INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA



LEAD AGENCY:

CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT 11710 TELEGRAPH ROAD SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA 90670

REPORT PREPARED BY:

BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING 2211 S. HACIENDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 107 HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 91745

MAY 25, 2021

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NAME: Greenstone Avenue Industrial Development.

- APPLICANT: Mr. Bobby Nassir, 1820 San Vicente Boulevard, Santa Monica, California, 90402.
- ADDRESS: 11401 Greenstone Avenue, Santa Fe Springs, CA, 90670. Assessor Parcel Number (APN): 8026-018-023.
- **CITY/COUNTY:** Santa Fe Springs, Los Angeles County.
- **DESCRIPTION:** This Initial Study evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is located at 11401 Greenstone Avenue and the corresponding assessor's parcel number (APN) is 8026-018-023. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new 144,434 square foot building that would include a 6,958 square foot mezzanine. Of this total floor area, 134,995 square feet would include warehouse space, 5,421 square feet of office space, and 4,018 square feet of storage space. A total of 16 dock high loading doors will be provided along the building's north elevation. A total of 205 parking spaces will be provided for employees and visitors. Access to the site will be provided by two, 40-foot wide driveway connections with the west side of Greenstone Avenue.
- **FINDINGS:** The environmental analysis provided in the attached Initial Study indicates that the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts with the implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures. For this reason, the City of Santa Fe Springs determined that a *Mitigated Negative Declaration* is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project. The following findings may be made based on the analysis contained in the attached Initial Study:
 - The proposed project *will not* have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
 - The proposed project *will not* have the potential to achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
 - The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, when considering planned or proposed development in the City.
 - The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects that will adversely affect humans, either directly or indirectly.

The environmental analysis is provided in the attached Initial Study prepared for the proposed project. The project is also described in greater detail in the attached Initial Study.

Signature

Date

City of Santa Fe Springs Planning and Development Department



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sectio	n	Pa	ge
1.0	Intr	oduction	.6
	1.1	Purpose of the Initial Study	6
	1.2	Initial Study's Organization	7
2.0	Proj	ect Description	.8
	2.1	Project Overview	8
	2.2	Project Location	8
	2.3	Environmental Setting	12
	2.4	Project Description	14
	2.5	Physical Characteristics of the Proposed Project	.14
	2.6	Construction Characteristics	.15
	2.7	Operational Characteristics	.19
	2.8	Discretionary Actions	19
	2.9	Related (Cumulative) Projects	19
3.0	Envi	ronmental Analysis	22
0	3.1	Aesthetics	23
	3.2	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	26
	3.3	Air Quality	29
	3.4	Biological Resources	35
	3.5	Cultural Resources	40
	3.6	Energy	44
	3.7	Geology and Soils	46
	3.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	51
	3.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	56
	3.10	Hydrology and Water Quality	61
	3.11	Land Use and Planning	65
	3.12	Mineral Resources	69
	3.13	Noise	.71
	3.14	Population and Housing	75
	3.15	Public Services	77
	3.16	Recreation	80
	3.17	Transportation and Circulation	82
	3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources	89
	3.19	Utilities	92
	3.20	Wildfire	97
	3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance 1	.01
4.0	Con	clusions)2
-	4.1	Findings1	02
	4.2	Mitigation Monitoring1	02
5.0	Refe	erences)4
0.0	5.1	Preparers	04
	5.2	References	.04
A		A	
Арре	enulx	A 10	90

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is located at 11401 Greenstone Avenue and the corresponding assessor's parcel number (APN) is 8026-018-023. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new 144,434 square foot building that would include a 6,958 square foot mezzanine. Of this total floor area, 134,995 square feet would include warehouse space, 5,421 square feet of office space, and 4,018 square feet of storage space. A total of 16 dock high loading doors will be provided along the building's north elevation. A total of 205 parking spaces will be provided for employees and visitors. Access to the site will be provided by two, 40-foot wide driveway connections with the west side of Greenstone Avenue.¹

The City of Santa Fe Springs is the designated *Lead Agency* for the proposed project and will be responsible for the project's environmental review.² The operation of the proposed development is considered to be a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and, as a result, the project is subject to the City's environmental review process.³ The project Applicant is Mr. Bobby Nassir, 1820 San Vicente Boulevard, Santa Monica, California, 90402.

As part of the proposed project's environmental review, the City of Santa Fe Springs has authorized the preparation of this Initial Study.⁴ The primary purpose of CEQA is to ensure that decision-makers and the public understand the environmental implications of a specific action or project. An additional purpose of this Initial Study is to ascertain whether the proposed project will have the potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment once it is implemented. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, additional purposes of this Initial Study include the following:

- To provide the City of Santa Fe Springs with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or Negative Declaration (ND) for a project;
- To facilitate the project's environmental assessment early in the design and development of the proposed project;
- To eliminate unnecessary EIRs; and,
- To determine the nature and extent of any impacts associated the proposed project.

Although this Initial Study was prepared with consultant support, the analysis, conclusions, and findings made as part of its preparation fully represent the independent judgment and position of the City of Santa Fe Springs in its capacity as the Lead Agency. The City determined, as part of this Initial Study's preparation,

¹ C.E.G. Construction, Inc. *Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05.* December 8, 2020.

² California, State of. California Public Resources Code. Division 13, Chapter 2.5. Definitions. as Amended 2001. §21067.

³ California, State of. *Title 14. California Code of Regulations. Chapter 3. Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.* as Amended 2016 (CEQA Guidelines). §15060 (b).

⁴ Ibid.

that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document for the proposed project's CEQA review. This Initial Study and the *Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration* will be forwarded to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the public for review and comment. A 20-day public review period will be provided to allow these entities and other interested parties to comment on the proposed project and the findings of this Initial Study.⁵ Questions and/or comments should be submitted to the following individual:

Vince Velasco, Associate Planner City of Santa Fe Springs, Planning and Development Department 11710 East Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, California 90670 562-868-0511

1.2 INITIAL STUDY'S ORGANIZATION

The following annotated outline summarizes the contents of this Initial Study:

- *Section 1 Introduction,* provides the procedural context surrounding this Initial Study's preparation and insight into its composition.
- *Section 2 Project Description*, provides an overview of the existing environment as it relates to the project area and describes the proposed project's physical and operational characteristics.
- *Section 3 Environmental Analysis,* includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with the construction (site improvement) and the subsequent operation of the proposed project.
- Section 4 Conclusions, summarizes the findings of the analysis.
- Section 5 References, identifies the sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study.



⁵ California, State of. *Title 14. California Code of Regulations. Chapter 3. Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.* as Amended 2016 (CEQA Guidelines). §15060 (b).

SECTION 2 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Initial Study evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new 144,434 square foot building that would include a 6,958 square foot mezzanine. Of this total floor area, 134,995 square feet would include warehouse space, 5,421 square feet of office space, and 4,018 square feet of storage space. A total of 16 dock high loading doors will be provided along the building's north elevation. A total of 205 parking spaces will be provided for employees and visitors. Access to the site will be provided by two, 40-foot-wide driveway connections with the west side of Greenstone Avenue.⁶

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located within the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs and occupies frontage along the west side of Greenstone Avenue. The City of Santa Fe Springs is located approximately 13 miles southeast of Downtown Los Angeles and 18 miles northwest of Downtown Santa Ana. Santa Fe Springs is bounded on the north by Whittier and an unincorporated County area (West Whittier); on the east by Whittier, La Mirada, and an unincorporated County area (East Whittier); on the south by Cerritos and Norwalk; and on the west by Pico Rivera and Downey.⁷

Major physiographic features located in the vicinity of the City include the San Gabriel River, located approximately 2.9 miles west of the project site and the Puente Hills, located 3.9 miles northeast of the site. Regional access to Santa Fe Springs is possible from two freeways: the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) and the San Gabriel River Freeway (I-605). The I-5 Freeway extends along the City's western and southern portions in a northwest-southeast orientation and the I-605 Freeway extends along the City's westerly side in a southwest-northeast orientation.⁸ The location of Santa Fe Springs in a regional context is shown in Exhibit 2-1. A citywide map is provided in Exhibit 2-2.

The project site's legal address is 11401 Greenstone Avenue, Santa Fe Springs, California, 90670. The project site is located on the west side of Greenstone Avenue approximately 1,350 feet south of Lakeland Road. The corresponding assessor's parcel number (APN) is 8026-018-023.⁹ Shoemaker Avenue, located approximately 900 feet to the east of the project site, is the corporate boundary between the City of Santa Fe Springs and the County of Los Angeles. A local map is provided in Exhibit 2-3. The nearest arterial roadways to the project site include Florence Avenue, located approximately 0.84 miles to the north of the site (via Bloomfield Avenue), and Imperial Highway, located approximately 0.86 miles to the south of the project site (via Sunshine Avenue and Shoemaker Avenue).¹⁰

⁶ C.E.G. Construction, Inc. *Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05*. December 8, 2020.

⁷ Google.com/maps. Website accessed April 5, 2021.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ C.E.G. Construction, Inc. *Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05.* December 8, 2020.

¹⁰ Google.com/maps. Website accessed April 5, 2021.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 2-1 REGIONAL LOCATION SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 2-2 CITYWIDE MAP Source: Quantum GIS

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 2-3 LOCAL MAP SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

2.3 Environmental Setting

The 6.63-acre project site is currently being used as a truck trailer parking facility and is occupied by J. B. Hunt Transport Services, Inc. The project site is surrounded by development on all sides. Exhibits 2-4 is an aerial photograph of the project site. Surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the project site are listed below:

- *North of the Project Site*. A distribution use, TwinMed, LLC., is located to the north of the site at 11133 Greenstone Avenue. The site is located adjacent to the project site.¹¹
- *South of the Project Site*. A manufacturing building, Maruichi American Corp. is located to the south of the site at 13929 Greenstone Avenue. This use is located adjacent to the project site's south side.¹²
- *East of the Project Site*. Greenstone Avenue extends along the project site's east side. Further east, on the east side of Greenstone Avenue, are other industrial uses. The Rio Hondo Fire Academy is located opposite the project site on the east side of Greenstone Avenue at 11400 Greenstone Avenue. A new FedEx Ground shipping facility is located further south.¹³
- *West of the Project Site*. A railroad right-of-way extends along the site's west side. Further west, is Kelly Pipe Co.¹⁴

As indicated previously, the project site is currently occupied by J. B. Hunt Transport Services, Inc. The site is being used as a truck trailer parking facility. An office and a maintenance building occupy the northeast corner of the property and these improvements will be removed when development commences. The majority of site is currently unpaved though the site is level and has been graded. The site's frontage along Greenstone Avenue is landscaped and includes seven mature evergreen trees in the parkway area. Access to the site is currently provided by a single driveway located along the west side of Greenstone Avenue. ¹⁵

The project site is located approximately 1,000 feet, north of the former Kalico Number 1 Landfill which is located at 11801 Greenstone Avenue. According to the City's methane zone maps, the proposed project site is located within a methane risk zone. Within the project site are a number of extraction monitoring wells that will be relocated to the site's southwest corner.¹⁶

- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- 15 Ibid.

¹¹ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on April 25, 2021.

¹⁶ City of Santa Fe Springs. <u>Methane Zones.</u> Website accessed April 27, 2021.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 2-4 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.4.1 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project will involve the construction of a new 144,434 square foot warehouse building within the 6.63-acre site. The proposed project will consist of the following elements:

- *Site Plan*. The project site has a total land area of 6.63 acres (288,935 square feet). The project site is rectangular in shape with a width (north to south) of 337 feet and a depth (east to west) of 857 feet. Once developed, the lot coverage would be 50% and the floor area ratio (FAR) would be 0.499:1.0. The project site, following development would be occupied by the single 144,434 square foot tilt-up concrete building. The loading docks (16 dock high doors) and truck maneuvering areas would be located in the northern portion of the site while the other parking areas would be concentrated along the north and east sides.
- *Building*. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new 144,434 square foot building that would include a 6,958 square foot mezzanine. The mezzanine would total 6,958 square feet and would include 2,940 square feet of office and 4,018 square feet of storage. Of the total building floor area, 134,995 square feet would include warehouse space, 5,421 square feet of office space, and 4,018 square feet of storage space. The building's dimensions are 728 feet (east to west) by 216 feet (north to south). The maximum outside height of the building would be 38 feet, 6-inches.¹⁷
- Access and Circulation. Access to the site will be provided by two, 40-foot-wide driveway connections located along the west side of Greenstone Avenue. The northernmost driveway will be the nearest driveway to the loading/receiving docks and the truck maneuvering area. The southernmost driveway will also be available for both trucks and vehicles. A 26-foot wide roadway will be located around the building and will also serve as a fire lane.¹⁸
- *Parking*. A total of 205 parking spaces will be provided for employees and visitors. A total of 139 stalls will be standard size, 8 stalls will be ADA accessible, 16 stalls will be reserved for clean air vehicles, and 10 stalls will be reserved for EV vehicles. Parking areas will be concentrated in the front (eastern) portion of the site, along the northern side, and 32 parallel spaces along the site's south side.¹⁹
- *Landscaping*. A total of 17,425 square feet of land area will be landscaped. Of this total, 6,408 square feet will be located in the Greenstone frontage and the remaining 11,017 square feet will be located around the new building and along the north and west perimeter. All of the landscaping will be drought resistant (xeriscape).²⁰

- 18 Ibid.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷ C.E.G. Construction, Inc. *Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05.* December 8, 2020.

