



## **10.0 Effects Found Not To Be Significant**





## 10.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The City of Azusa (City) circulated an *Initial Study* in December 2013 to determine significant effects of the proposed project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the project were found to be less than significant due to the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the Draft EIR. In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128, the following section provides a brief description of potential impacts found to be less than significant. The *Initial Study* is provided as Appendix 13.1, *Initial Study and Notice of Preparation*.

### **AESTHETICS. *Would the project:***

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

**No Impact.** No designated State scenic highways are located within the project area. However, Azusa Avenue (State Highway 39), to the north of I-210, is eligible to become a State scenic highway but has not yet been officially designated.<sup>1</sup> As the project site is located approximately one mile east of Azusa Avenue, the project would not be located in the viewshed of this segment of State Highway 39. No impacts would occur in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

**AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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. 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?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site has historically been occupied by a chemical engineering/manufacturing company, which did not engage in agricultural activities. However, until recently, a small portion of the eastern area of the project site was utilized by Colorama Nursery to support its operations. These activities have ceased and no nursery operations would be affected by the project. The portion of the site previously used for nursery purposes has never been

<sup>1</sup> State of California Department of Transportation, *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/), accessed on November 24, 2013.



characterized as farmland, and is not designated as farmland by the California Resources Agency. Thus, the project would not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural uses. No impact would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** The existing zoning and proposed zoning does not include any agricultural-related zoning designations, nor is the site part of a Williamson Act contract. Additionally, the land uses surrounding the project area are not zoned for agricultural uses or in a Williamson Act contract. Thus, no impact would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** Forestry operations do not occur within the vicinity of the project site. Also, the project site does not support any trees that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.<sup>2</sup> Project implementation would not result in the rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Agriculture and Forest Resources Response (c), above. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Agriculture and Forest Resources Response (a) through (c). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of designated farmland or forest land to non-agricultural/non-forest land use. No impacts would occur in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

### **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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

**No Impact.** The project area is fully urbanized and occupied primarily by industrial uses. The project proposes to demolish the existing on-site office building associated with the former Criterion Catalysts manufacturing facility and construct an industrial/warehousing development. The entire project site has been previously disturbed by industrial development and the majority of the site is

<sup>2</sup> Public Resources Code Section 12220(g).



paved. No special status plant or animals species listed in in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service exist in the local vicinity due to the level of past disturbance and non-native plant species in the area. Although the project would include the removal of existing landscaping (including numerous trees), none of the on-site landscaping has the potential to provide habitat for sensitive species due to the disturbed nature of the project site. Consistent with existing requirements under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), vegetation and tree removal would be conducted outside of the nesting bird season, which generally extends from February 1 - August 31. If this is not possible, then a qualified biologist shall conduct nesting bird surveys within three days of vegetation and tree removal in order to prevent a violation of the MBTA.

Thus, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any special status species upon compliance with existing regulations protecting biological resources. No impact would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** The entire project site has been previously disturbed by industrial development and the majority of the site is paved. The site was previously occupied by an industrial catalyst manufacturing facility which has since been demolished. There are no special status habitats, species, riparian areas, or other sensitive communities known to exist on-site. In addition, as noted above, the project would be consistent with MBTA requirements to minimize impacts to nesting birds during the nesting season. No impact would result and no further analysis of this issue is required.

*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?*

**No Impact.** No federally protected wetlands occur within the project area. Therefore, project implementation would not have an effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. No impact would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** No identified wildlife corridors or native wildlife nurseries occur within the boundaries of the project site. As noted above, the project area is fully urbanized and occupied primarily by industrial uses. Although the San Gabriel River may be considered an area for wildlife movement, the river is located approximately 700 feet to the west of the project site. The project would not affect any wildlife movement that may currently occur in the river. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, nor with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. No impact would occur in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.



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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site consists of vacant, disturbed land and contains ornamental vegetation. Section 62-197(b), General Requirements for New Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code requires that all existing living trees having a diameter at breast height (DBH) of six inches or more are required to be preserved when so directed by Director of Public Works, and no grading is allowed to endanger them. However, Section 62-197(c) states that if these trees are destroyed, the applicant is required to replace them with trees whose size, number, and planting location is required to be determined by the Director of Public Works before final occupancy is granted. The size and age of the tree would determine how many new trees may be substituted for the destroyed tree, but as a minimum three new trees would replace one tree removed. As noted above, there are no sensitive plant species or habitat (including trees) on-site. The project would comply with Section 62-197(b) of the Municipal Code in addition to the requirements of the MBTA. As such, impacts would be less than significant in this regard and no further analysis is required.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan currently exists in the project area. Thus, no impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:***

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project substantially alters the environmental context or removes identified historical resources. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines generally defines a historical resource as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural or cultural annals of California. Historical resources are further defined as being associated with significant events, important persons, or distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; representing the work of an important creative individual; or possessing high artistic values.

