

Initial Study for the Santa Fe Springs Townlots Housing Project

Introduction: This Initial Study has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA *Guidelines*.

Project Title: Santa Fe Springs Townlots Housing Project

Project Location: South of Telegraph Road, north of Clark Street,
east of Norwalk Boulevard, and west of Bloomfield
Avenue in the City of Santa Fe Springs

APNs: 8009-001-005,006,007,008,009,010, 011, 012, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021,
022, 023, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 900, 032, 901, 902, 903, 033, 034, 035,
036, 037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042, 043

8009-002-008, 009, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 901, 015, 016, 017,
018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 900, 023, 024, 025, 026, 902, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 033,
034, 035, 036

8009-004-904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 036, 037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042, 903,
902, 901, 900, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022,
023, 024, 025

8009-005-002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 900, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017,
018, 019, 020, 021, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029, 901, 030, 902, 903, 031, 904, 905, 906,
907, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036, 037, 038, 039

8009-012-002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017,
018, 019, 020, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 900, 901, 035, 036,
037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042, 043, 044, 045

General Plan Designation: Industrial

Zoning: M-2, Heavy Manufacturing

Lead Agency: City of Santa Fe Springs
11710 East Telegraph Road
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
Phone: (562) 868-0511

Project Applicants: City of Santa Fe Springs
11710 East Telegraph Road
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
Phone: (562) 868-0511

Comstock Homes
321 12th Street
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Phone: (310) 546-5781

TOWNLOT FEE LLC
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4800
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Phone: (213) 225-5900

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in the Southern California region within the City of Santa Fe Springs (see Figure 1). Regional access is provided by Interstate 5 (I-5), which is located approximately two miles south of the site, and Interstate 605 (I-605), which is located approximately one mile west of the site.

The approximately 54.5-acre project site is bordered by Telegraph Road and Banco Popular to the north, Clark Street to the south, Norwalk Boulevard and Banco Popular to the west, and Bloomfield Avenue to the east. Several unimproved dirt and gravel roads traverse the project site, including Park Avenue and Gardner Avenue, both of which run east/west; and Willis Street, Springdale Avenue, and Forest Street, all of which run north/south. Internal access to the project site is provided by these unimproved roads. Existing development on the project site includes the Lincoln School of Trucking and associated vehicle storage yards in the western portion of the site and two buildings currently being used for storage in the southwest corner of the site. The Community Development Commission of the City, Townlot Fee LLC, and approximately 10 others currently own the properties composing the project site.

The remaining majority of the project site is currently being used for oil and gas production but the remainder of the site is largely undeveloped. The site has also been previously disturbed by prior oil production activities. Other remnants of past industrial activity are present on the site, including an assortment of equipment pieces surrounded by chain-link fences, stockpiles of rocks and cement fragments, and pipe structures. Vegetation typical of disturbed urban areas is present throughout the project site, such as ornamental trees and annual, non-native grasses. Topographically, the project site is generally flat and mainly consists of permeable surface area, excluding the paved parking lots associated with the onsite structures mentioned above. The project site is predominantly surrounded by commercial/industrial land uses, particularly “business parks.”

Project Description:

The proposed project includes demolition and removal of all existing structures from the project site (with the exception of some of the oil wells and related equipment) and subdivision of the site into approximately 10 different individual residential communities and development of up to 650 residential units (refer to Figure 2). Approximately 4 of the 10 cluster communities would be developed on approximately 22.1 acres of the project site, with densities ranging from 5 to 13 dwelling units (du) per acre. These four communities would accommodate a total of up to 200 detached single-family homes (detached homes), varying in size from 1,450 to 2,900 square feet (sf). The remaining six communities would be developed on approximately 21.8 acres of the project site and would have densities ranging from 12 to 28 du per acre. These six communities would accommodate up to 450 attached single-family townhomes (attached homes), varying in size from 1,230 to 1,680 sf. All residential units would be for-sale market rate housing.

