditions of approval.
provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for
the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

Model defaults were used for construction phase lengths and construction equipment. It was also
assumed that the project would water exposed areas three times daily during construction
earthmoving activities to reduce fugitive dust emissions as directed under SCAQMD Rule 403
(Mitigation Measures AIR-1 through AIR-9), and would use architectural coatings with a maximum
VOC content of 50 g/L, in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113. Operational emissions associated with
development were also estimated using CalEEMod. Operational emissions include mobile source
emissions, energy emissions, and area source emissions. Mobile source emissions are generated by
the increase in motor vehicle trips to and from the project site associated with operation of onsite
development. Emissions attributed to energy use include electricity and natural gas consumption for
space and water heating. Area source emissions are generated by landscape maintenance equipment,
consumer products and architectural coating. To determine whether a significant regional air quality
impact would occur, the increase in emissions was compared to the SCAQMD’s recommended
regional thresholds for operational emissions.

The SCAQMD provides numerical thresholds to analyze the significance of a project’s construction and
operational emissions to regional air quality. These thresholds are designed such that a project
consistent with the thresholds would not have an individually or cumulatively significant impact to the
Basin’s air quality.

Table 2  SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Operation Thresholds (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG¹</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂,₅</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOₓ</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) are formed during combustion and evaporation of organic solvents. ROG are also referred to as Volatile
Organic Compounds (VOC)

Projects in the basin with construction-related emission that exceed any of these emission thresholds
are considered to be significant under SCAQMD guidelines.

In terms of regional operational emissions, project in the Basin that exceed any of these emission
thresholds are considered significant under SCAQMD guidelines.

The phase out of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Because gasoline no longer contains lead, the
project is not anticipated to result in air quality impacts related to lead; therefore, no further
discussion is provided in this analysis.
**Local Microscale Concentration Standards**

The significance of localized project impacts under CEQA depends on whether ambient CO levels in the vicinity of the project are above or below State and federal CO standards. If ambient levels are below the standards, a project is considered to have a significant impact if project emissions result in an exceedance of one or more of these standards. If ambient levels already exceed a State or federal standard, project emissions are considered significant if they increase 1-hour CO concentrations by 1 ppm or more or 8-hour CO concentrations by 0.45 ppm or more. The following are applicable local emission concentration standards for CO:

- California State 1-hour CO standard of 20 ppm
- California State 8-hour CO standard of 9 ppm

**Thresholds for Localized Impacts Analysis**

The SCAQMD has also developed Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) for nitrogen oxides (NOX), CO, PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. LSTs were devised in response to concern regarding exposure of individuals and local communities to these pollutants. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size, and distance to the sensitive receptor. However, LSTs only apply to emissions in a fixed stationary location during project construction and operation. LSTs do not apply to mobile sources, such as cars on a roadway (SCAQMD 2008a). Therefore, LSTs are typically applied only to construction emissions because the majority of operational emissions are associated with project-generated vehicle trips.

The project site is located in Source Receptor Area 10 (SRA-10) and is approximately 6.69 acres in size (SCAQMD 2008b). LSTs are provided for sites that are one, two, and five acres in size, and for receptors at a distance of 82, 164, 328, 656, and 1,640 feet from the project site boundary. To avoid the need for every air quality analysis to perform air dispersion modeling, SCAQMD performed air dispersion modeling for a range of construction sites less than or equal to 5 acres in size and created reference tables that correlate pollutant emissions rates with project size to screen out projects that are unlikely to generate enough emissions to result in a locally significant concentration of any criteria pollutant. These reference tables can also be used as screening criteria for larger projects to determine whether dispersion modeling may be required.

For construction and operational emissions, the localized significance for a project greater than 5 acres can be determined by performing the screening-level analysis before using the dispersion modeling because the screening-level analysis is more conservative, and if no exceedance of the screening-level thresholds is identified, and then the chance of operational LSTs exceeding concentration standards is small. The total gross area for the project site is approximately 6.69 acres; therefore, LST screening thresholds for the 5-acre tables were used in this analysis.

Sensitive receptors are off-site locations (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals, and workplaces) where people may be exposed to the emissions from project activities. For the purposes of a CEQA analysis, SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a receptor (e.g., a residence, hospital, or convalescent facility) where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours. Therefore, applying a 24-hour standard for PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ is appropriate not only because the averaging period for the State standard is 24 hours, but also because, according to the SCAQMD definition, the sensitive receptor would be present at the location for a full 24 hours. The existing residences nearest to the project site
are approximately 100 feet (ft) (30 meters [m]) to the west of the project site. Using the operations LSTs for receptors at 25 m from a 5-acre site for this project would result in a conservative analysis. Therefore, the following emissions thresholds apply during project construction and operations:

**Table 3  SCAQMD LSTs for Construction Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Allowable emissions from a 5-acre site in SRA-10 for a receptor 82 feet away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradual conversion of NO\textsubscript{x} to NO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>236 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1,556 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>12 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>7 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 2008b

**SCAQMD LSTs for Operational Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Allowable emissions from a 5-acre site in SRA-10 for a receptor 82 feet away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradual conversion of NO\textsubscript{x} to NO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>236 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1,556 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>3 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>2 lbs/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 2008b

a)  **Would the project conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**Less than significant impact.** A project may be inconsistent with the SCAQMD’s AQMP if it would generate population, housing, or employment growth exceeding the forecasts used in the development of the AQMP. The 2016 AQMP relies on local general plans and the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan’s (RTP) forecasts of regional population, housing, and employment growth in its own projections for managing Basin air quality.

The proposed project involves subdivision of a 6.69-acre property into 23 individual lots to be developed with 20 new single-family residences. As discussed in Section XIV, *Population and Housing*, the addition of 20 new single-family residences would generate a population increase of approximately 58 residents, SCAG estimates a population increase to 34,500 by 2040, or an increase of 269 (0.8 percent) residents (SCAG 2016), which would be within SCAG’s forecast for population growth in the City as stated in the SCAG RTP. According to the California Department of Finance (DOF), the current estimate for housing units in the City is 12,788 (DOF 2017). SCAG estimates a housing increase to 12,400 by 2040 (SCAG 2016). As such, the existing
housing units in the City currently exceed SCAG forecasts. However, SCAG estimates a regional housing increase to 3,493,700 households by 2020. Although the City’s current housing estimate exceeds SCAG’s forecast for the City, it does not exceed SCAG’s regional housing forecast. Furthermore, the addition of 20 in an existing residential community would constitute less than 0.01 percent of the projected regional housing total. Therefore, the potential housing increase generated by the proposed project would not substantially alter air quality conditions in the south coast air basin and, in result, would be consistent with SCAQMD’s AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction Emissions

Project construction would generate temporary air pollutant emissions. These emissions are associated with fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from heavy construction vehicles, as well as ROGs released during the application of architectural coatings. Grading, excavation, hauling, and site preparation would involve the greatest use of heavy equipment and generation of fugitive dust.

Table summarizes the estimated maximum daily emissions of pollutants during construction on the project site. Construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds or LSTs. Therefore, impacts to regional air quality and local receptors due to construction emissions would be less than significant.

Table 4  Short-Term Regional Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>Fugitive PM_{10}</th>
<th>Exhaust PM_{10}</th>
<th>Fugitive PM_{2.5}</th>
<th>Exhaust PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by LSA (May 2017)
See Appendix A for modeling details and CalEEMod results.

Note: Peak daily emissions occur during overlap of Building Construction and Architectural Coatings Phase.

CO = carbon monoxide  PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
lbs/day = pounds per day  
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

NOx = nitrogen oxides  
SOx = sulfur oxides  
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size  
VOC = volatile organic compounds

Notes: Emission data is pulled from “mitigated” results, which include measures that will be implemented during project construction, such as watering of soils during construction as required under SCAQMD Rule 403.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions associated with project operation would include emissions associated with vehicle trips (mobile sources); natural gas use (energy sources); and landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products, and architectural coatings associated with on-site operational activities (area sources). As shown in Table 5, operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Therefore, operational emissions would have a less than significant impact on regional air quality.

Table 5  Operational Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source</th>
<th>Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by LSA (May 2017)
See Appendix A for modeling details and CalEEMod results.
Notes: Emissions presented are the highest of the winter and summer modeled emissions. Numbers may not add up due to rounding.

As shown in Table 5 and Table 6, project construction and operation emissions would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, the project would not violate or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant. These impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. Sensitive receptors are associated with various land uses such as residences, schools, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions who would be adversely impacted by poor air quality. Sensitive receptors (residences) are in adjacent to the project site.

Construction-related activities would result in short-term emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) exhaust emissions from off-road diesel equipment. Diesel PM has been identified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as a carcinogen. Cancer risk id
dependent on the exposure concentration and duration of exposure. Generation of DPM from construction projects typically occurs in a single area for a short period. The exposure to which the sensitive receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health rise. Exposure is a function of the concentration of a substance or substances in the environment and the extent of exposure that person has with the substance. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Health Assessment (OEHHA), health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic emissions should be based on a 30-year exposure period; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the project (OEHHA 2015). Due to the short exposure period, and the implementation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and CARB requirements for cleaner fuels, diesel, engine retrofits, and new low-emission diesel engine types, diesel PM generated by project construction would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emission (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)

Less than significant impact. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if construction or operation of the proposed project would result in generation of odors that would be perceptible in nearby sensitive areas.

Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. The proposed project consists of demolishing existing structures and construction of 20 new single-story single family dwelling units. Residential uses are not typically associated with odor complaints. As the proposed project involves no elements related to industrial projects, no objectionable odors are anticipated. Therefore, impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures will help reduce potential impacts related to Air Quality.

**AIR -1**  Suspend grading operations during high winds (i.e., wind speeds exceeding 20 mph, as measured continuously over a one-hour period) in accordance with Rule 403 requirements.

**AIR -2**  Construction contractors should sweep all onsite driveways and adjacent street(s) and roads at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.

**AIR -3**  All paints and coatings shall meet or exceed performance standards noted in SCAQMD Rule 1113. Paints and coatings shall be applied either by hand or high volume, low-pressure spray.

**AIR – 4**  All asphalt shall meet or exceed performance standards noted in SCAQMD Rule

**AIR - 5**  All construction equipment shall comply with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403. Additionally, contractors shall include the following provisions:
• Reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.
• Pave or apply gravel to any on-site haul roads.
• Phase grading to prevent the susceptibility of large areas to erosion over extended periods of time.
• Schedule activities to minimize the amounts of exposed excavated soil during and after the end of work periods. Dispose of surplus excavated material in accordance with local ordinances and use sound engineering practices.
• Maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard ratio on soils haul trucks or cover payloads using tarps or other suitable means.

**AIR -6** The site shall be treated with water or other soil-stabilizing agent (approved by SCAQMD and Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB]) daily to reduce PM$_{10}$ emissions, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403.

**AIR -7** Chemical soil stabilizers (approved by SCAQMD and RWQCB) shall be applied to all inactive construction areas that remain inactive for 96 hours or more to reduce PM$_{10}$ emissions.

**AIR - 8** The construction contractor shall utilize electric or clean alternative fuel powered equipment where feasible.

**AIR - 9** The construction contractor shall ensure that construction-grading plans include a statement that works crew will shut off equipment when not in use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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?