²⁰ Ibid.

The proposed project is summarized in Table 2-1. The proposed site plan is provided in Exhibit 2-5 and the building elevations are provided in Exhibits 2-6 and 2-7.

Summary of Proposed Project					
Project Element	Total Project				
Parcel (Site) Area	288,935 sq. ft. (6.63 acres)				
Building Floor Area	144,434 sq. ft.				
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	0.499 to 1.0				
Lot Coverage	50%				
Building Height	38 feet				
Parking Stalls	205 parking spaces				
Loading Docks	16 truck doors				
Landscape Area	17,425 sq. ft.				

Table 2-1
Summary of Proposed Project

Source: C.E.G. Construction, Inc. *Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05.* December 8, 2020.

2.4.2 CONSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS

The construction of the phase for the proposed project would take approximately nine months to complete. The key construction phases are outlined below:

- *Grading and Site Preparation.* The project site will be readied for the construction of the proposed project. All of the existing onsite improvements will be removed during this phase. This must be done prior to building construction. This phase will take approximately one month to complete.
- *Construction.* The new building will be constructed during this phase. This phase will take approximately four months to complete.
- *Paving*. This phase will involve the addition of paving of the roadway and parking areas. This phase will take approximately two months to complete.
- *Landscaping and Finishing*. This phase will involve the planting of landscaping, painting of the building, and the completion of the on-site improvements. This phase will last approximately two months.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS





BUILDING 1 ELEVATIONS

SOURCE: C.E.G.

EXHIBIT 2-6



EXHIBIT 2-7 BUILDING 1 ELEVATIONS Source: C.E.G.

2.4.2 OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The specific business and/or tenant(s) that would ultimately occupy the proposed building are not known at this time. Any prospective use must be either permitted by right or conditionally permitted under the City of Santa Fe Springs Zoning Ordinance. The operating hours of the potential business or businesses that may ultimately occupy the building are also unknown at this time. The proposed project is anticipated to add up to 95 new jobs based on a ratio of one employee per 1,518 square feet of floor area.²¹ Nevertheless, the project will have an adequate supply of parking to accommodate demand from new employees.

2.5 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

A Discretionary Action is an action taken by a government agency (for this project, the government agency is the City of Santa Fe Springs) that calls for an exercise of judgment in deciding whether to approve a project. The proposed project will require the approval of the following discretionary actions:

- Development Plan Approval (DPA Case No. 980) to construct an industrial buildings on land currently used a truck trailer parking facility; and,
- Approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

2.6 RELATED (CUMULATIVE) PROJECTS

Cumulative impacts refer to the combined effect of project impacts with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. As set forth in the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15355,

"Cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

(a) The individual effects may include changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.

(b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time."

The cumulative project list identified below and on the following page was provided by the City of Santa Fe Springs. The identified related projects include the following:

• *Related Project #1 - Lakeland Road Housing Development*. This related project would involve the construction of a new 139-unit housing development on a site located near the intersection of Lakeland Road and Laurel Avenue. The proposed project would involve the construction and occupancy of 121 rental units and 18 owner-occupied townhome condominium units. The proposed project would also include the development of a total of four adjacent parcels, all with a Multiple-

²¹ The Natelson Company, Inc. Employment Density Study Summary Report. October 31, 2001.

Family Residential-Planned Unit Development (R3-PD) designation. The total land area to be developed with the construction of the proposed project is 4.68 acres (203,761 square feet). This related project is located approximately 3,200 feet to the northeast of the project site. The project is currently seeking entitlements.

- *Related Project #2 Lakeland Apartments*. This related project is a new 128-unit apartment complex within a 5.13-acre (223,421 square feet) site located on the west side of Carmenita Road in between Lakeland Road and Meyer Road. The project site is a remnant of Carmela Elementary School, which is adjacent to the related project site. This related project will consist of seven new apartment buildings and a community/recreation building (amenity building). This related project is located approximately 3,100 feet to the west of the project site. This project has been approved by the City and construction activities have commenced.
- *Related Project #3 Greenstone Trailer Parking Project.* The 5.55-acre project site consists of one parcel that is located at 12017 Greenstone Avenue. The proposed parking area would consist of 202,000 square feet and would be designed to accommodate 158 trailer parking spaces. The new parking lot will provide trailer parking for the nearby FedEx facility. This related project is located approximately 2,000 feet to the south of the project site. This related project was recently completed and is now operational.
- *Related Project #4 Rexford Project, 12133 Greenstone Avenue.* The proposed project would involve the expansion of an existing truck terminal_with a total land area of approximately 4.7-acres. As proposed, the lot will include 80 designated parking spaces for the parking of trucks and trailers as well as 35 standard parking stalls with 15 docking positions. In addition, an existing warehouse and maintenance building consisting of 12,586 square feet of floor area, will be refurbished with a new four-foot-high loading dock with an additional 4,633 square feet as the proposed building will be a total of 17,219 square feet. This related project is located approximately 2,240 feet to the south of the project site. This related project is awaiting approval.

The nearest related projects to the proposed project site include two related projects (Related Projects #3 and #4) located to the south of the project site on Greenstone Avenue. The potential for projects to have a cumulative impact depends on both their geographic location as well as the timing of development. The geographic area affected by cumulative projects will vary depending on the environmental topic. For example, construction noise impacts would be limited to areas directly affected by construction noise, whereas the area affected by a project's air emissions generally includes the local South Coast Air Basin. The timing of the future projects is likely to fluctuate due to schedule changes or other unknown factors.



THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

SECTION 3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This section of the Initial Study analyzes the potential environmental impacts that may result from the proposed project's implementation. The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include the following:

Aesthetics (Section 3.1); Agricultural &Forestry Resources (Section 3.2); Air Quality (Section 3.3); Biological Resources (Section 3.4); Cultural Resources (Section 3.5); Energy (Section 3.6) Geology & Soils (Section 3.7); Greenhouse Gas Emissions; (Section 3.8); Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Section 3.9); Hydrology & Water Quality (Section 3.10); Land Use & Planning (Section 3.11);

Mineral Resources (Section 3.12); Noise (Section 3.13); Population & Housing (Section 3.14); Public Services (Section 3.15); Recreation (Section 3.16); Transportation (Section 3.17); Tribal Cultural Resources (Section 3.18); Utilities (Section 3.19); Wildfire (Section 3.20); and, Mandatory Findings of Significance (Section 3.21).

The environmental analysis included in this section reflects the Initial Study Checklist format used by the City of Santa Fe Springs in its environmental review process (refer to Section 1.3 herein). Under each issue area, an analysis of impacts is provided in the form of questions followed by corresponding detailed responses. For the evaluation of potential impacts, questions are stated, and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- *No Impact*. The proposed project *will not* have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.
- *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project *may have* the potential for affecting the environment, although these impacts will be below levels or thresholds that the City of Santa Fe Springs or other responsible agencies consider to be significant.
- *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation*. The proposed project *may have* the potential to generate impacts that will have a significant impact on the environment. However, the level of impact may be reduced to levels that are less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.
- *Potentially Significant Impact*. The proposed project may result in environmental impacts that are significant.

This Initial Study will assist the City of Santa Fe Springs in making a determination as to whether there is a potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				×
B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				×
C. In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point)? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				×
D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics if it results in any of the following:

- Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? or,
- Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? • No Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard. Once constructed, the proposed project will not negatively impact views of the Puente Hills (located approximately 3.9 miles

$\label{eq:construction} Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration \\ Greenstone Avenue Industrial Development \bullet 11401 \\ Greenstone Avenue \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs$

northeast of the project site) because current development along Greenstone Avenue and other local roads restricts views of the Puente Hills from uses near the project site. In addition, all of the adjacent properties are industrial in nature (the site and the surrounding properties are all zoned M-2). Once occupied, public viewsheds of the surrounding areas would continue to be visible from the public right-of-way.²² The proposed project will facilitate the develop of an existing underutilized site with new development. As a result, no impacts will occur.

B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? • No Impact.

According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the nearby roadways, including Greenstone Avenue, are not designated State or County designated scenic highway. The closest designated scenic highway to the project site is a 7-mile segment of the Orange Freeway (SR-57), located approximately 12 miles to the east of the project site.²³ Two locations in the City are recorded on the National Register of Historic Places and the list of California Historical Resources: the Clarke Estate and the Hawkins-Nimocks Estate (also known as the Patricio Ontiveros Adobe or Ontiveros Adobe). The Clarke Estate is located at 10211 Pioneer Boulevard and the Ontiveros Adobe is located at 12100 Telegraph Road. The proposed project site does not contain any significant heritage trees, significant rock outcroppings or existing historic structures. The project site does not contain any buildings listed in the State or National registrar. As a result, no impacts will occur.

C. In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point)? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? • No Impact

The project site is currently used as a truck trailer parking facility.²⁴ The project site and the surrounding properties are developed in industrial uses. The proposed new development will conform to the applicable M2 zoning requirements. As a result, no impacts will occur.

D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? • Less than Significant Impact.

Exterior lighting can be a nuisance to adjacent land uses that are sensitive to this lighting. This nuisance lighting is referred to as light trespass which is typically defined as the presence of unwanted light on properties located adjacent to the source of lighting. There are no light sensitive land uses located within close proximity to the project site. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the residential neighborhoods located approximately 950 feet to the east, on the east side of Shoemaker Road. Project-related sources of nighttime light would include streetlights, parking lot security lighting, and vehicular headlights. Lighting that will be utilized by the proposed development will be typical of that associated with residential uses and would be provided in order to illuminate the building entrances and parking areas. The

²² Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site Survey*. Survey was completed on April 27, 2021.

²³ California Department of Transportation. Official Designated Scenic Highways. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways

²⁴ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site Survey*. Survey was completed on April 27, 2021.

project's exterior lighting would be directed towards the interior of the project site and away from any nearby land uses. Additionally, the proposed project will include directional lighting with shielding to ensure that on-site lighting does not cause light trespass onto the adjacent properties. Any potential light and glare from the parking areas would be required to comply with Section 155.496 of the City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code. As a result, less than significant impacts are anticipated to result upon the implementation of the proposed project.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential aesthetic impacts related to views, aesthetics, and light and glare are site-specific. Furthermore, the analysis determined that the proposed project combined with one or more of the related projects would not restrict scenic views along the local streets, damage or interfere with any scenic resources or highways, degrade the visual character of the project site and surrounding areas, or result in light and glare impacts. As a result, no cumulative aesthetic impacts will occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of aesthetics indicated that no impact on these resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project 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 uses?				×
B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or a Williamson Act Contract?				×
C. Would the project 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))?				×
D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?				×
E. Would the project 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 a non-forest use?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on agriculture and forestry resources if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project 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?
- Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- Would the project 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))?
- Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- Would the project 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?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project 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 uses? • No Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard. According to the California Department of Conservation, the project site does not contain any areas of Farmland of Statewide Importance. According to the California Department of Conservation, the City of Santa Fe Springs does not contain any areas of *Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland*, or *Farmland of Statewide Importance*. A Light Agriculture zone (A-1) exists within the City's zoning code and the proposed project site's M-2 zoning designation permits agricultural uses, excluding dairies, stockyards, slaughter of animals and manufacture of fertilizer.²⁵ The proposed project will not require a zone change and no loss of land zoned for permitting agricultural uses will occur. The implementation of the proposed project would not involve the conversion of prime farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to urban uses. As a result, no impacts will occur.

B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or a Williamson Act Contract? • No Impact.

According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract since the land does not qualify for a Williamson Act Contract.²⁶ There are no agricultural uses located within the site that would be affected by the project's implementation. As a result, no impacts will occur.

C. Would the project 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.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard. No forest lands are located within the vicinity of either site. Furthermore, the site's existing zoning designation does not contemplate forest land uses. As a result, no impacts will occur.

Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?
No Impact.

No forest lands are located within the project site or surrounding area. No loss or conversion of forest lands to urban uses would result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no impacts will occur.

²⁵ City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code. *Title XV, Land Usage*. Chapter 155, Code 155.241, Principal Permitted Uses.

