ADDENDUM TO INDUSTRIAL PARK PROJECT AT 1773 W. SAN BERNARDINO ROAD PROJECT

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

INTRODUCTION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

On January 23, 2007, the West Covina Planning Commission certified the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 70-unit industrial condominium development at 1773 W. San Bernardino Road. The initial study and Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the impacts of constructing a 158,443-square foot industrial park on a 6.45 acre site. The project was approved with primarily one-story buildings, with the center building on the front of the lot including some second floor office condominiums. The project was approved with 347 off-street parking spaces.

The project was approved by the Planning Commission in 2007 and the tract map (62346) has been recorded. The project was approved with six buildings, three at the front of the property and three at the rear of the property. The three buildings at the front of the property were constructed and occupied in 2009 along with associated parking.

The project site is bound by railroad tracks and City of Irwindale to the north, Single-family residential uses and school to the south (across San Bernardino Road), and manufacturing uses (currently vacant) to the east and west.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Addendum to a certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration is needed if minor technical changes or modifications to the proposed project occur (CEQA Guidelines § 15164). An addendum is appropriate only if these minor technical changes or modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines § 15164[c]; however, an addendum is to be considered along with the proposed project by the decision making body prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines § 15146[d].

This Mitigated Negative Declaration Addendum demonstrates that the environmental analysis, impacts, and mitigation requirements identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain substantively unchanged by the situation described herein, and supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of impacts identified in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration.

EVALUATION OF MODIFICATION

The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared on December 29, 2006 evaluated the construction of 158,443-square foot industrial park on a 6.45 acre site. Building permits to construct 101,000 square feet of industrial and office condominiums were issued in 2008 and finaled in 2009. The applicant is proposing to complete 57,608 square feet of industrial condominiums on the rear portion of the subject property (Precise Plan 15-02 and Variance 15-07). The proposed development is the same architecture and site layout that was reviewed under the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration.

A comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to the provision of CEQA Section 15162 and 16164 to provide the City with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project, any changes in circumstances, or any new information since the IS/MND was certified required additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent IS/MND.

- **Aesthetics**: The project site is not a part of a scenic vista, nor does it obstruct views of a scenic vista. The project site is located within an urbanized area surrounded by other industrial uses. The project is not located adjacent to or within view of a State scenic highway, and no trees of aesthetic value, rock outcropping, historic buildings or other scenic resources are located on the project site. Despite the change in timing of construction activities, the overall nature and intensity of the project would not be different than under the previously approved project, and all construction activities would occur within the project site (including staging areas), as was also evaluated in the IS/MND. Therefore, no mitigation measures were identified in IS/MND for aesthetic impacts and not new mitigation measures are warranted.

- **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** The construction of the additional 30 industrial condominium units will not result in additional impacts to agriculture as identified in the IS/MND because there not prime, unique, or statewide important farmlands in the project site. The IS/MND did not identify any impacts to agricultural uses; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed change in construction timing of the units.

- **Air Quality:** The proposed construction of 30 industrial condominiums would not result in additional impact to air quality beyond those identified in the IS/MND. The background conditions, construction equipment mix, and works hours identified in the IS/MND have not notably changed and the proposed construction of the remaining condominium units would not result in any operational changes to the Industrial park once constructed. The construction of the remaining units would not substantially change the intensity or duration of total construction identified in the IS/MND. Therefore, as described in the IS/MND, the proposed project would not exceed any South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) standards or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond SCAQMD projections. As was the case for the Approved Project, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

- **Biological Resources:** The timing of the construction and related activities would not increase impacts to biological resources, either directly or indirectly. The project would not result in the loss or destruction of individuals of a sensitive species or degradation sensitive habitat. The project site is located in an urbanized area of the City of West Covina and is currently developed with industrial condominium units and surface parking. The project site does not contain any natural habitat or species identified as candidate, sensitive or of special status. Furthermore, no candidate, sensitive, or special status species identified in local plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service occur on the project site, as the project site and the immediate surrounding area contain no habitat for such species. The project is surrounded by industrial uses. In addition, the project site is not located within an existing or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA), as designated by the County of Los Angeles. As was the case for the Approved Project, impacts would be less than significant and not mitigation measures are required.

- **Cultural Resources:** The timing of the project would not be materially different than under the previously approved project. Although the timing of construction is different, the extent and intensity of construction and operational activities would not vary relative to that evaluated in the IS/MND, and mitigation measures prescribed in the IS/MND would still be applicable.

- **Geology and Soils:** The proposed timing of the project would not result in substantially different geophysical impacts beyond those identified in the IS/MND. While the timing of construction has changed, the change in construction time does not represent a substantial deviation from the project analyzed in the IS/MND, and the conclusion of the IS/MND remains valid. Compliance with applicable code standards and seismic requirements identified in the IS/MND will reduce geotechnical concerns to below a level of significance.