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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal, pool coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) 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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) 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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared a Biological Resources Assessment for the 6.69-acre project site on August 2015 and updated the cover letter in April 2017. The Biological Resources Assessment identifies the biological resources that occur on the project site and vicinity (see Appendix B). Mike Parker, a certified arborist, prepared an Arboriculture Report for the project site on November 9, 2017, which identifies and classifies the trees within the project site (included in Appendix B). The following analysis is based on findings from the Biological Resources Assessment.

Setting

The portion of the project site that would be subdivided into 23-residential lots to construct a total of 20 new houses consists of two parcels separated by strip of land owned by the City of San Dimas. Existing development on the property includes San Dimas Equestrian Center, with associated stalls and riding arenas. The proposed project site is located at the northern limits of the developed portion of the City of San Dimas. The project site is surrounded by development to the south and west and undeveloped open space areas, including Horsethief Canyon Park, leading to the Angeles National Forest to the north and east. The naturally vegetated portion of San Dimas Wash comprises the eastern boundary of the project site and continued toward the southwest into a concrete flood control channel, which is maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD). Due to the location of the proposed project site along the southern edge of the San Gabriel Mountains and
the National Forest, there is likely to be wildlife movement adjacent to the area. However, within the project site wildlife movement is constrained by existing development.

The project is not located within or in proximity to any known regional wildlife movement corridors or any other Significant Ecological Area as indicated by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Critical Habitat portal, California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project or California Department of Fish and Wildlife Biogeographic Information and Observation System (CDFW BIOS).

**Regulatory Framework**

Federal, state, and local regulatory framework applicable to the biological resources present within the biological survey area are presented below.

**Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S. Code 703) prohibits “take” of migratory birds, including their occupied nests, eggs, and parts. “Take” is defined by the MBTA as “pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect” (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 10.12). The MBTA protects over 1,000 migratory bird species; species protected by the MBTA are listed in 50 CFR 10.13. Neither the MBTA nor its implementing regulations, found in 50 CFR 21, currently provide for the permitting of “incidental take” of migratory birds that may be killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. When vegetation clearing or other activities with the potential to kill or injure migratory birds are scheduled to occur during the avian breeding season (generally February 1 through September 15), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) typically requires surveys to locate active nests in project areas prior to commencing the activities. If active nests are detected, avoidance buffers and nest monitoring may be required. Project activities may also be temporarily halted until migratory birds are no longer at risk of being killed or injured.

**State California Fish and Game Code**

The California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) regulates the taking of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, and reptiles, as well as natural resources such as wetlands and waters of the State. Section 3503 of the CFGC states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird. Section 3503.5 of the CFGC states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any raptors (i.e., species in the orders Falconiformes and Strigiformes), including their nests or eggs. Typical violations of these codes include destruction of active nests resulting from removal of vegetation in which the nests are located. Violation of Section 3503.5 could also include failure of active raptor nests resulting from disturbance of nesting pairs by nearby project construction. These sections of the CFGC do not provide for the issuance of any type of incidental take permit. It is important to note that California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) proposed regulations in August 2015 to clarify key terms in Section 3503 and 3503.5. Finalization of these proposed regulations are pending.

**City of San Dimas Tree Preservation Ordinance**

Chapter 18.162 of the SDMC outlines the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, which includes regulations to preserve and protect the mature significant trees, as well as other trees which are determined to be desirable, growing within the City. According to Section 18.16.020 of the SDMC Tree Preservation Ordinance, mature significant trees refer to any tree of an oak genus with eight inches or more in trunk diameter, any other species of trees with ten inches or more in trunk diameter, and multi-trunk tree(s) having a total circumference of thirty-eight inches or more. The multi-trunk tree shall include at least one trunk with a diameter of a minimum of four inches.
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 the California of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** The project site is located in a suburban residential area and does not provide substantial native biological habitats or habitats for special status species. However, the site that would be subdivided contains approximately 59 trees. These include mature “significant” trees as specified by Tree Preservation Ordinance of the SDMC, some of which are Coast Live Oak trees. A total of four (4) mature Oak trees have been removed on the property without City’s approval (trees numbered 23, 24, 25, and 26) they were removed by Los Angeles County Flood Control District who claimed that the trees were on their property. Construction of the proposed subdivision on the project site would require removal of all the trees on the project site.

Although it is not anticipated that local nesting birds (such as common raven (*Corvus corax*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), and mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*)), wild red-lored or red-capped parrots (*Amazona* sp.) and Oak titmouse would be identified in these trees, there is always the potential that birds could use the existing trees to nest. Bird species are afforded protection under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA – 16 United State Code Section 703-711). The proposed project has the potential to impact migratory and other bird species if construction activities occur during the nesting season, which is typically February 1 through August 31. Construction-related disturbances could result in nest abandonment or premature fledging of the young. Given this potential, impacts are considered significant without mitigation. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce potential impacts to onsite nesting birds to a less than significant level by requiring the provision of buffers from any identified active bird nests during construction.

In addition, the applicant would be required to comply with the provisions of the SDMC regarding tree removal on developed property. Section 18.162.040 of the code requires that removal of more than three mature significant trees on a developed property must be approved by the Development Plan Review Board. Prior to board approval, the applicant must submit a written statement explaining the reason for tree removal, a map or plan detailing all trees on the site, and must demonstrate that the tree removal adheres to the required findings provided in Section 18.162.070. Further, the applicant would be required to abide by the tree ordinance of the City municipal code which requires replacement of any removed trees on the project site. This would help restore tree habitat for birds and other species on the project site and reduce potential impacts from tree removal.

With adherence to the provisions of Tree Preservation Ordinance of the SDMC and implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

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 the California Department of Fish and Game or US fish and Wildlife Service?**

**No impact.** As described above, the project site is within a developed suburban residential area. Vegetation within the project site includes minimum landscaped plants, trees, and other scattered trees throughout the site. However, the project site is not near any critical habitat
areas for endangered or threatened species per the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) critical habitat mapper (USFWS 2018a) or any habitat area identified in the Conservation Element of the City of San Dimas General Plan (City of San Dimas 1991c). There are no sensitive natural communities or riparian habitat present within the project site. No impact would occur.

c) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**No impact.** The site is developed with a vacant equestrian center and there is no wetland or riparian habitat on the property. The section of the San Dimas Wash that extends along and forms the southern project boundary is a concrete channel with no wetland habitat within this section of the wash. There is no wetland habitat either on or adjacent to the site that will be impacted by the project. In addition, the project site is not located on or near a federally protected wetland according to the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapper (USFWS 2018b). Therefore, no impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

d) **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.** The project site is located in developed area of the City of San Dimas. One of the two parcels supported two mobile homes and associated accessory building, parking area, trees, and horse arenas. No Threatened, Endangered, or Rare species or their habitats, locally designated species, locally designated natural communities, wetland habitats, or wildlife corridors exist on this site. The site is not within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or similar plan. The site is neither within nor proximate to any Significant Ecological Area, Land Trust, or Conservation Plan.

e) **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 fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**No impact.** As previously described, the project site is located in a suburban residential area surrounded by residential development, Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel and a park. Native trees present on-site include mature oak trees. All would be removed for construction. Because the site is surrounded by suburban development, it is not in a County of Los Angeles Regional Wildlife Linkage (County of Los Angeles 2014) or a CDFW Essential Habitat Connectivity Area (CDFW 2018). Further, although the on-site trees would be removed to accommodate development of the proposed subdivision, the proposed project would adhere to MBTA requirements regarding impacts to migratory nesting birds with mitigation measure BIO-1. In addition, the proposed project would adhere to the provisions of the SDMC with regard to tree removal and replacement of significant mature trees. Therefore, no impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

f) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**
**Less than significant impact.** San Dimas Municipal Code Chapter 18.162 relates to the protection of trees that are mature significant trees, as well as other trees which are determined to be desirable, growing within the city. Such trees are natural aesthetic resources which help define the character of the city and are worthy of protection in order to preserve the natural environment and to protect the City’s native plant life heritage for the benefit of all citizens. Mature significant trees, and other desirable trees, are unique because of their size and beauty, and their abundance adds distinction and character to the natural beauty of the community.

The City requires permits for the removal of mature trees. Mature significant trees may be removed from developed property with the approval of the director of development services or development plan review board. A Mature Significant Tree is determined by the following:

- A tree within the City of an oak genus that measure eight inches or more in trunk diameter;
- Any other species of trees which measure ten inches or more in trunk diameter;
- Any other species of trees that is a multi-trunk tree having a total circumference of thirty-eight inches or more; the multi-trunk tree shall include at least one trunk with a diameter of a minimum of four inches;
- The trunk diameter must be measured at a point thirty-six inches above the ground at the base of the tree.

As previously described, the proposed project would require the removal of on-site mature significant trees within a suburban residential area. However, the applicant would be required to comply with the provisions of the Tree Ordinance provided in the SDMC, which pertain to tree removal procedures and tree replacement requirements. With compliance to the city municipal code, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

**g) Would the project conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

**No impact.** The project site is not located in an area subject to an adopted conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measure**

The following mitigation measure and compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) requirements, would be required to ensure impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant.

**BIO-1** **Nesting Birds.** To avoid disturbance of nesting and special-status birds, project activities, including but not limited to vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction and demolition, shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If construction must begin during the breeding season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified City-approved biologist no more than 7 days prior to initiation of all ground disturbance and vegetation removal activities within all suitable
nesting habitat located within the project site. If no nesting birds are found, construction may be initiated without impacts to nesting birds. If active nests are found, the biologist shall determine a suitable buffer where no construction activities would occur. The distance will be determined by the biologist based on the species of bird to ensure that no direct or indirect impacts would occur. An avoidance buffer shall be determined and demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, or other means to mark the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during all project construction activities. The biologist shall monitor the nesting activity during construction to verify that the buffer was adequately placed and that breeding is not compromised by construction. The buffer shall remain in place while the nest is active. No ground-disturbing activities shall occur inside this buffer until the biologist has determined activities can be resumed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Responses:

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**

No Impact. No known historically or culturally significant resources, structures, buildings, or objects are located on the project site. The project site was used as an equestrian center until 2015, which contained couple of mobile homes one office, storage sheds and other accessory structures. The project site is not listed on the City’s list of most significant historic properties. Therefore, it is not anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact to historic resources.

b) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**
Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources, as discussed above, or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. As the southern and western portions of the project site have been subject to past subsurface disturbance associated with grading and foundations, it is unlikely that undisturbed unique archeological resources exist in these areas. However, the northern portion of the project site remains undisturbed with only trees and small vegetation. Thus, unanticipated discovery of unique archeological resources is possible during grading activities, construction of building pads and foundations, and other earthmoving activities. In the event of an unexpected disturbance, significant impacts to archaeological resources could occur. However, implementation of required Mitigation Measure CR-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. No further analysis is necessary.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. No formal cemetery exists on-site or in the vicinity of the proposed site. Grading of the project site would cause new subsurface disturbance and therefore, unanticipated discovery of unique paleontological resources is possible. In the event of an unexpected disturbance, significant impact to archaeological resources and human remains could occur. However, implementation of required Mitigation Measure CR-2 and CR-3 would reduce potentially significant impact to less than significant levels. No further analysis is necessary.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are required to reduce potential impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

CR-1 In the event that archaeological resources are uncovered on the project site during grading or other construction activities, the developer must notify the San Dimas Planning Division immediately and work must stop within a 100-foot radius until a qualified archeologist to be approved by the City, has evaluated the find. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the project site. If the find is determined by the qualified archeologist to be a unique archeological resource, as defined by Section 2103.2 of the Public Resources Code, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code. If the find is determined not to be a unique archeological resource, no further action is necessary and construction may continue. The applicant shall bear the cost of implementing this mitigation.