²⁶ California Department of Conservation. State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wa/Pages/ Farmland-Security-Zones.aspx

E. Would the project 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 a non-forest use? • No Impact.

The project would not involve the disruption or damage of the existing environment that would result in a loss of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because the project site is not located in close proximity to farmland or forest land. As a result, no impacts will occur. The proposed project would not involve any changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. As a result, no impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The analysis determined that there are no agricultural or forestry resources in the project area and that the implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts on these resources. In addition, none of the related projects would involve any impacts related to the loss of farmland resources or forestry impacts. As a result, no cumulative impacts on agriculture or forestry resources will occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of agricultural and forestry resources indicated that no impact on these resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				×
B. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?			×	
C. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			×	
D. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on air quality if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
- Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established quantitative thresholds for short-term (construction) emissions and long-term (operational) emissions for the following criteria pollutants:

- *Ozone* (O_3) is a nearly colorless gas that irritates the lungs, damages materials, and vegetation. Ozone is formed by photochemical reaction (when nitrogen dioxide is broken down by sunlight).
- *Carbon monoxide (CO)* is a colorless, odorless toxic gas that interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the brain. Carbon monoxide is produced by the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels emitted as vehicle exhaust.

• *Nitrogen dioxide* (NO_2) is a yellowish-brown gas, which at high levels can cause breathing difficulties. Nitrogen dioxide is formed when nitric oxide (a pollutant from burning processes) combines with oxygen.

• *Sulfur dioxide* (SO₂) is a colorless, pungent gas formed primarily by the combustion of sulfurcontaining fossil fuels. Health effects include acute respiratory symptoms and difficulty in breathing for children.

• *PM*₁₀ and *PM*_{2.5} refers to particulate matter less than ten microns and two and one-half microns in diameter, respectively. Particulates of this size cause a greater health risk than larger-sized particles because fine particles can more easily cause irritation.

Projects in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) generating construction-related emissions that exceed any of the following emissions thresholds are considered to be significant under CEQA:

- 75 pounds per day or 2.50 tons per quarter of reactive organic compounds;
- 100 pounds per day or 2.50 tons per quarter of nitrogen dioxide;
- 550 pounds per day or 24.75 tons per quarter of carbon monoxide;
- 150 pounds per day or 6.75 tons per quarter of PM₁₀;
- 55 pounds per day or 2.43 tons per quarter of $PM_{2.5}$; or,
- 150 pounds per day or 6.75 tons per quarter of sulfur oxides.

A project would have a significant effect on air quality if any of the following operational emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants are exceeded:

- 55 pounds per day of reactive organic compounds;
- 55 pounds per day of nitrogen dioxide;
- 550 pounds per day of carbon monoxide;
- 150 pounds per day of PM₁₀;
- 55 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$; or,
- 150 pounds per day of sulfur oxides.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? • No Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard..²⁷ Specific criteria for determining a project's conformity with the AQMP is defined in Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Air Quality Handbook refers to the following criteria as a means to determine a project's conformity with the AQMP:

²⁷ C.E.G. Construction, Inc. Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05. December 8, 2020.

- Consistency Criteria 1 refers to a proposed project's potential for resulting in an increase in the frequency or severity of an existing air quality violation or its potential for contributing to the continuation of an existing air quality violation.
- Consistency Criteria 2 refers to a proposed project's potential for exceeding the assumptions included in the AQMP or other regional growth projections relevant to the AQMP's implementation.²⁸

In terms of Criteria 1, the proposed project's long-term (operational) airborne emissions will be below levels that the SCAQMD considers to be a significant adverse impact (refer to the analysis included in the next section where the long-term stationary and mobile emissions for the proposed project are summarized in Tables 3-1 and 3-2). The proposed project will also conform to Consistency Criteria 2 since it will not significantly affect any regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared for the City of Santa Fe Springs. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the RTP/SCS forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. According to the Growth Forecast Appendix prepared by SCAG for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the City of Santa Fe Springs is projected to have an employment population of 20,300 job through the year 2045, which is an increase of 2,400 jobs from the 2020 figure.²⁹ The proposed project's number of 95 new jobs is well within SCAG's population projections for the City of Santa Fe Springs and the proposed project will not violate Consistency Criteria 2. As a result, no impacts related to the implementation of the AQMP are anticipated.

B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? • Less than Significant Impact.

According to the SCAQMD, any project is significant if it triggers or exceeds the most appropriate evaluation criteria. The project's construction period is expected to last approximately nine months and would include site preparation, grading, erection of the new industrial development, and the finishing of the project (e.g., painting, landscaping, paving of parking area). The analysis of daily construction and operational emissions was prepared utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod V.2020.4.0). Model defaults were used for construction phase lengths and construction equipment. The model assumed the entire construction period would occur over a nine-month period. It was also assumed that the project would water exposed areas three times daily during construction earthmoving activities to reduce fugitive dust emissions as directed under SCAQMD Rule 403 and would use architectural coatings with a maximum VOC content of 50 g/L, in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113. As shown in Table 3-1, daily construction emissions will not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds. Since the project area is located in a non-attainment area for Ozone and particulates, the contractors will be required to ensure that the grading and building contractors adhere to all pertinent provisions of SCAQMD Rule 403 pertaining to the generation of fugitive dust during grading and/or the use of equipment on unpaved surfaces.³⁰ The contractors will be

²⁸ South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Handbook. April 1993.

²⁹ Southern California Association of Governments. Adopted Growth Forecast Regional Transportation Plan 2016-2040. http://gisdata.scag.ca.gov/Pages/SocioEconomicLibrary.aspx

³⁰ South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Rule 403, Fugitive Dust.* As Amended June 3, 2005.

responsible for being familiar with and implementing any pertinent best available control measures. Therefore, less than significant impacts will occur.

Construction Phase	ROG	NO _x	СО	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Demolition (on-site)	2.64	25.72	20.6	0.04	1.24	1.15
Demolition (off-site)	0.05	0.04	0.56		0.17	0.04
Total Demolition	2.69	25.76	21.16	0.04	1.41	1.19
Site Preparation (on-site)	3.17	33.08	19.7	0.04	20.21	11.47
Site Preparation (off-site)	0.06	0.04	0.68		0.20	0.05
Total Site Preparation	3.23	33.12	20.38	0.04	20.41	11.52
Grading (on-site)	1.95	20.86	15.27	0.03	7.53	4.23
Grading (off-site)	0.05	0.04	0.57		0.17	0.04
Total Grading	2.00	20.9	15.84	0.03	7•7	4. 27
Building Construction (on-site)	1.71	15.62	16.36	0.03	0.81	0.76
Building Construction (off-site)	0.25	1.28	2.69	0.01	0.85	0.24
Total Building Construction	1.96	16.9	19.05	0.04	1.66	1.00
Paving (on-site)	0.98	9.52	12.2	0.02	0.49	0.45
Paving (off-site)	0.07	0.05	0.76		0.22	0.06
Total Paving	1.05	9.5 7	12.96	0.02	0.71	0.51
Architectural Coatings (on-site)	44.84	1.41	1.81		0.08	0.08
Architectural Coatings (off-site)	0.04	0.03	0.45		0.13	0.04
Total Architectural Coatings	44.88	1.44	2.26		0.21	0.12
Maximum Daily Emissions	44.88	33.13	21.16	0.04	20.41	11.52
Daily Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55

Table 3-1Estimated Daily Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod V.2020.4.0.

Long-term emissions refer to those air quality impacts that will occur once the proposed development has been constructed and is occupied. These impacts will continue over the operational life of the project. The long-term air quality impacts associated with the proposed project include mobile emissions associated with vehicular traffic. The analysis of long-term operational impacts also used the CalEEMod V.2020.4.0 computer model. Table 3-2 depicts the estimated operational emissions generated by the proposed project.

Table 3-2Estimated Operational Emissions in lbs/day

Emission Source	ROG	NO ₂	СО	SO_2	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	
Area-wide (lbs/day)	3.23		0.01	0			
Energy (lbs/day)	0.08	0.7	0.59		0.05	0.05	
Mobile (lbs/day)	3.24	4.48	36.3	0.08	8.71	2.36	
Total (lbs/day)	6.55	5.18	36.9	0.08	8.76	2.41	
Daily Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55	

Source: CalEEMod V.2020.4.0.

As indicated in Table 3-2, the projected long-term emissions are below thresholds considered to represent a significant adverse impact.

C. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is not located in close proximity to a number of sensitive receptors as shown in Exhibit 3-1. The potential long-term (operational) and short-term (construction) emissions associated with the proposed project are compared to the SCAQMD's daily emissions thresholds in Tables 3-1 and 3-2, respectively. As indicated in these tables, the short-term and long-term emissions will not exceed the SCAQMD's daily thresholds. While the proposed project would result in additional vehicle trips, there would be a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) because it is an infill project that is consistent with the regional and the State sustainable growth objectives. Finally, the proposed project would not exceed the adopted projections used in the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy). As a result, the potential air quality impacts related to the generation of criteria pollutants are less than significant.

D. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? ● No Impact.

The SCAQMD has identified those land uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. These uses include activities involving livestock, rendering facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, and businesses involved in fiberglass molding. The proposed project will not result in the generation of any odors. In addition, construction truck drivers must adhere to Title 13 - §2485 of the California Code of Regulations, which limits the idling of diesel-powered vehicles to less than five minutes. Furthermore, the project's contractors must adhere to SCAQMD rules and regulations that govern fugitive dust during site preparation which will significantly reduce the generation of fugitive dust. As a result, no impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The implementation of the individual related projects would result in both short-term (construction) and long-term (operational) air quality impacts. No demolition or construction activities for the proposed project or the related projects are anticipated to occur simultaneously. The construction periods would range over a four-to-five-year time frame. As a result, no significant cumulative emissions would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of air quality impacts indicated that the projected emissions would be below the SCAQMD's thresholds of significance. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

$\label{eq:constant} Initial \ Study \ and \ Mitigated \ Negative \ Declaration \\ Greenstone \ Avenue \ Industrial \ Development \ \bullet \ 11401 \ Greenstone \ Avenue \ \bullet \ City \ of \ Santa \ Fe \ Springs$



EXHIBIT 3-1 SENSITIVE AIR RECEPTORS MAP Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				×
B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				×
C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on State or Federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				×
D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				×
E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				×
F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on biological resources if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

 $Greenstone \ Avenue \ Industrial \ Development \bullet 11401 \ Greenstone \ Avenue \bullet City \ of \ Santa \ Fe \ Springs$

- Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? ● No Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard. A review of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Biodiversity Database (CNDDB) Bios Viewer for the Whittier Quadrangle indicated that there are six threatened or endangered species located within the Whittier Quadrangle (the City of Santa Fe Springs is listed under the Whittier Quadrangle).³¹ These species include:

- The Coastal California Gnatcatcher is not likely to be found on-site due to the existing surrounding development and the lack of habitat suitable for the California Gnatcatcher. The absence of coastal sage scrub, the coastal California Gnatcatcher's primary habitat, further diminishes the likelihood of encountering such birds.
- The Least Bell's Vireo lives in a riparian habitat, with a majority of the species living in San Diego County. As a result, it is not likely that any Least Bell's Vireos will be encountered in the project area due to the lack of riparian habitat in the surrounding area.
- The Santa Ana Sucker will not be found on-site because the Santa Ana Sucker is a fish and there are no bodies of water present on-site. The nearest body of water is the La Canada Verde Creek, located approximately 0.54 miles east of the project site.
- The Bank Swallow lives in a riparian habitat and nests along rivers or streams. The nearest stream or body of water is the La Canada Verde Creek, located approximately 0.54 miles east of the project site; therefore, it is not likely that the Bank Swallow will be found on the project site. Additionally, the current level of development in the surrounding area is not an ideal environment for the Bank Swallow.
- The Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo is an insect-eating bird found in riparian woodland habitats. The likelihood of encountering a Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo is low due to the level of development present within the City of Santa Fe Springs. Furthermore, the lack of riparian habitat further diminishes the likelihood of encountering populations of Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoos.

³¹ California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Bios Viewer. https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/printTablePreview.html.
• California Orcutt Grass is found near vernal pools throughout Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Diego Counties. As indicated previously, the project site is located in the midst of an urban area. There are no bodies of water located on-site that would be capable of supporting populations of California Orcutt Grass nor does the site have the capacity to form vernal pools during wet seasons.

The proposed project will have no impact on the aforementioned species because the project site is located in the midst of an urban area. The project site and surrounding areas are not conducive to the survival of the aforementioned species due to the lack of suitable habitat. As a result, no impacts on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species will result from proposed project's implementation.

B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? • No Impact.