The project site currently consists of vacant disturbed land, surface parking areas, and a vacant single-story office building in the eastern portion of the site near North Todd Avenue. The proposed project would demolish the office building and construct an industrial/warehousing development. The project site and surrounding area are not located within a National Register District. Also, based on Figure HR-1, Potential Historic Landmarks and Potential Historic Districts, of the Azusa General Plan, there are no known potential historic resources located within the project site. The existing vacant office building on-site does not possess unique architectural features, nor is it associated with important historical events or people. Thus, project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant and no further analysis of this issue is required.



- b) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No known human remains exist at the project site, and due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project area. In the event human remains are encountered during earth removal or disturbance activities, all activities would cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor would be immediately contacted. The Coroner would be contacted pursuant to Sections 5097.98 and 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code relative to Native American remains. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Upon compliance with these existing State requirements, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

- a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

- 1) *Landslides?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the California Seismic Hazard Zones Map, the project site is not located within an area of historical landslide occurrence, or located within an area identified as having a potential for slope instability. The site has been graded and the topography is generally flat, lacking features capable of generating a landslide. The foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains are located north of the project site and are the closest area with landslide potential. However, the foothills are situated approximately 4,000 feet to the north, and given the distance and intervening topography (including the San Gabriel River) the landslide hazard on the project site is considered low. Additionally, landslide impacts related to slopes at the Vulcan Materials Quarry (south of the site) are not expected to occur due to the geostability safety factors to prevent slope instability required per their conditional use permit (CUP). Thus, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant with regard to landslide hazards and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- b) *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 project site is located in a developed industrial area served by existing sewer infrastructure. The proposed project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact related to septic systems and alternative wastewater disposal would result and no further analysis of this issue is required.

**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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although specific tenants and their uses are not known at this time, long-term operation of the project may involve the transport, use, and/or storage of hazardous



materials. The majority of development on the site is not anticipated to involve large quantities of hazardous materials. However, operation of the industrial and warehousing uses are anticipated to utilize minor quantities of hazardous materials.

The proposed light industrial/commercial operations may include the use and storage of common petroleum products and/or cleaning solvents in small quantities. No acutely hazardous substances are expected to be utilized during operation of these facilities. In accordance with State requirements, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan for facilities storing substances above minimum reporting requirements must be prepared and kept on file with the LACFD. The Fire Department would inspect these facilities every year for adequate storage, handling, and labeling practices and would note changes in quantities. Contact names, diagrams for storage locations and emergency spill procedures are required as part of the Hazardous Materials Business Plan. Similarly, material safety data sheet (MSDS) be kept at the facility for each chemical used and stored, which outlines the chemical components and safety handling measures to be followed by employees. The project would also be required to comply with the Federal rule, USEPA Risk Management Planning (RMP) Rule 40 CFR 68, which would require the operator to register the facility with the EPA prior to on-site storage of hazardous chemicals.

Any uses within the proposed project that would generate toxic air emissions in their operations are required by State law to obtain facility permits for equipment producing those emissions from the SCAQMD. Operations that may generate such emissions may include painting, drying, or cleaning. The SCAQMD requires periodic emission stack testing to check that the business is conforming to the emission limits permitted.

As all hazardous materials are required to be treated and disposed of in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, risks related to the routine transport, use of disposal of hazardous materials would be minimized. Therefore, operation of proposed uses is not expected to pose a threat to people residing or working in the area. Impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of applicable Federal, State, and local standards and regulations, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In the past, the project site has been used to manufacture hydrogen cyanide (HCN) gas that was used by the citrus industry for fumigation, tear gas production for the U.S. Army for World War II, resin and wetting products, and since 1972 auto exhaust catalyst for use in automobile catalytic converters, commonly known as hydrodesulphurization (HDS) catalysts. In 1981, the HDS catalysts facility was converted to a hydro-treating catalysts facility. The plant was closed in 2010 and subsequently demolished in 2012.