CR-2 If paleontological resources are uncovered during excavation of the project site, the City of San Dimas Planning Division shall be notified immediately and work must stop within 100 feet of the find to allow a qualified paleontologist to appropriately remove the find. The applicant shall bear the cost of implementing this mitigation.

CR-3 If during excavation of the project site human remains are discovered, the steps described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) shall be followed. The applicant shall bear the cost of implementing this mitigation.
(1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

(A) The coroner of the County in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and

(B) If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:

1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.

3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or

(2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. The applicant shall bear the cost of implementing this mitigation.

(A) The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.

(B) The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or

(C) The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:

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

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

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?

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

Less than significant impact to responses a & b.

State Renewables Portfolio Standard Program. In 2002, California established its Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Program, with the goal of increasing the percentage of renewable energy in the state’s electricity supply. In 2008, Executive Order S-14-08 was signed into law requiring retail sellers of electricity to serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020. In October 2015, SB 350 was enacted to codify California’s climate and clean energy goals. SB 350 requires retail sellers of electricity and publicly owned utilities to procure 50 percent of their electricity from renewable sources by 2010.

Building Codes. The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, as specified in Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations (Title 24), were adopted in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California’s energy consumption. Title 24 is updated approximately every three years, and the 2016 Title 24 updates went into effect on January 1, 2017. Compliance with Title 24 is mandatory at the time new building permits are issued by local governments.

The California Green building Standards Code (CalGreen) establishes green building standards for buildings in California and covers five categories: planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material resource efficiency, and indoor environmental quality.

Electricity. In 2017, total system electric generation for California was 292,039 gigawatt-hours (GWH), up 0.5 percent from 2016’s total generation of 290,567 GWh. California’s non carbon dioxide-emitting electric generation (from nuclear, large hydroelectric, solar, wind, and
other renewable sources) accounted for more than 56 percent of total in-state generation in 2017, compared to 50 percent in 2016. California’s in-state electric generation was up by 4 percent to 206,336 GWh compared to 198,227 GWh in 2016 while net imports were down by 7 percent. The overall modest increase observed in California’s total system electric generation for 2017 is consistent with the recently published California Energy Demand (CED) 2018 -3020 Revised Forecast.

Factors contributing to the increase in total system electric generation include growth in the number of light duty electric vehicles registered in the state, increased manufacturing electricity consumption, and reductions in savings from energy efficiency programs, this point suggesting that population growth is the primary driver of increased electricity consumption.6

The Southern California Edison is the electricity provided for the City of San Dimas including the project site. SCE generates its electricity primarily from renewal resources.

The project would construct a maximum of 20 single family dwelling units. The Title 24, Building Standards Code, California Energy Code and California Green Building standards would be applicable to the project. Adherence to Title 24 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is located in Southern California, which is a seismically active region at the junction of the North American and Pacific tectonic plates. The proposed project would occur on an approximately 6.69-acre site in the northeaster portion of the city of San Dimas in Los Angeles County. Ground disturbance, such as grading activities, for development of the 20 single-family residences would be minimal as a majority of the site is currently undeveloped. This area is relatively flat. Soil groups in the project area primarily consist entirely of Urban Land consisting of alluvial fan deposits of loam, clay loam, and sandy clay loam (US Department of Agriculture 2016).

The fault closest to the project site is the San Dimas Fault, which generally runs east-west through the cities of Covina, San Dimas, and La Verne. The San Dimas Fault runs generally along Juanita Avenue and displacement along this fault occurred during the Late Quaternary period (during the past 700,000 years). Although the project site is located approximately a mile north of this concealed fault, this fault is not considered active as displacement has not occurred during the past 11,700 years (CGS 2015). Further, no faults have been mapped across the project site. The nearest potentially active fault is the Cucamonga Fault located approximately 8 miles east of the project site (CGS 2015). In addition, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones map for the San Dimas Quadrangle does not show the project site as being in an Earthquake Fault Zone (CGS 1999).

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 on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less than significant impact. Ground surface rupture is unlikely to occur due to the absence of any known active or potentially active faults on-site; lurching or cracking of the
ground surface as a result of nearby or distant seismic events is also considered unlikely. Since the site is located within the seismically active Southern California region, there is some possibility that there could be (a) trace(s) of (a) previously unidentified fault(s) on the project site. If evidence of faulting were to be discovered during the grading phase, potential building hazards would be mitigated to a level of less than significant, through application of already-required provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), which sets construction design standards that can reduce potential impacts related to seismic activity, including fault rupture. The project will abide all of the applicable City and state building codes and requirements. Thus, the potential for surface ground rupture at the project site is considered low.

ii. Strong Seismic ground shaking?

**Less than significant impact.** Since the site is located within the seismically active Southern California region, there is some possibility that there could be (a) trace(s) of (a) previously unidentified fault(s) on the project site. If evidence of faulting were to be discovered during the grading phase, potential building hazards would be mitigated to a level of less than significant, through application of already-required provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), which sets construction design standards that can reduce potential impacts related to seismic activity, including fault rupture. Adherence to the and state building codes and City’s requirements and recommendations from the Geotechnical Report (Appendix C) will reduce potential impacts associated with the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault would be reduced to less than significant levels.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Less than significant impact.** This impact is an effect of the environment on the project, which is not required to be analyzed under CEQA. Therefore, this discussion is provided for informational purposes only. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated silty-to-cohesionless soil above the groundwater table are subject to a temporary loss of strength due to the buildup of excess pore pressure during cyclic stresses induced by an earthquake. These soils may acquire a high degree of mobility and lead to structurally damaging deformations. Liquefaction begins below the water table, but after liquefaction has developed, the groundwater table will rise and cause the overlying soil to mobilize. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where groundwater is less than 30 feet from the surface and where the soils are composed of poorly consolidated fine- to medium-grained sand. In addition to the necessary soil conditions, the ground acceleration and duration of the earthquake must also be of a sufficient level to initiate liquefaction. According to the Earthquake Fault Zones map for the San Dimas Quadrangle, the project site is not located in an area at risk for liquefaction (CGS 1999). Therefore, the potential for liquefaction or seismic settlement at the project site is low and the proposed project would not exacerbate existing liquefaction conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

**Less than significant impact.** This impact is an effect of the environment on the project, which is not required to be analyzed under CEQA. Therefore, this discussion is provided
for informational purposes only. The geologic character of an area determines its potential for landslides. Steep slopes, the extent of erosion, and the rock composition of a hillside all contribute to the potential for slope failure and landslide events. In order to fail, unstable slopes need to be disturbed. Common triggering mechanisms of slope failure include undercutting slopes by erosion or grading, saturation of marginally stable slopes by rainfall or irrigation, and shaking of marginally stable slopes during earthquakes. The topography of the project site and the surrounding area consists of generally level land. According to the Earthquake Fault Zones map for the San Dimas Quadrangle, the project site is not located in a landslide hazard zone (CGS 1999). Therefore, the project site has low potential for landslides and development of the proposed project would not exacerbate existing landslide conditions. Impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

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

**Less than significant impact.** The project is not expected to cause substantial erosion or loss of topsoil due to standards engineering practices, stormwater requirements enforced by the City’s permit process, and the relatively flat topography. In addition, the site would be landscaped in accordance with the City’s requirements, which limit or preclude erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

**Less than significant impact.** The proposed project would involve a 20-unit subdivision for development of 20 single-family units. Development of the 20 residences would involve demolition of two mobile homes, one office and small miscellaneous buildings. Aside from these structures, the site is undeveloped. Construction activities for the new single-family residences such as excavation, stockpiling, and grading could result in increased erosion and sediment transport by stormwater to surface waters. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would include soil disturbance from grading activities, as development of the proposed subdivision would require construction of a new street to provide access to the proposed homes and provide new underground utility connections. However, construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with Construction General Permit (Order Nos. 2009-0009-DWQ and 2010-0014-DWQ), which is issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The Construction General Permit requires the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which outlines best management practices (BMP) to reduce erosion and topsoil loss from stormwater runoff. In addition, based on the geotechnical report, the majority of on-site materials are considered to have “very low” to “low” expansion potential. Should soils be uncovered near final pad grade during project grading that are considered to be expansive, measures in the city approved soils report will be implemented to the satisfaction of the city engineer to correct any soil compaction impacts.

---

d) **Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**

**Less than significant impact.** Expansive soils are soils that have the ability to shrink or swell as its water content changes. According to the Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the project site is located on urban land that consists primarily of loamy clays, which are prone to expansion. Neither the San Dimas General Plan nor the City Municipal Code currently address risks associated with expansive soils in the City. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with CBC foundation and structural design requirements prescribed to minimize related project impacts due to the possible presence of expansive soils. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

e) **Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

**No impact.** The proposed project would be served by the City’s existing sewer system and no septic tanks are proposed for the project. Therefore, there is no potential for adverse effects due to soil incompatibility. No impact would occur.

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

**Less than significant.** The site is not known to contain any unique geological feature. Mitigations measures CR-1 through CR-3 in Section V will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? □ □ ☒ □

Climate change is the observed increase in the average temperature of the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans along with other substantial changes in climate (such as wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) over an extended period of time. Climate change is the result of numerous, cumulative sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs). GHGs contribute to the “greenhouse effect,” which is a natural occurrence that helps regulate the temperature of the planet. The majority of radiation from the Sun hits the Earth’s surface and warms it. The surface in turn radiates heat back towards the atmosphere,
known as infrared radiation. Gases and clouds in the atmosphere trap and prevent some of this heat from escaping back into space and re-radiate it in all directions. This process is essential to supporting life on Earth because it warms the planet by approximately 60° Fahrenheit. Emissions from human activities since the beginning of the industrial revolution (approximately 250 years ago) are adding to the natural greenhouse effect by increasing the gases in the atmosphere that trap heat, thereby contributing to an average increase in the Earth’s temperature.

GHGs occur naturally and from human activities. Human activities that produce GHGs are the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas for heating and electricity, gasoline and diesel for transportation); methane from landfill wastes and raising livestock, deforestation activities; and some agricultural practices. GHGs produced by human activities include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). The global warming potential (GWP) of these gases is expressed in terms of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e). CO₂e represents the amount of CO₂ that would have the equivalent global warming impact for each GHG. Since 1750, it is estimated that the concentrations of, CH₄, and N₂O in the atmosphere have increased over by 36 percent, 148 percent, and 18 percent respectively, primarily due to human activity. Emissions of GHGs affect the atmosphere directly by changing its chemical composition while changes to the land surface indirectly affect the atmosphere by changing the way in which the earth absorbs gases from the atmosphere. Potential impacts of global climate change in California may include loss of snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years (California Energy Commission [CEC] 2009).

CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory direction for the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions appearing in CEQA documents, while giving lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts.

The City of San Dimas has developed a Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory, but has not adopted a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, Climate Action Plan, or any other regulatory plan addressing greenhouse gas reduction targets at this time.

In guidance provided by the SCAQMD’s GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group in September 2010, SCAQMD considered a tiered approach to determine the significance of residential and commercial projects. The draft tiered approach is outlined in meeting minutes dated September 29, 2010.

**Tier 1.** If the project is exempt from further environmental analysis under existing statutory or categorical exemptions, there is a presumption of less than significant impacts with respect to climate change. If not, then the Tier 2 threshold should be considered.