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the results of the site visits, there are no wetland or migratory bird nesting areas located within the project site.³² In addition, there is no riparian habitat located on-site or in the surrounding areas. No offsite wetland or migratory bird nesting areas will be affected by the proposed development since all new development will be confined to the project site. In addition, the proposed development will abide by all migratory and nesting bird protections required by the Migratory Bird Treaty act of 1918. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ● No Impact.

No wetland areas or riparian habitats (e.g., wetlands, vernal pools, critical habitats for sensitive species, etc.) were observed on the site during the field investigations (refer to Exhibit 3-2).³³ The site in its entirety is disturbed. Additionally, no offsite wetland habitats would be affected by the proposed development since the project's construction would be limited to the proposed project site. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? • No Impact.

The project site has no utility as a wildlife migration corridor due to the proposed site location in the midst of an urban area. According to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, a wildlife corridor may be defined as:

"Areas of open space of sufficient width to permit larger, more mobile species (such as foxes, bobcats and coyote) to pass between larger areas of open space, or to disperse from one major open space region to another are referred to as "wildlife corridors." Such areas generally are several hundred feet wide, unobstructed, and usually possess cover, food and water."³⁴

³³ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory. Wetlands Mapper. Website accessed April 14, 2021.

³⁴ Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. Significant Ecological Areas. <u>http://planning.lacounty.gov/sea/local and site specific habitat linkages and wildlife corridors</u>.



Exhibit **3-2** Wetlands Map

SOURCE: NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY

Wildlife migration through the proposed project site is inhibited by security fencing, surrounding development, utility lines, and major roadways. Future development of the site will require the removal of limited disturbed ground cover consisting of common grasses and other ruderal overgrowth within the project boundary. Given the disturbed character of the project site, no impacts will occur.

E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? • No Impact

General Regulations of the City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code Tree Ordinance establishes strict guidelines regarding the removal or tampering of trees located within any public right-of-way (such as streets and alleys).³⁵ Any plans to cut, trim, prune, plant, remove, injure or interfere with any tree, shrub or plant upon any street, alley or public right-of-way within the city must be approved in advance by the City. No protected or heritage trees are located within the development area. As a result, no trees will be removed with the implementation of the proposed project. As a result, no impacts will occur.

F. Would the project 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.

The project sites and the surrounding areas are urban. The proposed project's implementation would not be in conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans. In addition, the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA #15) is the closest protected SEA and is located approximately 8½ miles northeast from the project site.³⁶ The construction and operation of the proposed project will not affect the Puente Hills SEA because the proposed development will be restricted to the project site. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The proposed project will not involve an incremental loss or degradation of protected habitat. All of the related projects are located on properties that have been developed and are surrounded by urban development. None of the properties contain natural habitats or wetland areas that could lead to potential impacts related to an incremental loss in sensitive habitat. None of the five sites will involve the removal of heritage trees. As a result, no cumulative impacts on biological resources will be associated with the proposed project's implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The environmental analysis indicated that the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts on biological resources. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

³⁵ Santa Fe Springs, City of, Municipal Code. Title IX General Regulations, Chapter 96 Streets and Sidewalks, Street Trees.

³⁶ County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning. *Significant Ecological Areas and Coastal Resource Areas Policy Map.* February 2015.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?				×
B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?		×		
C. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to \$15064.5?
- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to \$15064.5?
- Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to *§*15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? ● No Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard.³⁷ Historical resources are defined by local, State, and Federal criteria. A site or structure may be historically significant if it is locally protected through a General Plan or historic preservation ordinance. In addition, a site or structure may be historically significant according to State or Federal criteria even if the locality does not recognize such significance. To be considered eligible for the National Register, a property's significance may be determined if the property is associated with events, activities, or developments that were important in the past, with the lives of people who were important in the past, or represents significant architectural, landscape, or engineering elements. Specific criteria outlined in CEQA Section 15064.5 used to evaluate the significance of a historical or cultural resource includes the following:

³⁷ Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site Visit*. Survey was conducted on April 27, 2021.

- A resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).
- (4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.³⁸

Two locations in the City are recorded on the National Register of Historic Places and the list of California Historical Resources: the Clarke Estate and the Hawkins-Nimocks Estate (also known as the Patricio Ontiveros Adobe or Ontiveros Adobe). The Clarke Estate is located at 10211 Pioneer Boulevard and the Ontiveros Adobe is located at 12100 Telegraph Road.³⁹ The proposed project site is not within proximity to either of these historic landmarks and is presently vacant and undeveloped with the exception of a previous asphalt parking area. The project site is not present on the list of historic resources identified by the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO). Since the project's implementation will not impact any Federal, State, or locally designated historic resources, no impacts will occur.

B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? • Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

The greater Los Angeles Basin was previously inhabited by the Gabrieleño people, named after the San Gabriel Mission. The Gabrieleño tribe has lived in this region for around 6,958 years. Prior to Spanish contact, approximately 5,421 Gabrieleño people lived in villages throughout the Los Angeles Basin. Villages were typically located near major rivers such as the San Gabriel, Rio Hondo, or Los Angeles Rivers. Two village sites were located in the Los Nietos area: Naxaaw'na and Sehat. The sites of Naxaaw'na and Sehat are thought to be near the adobe home of Jose Manuel Nietos that was located near the San Gabriel River.⁴⁰

³⁸ California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation. Listed California Historical Resources. Website accessed April 22, 2021.

³⁹ California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation. Listed California Historical Resources. Website accessed January 14, 2020.

⁴⁰ McCawley, William. The First Angelinos, The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles. 1996.

In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered by construction crews and/or the Native American Monitors, all excavation and grading activities shall be required to stop, and the City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Police Services will be contacted (the Department will then contact the County Coroner). Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. Adherence to the abovementioned mitigation will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

As part of the AB-52 requirements, the Gabrielino-Kizh responded and indicated that the project area is located within the Tribe's ancestral territory. The Tribe considers the area to be sensitive for cultural resources, and requested the following mitigation measure be implemented:

• The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground disturbing activities. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the monitor has indicated that the site has a low potential for archeological resources.

In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered by construction crews and/or the Native American Monitors, all excavation/grading activities shall be halted and the Whittier Police Department (which provides law enforcement services to the City of Santa Fe Springs) will be contacted (the Department will then contact the County Coroner). Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. Adherence to the abovementioned mitigation will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

C. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? • Less than Significant Impact.

There are no dedicated cemeteries located in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project will be restricted to the project site and therefore will not affect any dedicated cemeteries. Notwithstanding, the following requirement is mandated by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(b)(4):

"A lead agency shall identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures."

Additionally, Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code states:

"In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with

(b) Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. The coroner shall make his or her determination within two working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission."

Adherence to the aforementioned standard condition will ensure potential impacts remain at levels that are less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential environmental impacts related to cultural resources are site-specific. Furthermore, the analysis herein determined that the proposed project would not result in any impacts on cultural resources. All of the related projects are located on properties that are developed. None of the properties were located on sites that were undisturbed. As a result, no cumulative cultural resources impacts will occur as part of the proposed project's implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The Gabrielino-Kizh indicated that the project area is located within the Tribe's ancestral territory. However, the Tribe considers the area to be sensitive for cultural resources, and requests the following mitigation measure be implemented:

Mitigation Measure No. 1 (Cultural Resources). The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing or auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground disturbing activities. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the monitor has indicated that the site has a low potential for archeological resources.

In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered by construction crews and/or the Native American Monitors, all excavation/grading activities shall be halted and the Whittier Police Department (which provided law enforcement services to the City of Santa Fe Springs) will be contacted (the Department will then contact the County Coroner). Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. Adherence to the abovementioned mitigation will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

3.6 Energy

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?			×	
B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
- Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation? • Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction and subsequent development of a 6.63-acre site located in the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The proposed project site is a new 144,434 square foot building that would replace an existing truck trailer storage yard.⁴¹ The project site is served by Southern California Edison (electricity) and the Southern California Gas Company (SCG). The proposed project is anticipated to consume 1,899 kWH of electricity and 1,860 cubic feet of natural gas on a daily basis. The utilities worksheets are included herein in Appendix B. The project Applicant will work with the local electrical utility company to identify existing and future strategies that will be effective in reducing energy consumption. The Title 24, Building Standards Code, California Energy Code and California Green Building standards would be applicable to the project. Adherence to Title 24 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant level. As a result, the impact will be less than significant.

⁴¹ C.E.G. Construction, Inc. *Greenstone Avenue Industrial Site Plan, Sheet A 100-05*. December 8, 2020. SECTION 3 ● ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy *efficiency*? • Less Than Significant Impact.

On January 12, 2010, the State Building Standards Commission adopted updates to the California Green Building Standards Code (Code) which became effective on January 1, 2011. The California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards (Title 24) became effective to aid efforts to reduce GHG emissions associated with energy consumption. Title 24 now requires that new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials. The 2016 version of the standards became effective as of January 1, 2017. The proposed project will conform to all pertinent energy conservation requirements. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The four related projects would consume both electricity and natural gas. Given that all of the related projects must comply with the applicable energy conservation requirements, the cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the proposed project will not result in significant impacts related to energy and mitigation measures are not required.

3.7 GEOLOGY & SOILS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or, landslides?			×	
B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			×	
C. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			×	
D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2012), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			×	
E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				×
F. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on geology and soils if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and, landslides?
- Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

- Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?
- Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or, landslides? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs is located within a seismically active region. Many major and minor local faults traverse the entire Southern California region and earthquakes from several active and potentially active faults in the Southern California region could affect the project site. In 1972, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act was passed in response to the damage sustained in the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults.⁴² A list of cities and counties subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones is available on the State's Department of Conservation website. The City of Santa Fe Springs is not on the list.⁴³ Nevertheless, the site is within a seismically active region prone to occasional damaging earthquakes. The nearest active fault is the Whittier Fault, located approximately 3.3 miles northeast of the project site. In addition, the project will comply with the 2020 California Building Standards code, which is effective in minimizing any potential seismic-related impacts to structures.

According to the United States Geological Survey, liquefaction is the process by which water-saturated sediment temporarily loses strength and acts as a fluid. Essentially, liquefaction is the process by which the ground soil loses strength due to an increase in water pressure following seismic activity. The project site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction. Lastly, the project site is not subject to the risk of landslides because there are no hills or mountains within the vicinity of the project site. As a result, the potential impacts in regard to ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides are less than significant since the risk is no greater in and around the project site than for the rest of the area. Geologic hazards are shown in Exhibit 3-3.

⁴² California Department of Conservation. *What is the Alquist-Priolo Act*. <u>http://www.conservation.ca.gov</u>/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/main.aspx.

⁴³ Ibid.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 3-3 GEOLOGIC HAZARDS MAP

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? • Less than Significant Impact.

According to the soil maps prepared for Los Angeles County by the United States Department of Agriculture, the project site is underlain with soils of the Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex. Soils of this association have a moderate erosion hazard; however, current development and the placement of landscaping have reduced the soil's erosion risk. The project site is level and limited grading will be required for structural supports, building foundations, and utility lines. All grading activities will require grading permits from the City, which include requirements and standards designed to reduce potential erosion impacts. These requirements will effectively mitigate potential stormwater runoff impacts during construction. The project site is currently level and will remain level following the site's development. The surface grades within the parking and internal roadways will be designed to facilitate drainage into the nearest curbs and gutters. As a result, the impacts will be less than significant.

C. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? • Less than Significant Impact.

The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Report and General Soil Map for Los Angeles County were reviewed for this project. The project site is underlain with soils of the Urban land-Thums-Pierview complex. Soils of this association are at a moderate risk for erosion; however, the project site was previously developed, and the underlying soils have been disturbed in order to facilitate previous construction activities. In addition, these soils are described as being used almost exclusively for residential and industrial development, as evident by the current level of urbanization present within the project site and surrounding areas.⁴⁴ As previously mentioned, the project site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction.⁴⁵ The soils that underlie the project site pose no threat to development; in addition, the project site will be level once the project is complete. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose any person or structure to risks associated with soil collapse, landslides, or soil expansion. As a result, the potential impacts are less than significant.

D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2012), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? • Less than Significant Impact.

The Web Soil Survey, which is available on the United States Geological Survey website, was consulted to identify the soils that underlie the project site. According to the Web Soil Survey, the project site is underlain with soils of the Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex, which is partially composed of clay.⁴⁶ Shrinking and swelling is influenced by the amount of clay present in the underlying soils. Clay and silty clay loam are present in the composition of these soils and these soils associations possess a moderate shrink-swell potential. The project contractors will be required to comply with the structural engineer's recommendations. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

⁴⁴ United States Department of Conservation. Web Soil Survey. <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx</u>. Website originally accessed September 5, 2020.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? • No Impact.

No septic tanks will used for the proposed project since the units will be connected to the sanitary sewer system. As a result, no impacts associated with the use of septic tanks will occur as part of the proposed project's implementation.

F. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? • Less than Significant Impact.

According to the State of California Geological Survey, the site's geology is classified as Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex. Alluvium soil deposits that are present in a natural and undisturbed condition may contain paleontological resources, though these resources are more typically found in marine terraces and shales. The on-site soils have undergone disturbance due to the previous development. Furthermore, the on-site soils that underlie the property are Holocene-aged deposits that have a low potential for the discovery of paleontological resources. These soils are recent deposits that do not contain fossil deposits. Thus, the proposed project is not anticipated to disturb any paleontological resources and the impacts are less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

A potential project's geology and soils related impacts are generally site specific. As a result, the four related projects, together with the proposed project, are not anticipated to result in a significant adverse cumulative impact on geology and soils. Both the project site and this nearest related project site, exhibit the same topographical and soil characteristics, and each site was does not have any geotechnical constraints that are unique. As a result, no cumulative impacts will occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the proposed project will not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils and no mitigation measures are required.

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			×	
B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on greenhouse gas emissions if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.

The State of California requires CEQA documents to include an evaluation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. Examples of GHG that are produced both by natural and industrial processes include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). The accumulation of GHG in the atmosphere regulates the earth's temperature. Without these natural GHG, the Earth's surface would be about 61°F cooler.⁴⁷ However, emissions from fossil fuel combustion have elevated the concentrations of GHG in the atmosphere to above natural levels. These man-made GHG will have the effect of warming atmospheric temperatures with the attendant impacts of changes in the global climate, increased sea levels, and changes to the worldwide biome. They major GHG that influence global warming are described below.

• *Water Vapor*. Water vapor is the most abundant GHG present in the atmosphere. While water vapor is not considered a pollutant, while it remains in the atmosphere it maintains a climate necessary for life. Changes in the atmospheric concentration of water vapor is directly related to the warming of the atmosphere rather than a direct result of industrialization. As the temperature of the atmosphere rises, more water is evaporated from ground storage (rivers, oceans, reservoirs, soil). Because the air is warmer, the relative humidity can be higher (in essence, the air is able to

⁴⁷ California, State of. OPR Technical Advisory – CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. June 19, 2008.

"hold" more water when it is warmer), leading to more water vapor in the atmosphere. As a GHG, the higher concentration of water vapor is then able to absorb more thermal indirect energy radiated from the Earth, thus further warming the atmosphere. When water vapor increases in the atmosphere, more of it will eventually also condense into clouds, which are more able to reflect incoming solar radiation. This will allow less energy to reach the Earth's surface thereby affecting surface temperatures.

- *Carbon Dioxide (CO2)*. The natural production and absorption of CO2 is achieved through the terrestrial biosphere and the ocean. Manmade sources of CO2 include the burning coal, oil, natural gas, and wood. Since the industrial revolution began in the mid-1700's, these activities have increased the atmospheric concentrations of CO2. Prior to the industrial revolution, concentrations were fairly stable at 280 parts per million (ppm). The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, 2014) Emissions of CO2 from fossil fuel combustion and industrial processes contributed about 78% of the total GHG emissions increase from 1970 to 2010, with a similar percentage contribution for the increase during the period 2000 to 2010.
- *Methane (CH4).* CH4 is an extremely effective absorber of radiation, although its atmospheric concentration is less than that of CO2. Methane's lifetime in the atmosphere is brief (10 to 12 years), compared to some other GHGs (such as CO2, N2O, and Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). CH4 has both natural and anthropogenic sources. It is released as part of the biological processes in low oxygen environments, such as in swamplands or in rice production (at the roots of the plants). Over the last 50 years, human activities such as growing rice, raising cattle, using natural gas, and mining coal have added to the atmospheric concentration of methane. Other human-related sources of methane production include fossil-fuel combustion and biomass burning.
- *Nitrous Oxide (N2O).* Concentrations of N2O also began to increase at the beginning of the industrial revolution. In 1998, the global concentration of this GHG was documented at 314 parts per billion (ppb). N2O is produced by microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions which occur in fertilizer containing nitrogen. In addition to agricultural sources, some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to its atmospheric load. It is also commonly used as an aerosol spray propellant.
- *Chlorofluorocarbons (CFC).* CFCs are gases formed synthetically by replacing all hydrogen atoms in methane or ethane (C2H6) with chlorine and/or fluorine atoms. CFCs are nontoxic, nonflammable, insoluble, and chemically unreactive in the troposphere (the level of air at the Earth's surface). CFCs have no natural source but were first synthesized in 1928. It was used for refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. Due to the discovery that they are able to destroy stratospheric ozone, a global effort to halt their production was undertaken and in 1989 the European Community agreed to ban CFCs by 2000 and subsequent treaties banned CFCs worldwide by 2010. This effort was extremely successful, and the levels of the major CFCs are now remaining level or declining. However, their long atmospheric lifetimes mean that some of the CFCs will remain in the atmosphere for over 100 years.
- *Hydrofluorocarbons (HFC).* HFCs are synthetic man-made chemicals that are used as a substitute for CFCs. Out of all the GHGs, they are one of three groups with the highest global warming potential. The HFCs with the largest measured atmospheric abundances are (in order), HFC-23 (CHF3), HFC-134a (CF3CH2F), and HFC-152a (CH3CHF2). Prior to 1990, the only significant

emissions were HFC-23. HFC-134a use is increasing due to its use as a refrigerant. Concentrations of HFC-23 and HFC-134a in the atmosphere are now about 10 parts per trillion (ppt) each. Concentrations of HFC-152a are about 1 ppt. HFCs are manmade and used for applications such as automobile air conditioners and refrigerants.

- *Perfluorocarbons (PFC).* PFCs have stable molecular structures and do not break down through the chemical processes in the lower atmosphere. High-energy ultraviolet rays about 60 kilometers above Earth's surface are able to destroy the compounds. Because of this, PFCs have very long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Two common PFCs are tetrafluoromethane (CF4) and hexafluoroethane (C2F6). Concentrations of CF4 in the atmosphere are over 70 ppt. The two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing.
- *Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF6).* SF6 is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, nontoxic, nonflammable gas. SF6 has the highest global warming potential of any gas evaluated; 23,900 times that of CO2. Concentrations in the 1990s were about 4 ppt. Sulfur hexafluoride is used for insulation in electric power transmission and distribution equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas for leak detection.

GHG are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Examples of GHG that are produced both by natural and industrial processes include carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O). The SCAQMD has adopted interim GHG thresholds for development projects within the South Coast Air Basin. According to the SCAQMD, the interim thresholds for industrial projects are 10,000 MTCO2E per year.⁴⁸ Table 3-3 summarizes annual greenhouse gas (CO2E) emissions from build-out of the proposed project. Carbon dioxide equivalent, or CO2E, is a term that is used for describing different greenhouse gases in a common and collective unit. As indicated in Table 3-3, the CO2E total for the project is 24,583 pounds per day or 11.15 MTCO2E per day. This translates into an annual emission of 4,070 MTCO2E, which is below the aforementioned threshold for industrial projects.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory							
	GHG Emissions (Lbs/Day)						
Source	CO ₂	CH₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ E			
Construction Phase - Demolition	3,746.78	1.05		3,773.1			
Construction Phase - Site Preparation	3,686.06	1.19		3,715.86			
Construction Phase - Grading	0	0.93		2,895.27			
Construction Phase - Construction	0	0.61		2,569.63			
Construction Phase - Paving	0	1,805.13		1,819.31			
Construction Phase - Coatings	0	0.02		281.91			
Long-term Area Emissions	0.03			0.03			
Long-term Energy Emissions	836.1	0.02	0.01	841.08			
Long-term Mobile Emissions	8,574.54	0.50	0.34	8,686.95			
Total Long-term Emissions	16,843.51	1,809.45	0.35	24,583.14			

Table 3-3Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Source: CalEEMod V.2020.4.0.

⁴⁸ SCAQMD. Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. Agenda No. 31. December 5, 2008. https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf

This figure (4,070 MTCO2E) does not take into account the implementation of *low impact development* (LID) requirements (drought tolerant landscaping, water efficient appliances, and energy efficient appliances) and compliance to Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements. As indicated in the table, the great majority of the GHG emissions will be generated from mobile sources. For this reason, the project's use of trip reduction incentives (the use of alternative forms of transportation, the installation of electric vehicle charging stations (the project will provide 11 EV stations) and bicycle racks, and other TDM measures will be important). The project is also an infill development within an urban area. Therefore, the project's GHG impacts are less than significant.

B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases? • No Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs does not presently have an adopted Climate Action Plan. However, the City's General Plan includes a Conservation Element that has an air quality focus. In this section, the following policies related to air quality are identified:

- *Policy 2.1:* Continue to research alternatives and pollution control measures that influence air quality, including trip reductions, carpooling, and local transit services.
- *Policy 2.2:* Encourage urban infill and land uses and densities that result in reduced trips and reduced trip lengths, and that support non-motorized modes of travel.
- *Policy 2.3:* Initiate capital improvement programs that allow for bus turnouts, traffic synchronization, and intersection channelization.
- *Policy 2.4:* Continue to participate and support cooperative programs between cities which will reduce trips and vehicle miles traveled.

The proposed project will not involve or require any variance from the aforementioned policies. Furthermore, the proposed project will not involve or require any other variance from the adopted plan, policy, or regulation governing GHG emissions. There will also be a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) because it is an infill project that is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC).⁴⁹ As a result, no impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The implementation of the related projects would result in the generation of GHG emissions. The other related projects would largely involve replacement or the modernization of existing uses resulting in a limited increase in GHG emissions overall. The new development would be subject to new conservation measures that would translate into a reduction in overall GHG emissions over the life of the project. In addition, GHG emissions are inherently cumulative in nature though the new development will ensure that

⁴⁹ Promoting and enabling sustainable infill development is a principal objective of the SGC because of its consistency with the State Planning Priorities and because infill furthers many of the goals of all of the Council's member agencies. Focusing growth toward infill areas takes development pressure off conservation lands and working lands; it increases transit rider-ship and reduces vehicle trips; it requires less per capita energy and water use than less space-efficient development; it improves public health by promoting active transportation and active lifestyles; and it provides a more equitable mix of housing choices, among other benefits. Thus, the SGC has been investigating actions that can be taken to improve the ability of local governments and private developers to successfully plan and build good infill projects.

more modern measures and designs are implemented as a means to reduce GHG emissions. As a result, no cumulative impacts are anticipated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.9 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		×		
B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			×	
C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			×	
D. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				×
E. Would the project for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				×
F. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				×
G. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on hazards and hazardous materials if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?
- Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? • Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

A Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was previously prepared by Waterstone Environmental Group, Inc. (WEG) for the project site. Waterstone was retained to perform additional site assessment for the project site. Based on historical review, the property was undeveloped until an oil refinery was built in the late 1930s. Based on aerial photograph reviews, the refinery structures and equipment were removed from the site in stages starting in 1953 and ending in 1958. Construction materials including pipe and steel were stored on the site until about 1960. From 1960 until 1991, the Subject property was used by Riverside Steel as a steel fabricating facility.

The site is currently occupied by J. B. Hunt. The previous tenant who occupied the property for approximately ten years was Golden State Specialized Transportation, Inc. which transported and stored steel piping. A portable office trailer resides near the north-eastern section of the property. There are four portable storage units located immediately to the west of the office and tractor/trailer parking in the southeast corner of the property. The remainder of the property consists of pipe storage. The entrance to the property is along the eastern boundary with access from Greenstone Avenue. The property surface is primarily a gravel/asphalt mixture.

A total of 43 boring locations were advanced for the collection of soil samples. Of these, 7 borings were drilled to approximately 60 feet below the ground surface (bgs), 16 borings were drilled to approximately 30 feet bgs, and 20 borings were advanced to approximately 10 feet bgs. Sampling depths varied with each location depending on former chemical use and storage for that location. The results of the investigation indicate that TPH, BTEC, some semi-VOCs, and lead have been detected in the subsurface at the property in varying levels. The new monitoring equipment will be installed in the southwest corner of the site. The analysis determined that the following mitigation measures would be required to address potentially significant impacts:

- The project Applicant must retain the services of a qualified professional to oversee the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP) that will focus on the handling, storage, and transport of potentially contaminated soils during grading and excavation activities. The SMP will be reviewed and must be approved by the City of Santa Fe Springs and the Southern California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The SMP must be approved by the City prior to commencement of any removal of contaminated soils. The SMP mitigation will end once the project's construction activities commence.
- The project Applicant will be required obtain the services of a qualified contractor to design and

install proper ventilation in all enclosed spaces so as to prevent the build-up of methane and carbon monoxide. All of the units must contain methane and carbon dioxide (multi gas) monitors and alarms. All of the monitors must be maintained in good working order. The monitors must be installed prior to the issuance of occupancy permits. The City will make the determination as to the type of the vapor intrusion barrier that will be required and whether it will use passive or active venting prior to the approval of the proposed project.