Numerous hazardous materials investigations have been performed to investigate the potential for hazardous materials contamination. These investigations concluded that areas of lead and hexavalent chromium were present in on-site soils. As part of the hazardous materials remediation process overseen by the LACFD, 1,880 tons of Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) waste, 100 tons of non-RCRA waste, and 700 tons of non-hazardous materials were removed from the site.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *Soil Management Plan, Former Criterion Catalyst Facility*, Hazard Management Consulting, August 14, 2013.



The LACFD issued a letter dated June 16, 2012 that the known site contamination had been satisfactorily mitigated for the current use (i.e., the allowable uses pursuant to the City's Zoning Code) and no further action is required for the subject site. The letter further stated that the LACFD has no further requirement or restriction relating to this site at this time.

Based on the documented remedial work completed on the site and concurrence from the LACFD, hazardous materials at the project site have been adequately remediated and they do not pose a hazard to human health. Site grading would disturb approximately 21 acres and require approximately 120,000 cubic yards of cut and fill, all of which would remain on-site. Grading activities during construction would not upset contaminated soils and/or expose construction workers to hazardous materials. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no public schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. While not a public school, the Southern California Laborers Training School adjoins the project site to the west, which provides vocational training for construction workers. As noted above in Hazards and Hazardous Materials Response (a), long-term operations associated with the project would not result in significant hazardous impacts due to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, as noted in Hazards and Hazardous Materials Response 4.8(b), documented hazardous materials contamination associated with the Criterion Catalysts facility has been adequately remediated and no further action is required. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site has historically been occupied by Criterion Catalysts, a chemical engineering company that manufactures catalyst supplies for refining applications. However, according to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Hazardous Waste and Substances List (Cortese List), the project site is not listed as a hazardous waste facility. Further, hazardous materials contamination on the site has been remediated and the LACFD has indicated that contamination has been satisfactorily mitigated for the current use (i.e., the allowable uses pursuant to the City's Zoning Code) and no further action is required for the subject site. In addition, grading activities during construction would not upset contaminated soils and/or expose construction workers to hazardous materials. As such, the project site is not listed by any Federal, State, or local agencies as a site containing hazardous materials. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** The nearest airport is the El Monte Airport, located approximately seven miles southwest of the project site. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of an airport. Furthermore, the construction and operation of the proposed



project would not result in airport-related safety hazards for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, no impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Project construction and operation would not result in airstrip-related safety hazards for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, no impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is subject to compliance with Azusa's SEMS Multi-Hazard Functional Emergency Response Plan (ERP), adopted by Azusa City Council in 1997. The proposed project would result in increased vehicle trips during both construction and project operations. However, the proposed project would not result in any lane closures during construction, and the proposed project access from North Todd Avenue would remain and provide suitable site access for emergency vehicles as well as project traffic. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to the site plan review by the City of Azusa and Los Angeles County Fire Department to ensure that all access roads, driveways, and parking areas would remain accessible to emergency service vehicles. Therefore, a less than significant impact related to emergency response and evacuation plans would result and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In June 2008, the City adopted a new "Very High Fire" Hazard Severity Zone along the San Gabriel Mountain foothills. The eastern portion of the proposed project site falls within this zone. However, the project site is located in an urbanized area surrounded primarily by industrial uses, and is approximately two miles south of the San Gabriel Mountains. The site and surrounding area are devoid of any vegetation resulting in a substantial wildfire threat, and the site is not located adjacent to any wildlands. As such, the proposed project would not subject people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of exposure to wildland fires. Therefore, a less than impact related to the exposure of persons and property to wildfire would result, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

#### **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the Project:***

- a) *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)?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is vacant and the surrounding area is urbanized and built-out. The majority of the project site is paved; although the project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces on-site, the project would implement three retention basins (totaling 72,643 square feet) that would allow for groundwater recharge. As such, it is not anticipated that the



project would substantially impact groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No groundwater extraction would occur as part of the project. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant and further analysis is not required.