The detached homes would consist of a mixture of two- and three-story houses, extending in height from 28 feet (two-story house) to 35 feet (three-story house). The attached homes would reach 38 to 40 feet in height. All homes would be wood-framed with stucco exterior walls and would incorporate an earth-tone palette. Each detached home would have a different architectural style (i.e., Santa Barbara, Craftsman, etc.) and floor plan (i.e., two or three story, three or four bedroom). The attached homes would have a more “urban flair” than would the detached homes. All homes would be installed with low-flow toilets, sprinkler system for fire protection, and would be wired for security systems. Security Patrol would be included in the future Homeowner’s Association (HOA) budget.

Slip Page for Figure 1

Slip Page for Figure 2

The site plan includes three access points: one each on Telegraph Road, Norwalk Boulevard, and Bloomfield Avenue. Clark Street would provide emergency vehicle access only. Traffic signals would be installed at the project's access points on Telegraph Road and Norwalk Boulevard. The interior streets would be private and maintained by the future HOA. Sidewalks would be provided along the proposed interior streets. Each of the homes would have an attached two-car garage. Street parking would also be allowed. Additional off-street parking would be provided for visitors. The project would be gated for vehicular entry but open to pedestrian traffic.

The proposed site plan includes approximately 1.6 acres of park areas throughout the site. Additionally, the individual residential communities would also have their own private recreational sites. Recreational amenities that could be provided at that site include: a swimming pool, tennis courts, basketball courts, fitness center, changing rooms, and barbeque areas. Other passive park areas would be incorporated into areas between the homes and would include pathways, benches, and water features.

The front and side yards of the detached homes and areas around the attached homes would be landscaped with a combination of grass, low-lying shrubs, and trees. Wooden fences would separate each of the detached homes, and wrought iron fencing would be incorporated into the landscaping around the attached homes. The entire perimeter of the project site along Clark Street would include a 10- to 15-foot setback and an 8- to 10-foot high solid masonry wall with gated entrances. The setback area would be landscaped with large trees and vegetation to act as a visual buffer between the project site and surrounding industrial land uses. The wall would be planted with a vine-type plant that would eventually cover the entire wall (with the exception of entry areas). Along Telegraph Boulevard, the existing 15-foot, landscaped setback area would be extended another 10 to 15 feet. A 6-foot high, vegetated, masonry wall would be constructed between the setback area and the homes. The wall would include breaks or openings to allow pedestrian access to Telegraph Boulevard.

The project includes the retention of approximately 25 producing oil and water injection wells and related utilities and pipelines. Prior to any land development, extensive oilfield work including well abandonment, well re-abandonment, pipe removal and relocation would be performed. The entire site would be environmentally remediated to address contamination left by multiple historical usage of the site.

The proposed project would require an amendment to the *General Plan* from the site's existing land use designation, "Industrial," to "Single-Family Residential" and "Multiple-Family Residential." Also, the project would require a zone change from "M-2, Heavy Manufacturing" to "R-1-PD, Single-Family Residential-Planned Development" and "R-3-PD, Multiple-Family Residential-Planned Development."

Responsible/Trustee Agencies: *(Discuss other permits, financing or participation required):*

The City of Santa Fe Springs is the lead agency for the proposed project. Responsible agencies may include, but not be limited to:

- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources
- Certified Unified Program Agency

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

✓	1. Aesthetics	✓	7. Hazards & Hazardous Materials	✓	13. Public Services
	2. Agricultural Resources	✓	8. Hydrology & Water Quality	✓	14. Recreation
✓	3. Air Quality	✓	9. Land Use & Planning	✓	15. Transportation/Traffic
	4. Biological Resources		10. Mineral Resources	✓	16. Utilities & Service Systems
✓	5. Cultural Resources	✓	11. Noise		
✓	6. Geology & Soils	✓	12. Population & Housing		

Determination

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

Reviewed by: Paul Ashworth

Paul Ashworth
Assistant to the Director of Planning and Development

Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based in 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 may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration pursuant to Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

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

Environmental Analysis

1. **Aesthetics.** Would the project:

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?
- c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
		✓	

Discussion:

- a) *No Impact.* The project site is located in an area dominated by industrial-type land uses. No scenic vistas occur in the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within the viewing corridor of a city-designated scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- c) *No Impact.* The project site and surrounding area are characterized predominantly by industrial uses and vacant land, with some incidental commercial uses. The project site is largely vacant, with a few vacant buildings and several oil wells and water injection wells. Remnants of past industrial activity are strewn throughout the project site, including an assortment of equipment pieces surrounded by chain-link fences, stockpiles of rocks and cement fragments, and pipe structures. Vegetation typical of disturbed urban areas is present throughout the project site, such as ornamental trees and annual, non-native grasses. Overall, views of the project site are considered to be vacant, undeveloped, somewhat blighted and generally unpleasant. Implementation of the proposed project would likely improve the visual character of the site and surrounding area. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would introduce sources of light and glare, including interior and exterior building lighting and vehicle headlights, reflective surfaces, such as windows and light-colored paint. These new sources of light and glare would be noticeable from the surrounding area. The proposed residences would be wood-framed structures, with stucco on the outside walls. All of the proposed structures would be painted with earth tones. The proposed residences would not include highly reflective windows or sources of light; rather, all new light fixtures on the project site would be similar to those of a typical residential development. Overall, the light and glare that would be

introduced by the proposed project is anticipated to be less noticeable than that which currently emanates from the adjacent business parks, which include reflective windows and light-colored concrete buildings. Therefore, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No further analysis of this issue is required.

2. **Agricultural 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, 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. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) *No Impact.* The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designates the site as Urban and Built Up Land. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.¹
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is zoned M-2, Heavy Manufacturing. Additionally, the project site is located in the County of Los Angeles, which currently does not participate in the Williamson Act. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act Contract. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.
- c) *No Impact.* No agricultural land uses are located in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.

¹ California Division of Land Resource Protection, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Overview*, website: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/overview/survey_area_map.htm, November 23, 2004.

3. **Air Quality.** The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project::

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			
c.	✓			
d.	✓			
e.	✓			

Discussion:

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The air quality goals and policies identified in the AQMP are based on land use projections from local general plans and population growth projections; thus, projects that are consistent with local general plans are considered consistent with the AQMP. The proposed project is not consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation (i.e., Industrial). Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to result in significant impacts related to conflicting with or obstructing implementation of the AQMP.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Short-term construction emissions and traffic from long-term operation of the proposed project could result in the generation of criteria pollutant emissions that exceed thresholds established by SCAQMD. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to result in significant impacts related to violation of air quality standards or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The South Coast Air Basin is currently in non-attainment for ozone (O₃) and particulate matter 10 (PM₁₀). The emissions associated with long-term operation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulative air quality impacts related to these criteria pollutants. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.
- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site or along roadways that would be used by project traffic could be exposed to criteria pollutant emissions generated by the proposed project that are in excess of SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the

proposed project to result in significant impacts related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* During operation of the proposed project, oil drilling activities would continue to occur on the project site. Occasionally, oil wells release bubbles of sulphur into the air. Future residence in proximity to one of these bubbles could find the odor offensive. As such, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

4. **Biological Resources.** Would the project::

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations 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 the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) *No Impact.* The project site is entirely disturbed and has undergone substantial alteration over time. The vegetation communities observed are best described as ruderal/disturbed. Invasive plant species that readily adapt and thrive in disturbed soils, such as Castor Bean, *Ricinus communis*, Black Mustard (*Brassica Nigra*), Russian Thistle (*Salsola iberica*) and non-native annual grasses are also present. Natives such as *Isocoma menziesii* (Coast golden Bush) appear to be emergent rather than, and thus, their original

habitat is not intact. There is ornamental vegetation that appears deliberately placed on the northern perimeter of the property site. All vegetation is isolated from a larger, more biologically functional piece of land that may replenish vegetation.

The project site is located in the Whittier Quadrangle. CAJA staff conducted a search of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Diversity Database to determine if any plant or wildlife species of concern have been identified in the Whittier Quadrangle vicinity. All species considered threatened or sensitive in the subject quadrangle inhabit vernal pools, tidal marshes, coastal scrub, coastal dune, grassland, woodland, or riparian communities (refer to Table 1). None of the above communities were observed on site.

Therefore, no impact to special status species or habitats would occur. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.