With adherence to the above mitigation, the impacts will be less than significant.

B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.

As indicated in the previous section (Section 3.9.A), the project site has been subject to contamination from historic land uses that will require ongoing monitoring. Due to the nature of the proposed project, the use of any hazardous materials will be limited to those that are commercially available and typically used in a household setting and will be used in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project will not create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment through the routine use or transport of hazardous materials.

Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? • Less than Significant Impact.

The Carmela Elementary School is located 3,100 feet northeast of the project site. As indicated in the previous section (Section 3.9.A), the project site has been subject to contamination from historic uses. Adherence to the soil management plan (SMP) requirements will mitigate potential impacts. The previous section describes the location and extent of this contamination and also indicates the required mitigation. The following mitigation measures cited in the previous section will also be effective in ensuring that these hazardous materials are not released into the general environment. The project Applicant must retain the services of a qualified professional to oversee the preparation of a SMP that will focus on the handling of potentially contaminated soils during grading and excavation activities. The SMP will be reviewed and must be approved by the City of Santa Fe Springs. The SMP must be approved by the City prior to commencement of any removal of contaminated soils. The proposed units, once constructed, would not involve the use of any hazardous materials other than that typically used for routine cleaning and maintenance. As a result, the impacts are anticipated to be less than significant with adherence to the previous mitigation.

D. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ● No Impact.

A search of the Envirostor Hazardous Waste and Substances Site "Cortese" List database identified two Cortese sites within the City: Sonic Plating Co., Inc. (located at 13002 Los Nietos Road) and Kelly Pipe Co., LLC (located at 11700 Bloomfield Avenue). The nearest of these Cortese sites to the project site is Kelly Pipe Co., LLC.⁵⁰ Since the proposed project will not affect any Cortese site, no impacts will occur.

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 a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? • No Impact.

Fullerton Airport is located approximately 5.2 miles southeast of the project site and the Long Beach Airport is located approximately 9 miles to the southwest.⁵¹ The proposed project will not introduce a building that will interfere with the approach and take-off of airplanes utilizing any of the aforementioned airports and will not risk the safety of the people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

F. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • No Impact.

At no time will any adjacent street be completely closed to traffic during the project's construction. All construction staging must occur on-site. As a result, no impacts are associated with the proposed project's implementation.

G. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is not located within a "very high fire hazard severity zone." As a result, the potential impacts are will be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials are typically site specific. The analysis herein determined that the implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazards and/or hazardous materials with the implementation of the required mitigation measures. As a result, no cumulative impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials will result from the proposed project's implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the following mitigation measures would be required to address potentially significant impacts:

Mitigation Measure No. 2 (Hazardous Materials). The project Applicant must retain the services of a qualified professional to oversee the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP) that will focus on the handling, storage, and transport of potentially contaminated soils during grading and excavation activities. The SMP will be reviewed and must be approved by the City of Santa Fe Springs and the Southern California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The SMP must be approved by the City

⁵⁰ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor. <u>Hazardous Waste and Substances Site Cortese List.</u>.

⁵¹ Toll-Free Airline. *Los Angeles County Public and Private Airports, California*. .

prior to commencement of any removal of contaminated soils. The SMP mitigation will end once the project's construction activities commence.

Mitigation Measure No. 3 (Hazardous Materials). The project Applicant will be required obtain the services of a qualified contractor to design and install proper ventilation in all enclosed spaces so as to prevent the build-up of methane and carbon monoxide. All of the units must contain methane and carbon dioxide (multi gas) monitors and alarms. All of the monitors must be maintained in good working order. The monitors must be installed prior to the issuance of occupancy permits. The City will make the determination as to the type of the vapor intrusion barrier that will be required and whether it will use passive or active venting prior to the approval of the proposed project.

3.10 HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			×	
B. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				×
C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner in which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or, impede or redirect flood flows?			×	
D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				×
E. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on hydrology and water quality if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?
- Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
- Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or, impede or redirect flood flows?
- In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

• Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? • Less than Significant Impact.

In the absence of any requirements or regulations, a significant area of impervious surfaces (i.e., buildings, internal driveways, parking areas, etc.) may result in debris, leaves, soils, oil/grease, and other pollutants. The proposed project would be required to implement storm water pollution control measures pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. The contractors would also be required to prepare a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) utilizing Best Management Practices to control or reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. The WQMP will also identify post-construction best management practices (BMPs) that will be the responsibility of the contractors to implement over the life of the project. Prior to issuance of any grading permit for the project that would result in soil disturbance of one or more acres of land, the Applicant shall demonstrate that coverage has been obtained under California's General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity by providing a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board, and a copy of the subsequent notification of the issuance of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number or other proof of filing shall be provided to the Chief Building Official and the City Engineer. In addition, the contactors would be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would be submitted to the Chief Building Official and City Engineer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. With the above-mentioned standard conditions, the impacts would be reduced to levels that are considered to be less than significant.

B. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? • No Impact.

The proposed project will be connected to the City's utility lines and will not deplete groundwater supplies. Since there are no underground wells on-site that would be impacted by the proposed development, no impacts will occur.

C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner in which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or, impede or redirect flood flows? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project's construction will be restricted to the designated project site and the project will not alter the course of any stream or river that would lead to on- or off-site siltation or erosion. The site is currently vacant and undeveloped. No significant grading and/or excavation into the local aquifer will occur. No additional undisturbed land will be affected. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? • No Impact.

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan, "The 100-year flooding event is a flood having a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in magnitude in any given year. Contrary to popular belief, it is not a flood occurring once every 100 years. The 100-year floodplain is the area adjoining a river, stream, or watercourse covered by water in the event of a 100-year flood." The project site is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area, as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).⁵² According to the FEMA flood insurance map obtained from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, the proposed project site is located in Zone X.⁵³ This flood zone has an annual probability of flooding of less than 0.2% and represents areas outside the 500-year flood plain. Thus, properties located in Zone X are not located within a 100-year flood plain. Therefore, no impacts related to flood flows are associated with the proposed project's implementation.

The Santa Fe Springs General Plan and the City's Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan indicates the greatest potential for dam failure and the attendant inundation comes from the Whittier Narrows Dam located approximately five miles northwest of the City. The City of Santa Fe Springs Multi-Hazard Functional Plan states there is a low risk that the City will experience flooding due to dam failure. Nevertheless, in the event of dam failure, the western portion of the City located to the west of Norwalk Boulevard would experience flooding approximately one hour after dam failure. The maximum flood depths could reach as high as five feet in depth, gradually declining to four feet at the southern end of the City's impacted area.⁵⁴ The project site is located one mile east of Norwalk Boulevard and would not be impacted. As a result, no impacts related to flooding will occur.

The proposed project is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. As indicated earlier, there are no rivers located in the vicinity that would result in a seiche. In addition, the project site is located approximately 22 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and the project site would not be exposed to the effects of a tsunami.⁵⁵ Lastly, the proposed project will not result in any mudslides since the project site is generally level and is not located near any slopes. As a result, no impacts are expected.

E. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? • Less than Significant Impacts.

The proposed project will be in compliance with the City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code that outlines the local requirements for the implementation of the NPDES and MS4 stormwater runoff requirements. In addition, the project's operation will not interfere with any groundwater management or recharge plan because there are no active groundwater management recharge activities on-site or in the vicinity. As indicated in Section 3.10.A, the proposed project would be required to implement stormwater pollution control measures pursuant to the NPDES requirements. The Applicant would also be required to prepare a WQMP utilizing Best Management Practices to control or reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, the Applicant must prepare and implement a Storm Water

⁵² Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. Flood Zone Determination Website. <u>http://dpw.lacounty.gov/wmd/floodzone/</u>. Website accessed April 14, 2021.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ City of Santa Fe Springs. *Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan*. October 11, 2004.

⁵⁵ Google Earth. Website accessed April 22, 2021.

Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in order to ensure that potential water quality impacts are mitigated. The aforementioned requirements will reduce the potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential impacts related to hydrology and storm water runoff are typically site-specific. All four of the related project sites were previously developed. The related projects will not be permitted to drain offsite and will be required to impound stormwater runoff onsite. Furthermore, each individual development will be required to implement NPDES and SWPPP requirements. As a result, no cumulative impacts are anticipated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

As indicated previously, hydrological characteristics will not substantially change as a result of the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.11 LAND USE & PLANNING

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project physically divide an established community?			×	
B. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on mineral resources if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project physically divide an established community?
- Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project physically divide an established community? • Less Than Significant Impact.

The 6.63-acre project site is currently being used as a truck trailer parking facility and is occupied by J. B. Hunt Transport Services, Inc. The project site is surrounded by development on all sides. Exhibits 2-4 shows an aerial photograph of the project site and the adjacent development. Exhibit 2-5 and 2-5 includes photographs of the project site and the surrounding area. Surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the project site are listed below:

- *North of the Project Site*. A distribution use, TwinMed, LLC., is located to the north of the site at 11133 Greenstone Avenue. The site is located adjacent to the project site.⁵⁶
- *South of the Project Site*. A manufacturing building, Maruichi American Corp. is located to the south of the site at 13929 Greenstone Avenue. This use is located adjacent to the project site's south side.⁵⁷
- *East of the Project Site*. Greenstone Avenue extends along the project site's east side. Further east, on the east side of Greenstone Avenue, are other industrial uses. The Rio Hondo Fire Academy is

⁵⁶ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on April 25, 2021.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

located opposite the project site on the east side of Greenstone Avenue at 11400 Greenstone Avenue. A new FedEx Ground shipping facility is located further south.⁵⁸

• *West of the Project Site*. A railroad right-of-way extends along the site's west side. Further west, is Kelly Pipe Co.⁵⁹

As indicated previously, the project site is currently occupied by J. B. Hunt Transport Services, Inc. The site is being used as a truck trailer parking facility. An office and a maintenance building occupy the northeast corner of the property and these improvements will be removed when development commences. The majority of site is currently unpaved though the site is level and has been graded. The site's frontage along Greenstone Avenue is landscaped and includes seven mature evergreen trees in the parkway area. Access to the site is currently provided by a single driveway located along the west side of Greenstone Avenue. ⁶⁰ The proposed project and the applicable zoning and general plan land use designations will be compatible with the proposed use. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

B. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ● No Impact.

As indicated in the previous subsection, the use contemplated for the proposed development will not conflict with any existing General Plan land use designation or zoning designation.⁶¹ The Zoning Map is shown in Exhibit 3-4. In addition, the project site is located approximately 22 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and is not subject to a local coastal program.⁶² The proposed project will not impact an adopted or approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan because the proposed project is located in the midst of an urban area. In addition, the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA #15) is the closest protected SEA and is located approximately 8¹/₂ miles northeast from the project site.⁶³ The construction and occupancy of the proposed residential development will be restricted to the project site and will not affect the Puente Hills SEA. Therefore, no impacts will result.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential cumulative impacts with respect to land use are site-specific. There are no related projects located adjacent to the proposed project site. The proposed project will not require any GPA or ZC and the future use will be consistent with the Santa Fe Springs General Plan, no cumulative land use impacts will result from the proposed project's implementation.

⁵⁸ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on April 25, 2021.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ City of Santa Fe Springs. *General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map.* As amended 2010.

⁶² Google Maps. Website accessed April 14, 2021.

⁶³ County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning. *Significant Ecological Areas and Coastal Resource Areas Policy Map.* February 2015.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that no impacts on land use and planning would result upon the implementation of the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.



EXHIBIT 3-4 GENERAL PLAN ZONING MAP Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				×
B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on mineral resources if it results in any of the following:

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

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? • No Impact.

A review of California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources well finder indicates that there are no wells located within the project site boundaries. There is a plugged well located within the property to the north (well API 0403716439 operated by Ridge Hill Oil Company).⁸ The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) has developed mineral land classification maps and reports to assist in the protection and development of mineral resources. According to the SMARA, the following four mineral land use classifications are identified:

- *Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1):* This land use classification refers to areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.
- *Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2):* This land use classification refers to areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists.
- *Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3):* This land use classification refers to areas where the significance of mineral deposits cannot be evaluated from the available data. Hilly or mountainous areas underlain by sedimentary, metamorphic, or igneous rock types and lowland areas underlain by alluvial wash or fan material are often included in this category. Additional information about

the quality of material in these areas could either upgrade the classification to MRZ-2 or downgraded it to MRZ-1.

• *Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ-4):* This land use classification refers to areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other mineral resource zone.