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The timing of the project would result in a similar (or potentially reduced emissions due to the most recent Green Code and energy efficient requirements adopted within the California Building Code) duration and intensity of construction activities relative to the previously approved project as well as the operational impacts of the project. As such, the proposed construction would not result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions or related impacts to global climate change or conflicts with applicable climate change plans, policies, or regulations.

- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** The timing of the Project would not increase risks related to hazards or hazardous material relative to the Approved Project. The proposed construction phasing would not require additional construction equipment or increased use of such equipment. No structures need to be demolished since the site has previously been

graded. Therefore, the risk of potential hazards associated with asbestos-containing materials and lead-paint residues is minimal. Given the likeliness in overall construction activities and identical operational characteristics, the timing of the proposed project would not result in new or greater impacts in this regard.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The proposed project would be require, as under the Approved Project, to comply with all applicable water quality regulations during and following construction activities. As in the case with the Approved Project, compliance with stormwater regulations would preclude the potential for significant impacts.

- **Land Use and Planning:** The timing of the project requires the same type of construction entitlements and permits as the previously approved project. The timing of the proposed project would not result in notably increased adverse impacts on adjacent land uses, as the overall proximity and intensity of construction activities would not substantially different than under the Approved Project. The project is compliant with the General Plan and Zoning (with the exception of a variance to deviate from required landscape area).

- **Mineral Resources:** The timing of the proposed project would not result in additional impacts to mineral resources beyond those identified in the IS/MND and because the project site is not located within an area of known mineral resources, either of regional or local values, the IS/MND did not identify any impacts to mineral resources; therefore, mitigations were not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the changes in construction timing to the Approved Project.

- **Noise:** The timing of the proposed project would not result in additional impacts to noise beyond those identified in the IS/MND. The proposed construction phasing would not result in design or operational changes to the project site or surrounding uses from that analyzed in the IS/MND. Despite the modifications to the timing of construction activities, the overall intensity, equipment mix, duration, and proximity to other industrial uses would not be different than under the previously approved project. The subject property is located in an industrial area and is adjacent to a railroad right of way to the north. Mitigation measures were included for the Approved Project requiring the construction of 8-foot walls along the east and west property lines and an 11-foot wall along the north property line adjacent to the railway. As such, while mitigations would still be necessary to address noise impacts in the project area, no new mitigation measures are required for the project.

- **Population and Housing:** The timing of construction for the project would not have any effect on population, housing, or employment in the City or region at large, as was in the case for the previously approved project and as analyzed under the IS/MND. No adverse impacts would occur in this regard.

- **Public Services:** The timing of the proposed project would not result in additional impacts to public services/utilities beyond those identified in the IS/MND because they would not

result in operational changes beyond those identified and evaluated in the IS/MND for the previously approved project. The IS/MND did not identify any potentially significant impacts to public services; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the construction timing of the project.

- **Recreation:** The proposed modifications to the timing of the project would not result in additional impacts to recreation beyond those identified in the IS/MND because they would not result in operational changes beyond those identified and evaluated in the IS/MND for the Approved Project. The IS/MND did not identify any potentially significant impacts to recreation; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the construction timing of the project.

- **Transportation/Traffic:** The timing of the construction of projects would not result in additional impacts to transportation/traffic beyond those identified in the IS/MND. A Traffic Study was prepared for the Approved Project (November 2006). The construction of the additional industrial condominium units previously approved would not adversely affect overall vehicular circulation either on or off-site. The IS/MND did not identify any long-term impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, mitigation was not required. Furthermore, a Traffic Study for a residential project proposed for the site and neighboring properties (dated September 2014) revealed that existing traffic conditions in the vicinity have not substantially changed since the Traffic Study for the Approved Project was completed. The IS/MND did not identify any potentially significant impacts to transportation; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the construction timing of the project.

- **Utilities and Service Systems:** The timing of the project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of any utilities beyond those required by the project. Temporary short-term and operational demands on public utilities or other infrastructure would not measurably change under the timing of the construction of the project and therefore impacts would be less than significant and not mitigation measures are required.

- **Mandatory Findings of Significance:** The potential impacts of the changes of timing of construction of the previously approved project with regard to cultural resources and transportation/traffic would be comparable to the Approved Project. As impacts under the previously approved project, impacts would be less than significant in this regard and no mitigation measures are required.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon a review of the proposal to complete improvements that were originally approved and review of the surrounding area, it has been determined that an addendum is appropriate because

the proposed project is identical to the previously approved project and none of the following conditions) pursuant to CEQA Section 15162) have occurred:

1. Substantial changes are proposed for the project that will require major revision of the previous Negative Declaration due to new, significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects.