- b) *No Impact.* The project site is disturbed and does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Adjacent properties are developed with urban uses and do not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not adversely affect any such community, and no impact would occur. Thus, no further analysis of the issue is required.
- c) *No Impact.* No wetlands occur on the project site. Further, the project site is disturbed and surrounded by urban development. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on federally protected wetlands. Thus, no further analysis of the issue is required.
- d) *No Impact.* The project site is highly disturbed and contains no on-site waterways. Additionally, the site is located in an urbanized area and is not adjacent to or near any areas of open space. Further, no native wildlife nurseries are in the project area. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Thus, no further analysis of the issue is required.
- e) *No Impact.* No oak trees are located on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Thus, no further analysis of the issue is required.
- f) *No Impact.* The project site is not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other habitat plan. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conversion plan. Thus, no further analysis of the issue is required.

Table 1

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Potential to Occur on Site	Listing Status	
				Federal	State
<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	Western yellow-billed cuckoo	Riparian forest nester, along the broad, lower flood-bottoms of larger river systems. Nests in riparian jungles of willow, often mixed with cottonwoods, with lower story of blackberry, nettles, or wild grape.	No potential. Typical species habitat is not present on the site.	candidate	endangered
<i>Lasthenia glabrata ssp. coulteri</i>	Coulter's goldfields	Coastal salt marshes. Playas, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, usually found on alkaline soils in playas, sinks, and grasslands.	No potential. Typical species habitat is not present on the site.	none	none
<i>Navarretia prostrata</i>	Prostrate navarretia	Coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools. Alkaline soils in grassland, or in vernal pools.	No potential. Typical species habitat is not present on the site.	none	none
<i>Orcuttia californica</i>	California Orcutt grass	Vernal pools. Known only from southern California and Baja.	No potential. Typical species habitat is not present on the site.	endangered	endangered
<i>Phacelia stellaris</i>	Brand's phacelia	Coastal scrub, coastal dunes, southern California and Baja open areas.	No potential. Typical species habitat is not on site and degree of disturbance makes it unlikely that the species would occur on the property site.	none	none
<i>Spea (=Scaphiopus) hammondii</i>	Western spadefoot	Occurs primarily in grassland habitats, but can be found in valley-foothill hardwood woodlands. Vernal pools are essential for breeding and egg-laying.	No potential. Typical species habitat is not present on the site.	none	none

Source: California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Database, CNDDDB, updated September 09, 2004. Queried by Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, December 2, 2004.

5. **Cultural Resources.** Would the project:

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			
c.	✓			
d.	✓			

Discussion:

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site contains an industrial building that was constructed in 1952. A previous cultural resources report noted that although the structure is not eligible for the National Register, it is potentially eligible listing under a local ordinance for the protection of historic resources. This particular structure is currently in a state of disrepair having been significantly damaged by a fire in 2002. However, the potential for the project to cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5 will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* According to previous archaeological assessments that included the project site, known archaeological resources have been found on the site. As such, it is possible that known and unknown resources could be encountered during project construction, particularly during ground-disturbing activities such as excavation and grading. Therefore, the potential for the project to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Although no paleontological resources are known to exist on the project site, it is possible that unknown resources could be encountered during project construction, particularly during ground-disturbing activities such as excavation and grading. Therefore, the potential for the project to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Although no human remains are known to have been found on the project site, it is possible that unknown resources could be encountered during project construction, particularly during ground-disturbing activities such as excavation and grading. Therefore, the potential for the project to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of forma cemeteries, will be addressed in the EIR.

6. **Geology & Soils.** Would the project:

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?
- 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 18-1-B 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?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
✓			
✓			
			✓
		✓	
✓			
✓			
			✓

Discussion:

a.i) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as illustrated on the maps issued by the State Geologist for the area. However, in March of 1999, scientists confirmed the presence of a “blind thrust” fault system directly under the Los Angeles area. The newly mapped fault is 40 kilometers long and runs from beneath downtown Los Angeles to the Coyote Hills in northern Orange County and towards Brea in the east, covering at least 840 kilometers. Three distinct segments exist within the fault, with one segment directly underlying Santa Fe Springs. Although recent reports presented evidence that the Santa Fe Springs fault segment has the same strike and dip as the fault that ruptured in the 1987 Whittier Narrow earthquake, no evidence has been presented with respect to the frequency in which the rupture(s) may occur, thus the potential for a fault rupture is unknown. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to expose people or structures to potential

substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.