**Tier 2.** Consists of determining whether or not the project is consistent with a GHG reduction plan that may be part of a local general plan, for example. The concept embodied in this tier is equivalent to the existing concept of consistency in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), 15125(d) or 15152(a). Under this Tier, if the proposed project is consistent with the qualifying local GHG reduction plan, it is not significant for GHG emissions. If there is not an adopted plan, then a Tier 3 approach would be appropriate.

**Tier 3.** Establishes a screening significance threshold level to determine significance. The Working Group has provided a recommendation of 3,000 million tons (MT) of CO₂e per year for mixed use and residential projects.

**Tier 4.** Establishes a service population threshold to determine significance. The Working Group has provided a recommendation of 4.8 MT of CO₂e per year for land use projects.
The proposed project is not categorically exempt from environmental analysis and the City of San Dimas does not have an adopted GHG reduction plan. Therefore, Tier 3 would be the most applicable threshold where GHG emissions associated with the proposed project would be less than significant if total emissions are below SCAQMD’s 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year recommended limit.

This analysis is based on the methodologies recommended by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) *CEQA and Climate Change* (2008) white paper. The analysis focuses on CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ as these are the GHG emissions that on-site development would generate in the largest quantities.

**Methodology**

CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O emissions were calculated to identify the magnitude and nature of the project’s potential GHG emissions and environmental effects. The analysis focuses on CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O because these make up 98.9 percent of all GHG emissions by volume (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2007) and are the GHG emissions that the project would emit in the largest quantities. Fluorinated gases, such as HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆, were also considered for the analysis, but because the project is a residential development, the quantity of fluorinated gases would not be significant since fluorinated gases are primarily associated with industrial processes. Emissions of all GHGs are converted into their equivalent global warming potential (GWP) in MT CO₂e. Small amounts of other GHGs (such as chlorofluorocarbons [CFCs]) would also be emitted. However, these other GHGs would not substantially add to the total GHG emissions. Calculations are based on the methodologies discussed in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) *CEQA and Climate Change* white paper (CAPCOA 2008) and included the use of the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) *General Reporting Protocol* (CCAR 2009).

Emissions associated with the proposed project were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2. Complete CalEEMod results and assumptions can be viewed in Appendix A.

**Construction Emissions**

Although construction activity is addressed in this analysis, CAPCOA does not discuss whether any of the suggested threshold approaches adequately address impacts from temporary construction activity. As stated in the *CEQA and Climate Change* white paper, “more study is needed to make this assessment or to develop separate thresholds for construction activity” (CAPCOA 2008). In accordance with SCAQMD’s recommendation, GHG emissions from construction of the project are amortized over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project) and added to annual operating emissions.

Construction of the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions primarily due to the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Site preparation and grading typically generate the greatest amount of emissions due to the use of grading equipment and soil hauling. CalEEMod was used to estimate emissions associated with the construction period based on defaults for development of the proposed land uses. Complete results from CalEEMod and assumptions can be viewed Appendix A.

The total demolition for the proposed project was estimated based on building square-footage information taken from the Los Angeles County Property Assessment Information System.

**Operational Emissions**

CalEEMod provides operational emissions from the proposed project, which include CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄. Emissions from energy use include emissions from electricity and natural gas use. The emissions
factors for natural gas combustion are based on EPA’s AP-42, (Compilation of Air Pollutant Emissions Factors) and CCAR. Electricity emissions are calculated by multiplying the energy use times the carbon intensity of the utility district per kilowatt hour (CalEEMod 2016).

Emissions associated with area sources, including consumer products, landscape maintenance, and architectural coating were calculated in CalEEMod and utilize standard emission rates from CARB, USEPA, and district supplied emission factor values (CalEEMod 2016).

Emissions from waste generation were also calculated in CalEEMod and are based on the IPCC’s methods for quantifying GHG emissions from solid waste using the degradable organic content of waste (CalEEMod 2016). Waste disposal rates by land use and overall composition of municipal solid waste in California was primarily based on data provided by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

Emissions from water and wastewater use calculated in CalEEMod were based on the default electricity intensity from the CEC’s 2006 Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California using the average values for Southern California.

For mobile sources, CO₂ and CH₄ emissions from vehicle trips to and from the project site were quantified using CalEEMod. Because CalEEMod does not calculate N₂O emissions from mobile sources, N₂O emissions were quantified using the CCAR General Reporting Protocol (2009) direct emissions factors for mobile combustion (see Appendix A for calculations). The estimate of total daily trips associated with the project was based on CalEEMod defaults. Emission rates for N₂O emissions were based on the vehicle fleet mix output generated by CalEEMod and the emission factors found in the CCAR General Reporting Protocol.

a) Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than significant impact. Neither the City nor SCAQMD has adopted a formal significance threshold for GHG emissions associated with non-stationary source projects. Consequently, for the purposes of this GHG analysis, impacts would be significant/cumulatively considerable if the proposed project’s GHG emissions would increase above existing baseline conditions by more than the GHG threshold identified above (i.e., 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year).

Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions primarily due to the operation and transport of construction equipment and construction employee trips. Site preparation and grading typically generate the greatest amount of emissions due to the use of grading equipment and soil hauling.

As shown in Table 6, construction of the proposed project would generate an approximate total of 298 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e. Following the SCAQMD’s recommended methodology for amortizing construction emissions over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project), construction of the proposed project would generate an estimated average of 9.9 MT CO₂e per year.

Table 6  Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Emissions (MT CO₂e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amortized over 30 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operational Emissions

Operational GHG emissions would be emitted due to energy use (electricity and natural gas), solid waste disposal, water use, project-generated trips, and area sources (consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment, and painting) associated with the project. Table 7 summarizes the long-term GHG emissions generated by project operation. The project’s operational GHG emissions are estimated to be 314 MT CO₂e per year.

Table 7 Operational and Total Annual Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>Annual Emissions MT/yr CO₂e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ and CH₄</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined with amortized construction emissions, the project’s total GHG emissions would be approximately 314 MT CO₂e per year, which is less than the 3,000 MT CO₂e thresholds. Therefore, project emissions would not be significant or cumulatively considerable.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than significant impact. As discussed, the City of San Dimas currently has a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory but has not adopted a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, Climate Action Plan, or any other regulatory plan addressing greenhouse gas reduction targets at this time. However, SCAG’s 2016-2040 RTP/SCS provides transportation and growth strategies to reduce regional GHG emissions. Table shows the project’s consistency with the applicable regional goals and policies. As demonstrated below, the project would be consistent with goals and policies to reduce GHG emissions set forth in the 2016-2040 SCAG RTP/SCS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction Strategy</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Actions and Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus new growth around transit</strong></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2016 RTP/SCS land use pattern reinforces the trend of focusing growth in the region’s High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs). Concentrating housing and transit in conjunction concentrates roadway repair investments, leverages transit and active transportation investments, reduces regional life cycle infrastructure costs, improves accessibility, avoids greenfield development, and has the potential to improve public health and housing affordability. HQTAs provide households with alternative modes of transport that can reduce VMT and GHG emissions.</td>
<td>The proposed project would involve construction of a residential project within walking distance to several public resources including a public recreational park, businesses and restaurants. Proximity of the residences to these uses would incentivize modes of transport, such as walking or biking, that reduce both VMT and GHG emissions from traveling to these uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan for growth around livable corridors</strong></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Livable Corridors strategy seeks to create neighborhood retail nodes that would be walking and biking destinations by integrating three different planning components: 1. Transit improvements 2. Active transportation improvements (i.e. improved safety for walking and biking) 3. Land use policies that include the development of mixed-use retail centers at key nodes and better integrate different types of ritual uses.</td>
<td>The proposed project would be located in a residential area and in close proximity to public, residential, institutional, commercial, and recreational uses. The proposed project would enable development of a residential subdivision with a new access street and sidewalks bisecting the project site. The project site is walking distance from parks, retail stores, and restaurants. Therefore, the project would facilitate greater use of active transportation with installation of pedestrian sidewalks within the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide more options for short trips</strong></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 percent of all trips in the SCAG region are less than three miles. The 2016 RTP/SCS provides two strategies to promote the use of active transport for short trips. Neighborhood Mobility Areas are meant to reduce short trips in a suburban setting, while “complete communities” support the creation of mixed-use districts in strategic growth areas and are applicable to an urban setting.</td>
<td>The proposed project would involve construction of 20 residential structures. The project site is adjacent to other residential, as well as commercial, institutional, and recreational development. These uses are located along Foothill Blvd. As a result, the project site is within walking distance from nearby parks, retail stores, and restaurants. As such, active transportation (i.e., biking and walking) would be available for accessibility to other uses in proximity to the project site. This would encourage use of active transportation for short trips and reduce vehicle trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preserve our existing transit system</strong></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that the existing transportation system is operating efficiently is critical for the success of HQTAs, Livable Corridors, and other land use strategies outlined in the 2016 RTP/SCS.</td>
<td>The project site is located in an area surrounded by existing development and the proposed project would be infill development. Although the project site is not near existing transit opportunities, construction is not expected to result in permanent roadblocks in areas with existing transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Initiatives</strong></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop first-mile/last-mile strategies on a local level to provide an incentive for making trips by transit, bicycling, walking, or neighborhood electric vehicle or other ZEV options.</td>
<td>The proposed project would involve construction of a residential project adjacent to or within walking distance of other commercial, public, residential, institutional, and recreational development. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction Strategy | Project Consistency
---|---
| project site is walking distance from parks, retail stores, and restaurants. In addition, the proposed project would include public sidewalks and a street for walking and bicycle transport. This would incentivize greater use of active transportation to access the project site and surrounding community.

**Other Initiatives**

Reduce emissions resulting from a project through implementation of project features, project design, or other measures.

Incorporate design measures to reduce energy consumption and increase use of renewable energy. **Consistent**

The design and development of residential uses included in the proposed project would comply with CALGreen Building Standards, which includes measures to reduce emissions and energy consumption. The project would also comply with SCAQMD Rule 1113 that limits ROGs from building architectural coatings to 50 g/ L.

Source: SCAG 2016

As shown in Table , the project’s emissions would be less than the project-specific emissions threshold of 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year. The project would not conflict with any State regulations intended to reduce GHG emissions statewide and would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions, including the 2016-2040 SCAG RTP/SCS. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any plan, policy, or legislation related to GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IX. 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? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □
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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Expose people or structure, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildlands fires.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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. The proposed 20-unit project does not propose and will not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The only hazardous materials that will be transported and stored include standard household cleaning materials and herbicides and pesticides associated with landscape maintenance. The transportation, use and storage of these types of hazardous materials in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations will reduce the potential for significant impacts to less than significant. The project will have a less than significant impacts associated with the transportation, use or storage of hazardous materials.

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. The project involves the construction of 20 residential structures and the rezoning of parcels to allow for higher density single-family residential uses. The residential uses would not be involved in the regular handling or storage of large quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine handling of hazardous materials.

The proposed project would involve demolition of mobile homes, one office and miscellaneous accessory structures on the project site to accommodate construction of the proposed subdivision. Although demolition activities would produce construction waste, this waste is not anticipated to contain hazardous materials that would require special disposal procedures. Due to the age of the structures to be removed, it is possible that some may contain asbestos in building materials or may have lead-based paint. If such materials are found to be present in the structures, construction activities would comply with applicable laws and regulations regarding
proper handling and disposal of such materials. These regulations include but are not limited to California Code of Regulations, Title 8; Business and Professions Code; Division 3; California Health and Safety Code Section 25915-25919.7; and other local regulations.