The project site is not located in a Significant Mineral Aggregate Resource Area (SMARA) nor is it located in an area with active mineral extraction activities. A review of California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources well finder indicates that there are no wells located in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ-3A), which means there may be significant mineral resources present. However, the site is in use as a trailer and truck yard and is surrounded on all sides by development. In addition, there are no active mineral extraction activities occurring on-site or in the adjacent properties. As a result, no impacts to mineral resources will occur.

B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? • No Impact.

As previously mentioned, no mineral, oil, or energy extraction and/or generation activities are located within the project site. Moreover, the proposed project will not interfere with any resource extraction activity. Therefore, no impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential impacts on mineral resources are site-specific. Furthermore, the analysis determined that the proposed project would not result in any impacts on mineral resources. No mineral resources or extraction activities are located within the project site boundaries nor are any such resources found within the boundaries of the four related projects. As a result, no cumulative impacts will occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to mineral resources indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the approval of the proposed project and its subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.13 NOISE

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			×	
B. Would the project result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			×	
C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or- an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on noise if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? • Less than Significant Impact.

Noise levels may be described using a number of methods designed to evaluate the "loudness" of a particular noise. The most commonly used unit for measuring the level of sound is the decibel (dB). Zero on the decibel scale represents the lowest limit of sound that can be heard by humans. The eardrum may rupture at 140 dB. In general, an increase of between 3.0 dB and 5.0 dB in the ambient noise level is considered to represent the threshold for human sensitivity. Noise level increases of 3.0 dB or less are not generally

perceptible to persons with average hearing abilities.⁶⁴ Typical noise levels related to common activities are illustrated in Exhibit 3-5. The ambient noise environment in the vicinity of the proposed development is dominated by noise emanating from vehicles traveling on Greenstone Avenue.⁶⁵

Future sources of noise generated on-site will include noise typically associated with industrial uses and noise emanating from vehicles traveling to and from the site. The implementation of the proposed project will not expose any sensitive receptors to excessive noise because the proposed development's distance and separation from such uses. Furthermore, the proposed use will be required to adhere to all pertinent noise control regulations outlined by the City of Santa Fe Springs. The City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code has established the following noise control standards for development within M-2 zones: Absolute maximum of 90 dBA between 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM and an absolute maximum of 90 dBA between 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM.⁶⁶ The City's noise standards are not to be exceeded by five dBA for a cumulative period of 15 minutes in any hour, by ten dBA for a cumulative period of five minutes in any hour, by 15 dBA for a cumulative period of time (less than one minute in any hour).

A change in traffic noise levels of between 3.0 dBA and 5.0 dBA is generally considered to be the limit where the change in the ambient noise levels may be perceived by persons with normal hearing. It typically requires a doubling of traffic volumes to register a perceptible change (increase) in traffic noise. As indicated in Section 3.16, the project will generate approximately 333 net one-way PCE trips per average day. Therefore, the proposed project's traffic generation will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

B. Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ● Less than Significant Impact.

Construction activities for the proposed project have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne vibration. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that propagate though the ground and diminishes in intensity with distance from the source. The nearest noise sensitive land uses that may potentially be impacted by ground-borne vibration and noise (primarily from the use of heavy construction equipment) are the residential uses located to the east, east of Shoemaker Avenue. The noisiest phases of construction are anticipated to be 89 dBA as measured at a distance of 50 feet from the construction activity. The aforementioned homes are more than 900 feet from the project site. The construction noise levels will decline as one moves away from the noise source. This effect is known as spreading loss. In general, the noise level adjustment that takes the spreading loss into account calls for a 6.0 dBA reduction for every doubling of the distance beginning with the initial 50-foot distance. However, construction activities will be in compliance with the City's noise standards.

⁶⁴ Bugliarello, et. al. *The Impact of Noise Pollution*, Chapter 127, 1975.

⁶⁵ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site Survey*. April 27, 2021.

⁶⁶ Santa Fe Springs, City of. Municipal Code. Title XV Land Usage, Chapter 155 Zoning, Section 155.424.


EXHIBIT 3-5 TYPICAL NOISE SOURCES AND LOUDNESS SCALE

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

As previously mentioned, the operation of equipment or the construction of projects is prohibited in between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day when the project is located within a radius of 500 feet from a residential area. Compliance with City noise standards will decrease any potential adverse impacts to the nearby residential neighborhood. Adherence to the City's noise control standards will reduce the construction-related noise impacts to levels that are less than significant since the hours of construction will be limited to the daytime periods.

The City of Santa Fe Springs has not adopted policies or guidelines relative to ground-borne vibration resulting from construction. The City Municipal Code (Section 155.428) states, "Every use shall be so operated that the ground vibration generated by said use is not harmful or injurious to the use or development of surrounding properties. No vibration shall be permitted which is perceptible without instruments at any use alone the property line on which said use is located." However, this threshold applies to ground-borne vibrations from long-term operational activities, not construction. The proposed project is a residential development and would not involve the use of equipment that would result in high vibration levels, which are more typical for large commercial and industrial projects. In addition, the proposed use would not result in the increased use of heavy-duty vehicles on the public roadways. As a result, the potential ground-borne noise impacts are considered to be less than significant.

C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? • No Impact.

The project site is not located within two miles of an airport. Fullerton Airport is located approximately six miles southeast of the project site and the Long Beach Airport is located approximately ten miles to the southwest.⁶⁷ The proposed project is not located within the Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) of any of the aforementioned airports. As a result, the project will not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels and no impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The related projects are located away from each other so that the cumulative stationary noise impacts would not be audible. None of the related projects are located within 800 feet of the project site. In addition, none of the related projects are located within a direct line of sight of the proposed project. As a result, no cumulative noise impacts will result.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential noise impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's construction and operation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

⁶⁷ Toll-Free Airline. Los Angeles County Public and Private Airports, California. <u>http://www.tollfreeairline.com</u> /california/losangeles.htm.

3.14 POPULATION & HOUSING

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				×
B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on population and housing if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ● No Impact.

Growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with the provision of urban services to an undeveloped or rural area. Growth-inducing impacts include the following:

- *New development in an area presently undeveloped and economic factors which may influence development.* The project site is currently being used as a truck trailer parking facility. The site is surrounded on all sides by urban development.
- *Extension of roadways and other transportation facilities*. No roadway extensions will be required to accommodate the proposed development.
- *Extension of infrastructure and other improvements.* The installation of any new utility lines will not lead to subsequent offsite development since these utility lines will serve the site only.

- *Major off-site public projects (treatment plants, etc.).* The project's increase in demand for utility services can be accommodated without the construction or expansion of landfills, water treatment plants, or wastewater treatment plants.
- *The removal of housing requiring replacement housing elsewhere*. There are no housing units located on either property. As a result, no replacement housing will be required.
- Additional population growth leading to increased demand for goods and services. The project's construction would result in a limited increase in construction employment which can be accommodated by the local labor market.
- *Short-term growth-inducing impacts related to the project's construction.* The project will result in temporary employment during the construction phase.

The proposed project is projected to add 95 new jobs. According to the Growth Forecast Appendix prepared by SCAG for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the City of Santa Fe Springs is projected to have an employment population of 20,300 job through the year 2045, which is an increase of 2,400 jobs from the 2020 figure.⁶⁸ The proposed project's number of 95 new jobs is well within SCAG's population projections for the City of Santa Fe Springs.⁶⁹ The proposed project will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area. As a result, no impacts will occur.

B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? • No Impact.

No housing units will be displaced as a result of the proposed project's implementation. The site is currently being used as a truck and trailer parking facility. As a result, no housing displacement impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The proposed project's development of would not involve any residential development nor would it result in any displacement of housing units. Two related projects (Related Project #1, Lakeland Road Housing Development and Related Project #2, Lakeland Apartments) would result in potential residential development. The projected employment increase from the proposed project and the population increase resulting from the single related project would be consistent with the Growth Forecast in SCAG's RTP/SCS. As a result, no cumulative housing and population impacts would result.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential population and housing impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

⁶⁸ Southern California Association of Governments. <u>Adopted Growth Forecast Regional Transportation Plan 2016-2040</u>.

⁶⁹ Southern California Association of Governments. <u>Adopted Growth Forecast Regional Transportation Plan 2016-2040</u>.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for: fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; or other public facilities?			×	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on public services if it results in any of the following:

• 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: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; or other public facilities? • Less than Significant Impact.

Fire Department

The City of Santa Fe Springs Fire Department provides fire prevention and emergency medical services within the City. The department consists of three separate divisions: Operations, Fire Prevention and Environmental Protection. The Operations Division provides fire suppression, emergency medical services (EMS), hazardous materials response, and urban search and rescue. The Fire Prevention Division provides plan check, inspections, and public education. Finally, the Environmental Protection Division is responsible for responding to emergencies involving hazardous materials. The Fire Department operates from four stations: Station No. 1 (11300 Greenstone Avenue), Station No. 2 (8634 Dice Road), Station No. 3 (15517 Carmenita Road), and Station No. 4 (11736 Telegraph Road). The first response station to the site is station No. 1.⁷⁰ The Fire Department currently reviews all new development plans, and future development will be required to conform to all fire protection and prevention requirements, including, but not limited to, building setbacks and emergency access. The proposed project would only place an incremental demand on

⁷⁰ Santa Fe Springs Fire Department. Website accessed on August 22, 2020.

fire services since the project will involve the construction of a modern structure that will be subject to all pertinent fire and building codes. Like all development projects within the City, the proposed project will undergo review by the City of Santa Fe Springs Fire Department to ensure that sprinklers, hydrants, fire flow, etc. are adequate in meeting the Department's requirements. The Department will also review the project's emergency access and clearance. Compliance with the abovementioned requirement, as well as the pertinent codes and ordinances, would reduce the impacts to levels that are less than significant. Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection services, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to local roadways and potentially requiring partial lane closures during street improvements and utility installations. However, at no time will Greenstone Avenue be completely closed to traffic. All construction staging areas will be located within the project site. As a result, the project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and less than significant impacts are associated with the proposed project's implementation

Law Enforcement

The City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Police Services (DPS) is responsible for management of all law enforcement services within the City. The DPS is staffed by both City personnel and officers from the City of Whittier Police Department (WPD) that provide contract law enforcement services to Santa Fe Springs. The police services contract between the two cities provides for a specified number of WPD patrolling officers though the DPS has the ability to request an increased level of service. WPD law enforcement personnel assigned to the City includes 35 sworn officers and six support personnel.⁷¹ The proposed project would only place an incremental demand on police protection services since the project would be secured at all times. The building and layout design would include crime prevention features, such as nighttime security lighting and secure parking facilities. A sliding wrought iron gate will be installed at the entrance to the loading dock area. To ensure the proposed project adheres to the City's security requirements, the City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Police Services will review the site plan for the proposed project to ensure that the development adheres to the Department requirements, including, but not limited to, photometric plan review. Adherence to the abovementioned requirement will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

Schools

The project site is served by the following schools and school districts: Carmela Elementary School (South Whittier School District), Richard Graves Middle School (South Whittier School District), and Santa Fe High School (Whittier Union High School District). The nearest other school district to the project site, the Norwalk-La Mirada School District, does not have any schools within the project area. Pursuant to SB-50, payment of fees to the applicable school district is considered full mitigation for project-related impacts. The proposed project's school enrollment impacts will be offset by the school fees that will be paid by the developer. As a result, less than significant impacts will result from the proposed project's implementation.

Recreational Services

Due to the industrial nature of the proposed project, the proposed project will not likely place a demand for recreational open space and services. As a result, the impacts anticipated are less than significant.

⁷¹ City of Whittier. <u>http://www.cityofwhittier.org/depts/police/sfs/default.asp</u>.

Governmental Services

No new governmental services will be needed, and the proposed project is not expected to have any significant impact on existing governmental services. The proposed project will not directly increase demand for governmental services. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The projected population increase resulting from the proposed project and the two related projects that are residential would still be within the projected year 2040 population projection developed by SCAG. During the period from 2006-07 through 2015-16, the South Whittier School District enrollments declined by 1,016 students, or 24.9%. In addition, all of the cumulative projects along with the proposed project will be required to pay all pertinent school development fees. As a result, the additional students generated by the proposed project would not result in any adverse cumulative impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of public service impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required with the implementation of the proposed project.

3.16 RECREATION

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			×	
B. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on recreation if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

 Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs Parks and Recreation Services Department operates and maintains a wide range of active and passive facilities for local residents. These parks include Los Nietos Park, Little Lake Park, Lake Center Athletic Park, Lakeview Park, Santa Fe Springs Park and Heritage Park. The nearest park to the project site is the Amelia Mayberry Park located approximately 2,100 feet to the northeast. This park is owned and operated by Los Angeles County Department of County Parks and Recreation. Given the industrial nature of the proposed project, there will not be an increase in the demand for recreational use and services. As a result, the impacts anticipated are less than significant.

B. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? • No Impact.