- a.ii) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site is located in the Southern California region, which is a seismically-active area. Thus, the project site could experience strong ground shaking during a seismic event. Aside from the blind thrust fault system mentioned above, the nearest known active faults are the Whittier-Elsinore fault, which is located approximately two miles north of the City and the Norwalk Fault which is located approximately two miles south of the City. Other faults in the area are the San Andreas and San Jacinto faults and the Newport-Inglewood faults. These local and regional fault systems have a potential to impact the subject site when considering the maximum expected earthquake from each fault. Therefore, the potential for the project to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking will be addressed in the EIR.
- a.iii) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Although the project site has not been identified on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, Whittier Quadrangle official map, (released March 25, 1999) as a site that is subject to liquefaction during a seismic event, the exact potential for liquefaction to occur on the project site is unknown at this time. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction.
- a.iv) *No Impact.* The project site and surrounding area are relatively flat and are not located within an area that is prone to landslides.² Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving landslides. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* See Checklist Discussion 8c below.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The geologic stability of the project is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be addressed in the EIR. With respect to on- or off-site landslides, refer to answer to question 6aiv above.
- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* It is not known at this time if the project site contains expansive soils. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in impacts related to expansive soils will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) *No Impact.* The project site is located in a developed area of the City of Santa Fe Springs that is served by a municipal wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment system operated by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. No septic tanks are proposed. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required.

² California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, *Seismic Hazard Zones Map, Whittier Quadrangle, released March 25, 1999.*

7. **Hazards & Hazardous Materials.** Would the project:

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
✓			
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes development of residential uses. The types of hazardous materials associated with routine, day-to-day operation of the proposed project would include landscaping chemicals that would be used in quantities typical for landscaped residential developments and typical cleaning solvents used for janitorial purposes. The transport, use, and disposal of these materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Portions of the project site currently contain contaminated soils. It is planned that these contaminated soils would be completely remediated in accordance with applicable laws prior to the initiation of housing construction activities. However, if said contaminated soil is not properly removed and/or managed, construction workers and future residents at the project site could be exposed to this contamination. Therefore, this issue will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) *No Impact.* There are no existing schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.³ Therefore, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.⁴ Therefore, the project would not result in impacts related to being located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.
- e) *No Impact.* The project site is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.⁶ Therefore, the project would not expose persons to a safety hazard related to airports. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- f) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard associated with a private airstrip. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- g) *No Impact.* According to the Santa Fe Springs Fire Department, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.⁷
- g) *No Impact.* The project site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs that does not include wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss associated with wildland fires. Thus, no further discussion of this issue is required.

³ Rand McNally, *Thomas Guide Digital Edition 2003/4, State of California.*

⁴ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, *Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites*, www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List.cfm, December 1, 2004.

⁵ <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/ca.htm#>

⁶ Rand McNally, *Thomas Guide Digital Edition 2003/4, State of California.*

⁷ Welland, Neal, Fire Chief, Santa Fe Springs Fire Department, personal communication with CAJA staff, January 3, 2005.

8. **Hydrology & Water Quality.** Would the project:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
✓			
		✓	
✓			
✓			
		✓	
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project could affect the quality of runoff from the project site. During construction, sediment is typically the constituent of greatest potential concern. The greatest risk of soil erosion during the construction phase occurs when site disturbance peaks due to grading activity and removal and re-compaction or replacement of fill areas. (Sediment is not typically a constituent of concern during the long-term operation of developments similar to the proposed

project because sites are usually paved, and proper drainage infrastructure has been installed.) Other pollutants that could affect surface-water quality during the project construction phase include petroleum products (gasoline, diesel, kerosene, oil and grease), hydrocarbons from asphalt paving, paints and solvents, detergents, fertilizers, and pesticides (insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides).

Once the project has been constructed, urban runoff might include all of the above contaminants, as well as trace metals from pavement runoff, nutrients and bacteria from pet wastes, and landscape maintenance debris may be mobilized in wet-season storm runoff from roadway areas, parking areas, and landscaping, and in dry-season “nuisance flows” from landscape irrigation. Liquid product spills occurring at the project site could also enter the storm drain. Dry product spills could enter the storm drain via runoff in wet weather conditions or dry-season “nuisance flows.”