Potentially hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents could be used during grading and demolition of the proposed project. Further, construction activities could use a limited amount of hazardous and flammable substances/oils during heavy equipment operation for site preparation and building construction. However, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. In addition, in the event of an unanticipated spill or related accident during the construction of the project, the applicant and any contractors would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and federal laws for responding to spills or handling potentially hazardous materials. Therefore, adherence to these requirements would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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?**

**Less than significant impact.** The project site is approximately .85 mile north of Fred Ekstrand Elementary School, .70 mile northeast of Allen Avenue Elementary School, and .48 mile southwest from Chaparral High School. However, the project would not emit hazardous emissions, and the small amounts of solvent and petroleum used during the construction would be managed and used in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and therefore would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. A less than significant impact would occur.

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?**

**No impact.** The hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document that provides information about the location of hazardous materials release sites in the state. Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. The proposed project site is not associated with any known hazardous materials or on any known hazardous materials list. The project site is not listed on the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s National Priority List, or the State Water Resources Control Board’s Geotracker list. Therefore, no impact would occur.

---

8 United States Environmental Protection Agency, National Priorities List website, http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/ The National Priorities List is the list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States and its territories.

9 State Water Resources Control Board, Geotracker website, https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=123+N.+Monte+vista%2C+san+dimas%2C+ca GeoTracker is a geographic information system (GIS) that provides online access to environmental data. GeoTracker is
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 site is the Brackett Field Airport that is located slightly over 2 miles southeast of the Project site. The project is located within the Brackett Field Airport Influence Area, but is not within the airport’s noise contours. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people in the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airports. No impact would occur.

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

**No impact.** No roads would be permanently closed as a result of the construction or operation of the proposed project, and no structures would be developed that could potentially impaire implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project proposed two new streets. Street A will be off Foothill Blvd., and Street B will be off Street A. Both streets will be terminating in a cul-de-sac. The new streets would be 56 feet wide and the cul-de-sac would be approximately 64 feet in diameter. The street driveway would provide adequate ingress/egress for the standard passenger vehicles, trucks, and occasional medium-duty trucks (such as trash trucks and street sweepers) that would frequent the project site, and the cul-de-sacs would be wide-enough to allow for such vehicles to easily turnaround to exit the site. Emergency vehicles including fire trucks would also be able to sufficiently access the site from these streets. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with existing emergency evacuation plans or emergency response plans in the area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

**Less than significant impact.** San Dimas faces the greatest ongoing threat from a wind-driven fire in the Wildland/Urban Interface area found in the hillsides and canyons in the northern part of the City according to the 2004 Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. The project is located in a very high fire hazard area according to maps provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Because the project is located in a very high fire hazard area, the project could be impacted by a wild land fire. The project will be required to meet and provide all fire safety and protection required by the San Dimas Building Code for development in a very high fire hazard area, Zone 4 and identified as a State Responsibility Area High by CalFire.

The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides Fire Protection services to the City of San Dimas. The proposed subdivision and proposed development will be reviewed for compliance with the California Building Code Chapter 7A — Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure and Chapter 49 of the California Fire Code – Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas. Adherence to the California Building Code and Fire Code would reduce impact to less than significant impact.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation off- or off-site;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses:

a)  *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

A hydrology study and a LID/MS4 Storm water Quality Design Report were prepared and a copy is included in Appendix C. An updated drainage and hydrology report\(^\text{10}\) was prepared and is also included as part of Appendix C.

**Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. A significant impact would also occur if the proposed project would not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the County of Los Angeles, and the City of San Dimas.

Three general sources of potential short-term, construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the proposed project include: (1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction material containing pollutants, (2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and (3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion via storm runoff or mechanical equipment.

As required under the NPDES, the proposed project applicant is responsible for preparing a SWPPP to mitigate the effects of erosion and the inherent potential for sedimentation and other pollutants entering the stormwater system. The primary objective of the NPDES stormwater program are to: (1) effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges, and (2) reduce the discharge of pollutants from stormwater conveyance systems to the Maximum Extent Practicable (“MEP” statutory standards) The SWPPP would incorporate the required implementation of Best Management Practice (BMPs) for erosion control and other measures to meet the NPDES requirements for stormwater. Implementation of the BMPs identified in the SWPPP and compliance with the NPDES and City discharge requirements would ensure that the construction of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Furthermore, the implementation of the Mitigation Measures MM-HYD-1 through MM-HYD-12 would ensure that the proposed project’s construction-related water quality impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The proposed project would continue to generate operational-related surface water runoff. The project site generally drains via a catch basin to an outlet to the San Dimas Wash to the south. A private storm drain system located within the proposed project shall connect to the existing Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel (San Dimas Wash) along the southern property line. On-site flows would be treated prior to entering San Dimas Wash (Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel). The proposed project will be requires to handle the historical run off from the park located to the north of the project site. The project proposes a 3-foot tall wall to divert debris and water to a proposed 18-inch PCC drainage swale that will run along the perimeter of the site along the east and south where it will join a channel wall. The proposed project would also comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge.

requirements set forth by the SUSMP for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County and approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). Full compliance with the SUSMP and implementation of design-related BMPs, including applicable requirements in the mitigation measures below, would ensure that the operation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

The applicant has designed the private storm drain system/retention basin deviating from the Los Angeles County standards. Therefore, the retention basin will remained a private facility that will be maintained by the future residents of the project. The applicant and future residents will bear the cost of maintaining the retention basin and all associated components related the basin. The operational water quality impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b. Substantially decrease 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?)

Less than significant impact. The City of San Dimas receives its water from the Golden State Water Company (GSWC). GSWC owns and operates the San Dimas System which serves the City of San Dimas, portions of the cities of La Verne, Walnut, and Covina, and a portion of the adjacent unincorporated area of Los Angeles County (GSWC 2015). GSWC’s water supply is provided by local groundwater from the Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin, purchased water from the Three Valleys Municipal Water District, and local surface water from the Covina Irrigating Company. Groundwater currently makes up between 18 and 31 percent of the available water supply. The Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin is adjudicated, which limits the amount of groundwater permitted to be pumped to a safe yield amount. As discussed in GSWC’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the wells to the basin have a current total active capacity of 6,533 acre-feets per year (AFY).

A majority of the project site is unpaved and covered with trees, grasses, and other vegetation. All but three trees would be removed to accommodate construction of the proposed subdivision and the new access streets. The total proportion of impervious surface area of the site would increase from seven to 90 percent. However, although development of the proposed subdivision would increase the amount of impervious surface area and would increase onsite runoff, the residential lots would be required to include installation of catch basins to catch water and drainage runoff generated from changes to impermeable surface areas within the project site. These would allow for percolation of the flows into underlying groundwater. The catch basins are anticipated to generate an average water percolation and storage rate of 269 cubic feet per storm. This recharge amount would exceed the required average of 260 cubic feet per storm for Low Impact Development standards. Further, although development of the proposed subdivision would generate an increase in population, the approximately 33 new residents would not generate water demand that exceeds local supplies. The water demand forecasts presented in GSWC’s 2015 UWMP account for cumulative population and development growth projections as provided by SCAG’s regional growth forecasts. As discussed in Population and Housing, because population growth generated by the proposed project is within SCAG’s regional population projections, water demand associated with the population growth was included in the UWMP’s water demand projections.
Therefore, development of the new subdivision would not substantially increase on-site water use beyond existing and projected supplies. Further, the 2015 UWMP states that GSWC would be able to provide reliable water supplies for an average year, single dry year, and multiple dry years for its existing and planned supplies. Therefore, the proposed project would be able to be served by available water supply and would not result in an exceedance of safe yield or a significant depletion of groundwater supplies. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation off- or off-site;
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
(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?

Less than significant impact. On-site surface flows are to the southwest into the San Dimas Wash that is adjacent to and south of the site. There is off-site drainage from north of the site that flows to the south via a small concrete “V” ditch along the west boundary of the site. The proposed developed drainage flow patterns of the project will be generally consistent with the existing drainage patterns of the property. The proposed storm water drainage system will include the construction of catch basins that will collect on- and off-site surface flows and convey the flows via an underground detention system to the San Dimas Wash adjacent to the site.

Off Site Hydrology

The project proposes a debris basin (“Basin”) at the northwest corner of the site (Lot 23) as shown in Figure 11. The Basin is designed with a capacity to hold approximately 2,500 cubic yards of debris from Horsethief Canyon Park that is adjacent to and north of the project. The Basin and the connection to the public storm drain system on Foothill Boulevard will be designed to hold 2,500 cubic yards of burn and bulk. Based on Los Angeles County Flood Control District (“LACFCD”) standards the correct size of the basin should be large enough to hold 6,040 cubic yards of burn and bulk. The applicant has submitted geologic and geotechnical report stating that the reduced size basin would be sufficient because in the opinion of their engineer Allen E. Seward the other 50% (3,020 cy) of debris flow would be deposited (drop out) as it crossed Horsethief Canyon Park prior to being intercepted by the debris basing on Lot 23. Runoff from the Basin will flow south in a 22’ wide open drainage channel and empty into San Dimas Canyon Wash south of the site. The Basin drainage channel will require full permitting through the City of San Dimas (grading, water quality etc.), LACFCD (encroachment and connection permit), and the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (connection permit).

The runoff that will be generated by the project will not change or alter the course of San Dimas Wash or any stream or river downstream of the project. All project runoff will be conveyed to existing storm drain facilities at the same quantity as presently exists. The project must provide all applicable BMPs prior to the start of project demolition and construction and maintain the BMPs throughout construction to minimize and reduce erosion and siltation.
impacts. The incorporation of all applicable BMPs as required by law, will reduce potential soil erosion and siltation to less than significant. The proposed 20-unit project will not have any significant erosion or siltation impacts either on- or off-site.

The project will cause changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface water runoff due to the amount of new building and hardscape proposed on a site. The project will generally maintain the existing drainage patterns, flow rates and amount of surface water runoff by the project. The proposed on-site storm drain system will be designed to accommodate the developed 10-year storm. The first one-inch of rainfall runoff must be collected and treated prior to its discharge to the storm drain collection system. The project proposes to construct an underground infiltration system with chambers to collect and treat the first one-inch of rainfall within Lot 21 in the southwest area of the site. For the 10-year storm, the underground infiltration chambers will flow into San Dimas Wash that currently serves the site. The proposed underground infiltration collection and treatment system will be constructed during project grading and sized to capture and retain the required surface flows. The proposed storm drain system will reduce the peak flow leaving the site to the pre-developed condition. The project will be required, by law, to retain on-site all increased quantities of water and only discharge the quantity of water that is presently generated from the site. All project runoff will be conveyed to existing storm drain facilities, which have been designed to handle the flows. All off-site larger storm water runoff that passes through the site will be discharged directly into the storm water channel adjacent to and south of the site. All on-site building pads will be designed for a 50-year storm. A grading and drainage plan must be approved by the Building Official and City Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, the project will not alter the course of any stream or river downstream of the site or have any on- or off-site flooding impacts.

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

**No impact.** A seiche is a standing wave in a completely or partially enclosed body of water. Areas located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir is susceptible to inundation by a seiche. High winds, seismic activity, or changes in atmospheric pressure are typical causes of seiches. The size of a seiche and the affected inundation area is dependent on different factors including size and depth of the water body, elevation, source, and if manmade, the structural condition of the body of water in which the seiche occurs. Tsunamis are long-wavelength, long-period sea waves generated by an abrupt movement of large volumes of water. These waves can be caused by underwater earthquakes, landslides, volcanic eruptions, meteoric impacts, or onshore slope failures. The Project is not in proximity to any large bodies of water or sea and, therefore, is unlikely to be at risk of inundation by seiches and tsunamis.