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new, significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects.

3. New information of substantial importance indicated that:

    a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Negative Declaration.

    b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Negative Declaration.

FINDINGS

1. The City of West Covina has determined that an addendum is warranted, finding that none of the above conditions are in evidence and that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the City, that the amendment proposal will have a significant effect on the environment.

2. The Addendum to the Negative Declaration, with its supporting documentation (Initial Study), reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City of West Covina.

3. Pursuant to Section 15074.1(b) of CEQA, the City of West Covina finds that the revised project will not cause potentially significant effect on the environment.

In preparing this Addendum, all of the potential impacts identified on the CEQA "Environmental Checklist Form" were considered. For all impact areas, a preliminary review indicated that the proposal is consistent with the original design of the project and therefore would have no new impact(s) not already identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Approved Project.

Based on the information provided above, the modification of construction timing to the Approved Project would not result in a measurable increase in environmental impacts over what was previously analyzed in the IS/MND. Although, timing of construction has changed, no new significant impacts have been identified that are substantially greater than the conclusions of the IS/MND.

APPLICABLE REPORTS IN CIRCULATION

This addendum is written as an addition to the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 70-unit industrial condominiums, certified January 23, 2007. A copy of the document is available for review at the West Covina Planning Department, 1444 West Garvey Avenue, Room 208, West Covina, CA 91790.

Jeff Anderson, Planning Director

4/30/15
Date

Attachments:

Certified Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Approved Project

CEQA INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. **Project Title:** Tentative Tract Map No. 62346 Revision 1, Precise Plan 06-17

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of West Covina
1444 W. Garvey Avenue South
West Covina, CA 91790

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Teresa Li
(626) 939-8764

4. **Project Location:** 1773 San Bernardino Road, located between Azusa Canyon Road and Yaleton Avenue, in the City of West Covina, Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County Assessor's No. 8435-015-036).

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** David Cook
WC Homes, LLC
2149 East Garvey Avenue North, Suite A-12
West Covina, CA 91791

6. **General Plan Designation:**
Current: Industrial and Manufacturing
Proposed: Industrial

7. **Zoning:**
Current: "Manufacturing" (M-1)
Proposed: "Manufacturing" (M-1)

8. **Specific Plan/Redevelopment Plan Designation:** N/A

9. **Description of Project:**
The proposed project consists of 70 industrial and 18 office condominium units in a 158,443 square-foot industrial park. Of the total square footage, 135,043 square feet would be devoted to industrial use, 20,578 square feet would be devoted to office use, and 2,822 square feet of the building area would be non-leasable. These uses would be housed in five one-story buildings and one two-story building. The proposed project will have 347 off-street parking spaces to serve the industrial and office condominium uses. A future cellular site will be located at the northwest corner of the project site. The parcel for the future cellular site is approximately 1,752 square feet. The proposed project would replace a previously-approved plan that included public storage.

10. **Surrounding Land Use and Setting:**
The project site is located at 1773 San Bernardino Road, between Azusa Canyon Road and Yaleton Avenue in the City of West Covina. The current address for the project site is 1631 to 1643 San Bernardino Road. The project site is located at the northwestern portion of the City of West Covina and abuts the City of Irwindale and the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The size of the project site is approximately 6.45-acres and consists of a drive-through dairy, a commercial vehicle storage facility, and a single-family residence. The project site is partially covered with pavement, gravel, and vegetation.

Surrounding land uses include a school within the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County located to the south of the site; a newspaper printing and distribution center located to the west of the site; a hardware store and lumber yard located to the east of the site; and a cabinet company across the nearby railroad tracks and within the jurisdiction of Irwindale to the north.

11. **Other public agencies whose approval is or may be required (e.g. permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement):**
None known.

12. Sources consulted in preparing Initial Study.

Ami Adini & Associates, Inc, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report*, September 2004

Ami Adini & Associates, Inc, *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Report*, November 2004

Environmental Science Associates, Environmental Review, March 2, 2006

Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Seismic Hazard Zones map

Katz, Okitsu, & Associates, *Traffic Impact Study for an Industrial Project in the City of West Covina*, November 2006

Gorden Bricken & Associates, Acoustical Analysis, March 2005

Thomas Olsen Associates, Tree Survey, March 2005

South Coast Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, 1993

Southern California Association of Governments, *Employment Density Study*, October 2001

West Covina General Plan

West Covina Municipal Code

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

1. Land Use and Planning
2. Population and Housing
3. Geological Problems
4. Water
5. Air Quality
6. Transportation/Circulation
7. Biological Resources
8. Energy and Mineral Resources
9. Hazards
10. Noise
11. Public Services
12. Utilities and Service Systems
13. Aesthetics
14. Cultural Resources
15. Recreation
16. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I found that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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 environments, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately addressed in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions to the project design or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Teresa Li
Signature

December 29, 2006
Date

Teresa Li
Printed Name

Planning Associate
City of West Covina

Instructions for the Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

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

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

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

4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from section 17, "earlier analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, as effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.

CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

WOULD THE PROPOSAL RESULT IN THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:	No Impact	Yes		
		Potential Significant Impact	Potential Unless Mitigation Inc.	Less Than Significant Impact
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING:				
A. Conflict with the general plan designation or zoning?	X			
B. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	X			
C. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	X			
D. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from the incompatible land uses)?	X			
E. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	X			
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING:				
A. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	X			
B. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	X			
C. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	X			
3. GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS:				
A. Fault Rupture?	X			
B. Seismic ground shaking?			X	
C. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	X			
D. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	X			
E. Landslides or mudflows?	X			
F. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?			X	
G. Expansive soils?	X			
H. Subsidence of the land?	X			
I. Unique geologic or physical features?	X			
4. WATER:				
A. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount or surface runoff?			X	
B. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding?	X			
C. Discharge into surface water or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	X			
D. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	X			
E. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	X			

WOULD THE PROPOSAL RESULT IN THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:	No Impact	Yes		
		Potential Significant Impact	Potential Unless Mitigation Inc.	Less Than Significant Impact
4. WATER (cont.):				
F. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge or capability?			X	
G. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	X			
H. Impacts to groundwater quality?	X			
I. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?			X	
5. AIR QUALITY:				
A. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	X			
B. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	X			
C. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	X			
D. Create objectionable odors?	X			
6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION:				
A. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?				X
B. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X
C. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	X			
D. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off site?	X			
7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:				
A. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	X			
B. Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)?	X			
C. Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	X			
D. Wetlands habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?	X			
E. Wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridors?	X			
8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES:				
A. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	X			
B. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	X			
C. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	X			

WOULD THE PROPOSAL RESULT IN THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:	No Impact	Yes		
		Potential Significant Impact	Potential Unless Mitigation Inc.	Less Than Significant Impact
9. HAZARDS:				
A. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?	X			
B. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X			
C. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	X			
D. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	X			
E. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	X			
10. NOISE:				
A. Increases in existing noise levels?			X	
B. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				X
11. PUBLIC SERVICES:				
A. Fire protection?	X			
B. Police protection?	X			
C. Schools?	X			
D. Other governmental services?	X			
E. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	X			
12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:				
A. Power or natural gas?				X
B. Communications systems?				X
C. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?				X
D. Sewer or septic tanks?				X
E. Storm waste disposal?				X
F. Solid waste disposal?				X
G. Local or regional water supplies?				X
13. AESTHETICS:				
A. Affect the scenic vista or scenic highways?	X			
B. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	X			
C. Create light or glare?				X
14. CULTURAL RESOURCES:				
A. Disturb paleontological resources?	X			
B. Disturb archaeological resources?	X			
C. Affect historical resources?	X			
15. RECREATION:				
A. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	X			
B. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	X			

WOULD THE PROPOSAL RESULT IN THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:	No Impact	Yes		
		Potential Significant Impact	Potential Unless Mitigation Inc.	Less Than Significant Impact
16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X			
B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	X			
C. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
D. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

EXPLANATION OF RESPONSES

LAND USE AND PLANNING

NO IMPACT

1. A-E. The project proposes the construction of an industrial park with 70 industrial condominium units and 18 office condominium units. The General Plan Land Use designation of the project site is "Industrial and Manufacturing." The current zoning of the project site is "Manufacturing" (M-1). The proposed industrial and office condominiums would be consistent with both the current General Plan land use designation and zoning.

The proposed project would be compatible with the land uses that surround the project site. Surrounding land uses include a school within the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County located south of the site; a newspaper printing and distribution located west of the site; a hardware store and lumber yard located east of the site, and a cabinet company across the nearby railroad tracks and within the jurisdiction of the City of Irwindale located north of the site.

Surrounding General Plan Land Use designations include "Industrial and Manufacturing" located west of the site, "Industrial and Manufacturing" located east of the site, the City of Irwindale across the train tracks located north of the site (industrial), and Los Angeles County across San Bernardino Road located south of the site (elementary school).

Surrounding zones include M-1 to the west and east of the project site, with Los Angeles County land to the south of the site and the City of Irwindale to the north of the site.

The proposed development would not conflict with any environmental plans or policies, nor affect any agricultural resources as no agricultural resources or

operations are located on or within the vicinity of the project site. The project site is located in an industrial area. No residential uses surround the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

NO IMPACT

2. A-C. The proposed project would not induce population growth in the area as no residential uses are being proposed on the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. Given the type of land use that is being proposed, it is expected that the new employees would be drawn from the local labor force readily available in the City and its surrounding communities. Thus, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and no impacts are anticipated.

GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

YES, POTENTIAL UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED

3. B, F. As with all properties in the seismically-active southern California region, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. Due to its southern California location, the proposed project would result in the exposure of persons and structure to an area of potentially medium to strong seismic ground motion. Construction of the proposed project and associated infrastructure shall be conducted in compliance with the standards of the Uniform Building Code, the City's Municipal Code, and the Public Works Department. Compliance with the applicable regulations would provide an acceptable level of protection from potential seismic ground shaking and associated hazards.

The project site is located on relatively flat land. Construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disruption activities, such as site grading. Grading would expose soils for a limited time, allowing for possible erosion. However, the temporary nature of the soil exposure would not be expected to cause substantial erosion. The site is relatively flat, and any subterranean excavation would be limited to that necessary for the extension of the existing foundation. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Erosion and subsequent sedimentation on the project site would be reduced as a result of implementation of the proposed project because the proposed construction would improve the surface drainage of the project site. Additionally, the proposed project shall comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board standards regarding storm water runoff and shall implement best management practices to minimize erosion. The building department monitors the implementation of best management practices.

NO IMPACT

3. A, C-E, G-I.

According to the West Covina General Plan, no fault zones are located within the City. According to the Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology Seismic Hazard Zones map (Baldwin Park Quadrangle), the project site is not located within a liquefaction hazard zone. As such, the project site would not be considered prone to liquefaction.

No landslides or mudflows are anticipated as the project site and the surrounding area is relatively flat and no watercourses or drainages are located within the immediate vicinity of the project site.

No potential for tsunamis exists due to the distance of the project site to the sea. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone.

The proposed project would be subject to grading, foundation design, and building design safety requirements of the City's Public Works Department, Municipal Code, and the Uniform Building Code, which would minimize the potential risks associated with exposing properties to expansive soil and subsidence. Additionally, no known unique physical or geological features are associated with the project site.

WATER

YES, POTENTIAL UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED

4. A, F, I. The project site is partially covered with pavement, gravel, and vegetation, with the majority of the project site covered with vegetation or is unpaved. With the addition of impermeable surfaces, the amount of water absorbed directly below the project site into the aquifers would be greatly reduced.

Development of the proposed industrial park and associated infrastructure would result in the construction of impermeable surfaces on the project site, for example: driveways, rooftops, etc. Construction of impermeable surfaces might affect drainage patterns, absorption rates, runoff amounts, and consequently might increase the amount of water discharged from the site. The proposed project shall meet the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plans (SUSWMPS) standards. The grading and drainage design shall also be designed by a registered Civil Engineer and reviewed by the City Engineer to determine compliance with SUSWMPS. Compliance with the Municipal Code and the requirements of the City Engineering Department would reduce potential impacts on drainage to a less than significant level.

NO IMPACT

4. B-E, G-H. The proposed project would not expose people or the property to a significant flooding hazard as the project site is not located within an area subject to flooding. The City of West Covina is generally within a zone "X" flood plain designation, which does not require the implementation of a flood plain management plan.

No watercourses are located on or within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly discharge water into surface water or otherwise affect water quality, change the amount of surface water in a body of water, or change the course of direction of water movements.

The proposed project does not propose to extract groundwater; therefore, no changes to groundwater supply or quality would occur. Due to the small scale of the proposed project and in considering its urbanized setting, no significant impacts to groundwater recharge would occur. Erosion and subsequent sedimentation at the project site would be reduced because the development would be constructed so that the drainage of surface water on the site will be improved.

AIR QUALITY

NO IMPACT

5. A-D. The proposed industrial and office condominiums on an 6.45-acre site would involve site grading, building construction, and landscape installation. These activities would generate construction-related emissions. The vehicular trips generated by the future occupants of the proposed project would also result in vehicular (operational) emissions.

Construction and operational emissions associated with the implementation of the proposed project were estimated using URBEMIS 2002. This program uses built-in defaults based on the type of project that is being proposed. The estimated emissions were then compared with the significance thresholds for air quality specified in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Handbook. For the previous project, both construction and operations impacts were substantially less than significant as construction and operational emissions were below the SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds. By changing the use of a portion of the project site from self-storage to industrial use, daily trips will increase slightly but not nearly enough to result in a significant air quality impact. Construction emissions associated with the proposed project are not substantially different than quantified in the previously approved Initial Study.

Project grading and construction has the potential to result in the generation of fugitive dust (particulate matter) that could impact surrounding properties. SCAQMD has developed Rule 403, which requires the implementation of best available fugitive dust control measures during operations capable of generating fugitive dust. The purpose of Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter that is present in the air as a result of man-made fugitive dust sources.

Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce fugitive dust emissions during construction of the proposed project and would ensure proper implementation of Rule 403. These mitigation measures include wetting down soils, chemical stabilization of unattended construction areas, planting vegetative ground cover as soon as possible on construction sites, and physically covering all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or other loose materials to and from the site. See the "Mitigation Measures" section located at the end of this Initial Study for a list of mitigation measures to reduce fugitive dust.

Due to the scale and character of the proposed development, air movement, moisture, temperature, or changes in the climate are not anticipated.

Construction activities within the project area may cause temporary objectionable odors affecting people in the immediate vicinity. Any odors would be temporary and intermittent in nature.

The proposed project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 (prohibiting nuisance air emissions), which would ensure that no impacts related to objectionable odors would occur.

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

YES, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

6. A, B. Katz, Okitsu and Associates (KOA) conducted a traffic study, dated November, 2006, for the proposed project. Access to the project site would be via two entrances on San Bernardino Road. San Bernardino Road is designated a four-lane (80-foot right-of-way) "Minor Arterial." The trip generation rates in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* (7th Edition) was used to estimate traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. The proposed project is estimated to result in a net increase of about 1,093 daily trips, 109 weekday a.m. peak-hour trips, and 110 weekday p.m. peak-hour trips.

Per the traffic study conducted by KOA, the current roadway level of service (LOS) for the project area ranges from LOS A to LOS B during the AM peak hour, and LOS A through LOS C during the PM peak hour. These conditions are within the acceptable range for the City. LOS C would occur at the intersection of San Bernardino Road and Irwindale Avenue. Project-related traffic is not anticipated to degrade existing LOS to unacceptable levels (i.e., LOS E and F). LOS at the analyzed intersections would remain the same as existing conditions.

Thus, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase traffic congestion in the project vicinity, and traffic impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project does not consist of any design features that would result in safety hazards. Thus, impacts associated with safety hazards are considered less than significant.

NO IMPACT

6. C-D. Emergency access to and within the project site would be reviewed by the City of West Covina Public Works Department and Fire Department. The proposed project would contain a fire lane along the proposed driveways. The firelane would be accessible through the two entrances on San Bernardino Road.

The City Municipal Code requires the proposed project to provide 339 parking spaces. The proposed project would provide 347 parking spaces, which is eight spaces more than the required amount. Thus, the proposed project would provide sufficient amount of parking spaces, and no impacts are anticipated.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

NO IMPACT

7. A-E. The project site is located on San Bernardino Road, in the City of West Covina. The 6.45-acre project site is developed with a single-family home, a drive through dairy, and a vehicle storage facility. The project site had been previously operated as a poultry and egg ranch. The project site and vicinity have been heavily impacted as a result of prior development.

Surrounding land uses include a school within the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County located south of the site, a newspaper printing and distribution center located west of the site, a hardware store and lumber yard located east of the site, and a cabinet company located north of the site across from the adjacent railroad tracks and within the jurisdiction of the City of Irwindale.

The project site is previously disturbed and located within an urbanized setting. No natural communities, endangered species or their habitats, locally-designated species, or locally-designated natural communities are located on the project site. No wetlands or watercourses are located at the site or within its immediate vicinity. The proposed project would, therefore, not significantly impact wildlife migration corridors.

ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

NO IMPACT

8. A-C. All buildings would be constructed in compliance with Title 24 of the California Building Code that requires use of energy efficient equipment and fixtures. In addition, landscaping and irrigation plans would be reviewed to ensure implementation of water efficient measures and the use of drought tolerant plant materials. No known economic mineral resources are present at the project site.

HAZARDS

NO IMPACT

9. A-E. The proposed project includes approximately 135,043 square feet of light industrial land uses that might involve the use and management of hazardous materials whose release could pose a risk to nearby land uses. Other proposed land uses are not of a type that is likely to involve the use or management of hazardous materials. It is anticipated that small amounts of hazardous materials in

the form of paints and solvents would be used during project construction and operation.

The proposed industrial land uses would comply with Fire Department requirements regarding the use, management, and disclosure of information pertaining to the presence of any hazardous materials on the project site. Compliance with the Fire Department requirements would protect ensure that potential health hazards are avoided. The proposed project would not expose people to existing sources of health hazards.

The proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The proposed project was developed in consultation with the Fire Department and Police Department. The proposed project is required to comply with applicable access standards, as determined by the Fire Department.

The proposed project is located within an already urbanized area and would not significantly increase wild lands fire hazards, as the project site is not located near areas of flammable brush.