As a condition of project approval to be set forth in the Conditional Use Permit required for the proposed project, the project applicant would be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), in accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. The SWPPP would detail the treatment measures and BMPs to control pollutants and an erosion control plan that outlines erosion and sediment control measures that would be implemented during the construction and post-construction phases of project development. In addition, the SWPPP would include construction-phase housekeeping measures for control of contaminants such as petroleum products, paints and solvents, detergents, fertilizers, and pesticides. It would also describes the post-construction BMPs used to reduce pollutant loadings in runoff and percolate once the site is occupied (e.g., grassy swales, wet ponds, and educational materials) and would set forth the BMP monitoring and maintenance schedule and responsible entities during the construction and post-construction phases. Under the authority granted by the RWQCB, the City will enforce compliance with the regulatory requirements of the General Permit through compliance with the SWPPP, project impacts related to water quality would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site is composed primarily of permeable surfaces and is relatively flat. During storm events, stormwater seeps into the ground on the site and eventually makes its way down to the aquifer beneath the site. The proposed project would introduce impermeable surface area to the project site in the form of roads, driveways, sidewalks, and structures. Rather than permeating the surface, stormwater would instead be directed to onsite drainage infrastructure and then to the existing local stormdrain system. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact.* As discussed above in answer to question 8b, the majority of the project site currently consists of permeable surface area. The proposed project would introduce impermeable surface area to the project site in the form of roads, driveways, sidewalks, and structures. Rather than permeating the surface, stormwater would instead be directed to onsite drainage infrastructure and then to the existing local stormdrain system, thus altering the existing drainage pattern of the site by changing the direction, rate, and amount of surface runoff. However, since drainage would be directed to an impervious drainage system and would not encounter unpaved or unprotected surfaces, the alteration of the existing drainage pattern would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As discussed above in answer to question 8c, the proposed project would increase the amount of impermeable surface on the site (and thus, the amount of runoff draining from the site) and would alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site. Whether this alteration would increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in impacts related to flooding on-or off-site will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* With respect to polluted runoff, see answer to question 8 a. With respect to the project's potential to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, as discussed above in answer to question 8 c, the proposed project would change the direction, rate, and amount of surface runoff from the project site by introducing impermeable surface area to the site. Whether this alteration of the existing drainage pattern would cause runoff from the project site to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the project to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems will be addressed in the EIR.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact.* See answer to question 8 a.
- g) *No Impact.* The project site is located in Flood Zone "C", an area defined as subject to "minimal flooding" (Panel 1:3, Community Panel No. 060158-0001-B, Effective Date: 1980) and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.⁸ Therefore, the project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Thus, no further discussion of this issue is required.
- h) *No Impact.* See answer to question 8g above.
- i) *No Impact.* No dams or levees are located in the project site area. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding, as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Thus, no further discussion of this issue is required.
- j) *No Impact.* Seiches are standing waves created by seismically induced ground shaking (or volcanic eruptions or explosions) that occur in large, freestanding bodies of water. A tsunami is a series of waves that are caused by earthquakes that occur on the seafloor or in coastal areas. The project site is approximately 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean, and therefore, would not be subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. The project area is relatively flat and does not contain any hillside terrain; therefore, there is no potential for the project site to be inundated by a mudflow. Thus, no further discussion of this issue is required.

⁸ ESRI and FEMA, *Hazard Information and Awareness*, website: <http://www.esri.com/hazards/makemap.html>, November 29, 2004.

9. **Land Use and Planning.** Would the project:

- a. Physically divide an established community?
- b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				✓
b.	✓			
c.				✓

Discussion:

- a) *No Impact.* The project site is surrounded by areas that are developed with urban land uses, primarily consisting of industrial uses, with incidental commercial uses. The proposed project would include the development of single-family residential uses on a lot that is designated for development and would not create a physical barrier within the community or otherwise divide contiguous land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community, and no further discussion is necessary.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site’s current land use designation in the City of Santa Fe Springs *General Plan* is “Industrial,” while the current zoning designation (per the City’s Zoning Code) is “M-2, Heavy Manufacturing.” The proposed project is a residential development and is not consistent with the project site’s land use or zoning designations. As such, implementation of the proposed project would require a *General Plan* Amendment to change the site’s designation to “Single Family Residential” and “Multiple Family Residential” and a zoning code amendment to change the site’s zoning to “R-1-PD, Single Family Residential-Planned Development” and “R-3-PD, Multiple Family Residential-Planned Development.” It is possible that developing the site with uses that were not planned for could result in conflicts with plans and policies governing the site. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in impacts related to applicable land use plans, including the General Plan and the Zoning Code, will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) *No Impact.* See answer to question 4f above.