The City of San Dimas, including the project, is protected from floods by an extensive storm drain system that is designed to convey a 100-year storm event. The existing storm drain collection system includes debris dams and levees north of the City, spreading grounds, concrete-lined channels, and underground storm drains. San Dimas Wash, which is upstream and adjacent to the site, is designed to contain a 100-year storm and protect the site from flooding. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project will not be impacted by the failure of an upstream dam or levee.
e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No impact. A Low Impact Development (LID) report\(^\text{11}\) was prepared for the project as required by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Municipal National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm water Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001). An updated LID report\(^\text{12}\) was prepared for the proposed 20-unit project and attached in Appendix E. The LID/MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Plan) report addresses the Low Impact Development requirements to treat storm water pollutants from the project with infiltration, storage, reuse, and/or biofiltration. As discussed in Section 9.a above, the project will be required by law to install and maintain BMPs and other storm water collection and treatment measures to treat surface water runoff prior to its discharge to reduce surface water pollution. The combination of the implementation of the state required LID/MS4 and NPDES to minimize water pollution the potential surface water runoff water quality impacts as well as the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are required to ensure impacts related to hydrology and water quality would remain less than significant.

**MM-HYD-1** Appropriate erosion control and drainage devices shall be incorporated to the satisfaction of the Building Division, such as interceptor terraces, berms, vee-channels, and inlet and outlet structures.

**MM-HYD-2** All waste shall be disposed properly. Use appropriately labeled recycling bins to recycle construction materials including: solvents, water-based paints, vehicle fluids, broken asphalt and concrete, wood, and vegetation. Nonrecyclable materials/wastes shall be taken to an appropriate landfill. Toxic wastes must be discarded at a licensed regulated disposal site.

**MM-HYD-3** Leaks, drips and spills shall be cleaned up immediately to prevent contaminated soil on paved surfaces that can be washed away into the storm drain.

**MM-HYD-4** Where truck traffic is frequent, gravel approaches shall be used to reduce soil compaction and limit the tracking of sediment into streets.

**MM-HYD-5** All vehicle/equipment maintenance, repair, and washing shall be conducted away from storm drains. All major repairs shall be conducted off-site. Drip pans or drop cloths shall be used to catch drips and spills.

**MM-HYD-6** The project applicant shall implement stormwater BMPs to retain or treat the runoff from a storm event producing one-inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. The design of structural BMPs shall be in accordance with the Development Best Management Practices Handbook, Part B - Planning Activities. A signed certificate

\[^\text{11}\] LID/MS4 Storm water Quality Design Report, Tentative Tract No. 72368, 299 East Foothill Boulevard, City of San Dimas, County of Los Angeles, California 91773, Alan R. Short, March 25, 2014.

from a California licensed civil engineer or licensed architect that the proposed BMPs meet this numerical threshold standard is required.

MM-HYD-7 Post development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates shall not exceed the estimated pre-development rate for developments where the increase peak stormwater discharge rate will result in increased potential for downstream erosion.

MM-HYD-8 Any connection to the sanitary sewer shall have authorization from the Bureau of Sanitation.

MM-HYD-9 Materials with the potential to contaminate stormwater must be: (1) placed in an enclosure such as, but not limited to, a cabinet, shed, or similar structure that prevents contact with runoff spillage to the stormwater conveyance system; or (2) protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs.

MM-HYD-10 Storage areas shall be paved and sufficiently impervious to contain leaks and spills.

MM-HYD-11 All storm drain inlets and catch basins within, and immediately adjacent to the project site, as permitted and approved by the Department of Public Works, must be stenciled with prohibitive language (such as “NO DUMPING – DRAINS TO OCEAN”) and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Legibility of stencil and signs must be maintained at all times.

MM-HYD-12 An efficient irrigation system shall be designed to minimize runoff, including: drip irrigation for shrubs to limit excessive spray; shutoff devices to prevent irrigation after significant precipitation; and flow reducers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Responses:

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?
No impact. The project site is located in a low density residential area and is surrounded by other low density residential development. Commercial, residential and recreational uses are located within the vicinity of the project site. The development of the proposed subdivision would involve construction of two new streets that would serve the project site with 20 new homes. The proposed single-family residences would be consistent with the surrounding residential uses. Therefore, development of the proposed subdivision would not divide an established community but, rather, would contribute to and expand the residential community in the area. No impact would occur.

b) Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No impact. The City of San Dimas General Plan includes several policies that would be applicable to the proposed project. These policies are listed below in Table 9 followed by a determination of the project’s consistency with each policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Policy</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element – Goal 1: Conserve and Improve Existing Housing in San Dimas.</td>
<td>The proposed project is consistent with the policy. The proposed project will replace a single-family dwelling unit with a similar structure that respects the scale and quality of the existing neighborhood fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1: Preserve the character, scale and quality of established residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>The proposed project is consistent with this policy. The proposed project will constructed with housing set-aside funds and it will yield an affordable housing unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element Goal 3: Assist in Development and Provision of Affordable Housing.</td>
<td>The City will hold a public hearing through the entitlement process that will notify property owners and residents within a 300-foot radius to allow residents to participate in the decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2: Encourage the production of housing that meets all economic segments of the community, including lower, moderate, and upper income households, to maintain a balanced community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated above, the proposed house is consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan, thus the development of a similar residence would be consistent. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation, and no impacts would occur.
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

□ □ □ ☑

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?

□ □ ☑ □

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. The site is not designated as a State Aggregate Resources Area according to the General Plan Exhibit VI-2. There are no mining activities on the site or any adjacent properties. The project will not impact 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?**

Less than significant impact. The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) was enacted to promote conservation and protection of significant mineral deposits. According to the California Department of Conservation Mineral Land Classification Maps, the project site is located in an area with MRZ-3 designation, indicating that there is inadequate information to determine the significance of mineral deposits present in the area (DOC, Mineral Land Classification Map). According to the City’s General Plan Conservation Element, there is currently no aggregate mining, oil or gas drilling, or active wells in the City (City of San Dimas 1991c). In addition, construction of the proposed project would not include substantial excavation since the project would not include subterranean residential uses or parking. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the projects in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Responses:

a) Would the project result in generation substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the projects in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than significant impact. Sound is measured on a logarithmic scale of sound pressure level known as a decibel (dB). The decibel scale is a logarithmic scale that describes the physical intensity of the pressure vibrations that make up any sound. The pitch of the sound is related to the frequency of the pressure vibration. The human ear does not respond uniformly to sounds at all frequencies, being less sensitive to low and high frequencies than to medium frequencies that correspond with human speech. In response to this, the A-weighted noise level (or scale) has been developed. It corresponds better with people’s subjective judgment of sound levels. This A-weighted sound level is called the “noise level” referenced in units of dB(A). Because noise is measured on a logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy results in a 3 dB(A) increase in noise levels. However, changes in a community noise level of less than 3 dB(A) are not typically noticed by the human ear. Changes from 3 to 5 dB(A) may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A 5.0 dB(A) increase is readily noticeable, while the human ear perceives a 10 dB(A) increase in sound level to be a doubling of sound.

Noise, on the other hand, is typically defined as unwanted sound. A typical noise environment consists of a base of steady ambient noise that is the sum of many distant and indistinguishable noise sources. Superimposed on this background noise is the sound from individual local sources. These can vary from an occasional aircraft or train passing by to virtually continuous noise from, for example, traffic on a major highway.

Noise sources occur in two forms: (1) point sources, such as stationary equipment or individual motor vehicles; and (2) line sources, such as a roadway with a large number of point
Sound generated by a point source typically diminishes (attenuates) at a rate of 6.0 dB(A) for each doubling of distance from the source to the receptor at acoustically “hard” sites and 7.5 dB at acoustically “soft” sites. For example, a 60.0 dB(A) noise level measured at 50 feet from a point source at an acoustically hard site would be 54.0 dB(A) at 100 feet from the source and 48 dB(A) at 200 feet from the source. Sound generated by a line source typically attenuates (i.e., becomes less) at a rate of 3.0 dB(A) and 4.5 dB(A) per doubling of distance from the source to the receptor for hard and soft sites, respectively. Examples of hard sites include asphalt, concrete, and hard and sparsely vegetated soils. Examples of acoustically soft sites include sand, plowed farmland, grass, crops, and heavy ground cover.

Sound levels can also be attenuated by man-made or natural barriers (e.g., sound walls, berms, ridges), as well as elevation differences. Solid walls and berms may reduce noise levels by 5.0 to 10.0 dB(A) depending on their height and their horizontal distance relative to the noise source and the noise receptor. A higher noise barrier lengthens the path of a sound wave from the source to the receptor. The longer the distance a sound wave needs to travel to reach the receptor, the greater the sound attenuation. Sound levels may also be attenuated 3.0 to 5.0 dB(A) by a first row of houses and 1.5 dB(A) for each additional row of houses in residential environments.

The most frequently used noise descriptors are summarized below:

Leq: The equivalent sound level is used to describe noise over a specified period of time, typically 1 hour, in terms of a single numerical value. The Leq is the constant sound level, which would contain the same acoustic energy as the varying sound level, during the same period (i.e., the average noise exposure level for the given period).

Lmax: The instantaneous maximum noise level for a specified period of time.

L50: The noise level that is equaled or exceeded 50 percent of the specified time. This is the median noise level during the specified time.

L90: The noise level that is equaled or exceeded 90 percent of the specified time. The L90 is often considered the background noise level averaged over the specified time.

DNL: The Day/Night Average Sound Level is the 24-hour day and night A-weighted noise exposure level, which accounts for the greater sensitivity of most people to nighttime noise by weighting noise levels at night. Noise between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM is weighted (penalized) by adding 10 dB(A) to take into account the greater annoyance from nighttime noise (also referred to as Ldn).

CNEL: Similar to the DNL, the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) adds a 5-dB(A) “penalty” for the evening hours between 7:00 PM and 10:00 PM in addition to a 10-dB(A) penalty between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM.

The DNL and CNEL values differ by much less than 1 dB(A). In general, changes in a community noise level of less than 3.0 dB(A) are not typically noticed by the human ear. Changes from 3.0 to 5.0 dB(A) may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A greater than 5.0 dB(A) increase is readily noticeable, while the human ear perceives a 10.0 dB(A) change in sound level to be a doubling or halving sound. A 1 dB difference in noise
level is not noticed by the human ear. Therefore, as a matter of practice, Ldn and CNEL values are considered to be equivalent and are treated as such in this assessment.

Existing noise sources in the project site include traffic, trains, aircraft, landscaping equipment, animal vocalizations, and wind. While the noise from trains, landscaping equipment, and aircraft is periodic, the notice from traffic is relatively constant. The replacement of the single family residential unit is not anticipated to exceed the 50 community noise equivalent level.

Construction noise is regulated within the City by the Noise Ordinance Section 8.36.100 that states “it is unlawful for any person to within a residential zone, or within a radius of five hundred feet therefrom, to operate equipment or perform any outside construction or repair work on any building, structure or project, or to operate any pile driver, steam shovel, pneumatic hammer, steam or electric hoist or other construction-type equipment or device between the hours of 8:00 pm of one day and 7:00 am of the next day, at any time on Sunday, or at any time on any public holiday in such a manner that a reasonable person of normal sensitivity residing in the area is caused discomfort or annoyance.”