b) *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?*

**No Impact.** Flood hazards related to storm events generally are described in terms of the “100-year flood.” As its name implies, the 100-year flood is the largest flood event, which may be expected to occur within a 100-year period. This flood is considered a severe flood, but one that can be reasonably predicted and mitigated.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prepares and maintains Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), which show the extent of Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) and other thematic features related to flood risk. Based on FEMA FIRM Map 06037C1420F for the project site, the project site is not located within a 100 year flood zone.<sup>4</sup> Also, the proposed project does not include the construction of residential uses. Thus, no impacts would result with regard to a 100-year flood hazard area. No further analysis of this issue is required.

c) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Hydrology and Water Quality Response (b) above. No impacts would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required.

d) *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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located approximately 3.5 miles southwest of the Morris Dam and approximately 7 miles south of the San Gabriel Dam. According to the City of Azusa General Plan EIR, the project site is located within the San Gabriel and Morris Dam failure inundation zone. The San Gabriel and Morris Dams are owned by the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) Flood Control Division. These dams, as well as others in California, are continually monitored by various governmental agencies (such as the State of California Division of Safety of Dams and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to guard against the threat of failure. Current design and construction practices and ongoing programs of review, modification, or total reconstruction of existing dams are intended to ensure that all dams are capable of withstanding the maximum credible earthquake (MCE). Further, although the project site is within a dam inundation area, the project site was previously developed with a manufacturing facility and is located within a developed industrial area; as such, the risk of loss, injury, or death involving dam failure already exists. Therefore, the potential for inundation at the site as a result of an earthquake-induced dam failure is less than significant and no further analysis of this issue is required.

e) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

**No Impact.** Seiches are large waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. The project site is not located within a coastal area, and no water bodies are on or adjacent

<sup>4</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Flood Insurance Rate Map 06037C1420F*, effective date September 26, 2008.



to the project site that would impact the project due to seiche. The nearest water body to the project site is the San Gabriel River situated approximately 0.15-mile to the west; however, the project site is at an elevation approximately 30 feet higher than the river. The nearest coastal area is the Pacific Ocean, located approximately 35 miles west of the project site. As a result, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) and seiches are not considered a significant hazard at the project site. In addition, given the developed nature of the project area, there are no features adjacent to the project site that are capable of inundating the site by mudflow. Thus, no impacts are anticipated with regard to the inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No further analysis of this issue is required.

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

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located in a developed industrial area in the City of Azusa, along North Todd Avenue (northwest of the North Todd Avenue and West Tenth Street intersection). The project site adjoins industrial uses as well as the UPRR alignment. The nearest residential land use is located approximately 0.2-mile northeast of the project site. The project site has historically been utilized for industrial purposes and would not represent a change in land use that would adversely affect surrounding areas, and the project would be consistent with the City's General Plan and Zoning designations for the site. The physical arrangement of the surrounding community and roadway network would not be modified or divided. Therefore, development anticipated by the proposed project would not physically divide an established community or reduce access to community amenities. No impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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?*

**No Impact.** The existing Azusa General Plan land use designation for the project site is Light Industrial. The existing Zoning for the project site is DWL (District West End Light Industrial). The proposed project would construct an industrial/ warehousing development on the project site that would be consistent with the City's existing land use and zoning designations. Therefore, amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code would not be required, and no conflicts with City plans or policies would occur. No further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan currently exists in the project area. Thus, no impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required. Refer to Biological Resources Response (f).

**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?*



**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Azusa is situated on sand and gravel deposits formed at the base of the San Gabriel Mountains known as the San Gabriel Fan District. These aggregate deposits are designated by the Department of Conservation as mineral resources of regional importance. Aggregate from Azusa and surrounding areas is used for a variety of construction activities throughout the San Gabriel Valley and Los Angeles Basin, including production of concrete, road base, and related building materials. Presently, only aggregate and Portland Cement Concrete are commercial commodities within Azusa. Three active aggregate mining pits lie within the Azusa city limits, two operated by Vulcan Materials (one located adjacent to the south of the project site), and the third by Cemex. Other areas containing aggregate resources are not mined, but are devoted to other uses, including agriculture, residential, and industrial uses.

Based on Figure MR-1, Mineral Resource Zones in Azusa, of the Azusa General Plan, the project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2). MRZ-2 consists of areas where adequate information indicates significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence.