10. **Mineral Resources.** Would the project:

- a. Result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be or value to the region and the residents or the state?
- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery size delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	

Discussion:

- a) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is currently under a surface use lease for oil field activities by BreitBurn Energy Company and includes nine abandoned oil drills and one operating oil drill. Oil extraction activities at the project site would continue after development of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be or value to the region and the residents or the state, and no further discussion of the issue is required.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* See answer to 10a above.

11. **Noise.** Would the project result in:

- a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
		✓	
✓			
✓			
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels both during construction and long-term operation that could exceed standards established in the City’s *General Plan* and/or Noise Ordinance. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to expose people to excessive noise levels.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed project would include the use of typical construction equipment such as jackhammers, pneumatic tools, saws, and hammers, all of which would generate some groundborne vibration and groundborne noise. The proposed project would not involve the use of pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial vibration. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No further analysis is required.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Long-term operation of the proposed project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels, mainly due to project-related traffic. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project will be addressed in the EIR
- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Noise generated during the proposed project’s construction phase could, on a temporary basis, substantially increase noise levels at nearby land uses. Therefore, the EIR will address the proposed project’s potential to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- e) *No Impact.* As discussed above in answer to question 7e, the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a public airport or public use airport. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- f) *No Impact.* As discussed above in answer to question 7f above, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. No further analysis of this issue is required.

12. **Population and Housing.** Would the project:

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.				✓
c.				✓

Discussion:

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would induce direct population growth by introducing up to 650 single-family residential units and approximately 2,275 new permanent residents to the project site.⁹ Therefore, the potential for the project to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) *No Impact.* There are no existing housing units on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, and no further discussion of this issue is required.
- c) *No Impact.* See answer to question 12b above.

13. Public Services.

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

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
✓			
✓			
✓			
			✓

Discussion:

a.i) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would introduce up to 650 new single-family residential units and approximately 2,275 new residents to the project site, thereby increasing the demand for fire protection services at the site and potentially affecting service ratios and response times. A recent Fiscal Impact Assessment for the proposed Townlots Housing Project performed by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (August 2004) concluded that the housing project would require one additional firefighter on a 24-hour basis (1/shift = 3 additional personnel). Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to result in the need for enhanced fire protection services, including additional fire protection personnel.

⁹ (18,263 people ÷ 5,201 houses) = 3.5 persons per household x 650 units. These estimates are based on SCAG's 2010 population and housing projections for the City of Santa Fe Springs. Source: SCAG 2004 RTP Growth Forecasts, website: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/rtpgf2004.htm>, December 8, 2004.

- a.ii) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would introduce up to 650 new single-family residential units and approximately 2,275 new residents to the project site, thereby increasing the demand for police protection services at the site and potentially affecting service ratios and response times. A recent Fiscal Impact Assessment for the proposed Townlots Housing Project performed by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (August 2004) concluded that the housing project would require two additional police officers. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to result in the need for enhanced police services, including additional sworn police officer personnel.

- a.iii) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would introduce up to 650 new single-family residential units and approximately 2,275 new residents to the project site, thereby inducing direct population growth and increasing the number of school-aged children who would attend local schools. It is possible that the demand for school services associated with the project could require the need for a new or physically altered school. A recent Fiscal Impact Assessment for the proposed Townlots Housing Project performed by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (August 2004) concluded that the housing project would generate the need for approximately 11 additional classrooms for the Little Lake School District and nine additional classrooms for the Whittier Union High School District. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities (e.g., schools), need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for the local school district.