Construction noise would be generated by diesel engine-driven construction equipment used for demolition, site preparation, and building construction. Also, diesel engine-driven trucks would bring materials and debris to and from the site.

Construction equipment move to different locations and goes through varying load cycles and there are breaks for the operators and non-equipment tasks. Thus, equipment is not continuously generating noise. Construction of a one-story structure may require an excavator, bobcat, and backhoe. Construction equipment noise levels are summarized in Table 10. Although, maximum noise may be 81 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet during demolition and excavation, this noise level would not be continuous. Average hourly noise levels would be lower when taking into account equipment usage factors and breaks for non-equipment tasks. Maximum average hourly noise levels due to heavy equipment would range from 73 to 77 dB(A) $L_{eq}$. Although the existing adjacent residences would be exposed to construction noise levels that may be heard above ambient conditions, the exposure would be temporary. The closest sensitive receptors are located to the west of the project, more than 50 feet away. All construction would occur daytime hours consistent with the Noise Ordinance. Thus, impacts associated with construction noise would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Construction Equipment Noise Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maximum Noise Level at 50 Feet [dB(A) $L_{eq}$]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Federal Highway Administration 2006*
b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**Less than significant impact.** Ground vibrations in an outdoor environment are generally not perceptible (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] 2006). Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. The rumbling sound caused by the vibration of room surfaces is called groundborne noise. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second, and in the US is referenced as vibration decibels (VdB).

The background vibration velocity level in residential and educational areas is usually around 50 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximately dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors causes most perceptible indoor vibration. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, and 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

Construction of the project would involve standard construction activities that do not require the use of equipment that creates significant groundborne vibration or groundborne noise, and no uses occur in the area that produce vibration or groundborne noise. Standard construction equipment such as backhoe would be used. Construction activities would include demolition, site preparation work, and building construction. None of these activities are anticipated to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; therefore, vibration would be less than significant. None of these noise sources are anticipated to exceed the noise sources are anticipated to exceed the City’s ordinance limits or result in an increase over existing noise levels. Thus, there would be no substantial increase in impact in increase in ambient noise level, and impacts would be less than significant.

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 proposed project is located over 2 miles northwest of the Brackett Field Airport. The project site is located within the bracket Field Airport Influence Area, but is not within the airport’s noise contours. The proposed project would not expose people in the project site to excessive noise levels associated with airports. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to airport noise.
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would 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 road or other infrastructure)?

Less than significant impact. According to the California DOF estimates, the City of San Dimas has a population of 34,507 with an average household size of 2.78 (DOF 2018). SCAG estimates a population increase to 34,000 by 2020 (SCAG 2016). Therefore, the City is already in exceedance of the forecasted 2020 population by approximately 507 persons. The proposed project involves construction of a 20-lot residential subdivision in an existing residential area. Based on the average household size of 2.78 in the City of San Dimas, the proposed project would accommodate approximately 56 persons. Therefore, the proposed project would increase the City’s population to 34,328, which would exceed the forecasted 2020 population by approximately 328 persons. However, an increase of 56 persons would constitute less than a 0.1 percent increase from the City’s existing population of 34,328. The increase in population generated by the proposed project would consist of less than 0.05 percent of countywide population increase from 2017 to 2020. SCAG estimates a housing increase to 12,400 by 2040 (SCAG 2016). As such, the existing housing units in the City are also in exceedance of SCAG forecasts. However, SCAG estimates a regional housing increase to 3,493,700 households by 2020. Although the City’s current housing estimate exceeds SCAG’s forecast for the City, it does not exceed SCAG’s regional housing forecast. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth when compared to the City’s existing population and housing units.

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

Responses:

- 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 road or other infrastructure)?

Less than significant impact. The project site is not identified in the City’s Housing Element as an opportunity site. The project site contains two mobile homes that are vacant/abandoned and beyond repair. While the demolition of these structures would result in a loss of two housing units, the new development would replace the units lost and increase the number of residential housing units in the City; therefore, resulting in no net loss. Additionally, a Zone Change to S-F 7,500 would allow for the development of additional housing units at a higher density than currently allowed.
The proposed project would also include development of two new streets to serve the project. The access street would not be part of the City’s general circulation system, and would only serve to provide access to the proposed single-family residences. The project would not cause a substantial increase in population or induce population growth. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**Less than significant.** The proposed project involves demolition of two mobile homes. However, the existing two mobile homes are currently vacant. Therefore, the construction of the proposed 20-lot subdivision would not displace people or occupied housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project will increase the number of housing units available in the City. Therefore, the project would not displace people or existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and impacts would be less than significant.

### Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would 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?  
ii. Police protection?  
iii. Schools?  
iv. Parks?  
v. Other public facilities?

**Responses:**

a. i-v) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new physically altered governmental facilities, need for 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.** The Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) provides full fire protection services, including air and wildland fire support, emergency medical, and fire prevention for the City of San Dimas. The LACoFD has two facilities in the City, consisting of Fire Station #64 and Fire Station #141 (San Dimas 2018a). As the nearest station to the project site, the site would be served by Fire Station #64 located at 164 South Walnut Avenue approximately one mile south of the site. Other stations would respond to emergencies at the project site as needed.

The proposed project would involve the construction of a 20-lot residential subdivision and rezone of the lot located at 216 North Walnut Avenue could facilitate future development of an additional two to three single-family residences. Therefore, 20, residences would be generated by the project. As discussed in Section XIV, *Population and Housing*, the proposed project would generate an increase of approximately 56 persons. Therefore, the project would incrementally increase the service population for Fire Station #64 or any responding station. However, the LACoFD would review the proposed site plan and building plans prior to construction to ensure that required fire protection safety features, including building sprinklers and emergency access, comply with LACoFD requirements. Because the proposed project is in the LACoFD’s existing service area and would not require new or expanded fire protection facilities, impacts related to fire protection services and facilities would be less than significant.

ii. **Police protection?**

**Less than significant impact.** Law enforcement services are provided to the City by contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD). The LASD maintains the San Dimas Station located at 270 South Walnut Avenue, approximately one mile south of the project site.

The proposed project would involve construction of a 20-lot residential subdivision. Therefore, the project would accommodate approximately 56 persons (see Section XIV, *Population and Housing*). Although the proposed project would not cause a substantial growth in the City’s population, the project would incrementally increase demand for police protection services. However, the project site is within the service area of the San Dimas Station and would neither substantially affect the Station’s existing service ratio nor create the need for new or expanded police protection facilities. Impacts related to police protection services and facilities would be less than significant.

iii. **Schools?**

**Less than significant impact.** The Bonita Unified School District (BUSD) provides education services to students living in the City of San Dimas. The BUSD currently maintains eight elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools, and one educational center. The proposed project would increase the City’s population by approximately 56 persons (see Section XIV, *Population and Housing*), including potential school age children. However, students generated by the proposed project would represent an incremental increase in the students served by BUSD.
In accordance with State law, the applicant would be required to pay school impact fees. Pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees “...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization.” Payment of the development fees would mitigate any potential impacts, and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Parks?

Less than significant impact. Refer to Section XVI, Recreation, for discussion of the proposed project’s impacts to recreational facilities and parks. The City currently owns and operates 14 recreational facilities, which include 12 parks, a Swim and Racquet Club, and the Sportsplex (San Dimas 1991a). The parks nearest to the project site are Horsethief Canyon Park and Los Angeles County - San Dimas Canyon Park located adjacent north property line of the site. Horsethief Canyon Park and Los Angeles County - San Dimas Canyon Park include shade shelters, restrooms, picnic tables, benches, play equipment, soccer fields, barbecues, open sports areas and a dog park. Although the proposed project would construct a 20-lot residential subdivision, the project would only increase the service population by approximately 56 persons (see Section XIV, Population and Housing). As the nearest parks to the project site, Horsethief Canyon Park and Los Angeles County - San Dimas Canyon Park would serve the project’s recreational needs. However, each proposed residential lot would also include rear gardens for passive on-site recreational uses, which would slightly offset the need to use parks in the project vicinity. Because the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the City’s population, the project would not cause the need for new or physically altered parks. Impacts would be less than significant.

vi. Other public facilities?

Less than significant impact. Development of the proposed project would result in incremental increase in the demand of and usage to the City’s public facilities and infrastructure, such as those related to storm drain usage, solid-waste disposal, water usage, and wastewater disposal. Refer to the impact analysis in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems, for discussion of the proposed project’s impacts to public facilities and infrastructure. Other commonly used public facilities in the City include libraries and medical facilities. The nearest library to the project site is the San Dimas Library, located approximately 1.18 miles south of the site. In addition, the nearest medical facilities to the project site include the Kaiser Permanente San Dimas Medical Offices building located approximately 2.0 miles west of the site, and San Dimas Community Hospital located approximately two miles southwest of the site. As discussed in Section XIX, Population and Housing, the proposed project would increase the City’s population by approximately 56 persons. However, the project site is located in a developed suburban area in the City, which is currently serviced by existing public libraries and medical facilities. Although the proposed project would increase the demand of and usage to the City’s existing library and medical facilities, the project would not create the direct need for construction of new facilities. Existing facilities would continue to accommodate the needs of the City and others in Los Angeles County. Because the proposed project would not substantially increase the City’s population or cause the need for new or expanded library or medical facilities, impacts would be less than significant.
XVI. RECREATION. Would 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?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Responses:

a-b) No impact. Refer to Section XV - Public Services, above. Demolition of the existing improvements within the project site include several buildings, two mobile homes, stables, corrals, and other related equestrian improvements and construction of 20-single family, two-story houses would ensure that there would be no net loss in housing in San Dimas. Consequently, the project would not result in a significant population growth that would significant 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 impacts to recreation facilities would occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:

a) Conflict with 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)?
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  
Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Responses:
A traffic analysis was prepared for the 48-unit project and included in Appendix D. An updated traffic memorandum was prepared for the proposed 20-unit project and is also included in Appendix D as the project was revised to less units.

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

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The project is forecast to generate approximately 15 AM peak hour trips, 2 PM peak hour trips and 190 daily trips as shown in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM In</td>
<td>AM Out</td>
<td>AM Total</td>
<td>PM In</td>
<td>PM Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>20 DU</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Generation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Project Trip Generation

1 Rates based on Land Use 210 - “Single Family Detached Housing” from ITE Trip Generation (9th Ed).

All study area intersections currently operate at Level of Service D (LOS) or better during the AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the Walnut Avenue/Foothill Boulevard and San Dimas Canyon Road/Foothill Boulevard intersections during the P.M. peak hour as shown in Table 11. While the net traffic generated by the project will not have significant traffic impacts to any study area intersections, the intersections of Walnut Avenue/Foothill Boulevard and San Dimas Canyon Road/Foothill Boulevard would continue to operate at Level of Service F at the P.M. peak hour as shown in Table 11.
Table 12
Existing With Project Alternative Intersection Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V/C Delay LOS</td>
<td>V/C Delay LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. San Dimas Avenue/Foothill Boulevard</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.58 A 0.84 D</td>
<td>0.58 A 0.87 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Walnut Avenue/Foothill Boulevard</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>14.3 B 76.1 F*</td>
<td>27.0 D 72.9 F*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sycamore Canyon Road/Horsethief Canyon Road</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>8.4 A 8.6 A</td>
<td>8.4 A 8.6 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Dimas Canyon Road/Foothill Boulevard</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.66 B 0.93 E*</td>
<td>0.66 B 0.93 E*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- LOS = Level of Service
- TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control; For TWSC intersections, reported delay is for worst-case approach.
- The City of San Dimas uses LOS D as the minimum level of service objective for intersections.
- A significant project impact occurs when the project increases demand at a signalized intersection by a volumes to capacity ratio by .04 or more for LOS C, .02 or more for LOS D and .01 for LOS E/F
- Due to the existing P.M. peak hour LOS F during the P.M. peak at the Walnut Avenue/Foothill Boulevard intersection, traffic signal warrants were conducted. Based on the traffic signal warrants, a traffic signal is not warranted at the Walnut Avenue/Foothill Boulevard intersection (project entrance). The traffic study concludes the vacant equestrian center on the site generated approximately 21 peak hour trips when it was operational, similar to the 20 P.M. peak hour trips estimated to be generated by the project. The project itself does not warrant the need for a traffic signal.