The project consists of developing industrial/warehousing uses on the project site. The project would not result in the displacement of an existing mining operation since no such activities currently occur on-site. Although the site is located within MRZ-2, numerous large-scale aggregate mining facilities exist within the site vicinity and implementation of the project would not represent a loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

In addition, the Vulcan Materials mining quarry is adjacent to the southern portion of the project site, a commercial sand and gravel mining operation. The project would not impact this mining facility or access to the Vulcan Materials site. Therefore, impacts are less than significant in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Mineral Resources Response (a) above. A less than significant impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

## **NOISE.**

*a) 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?*

**No Impact.** The nearest airport is the El Monte Airport, approximately seven miles southwest of the project site. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. Project implementation would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with an airport or private airstrip. No impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

*b) 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?*



**No Impact.** Refer to Noise Response (a). No impacts would occur and no further analysis is required.

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

a) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project site is vacant and would not displace any existing housing. Thus, no impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not displace any people since the project site is vacant. Thus, no impacts would result in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

**PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the project:***

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:*

1) *Other public facilities?*

**No Impact.** All impacts related to public services have been analyzed within the EIR. The proposed project is not expected to require the provision of new or altered governmental facilities beyond what has been analyzed in the EIR. Impacts to public infrastructure and utilities are analyzed in the Utilities and Service Systems section, below. No impacts would occur in this regard and no further analysis is required.

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

a) *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?*

**No Impact.** The project proposes an industrial/warehousing facility. The on-site uses proposed at this facility would not have the capacity to directly change air traffic patterns or change the location of air traffic. The project site is not within the immediate vicinity of an airport, and would not be capable of generating a population increase that would substantially increase air traffic levels or require relocation of an existing airport. No impacts are anticipated in this regard and no further analysis of this issue is required.

b) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Hazards and Hazardous Materials Response (g), above. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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



**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project area is served by Foothill Transit bus routes 185, 187, and 494. The nearest bus stop is located approximately 0.40-mile south, along Foothill Boulevard. The proposed project would not affect bus service in the project area. Additionally, the project would not alter existing pedestrian or bicycle paths of travel in the project area. The project would not result in conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs for alternative transportation. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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

a) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In 1989, the Legislature adopted the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), in order to “reduce, recycle, and re-use solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible.” AB 939 established a waste management hierarchy: Source Reduction; Recycling; Composting; Transformation; and Disposal. The law also required that each county prepare a new Integrated Waste Management Plan and each city prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) by July 1, 1991. The SRRE is required to identify how each jurisdiction will meet the mandatory state waste diversion goal of 50 percent by the year 2000. The Act mandated that California’s 450 jurisdictions (i.e., cities, counties, and regional waste management compacts), implement waste management programs aimed at a 25 percent diversion rate by 1995 and a 50 percent diversion rate by 2000. If the 50 percent goal was not met by the end of 2000, the jurisdiction was required to submit a petition for a goal extension to CalRecycle.

Senate Bill (SB) 2202 made a number of changes to the municipal solid waste diversion requirements under the Integrated Waste Management Act. These changes included a revision to the statutory requirement for 50 percent diversion of solid waste to clarify that local governments shall continue to divert 50 percent of all solid waste on and after January 1, 2000.

SB 1016, Wiggins, Chapter 343, Statutes of 2008 introduced a per capita disposal measurement system that measures the 50 percent diversion requirement using a disposal measurement equivalent. The bill repealed the board’s two-year process, requiring instead that the board make a finding whether each jurisdiction was in compliance with the act’s diversion requirements for calendar year 2006 and to determine compliance for the 2007 calendar year, and after, based on the jurisdiction’s change in its per capita disposal rate. The board is required to review a jurisdiction’s compliance with those diversion requirements in accordance with a specified schedule, which is conditioned upon the board finding that the jurisdiction is in compliance with those requirements or has implemented its source reduction and recycling element and household hazardous waste element. The bill requires the board to issue an order of compliance if the board finds that the jurisdiction has failed to make a good faith effort to implement its source reduction and recycling element or its household hazardous waste element, pursuant to a specified procedure.

The per capita disposal rate is a jurisdiction-specific index, which is used as one of several “factors” in determining a jurisdiction’s compliance with the intent of AB 939, and allows CalRecycle and jurisdictions to set their primary focus on successful implementation of diversion programs. Meeting the disposal rate targets is not necessarily an indication of compliance.



The City's recycling program is consistent with the legislation described above. As such, the project's participation in the City's recycling programs during construction of the project and operation would ensure that the proposed project would not conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard, and does not require further analysis.