NOISE

YES, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

10. A. Two types of short-term noise impacts might occur during construction. The first type would be related to construction crew commutes and the transport of materials and equipment to and from the project site. The second type of noise impact is related to noise generated by demolition, excavation, grading, and building construction at the project site. Construction of the proposed project is expected to require the use of earthmovers, bulldozers, and water and pickup trucks.

Short-term noise levels would increase during the grading and construction phases of the proposed project as a result of the operation of vehicles and construction equipment. The increased noise levels could affect surrounding land uses such as the nearby school south of the project site. Compliance with the City's construction and noise ordinances would reduce the temporary noise level increases to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures include restricting excavation, grading, and other construction activities to daytime hours when construction activities could cause the noise level at the site to exceed the ambient noise levels by more than five decibels.

During operation, the proposed project would not generate a significant increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Noise generated from the project site would be consistent with other industrial uses surrounding the project site. Additionally, it generally takes doubling of the traffic volume to have a noticeable (i.e., three-decibel) increase in traffic noise. Vehicular trips associated with the proposed project would not double the amount of traffic that currently exist on the surrounding streets. Thus, noise level increase would not be perceptible and sensitive receptors would not be exposed to severe noise levels.

With regards to interior noise, the proposed project would be required to comply with Title 24 of the Uniform Building Code for the conservation of energy. Consequently, the buildings would be constructed with insulated walls, glazed windows, etc.

YES, POTENTIAL UNLESS MITIGATION INCLDED

10. B. The property line of the project site is located within 16 feet of the centerline of an existing railroad tracks located north of the site. Additionally, industrial land uses are located across the railroad tracks, north of the project site in the City of

Irwindale, a lumber yard is located to the east of the site, and a newspaper printing and distribution center to the west of the site.

Gordon Bricken & Associates submitted an Acoustical Study in March 2005. The study indicated that the noise from the surrounding industrial land uses and train could significantly impact the site and would require noise control barriers to minimize the affect of noise producing sources that surround the project site. According to the acoustical study, the Metrolink train runs approximately 36 times a day with the majority of the trips in the morning and evening hours during rush hour.

The exterior noise calculations have predicted exterior noise levels of 70 decibels (dBA) community noise equivalent level (CNEL) along San Bernardino Road, 71 dBA (CNEL) along the east and west property line, and 74 dBA (CNEL) along the north property line.

The maximum interior noise level permitted by the Municipal Code is 45 dBA (CNEL). Interior noise reduction levels as high as 26 dBA would be required for second floor office spaces along San Bernardino Road. Such interior reduction levels are beyond normal yield of construction minimums. Thus, additional interior mitigation measures would be required and are included at the end of this Initial Study.

The acoustical study indicated that to reduce the effect of noise from the surrounding noise sources, sound walls would be required. The study recommends that an eight-foot sound wall be installed on the east and west sides of the property to mitigate noise from the neighboring industrial land uses. Additionally, the study recommended that the design of the buildings include double-pane glass, the use of siding or stucco, mounting interior drywall on resilient channels and carpeting to help minimize interior noise levels.

PUBLIC SERVICES

NO IMPACT

11. A-E. The proposed project would not result in an increase in demand for public services including fire protection, police, and school services. The proposed project includes the construction of an industrial park that would not require a significant increase in the provision of public services.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

YES, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

12. A-G. The proposed project would result in an incremental increase in demand on utilities such as gas, power, water, and sewer systems. Given the relatively small scale of the project in comparison to the surrounding heavily developed urban setting, the project is not expected to significantly impact utilities and service systems. Further, the proposed project would be designed in compliance with Title 24 of the California Building Code's energy efficiency criteria. Appropriate connections to utility systems would also be installed by the developer in compliance with the requirements of the Building Division.

AESTHETICS

NO IMPACT

13. A, B. No scenic highways are located on the project site. The proposed project includes 70 industrial condominiums, 18 office condominiums, and other facilities typically appurtenant to this type of development. The proposed project is located within an industrial area, and the proposed uses are compatible with the

surrounding area in terms of height and massing. As such, the proposed project would not have an impact on aesthetic resources.

YES, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

13. C. The proposed project would introduce new sources of light as a result of exterior and street lighting. Light spillover and glare would be minimized by requiring lights to be designed so as to prevent the light from shining directly onto surrounding properties, per the requirements of the Planning Commission Resolution No. 2513, Revision No. 6. Architectural building lighting would be subject to West Covina Municipal Code Section 26570. Light and glare impacts would, therefore, be less than significant.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

NO IMPACT

14. A-C. There are no known historically or culturally significant resources, structures, buildings or objects associated with the project site. The project site is largely surrounded by developed and disturbed properties. In the event that cultural resources are discovered, the developer shall notify the Planning Department and halt or divert work until such time as a qualified specialist, as determined by the West Covina Planning Department, has been retained to assess the findings and initiate a recovery program.