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

**No impact.** According to the Congestion Management Plan (CMP)\(^\text{13}\), projects that meet the following criteria, shall be evaluated for CMP impacts:

\(^\text{13}\) Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, July 2010.
• All CMP arterial monitoring intersections, including monitored freeway on or off-ramp intersections, where the proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours (of adjacent street traffic).

• Mainline freeway monitoring locations where the project will add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours.

No CMP monitored intersections are forecast to receive 50 or more project-generated trips during either the AM peak hour or the PM peak hour. The project is forecast to generate approximately 15 AM peak hour trips and 20 PM peak hour trips. As a result, no CMP mainline freeway monitoring location is forecast to receive 150 or more project-generated trips during either the AM peak hour or the PM peak hour. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact a CMP roadway or intersection.

The City has a Transportation Development fee that must be paid by the project developer prior to the issuance of building permits. Transportation Demand fees are used by the city to fund necessary roadway improvements to support adequate traffic circulation. The project developer will be required to pay the required TDM fee as required.

c) **Would the project result in substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No impact.** The project will be required to provide site access, including driveways, and other street improvements, such as curb, gutter and sidewalk at the project entrance with Foothill Boulevard and meet City design requirements. The project street and site access design does not include any sharp curves or dangerous intersections that would significantly impact site access. The project will not have any significant hazards due to a design feature.

d) **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**No impact.** The project will be required to provide suitable access to the site for all emergency vehicles. The City engineer will review and approve all street plans for compliance with city driveway and street standards prior to the issuance of building permits. Therefore, the project will not have any significant emergency site access impacts.
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

a) Would the project cause an substantial adverse change in the significant of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is: in Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

   i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

   ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

As of July 1, 2015, California Assembly Bill 52 of 2014 (AB 52) was enacted and expands CEQA by defining a new resource category, “tribal cultural resources.” Assembly Bill 52 establishes that “A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3). PRC Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural
landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and meets either of the following criteria:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

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 Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. AB 52 requires that lead agencies “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

Responses

a) Would the project cause an substantial adverse change in the significant of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is: in Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

a i-ii) Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. In response to the implementation of AB 52, the City has solicited Native American tribes to determine interest in being included in the formal consultation process for new projects in the City of San Dimas. The City has notified those tribes that have requested to be notified. At this time, the City is still waiting for responses from the noticed tribes; however, since the property has been developed with an existing single family home and detached garage since Circa 1908, it is unlikely that tribal cultural resources will be identified on the project site. See also response in Section V above. Thus, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, the project site is currently developed with two mobile homes. The remainder of the site is vacant and undeveloped and covered with trees, grasses, and some agricultural vegetation. Given the existing level of disturbance on-site, a systematic survey was not conducted for the proposed project. Based on the current
conditions and level of existing disturbances, the likelihood that intact tribal cultural resources are present is low during ground disturbing activities for the proposed project. The City of San Dimas opened consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation under AB 52. During the consultation effort, the Kizh Nation requested the monitors be present during ground disturbing activities. Regardless, the potential for the recovery of buried cultural materials during development activities remains possible. However, compliance with Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3 in Section 5, Cultural Resources, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level by providing a process for evaluating and, as necessary, avoiding impacts to any identified resources. In addition, Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would require the presence of a Native American monitor during all demolition and grading activities associated with development of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure and compliance with Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3, would be required to ensure impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

TCR-1 Cultural Resources Monitoring. A Native American consultant must monitor project implementation during the initial grading and excavation activities until such time as sufficient subsurface soil has been uncovered/excavated to ascertain that no prehistoric archaeological/cultural resources are located on the project site. The monitor(s) must have the following authority:

- The monitor(s) must be on-site during earthmoving activities, including preparation of the area for capping, grading, trenching, vegetation removal, or other excavation activities. The monitors will continue their duties until it is determined through consultation with the permittee, City Planning and Environmental Review staff, archaeological consultant, that monitoring is no longer warranted;
- The monitor(s) may halt any activities impacting previously unidentified cultural resources and conduct an initial assessment of the resource(s);
- If an artifact is identified as an isolated find, the monitor(s) must recover the artifact(s) with the appropriate locational data and include the item in the overall inventory for the site;
- If a feature or concentration of artifacts is identified, the monitor must halt activities in the vicinity of the find, notify the permittee and City Planning and Environmental Review staff and prepare a proposal for the assessment and treatment of the find(s). This treatment may range from additional study to avoidance, depending on the nature of the find(s);
- The monitor must prepare a comprehensive archaeological technical report documenting the results of the monitoring program and include an inventory of recovered artifacts, features, etc.;
- The monitor must prepare the artifact assemblage for curation with an appropriate curation facility and include an inventory with the transfer of the collection.
### XIV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **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 or expansion of existing facilities or the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?  
  - Less than significant impact. The wastewater that will be generated by the project will not cause the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant in the City of Industry that serves the project to exceed any applicable Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board wastewater requirements. The project will not have any wastewater treatment requirement impacts.

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

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

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

- **e)** Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  
  - Less than significant impact.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less than significant impact. The project is served by the Golden State Water Company water system. Golden State Water Company currently has a sufficient water supply available for the City of San Dimas to serve this project. The project will not have any significant water supply impacts.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Less than significant impact. The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts has adequate capacity to treat the wastewater generated by the project at its San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant in the City of Industry and has capacity to treat the wastewater generated by the cumulative projects. The project, along with the cumulative projects, will not have any significant treatment capacity impacts to the treatment plant. The project will not have any significant wastewater treatment plant capacity impacts.

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. Solid waste collection and disposal is currently provided in San Dimas by Waste Management. Solid waste is collected and sorted for recyclables and the solid waste that is not recycled is hauled to a permitted landfill. The solid waste generated by the project is not anticipated to significantly impact the life expectancy of the landfill that serves the city. While the solid waste generated by the project and the cumulative projects will incrementally reduce the life expectancy of the landfill, they will not significantly impact its life capacity.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less than significant impact. This project will be required to comply with and meet all applicable with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste collection and disposal. The City of San Dimas continues to implement waste reduction procedures consistent with AB 939. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact related to solid waste regulation impacts.
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? [ ] [ ] [X] [ ]

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? [ ] [ ] [X] [ ]

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? [ ] [ ] [X] [ ]

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? [ ] [ ] [X] [ ]

Responses

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

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?

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?

a-c. Less than significant. San Dimas faces the greatest ongoing threat from a wind-driven fire in the Wildland/Urban Interface area found in the hillsides and canyons in the northern part of the City according to the 2004 Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. The project is located in a very high fire hazard area according to maps provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Because the project is located in a very high fire hazard area, the project could be impacted by a wild land fire. The project will be required to meet and provide all fire safety and protection
required by the San Dimas Building Code for development in a very high fire hazard area, Zone 4 and identified as a State Responsibility Area High by CalFire.

The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides Fire Protection services to the City of San Dimas. The proposed subdivision and proposed development will be reviewed for compliance with the California Building Code Chapter 7A – Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure and Chapter 49 of the California Fire Code – Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas. Adherence to the California Building Code and Fire Code would reduce impact to less than significant impact.

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

**Less than significant impact.** As discussed in Section X, the project site is not in dam inundation area. The project proposes a retention basin to handle water runoff from the slopes/open space to the north of the project. These slopes contained different type of grasses but it does not contain a significant number of trees. The lack of trees and overgrown vegetation provides less risk for fires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential substantially 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, 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 the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  

Less than significant impact. The project site is not located in a conservation overlay area of sensitive biological resources as identified on the City of San Dimas General Plan Exhibit II-4.1. Additionally, the area surrounding the site is developed. Based on previous development and street improvements, it is unlikely that any endangered or rare animal species would inhabit the site. Some significant trees on the property will have to be removed to allow development as proposed. A tree removal permit from the City will be required to remove the significant trees on the site. None of the significant trees to be removed are considered to be rare or endangered. The removal of the significant trees will have an insignificant impact. The project area is known to have cultural resources, which could be present on the site and uncovered during grading and construction. Measures are provided to reduce potential cultural resource impacts if discovered during construction. The incorporation of the recommended cultural resource mitigation measures will reduce cultural resource impacts to less than significant.

Responses:

a) Does the project have the potential substantially 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, 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. The project site is not located in a conservation overlay area of sensitive biological resources as identified on the City of San Dimas General Plan Exhibit II-4.1. Additionally, the area surrounding the site is developed. Based on previous development and street improvements, it is unlikely that any endangered or rare animal species would inhabit the site. Some significant trees on the property will have to be removed to allow development as proposed. A tree removal permit from the City will be required to remove the significant trees on the site. None of the significant trees to be removed are considered to be rare or endangered. The removal of the significant trees will have an insignificant impact. The project area is known to have cultural resources, which could be present on the site and uncovered during grading and construction. Measures are provided to reduce potential cultural resource impacts if discovered during construction. The incorporation of the recommended cultural resource mitigation measures will reduce cultural resource impacts to less than significant.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

Less than significant impact. The project will have cumulative impacts, including increased noise, consumption of and increased demand for public services and utilities, etc. However, none of the cumulative impacts will be cumulatively considerable. In the case of short-term construction noise impacts, measures are recommended to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project will not have any significant cumulative impacts.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less than significant impact. As described in the discussion of environmental checklist Sections I through XX, the project would have no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated, with respect to all environmental issues. These include short-term, long-term, and where appropriate, cumulative impacts. Cumulative
impacts of the following resource areas have been addressed in the individual resource sections above: Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Noise, and Transportation (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15064[h][3]). CalEEMod was utilized to assess the air quality and greenhouse gas impacts resulting from the proposed project, concluding that the impacts associated with air quality and GHG emissions would be less than significant. In addition, both noise and traffic analyses conducted as part of this Initial Study also concluded that cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Certain resource areas (e.g., agricultural and mineral) were determined to have no impact in comparison to existing conditions. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to these issues. Other issues (e.g., geology and hazards and hazardous materials) are by their nature project-specific and impacts at one location do not add to impacts at other locations or create additive impacts. As discussed, all other issue areas analyzed for the proposed project were determined to have no impacts or less than significant impacts after mitigation, and would not contribute to potential impacts from other projects in the City. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) after implementation of mitigation outlined in impact a., of this section.

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

**Less than significant impact.** In general, impacts to human beings are associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise impacts. As detailed in analyses for air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise, the proposed project would not result, either directly or indirectly, in adverse hazards related to air quality, hazardous materials or noise. Compliance with applicable rules, regulations, and recommended mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts on human beings to a less than significant level.