- a.iv) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would introduce up to 650 new single-family residential units and approximately 2,275 new residents to the project site, thereby inducing direct population growth and increasing the number of people who could potentially use local parks and recreational facilities. While the project is planned to provide open space/recreation area, it is possible that the demand for parks and recreational facilities resulting from the project could require the need for new or physically altered city parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities (e.g., parks and recreational 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 and performance objectives for local parks and recreational facilities.

- a.v) *No Impact.* No other public facilities have been identified that could be substantially adversely affected by the project. No further analysis of this issue is necessary.

14. Recreation.

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			

Discussion:

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See answer to question 13aiv above.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See answer to question 13aiv above.

15. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:

- a. 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)?
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
✓			
			✓
✓			
✓			
✓			
✓			

Discussion:

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would create new vehicle trips traveling to and from the project site. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project and other reasonably-foreseeable development in the project area would create new vehicle trips traveling to and from the project site. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.
- c) *No Impact.* Due to the nature and scope of the proposed project, implementation of the project would not have the potential to result in a change in air traffic patterns at any airport in the area. Therefore, no further discussion of this issue is required.

- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would alter access to the project site. In addition, roadway and/or intersection improvements may be required in order to mitigate any potentially significant traffic impacts that could be identified in the EIR. Without proper design, the project could result in traffic hazards. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections). No agricultural land uses are located in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in traffic hazards associated with incompatible uses, such as farm equipment. No further discussion related to this specific issue is required.
- e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project would alter access to the project site. Clark Street would provide emergency vehicle access only; however, whether the design of the proposed emergency access complies with the City Fire Department’s requirements for emergency access is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in inadequate emergency access will be addressed in the EIR.
- f) *Potentially Significant Impact.* At this time, whether the proposed amount of parking spaces complies with the City’s Parking Code requirements is unknown. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in inadequate parking capacity will be addressed in the EIR.
- g) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Traffic generated by the proposed project could exceed level-of-service standards. Whether the proposed project would incorporate measures that support alternative transportation for the purpose of reducing vehicle trips is unknown at this time. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

16. **Utilities & Service Systems.** Would the project:

- a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b. Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?
- f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.			✓	
b.	✓			
c.	✓			
d.	✓			
e.	✓			
f.	✓			

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

		✓	
--	--	---	--

Discussion:

- a) *Less than Significant Impact.* The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements for properties in the project area. The project site is not served by a private onsite wastewater treatment system but instead conveys wastewater via municipal sewage infrastructure maintained by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) to one of the LACSD’s 11 public wastewater treatment facilities, all of which are subject to the State’s wastewater treatment requirements.¹⁰ Wastewater from the project site would therefore be treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the LARWQCB. Therefore, project impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant, and no further discussion of this issue is required.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in on-site water consumption and wastewater generation, increasing the need for additional water and wastewater treatment. Whether the water and wastewater needs of the project could be accommodated is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects will be addressed in the EIR.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As discussed in answer to question 8b, onsite stormwater drainage infrastructure would be constructed as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, will be addressed in the EIR.
- d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for potable water. Whether the project’s demand for water can be accommodated is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the project to require new water supply entitlements will be addressed in the EIR. In addition, in accordance with SB 610 and SB 221, a water assessment will be prepared for the proposed project in order to investigate water availability.
- e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in on-site wastewater generation. Whether the project’s demand for wastewater treatment can be accommodated is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to 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 will be addressed in the EIR.
- f) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in solid waste generated at the project site on a daily basis. Whether the project’s demand for landfill capacity can be accommodated is unknown at this time. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to result in the need for additional land fill capacity will be addressed in the EIR.

¹⁰ Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, *Wastewater Treatment Facilities*, website: <http://www.lacsd.org/waswater/wrp/wrp2.htm>, November 29, 2004.

- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The construction and operation of the proposed project would be required to adhere to all applicable federal, State, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, project impacts regarding compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste would be less than significant, and no further discussion of this issue is required.

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Yes	No
✓	
✓	
✓	

Discussion:

- a) *Yes.* As noted throughout this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project could potentially degrade the quality of the environment.
- b) *Yes.* As noted in this Initial Study, the proposed project could contribute to cumulative environmental impacts.
- c) *Yes.* As noted throughout this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.