RECREATION

NO IMPACT

15. A, B. Permanent residential population primarily generates the demand for recreational facilities. As the proposed project does not involve residential land uses, a direct increase in residential population is not anticipated. The land uses associated with the proposed project would attract individuals who have a specific destination and purpose for being on the project site and are not likely to pursue other recreational activities. Thus, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities or affect existing recreational opportunities.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NO IMPACT

16. A. No sensitive native plant communities are located at the project site. The project site is currently developed with a drive-through dairy, a single-family home, and a vehicle storage facility. The project site is located within a highly urbanized setting. No known cultural resources are associated with the project site. The proposed project would not degrade the quality of the natural environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

16. B. This Initial Study has not identified any potential for the proposed project to achieve short-term environmental goals at the expense of long-term environmental goals. The proposed project is required to comply with the West Covina Municipal Code and all other applicable codes and regulations.

YES, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

16. C. The proposed project includes the development of an underutilized manufacturing property along San Bernardino Road. The project site is currently zoned for manufacturing development. Due to the relatively small scale of the development, the design of the proposed project, the compatibility with surrounding land uses,

and mitigation measures that would be incorporated into the project design as conditions of approval, the impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

16. D. The proposed project does not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects to humans directly or indirectly. Potential impacts of the project would be less than significant, and mitigation measures would be incorporated into project approval to reduce the effects on the environment.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures below shall be applied to the proposed project:

GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

1. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall obtain the approval of the grading plan from the Engineering Division. The developer shall comply with the requirements of the City Engineer and Building Official. All grading shall comply with the provisions of the West Covina Municipal Code.

2. All graded areas shall be protected with suitable groundcover so as to stabilize graded surfaces. The developer shall install all intended vegetative ground cover as soon as practicable after completion of earthmoving operations to provide effective soil stabilization.

WATER

3. Drainage improvements shall conform to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District and be reviewed and approved prior to issuance of grading permits. All grading and drainage shall comply with the provisions of the West Covina Municipal Code.

4. The developer shall obtain a construction permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction period stormwater discharges. The developer shall comply with the SUSMP. Additionally, the developer shall incorporate best management practices to prevent the discharge of pollution, trash, litter, etc. into watercourses.

AIR QUALITY

5. Vigorous wetting procedures or other dust palliative measures shall be maintained during earth moving operations to minimize fugitive dust emissions in compliance with applicable codes and ordinances pertaining to dust suppression requirements (including SCAQMD Rule 403).

6. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the project site. At a minimum, this measure would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.

7. Roadways shall be periodically swept as determined by the City engineer and/or maintenance services superintendent or otherwise cleared of any spilled materials to assist in minimizing fugitive dust.

8. Trucks importing or exporting earthen materials shall be covered or sprinkled with water prior to entering public streets.

9. Heavy-duty construction equipment shall be kept onsite when not in use to minimize exhaust emissions associated with vehicles repetitiously traveling to and from the project site.

10. The number of pieces of equipment simultaneously operating shall be minimized through efficient management practices.

11. Construction equipment shall be maintained in proper tune to reduce exhaust emissions.

12. Diesel-powered equipment such as booster pumps or generators shall be replaced by electric equipment, if feasible.

13. During Santa Ana wind conditions with wind speeds exceeding 15 mph, soil disturbance areas shall be watered hourly or active operations on unpaved surfaces shall be terminated until the wind speeds no longer exceed 15 mph.

14. Graded surfaces shall be vegetated as soon as feasibly possible after the completion of grading within the construction area.

15. Landscaping shall be installed on all graded surfaces proposed for landscaping as soon as feasibly possible after the completion of grading operations.

HAZARDS

16. All demolition procedures shall comply with state and West Covina Public Works Department requirements regarding the removal of any hazardous substances, including but not limited to asbestos and asbestos-containing building materials.

NOISE

17. During grading and construction, delivery of materials and equipment, outdoor operations of equipment, and construction, activity shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

18. Mechanical equipment to be installed at the project site shall be required to operate below 65 dB levels as measured from the nearest property line.

19. All construction equipment, stationary or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.

20. All construction equipment shall be stored on the project site during the construction phase to eliminate daily heavy-duty truck trips on vicinity roadways.

21. Building façade upgrades shall be installed in accordance with the Gorden Bricken & Associates' acoustical analysis dated March 2005.

AESTHETICS

22. All exterior lighting shall be hooded and directed so as to reflect away from adjoining properties. Architectural building lighting shall be subject to West Covina Municipal Code Section 26-570.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

23. In the event that paleontological or cultural resources are discovered at the project site, the developer shall notify the Planning Department and halt or divert work until such time as a qualified specialist, as determined by the West Covina Planning Department, has been retained to assess the findings and initiate a recovery program, as appropriate.