The proposed project does not involve recreational facilities or the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The analysis determined that the proposed project would not result in any impacts on recreational services or facilities. These potential residents will utilize the various public services in the City. Two related projects (Related Project #1, Lakeland Road Housing Development and Related Project #2, Lakeland Apartments) would result in potential residential development. These two related projects that are residential will provide recreational amenities as part of their individual developments. As a result, the potential cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to parks and recreation indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			×	
B. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)?				×
C. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				×
D. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on transportation and circulation if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project will provide two full-access driveways on Greenstone Avenue for both cars and trucks. The following paragraphs provide a brief description of the existing roadways which comprise the circulation network of the study area, providing the majority of both regional and local access to the project.

• *Bloomfield Avenue* is a major north-south major arterial highway with two travel lanes in each direction. The street is approximately 84 to 90 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by either raised median or a 2-way turn lane along the center of the street. The intersections of Bloomfield Avenue at Florence Avenue, Lakeland Road and Imperial Highway are signalized. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The

average daily volume on Bloomfield Avenue is approximately 17,610 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Bloomfield Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

- *Greenstone Avenue* is a north-south local street with one travel lane in each direction. The street is approximately 64 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 35 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by a yellow line along the center of the street. Parking is permitted along the sides of the street.
- *Shoemaker Avenue* is a north-south secondary arterial highway per the City's Circulation Element of General Plan with two travel lanes in each direction. The street is approximately 84 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 45 miles per hour in the vicinity of the project site. Directional travels are separated by a yellow line along the center of the street. The intersections of Shoemaker Avenue at Florence Avenue, Lakeland Road and Imperial Highway are signalized. Parking is permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Shoemaker Avenue is approximately 11,460 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Shoemaker Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- *Florence Avenue* is a major east-west arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction plus left turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 80 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Florence Avenue is approximately 23,830 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Florence Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- *Lakeland Road* is a north-south secondary arterial highway with one travel lane in each direction. Directional travel is separated by a 2-way turn lane along the center of the street. The street is approximately 64 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Parking is partially permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Lakeland Road is approximately 7,000 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Lakeland Road represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- *Imperial Highway* is a major east-west arterial street with three travel lanes in each direction plus turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 84 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Imperial Highway is approximately 26,860 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Imperial Highway represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).⁷²

For the purpose of evaluating existing operating conditions as well as future operating conditions with and without the proposed project, the study area was carefully selected in accordance with local traffic study guidelines. Manual turning movement counts for the selected intersections were collected in the field for the morning and evening peak periods during the month of April 2021.

⁷² Crown City Traffic Engineers. Greenstone Avenue Warehouse Project: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report. April, 2021

The intersections were counted during the peak hours of 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday) in a non-holiday week. It was determined that the following six (6) key signalized intersections would be analyzed in the study:

- Bloomfield Avenue and Florence Avenue (Signalized);
- Bloomfield Avenue and Lakeland Road (Signalized);
- Bloomfield Avenue and Imperial Highway (Signalized);
- Shoemaker Avenue and Florence Avenue (Signalized);
- Shoemaker Avenue and Lakeland Road (Signalized); and,
- Shoemaker Avenue and Imperial Highway (Signalized).73

Year 2021 existing traffic conditions were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method of level of service (LOS) analysis for signalized intersections. Table 3-4 presents existing condition intersection level of service (LOS) analysis summary. Detailed calculations relating to the study intersections are included in the Technical Appendix of this report. Based on the results of this analysis, all 6 of the 6 study intersections are operating at an acceptable level of service (i.e., LOS D or better) during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 3-4.⁷⁴

S	ummary		
Intersection	Peak Hour	Future Pre-F Level of Service (LOS)	Project Conditions Volume to Canacity (V/C)
	AM	В	0.704
1. Bloomfield Ave. & Florence Ave. (Signalized)	РМ	D	0.813
o Ploomfield Are & Labeland Rd (Cignalized)	AM	А	0.415
2. Bioomneid Ave. & Lakeland Rd. (Signanzed)	PM	А	0.566
a Bloomfield Ave & Imporial Hugy (Signalized)	AM	В	0.613
3. Biodinneu Ave. & Imperial Hwy. (Signalized)	PM	В	0.690
4 Shoomakan Ava & Florence Ava (Signalized)	AM	В	0.607
4. Shoemaker Ave. & Florence Ave. (Signalized)	РМ	В	0.677
- Shoomakan Avo & Lakaland Dd (Signalized)	AM	А	0.326
5. Shoemaker Ave. & Lakeland Ku. (Signanzed)	РМ	А	0.416
6 Shoemaker Ave & Imperial Hugy (Cignalized)	AM	A	0.598
o. Shoemaker Ave. & Imperial Hwy. (Signalized)	PM	В	0.612

 Table 3-4

 Future Year (2022) Pre-Project Conditions without Level of Service

Source: Crown City Engineers, Inc.

⁷³ Crown City Traffic Engineers. Greenstone Avenue Warehouse Project: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report. April, 2021.

In order to accurately assess future traffic conditions with the proposed project, trip generation estimates were developed for the project. Trip generation rates for the project are based on the nationally recognized recommendations contained in "Trip Generation" manual, 10th edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). ITE also provides information on percentage of truck traffic associated with warehouse/storage land use. The vehicle-mix percentages provided for heavy warehouse use in the City of Fontana's "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003, were used to determine the number of various types of truck trips to be generated. A truck trip is generally equivalent to 2 or 3 passenger car trips depending on the type of trucks. Accordingly, a 2.0 factor was applied to the number of 2-axle and 3-axle truck trips and a 3.0 factor was applied to the number of 4+-axle truck trips to estimate passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips generated by the trucks.⁷⁵

Table 3-5 shows a summary of trip generation estimates for the project. It is estimated that the project will generate approximately 333 net one-way PCE trips per average day (167 inbound and 166 outbound). The average weekday net new peak hour PCE trips will be approximately 33 trips during the AM peak hour (25 inbound and 8 outbound), and 36 trips during the PM peak hour (10 inbound and 26 outbound).

Table 3-5Proposed Project's Trip Generation

			Trip Generation Rate ¹						Average Traffic Volume						e
	Size &	Daily	A	M Peal	k Hour	P	M Peal	k Hour	Daily	AM	I Peak	Hour	PM	[Peak	Hour
Use	Unit	Total	Total	%IN	%OUT	Total	%IN	%OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total

Total Vehicle Trip Generation

150 Warehouse	150.548 KSF	1.74	0.17	77%	23%	0.19	27%	73%	251	19	6	25	8	21	29
------------------	----------------	------	------	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	----	---	----	---	----	----

Vehicle Mix² and Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Trips

			Vehicle Trips						PCE trips						
Vehicle Mix	Trip %	Daily	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour				
		Total	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total	Total	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total
Car (PCE=1.0)	79.57%	200	15	4	19	5	16	21	200	15	5	20	6	16	22
2-axle Truck (PCE=2.0)	3.46%	9	1	0	1	1	1	2	17	1	1	2	0	1	1
3-axle Truck (PCE=2.0)	4.64%	11	1	1	2	0	1	1	23	2	0	2	1	2	3
4+-axle Truck (PCE=3.0)	12.33%	31	2	1	3	1	2	3	93	7	2	9	3	7	10
TOTAL TRIPS IN PCE:							333	25	8	33	10	26	36		

Note: All trip rates are average rates per Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)'s publication manual "Trip Generation", 10th Edition, 2017.

¹ Trip rates for Warehouse (ITE Code 150) from Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), "Trip

Generation" manual, 10th Edition, 2017

2 Vehicle mix percentages for Heavy Warehouse (ITE Code 150) from the City of Fontana, "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003

⁷⁵ Crown City Traffic Engineers. Greenstone Avenue Warehouse Project: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report. April, 2021.

All of the study intersections will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) D or better (i.e., within the range of acceptable thresholds of LOS A through D) during the AM and PM peak hours under future traffic conditions with the project (refer to Table 3-6). The project's off-site traffic impact would not be considered significant at any of these intersections based on volume to capacity ratio and level of service expected after the project. A project's impact on the circulation system is determined by comparing the level of service (LOS) and V/C ratios at key intersections under the future pre-project conditions and future post-project conditions. A LOS level D or better is acceptable for urban area intersections. A level of service worse than D (i.e., LOS E or F) is considered deficient and unacceptable. A project's traffic impact is determined to be significant if the increase in V/C ratio is 0.04 or more at LOS C, or 0.02 or more at LOS D, or 0.01 or more at LOS E and F.⁷⁶

			ns	Incheses		
Intersection	Peak Hour	Withou	ıt Project	With	Project	in V/C by
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Project
1 Bloomfield Ave & Florence Ave (Signalized)	AM	D	0.714	С	0.706	0.002
1. Dioonnieu Ave. & Florence Ave. (Signalizeu)	PM	В	0.813	D	0.816	0.003
a Plaamfield Ava & Lakeland Pd (Signalized)	AM	А	0.415	А	0.420	0.005
2. Dioonnieu Ave. & Lakelanu Ku. (Signanzeu)	PM	А	0.566	Α	0.566	0.000
a Bloomfield Ave & Imporial Huzy (Signalized)	AM	В	0.613	В	0.616	0.003
3. Diodinneu Ave. & Imperial Hwy. (Signalized)	РМ	В	0.690	В	0.691	0.001
4 Shoomakan Ava & Elaranaa Ava (Signaliyad)	AM	В	0.607	В	0.608	0.001
4. Shoemaker Ave. & Florence Ave. (Signalized)	PM	В	0.677	В	0.677	0.000
- Shoomakan Ava & Lakaland Rd (Signalizad)	AM	А	0.326	А	0.327	0.001
5. Shoemaker Ave. & Lakeland Ku. (Signanzed)	РМ	А	0.416	А	0.416	0.000
6 Shoomakar Avo & Imporial Hury (Signalized)	AM	A	0.598	A	0.599	0.001
o. Shoemakei Ave. & Imperial fiwy. (Siglializeu)	PM	В	0.612	В	0.613	0.001

Table 3-6Future (2021) Level of Service Summary with and without Project

Source: Crown City Engineers, Inc.

As the above results in Table 3-6 indicate, the increases in V/C ratio by project traffic would not exceed the significance thresholds of project-related impacts. Therefore, the project is not expected to significantly impact traffic conditions at any of the key intersections in the vicinity. As a result, the impacts are less than significant.

B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)? ● No Impact.

According to CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)(1), vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. It is important to note that the project is an

⁷⁶ Crown City Traffic Engineers. Greenstone Avenue Warehouse Project: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report. April, 2021.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

"infill" development, which is seen as an important strategy in combating the release of GHG emissions. The County of Los Angeles is included in the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), which is prepared and maintained by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). The requirements of the CMP became effective with voter approval of Proposition 111. The purpose of the CMP is to link land use, transportation, and air quality decisions to develop a partnership among transportation decision-makers in devising appropriate transportation solutions that include all modes of travel and to propose transportation projects that are eligible to compete for State gas tax funds. The CMP also serves to consistently track trends during peak traffic hours at major intersections in the Country and identify areas in great need of improvements where traffic congestion is worsening. The CMP requires that intersections which are designated as being officially monitored by the Program be analyzed under the County's CMP criteria if the proposed project is expected to generate 50 or more peak hour trips on a CMP-designated facility. The nearest CMP-designated intersection to the project site is Imperial Highway/Carmenita Road. This intersection was not analyzed within the traffic impact analysis and will not experience more than 50 peak hour trips at a freeway intersection.

Based on the results of the traffic impact analysis, the proposed Greenstone Warehouse project would not significantly impact any of the key intersections analyzed in the surrounding roadway system. The addition of project traffic will not increase the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios at these intersections beyond the significance thresholds of project related impacts as defined in the City's Traffic Study Guidelines. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary for the development of this project.

C. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? No Impact.

The project will provide two full-access driveways along the east side of Greenstone Avenue. A maximum of 19 vehicles (passenger car equivalent) will enter the site during the peak hour through the driveways on Greenstone Avenue from the north by making a right-turn movement. A maximum of 20 vehicles (passenger car equivalent) will exit the site during the peak hour through the driveways to travel north by making a left-turn movement. This low volume of traffic is not expected to cause any significant on-street delays or long queues. Adequate sight distance is available from the driveways along both directions on Greenstone Avenue⁷⁷. As a result, no impacts will occur.

D. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? • No Impact.

The project would not affect emergency access to any adjacent parcels. At no time will any local streets or parcels be closed to traffic. As a result, the proposed project's implementation will not result in any impacts.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Trip generation estimates for these related projects were developed by using nationally recognized and recommended rates contained in "Trip Generation" manual, 10th edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). ITE also provides information on percentage of truck traffic associated with warehouse/storage land use. For warehouse uses, vehicle trips were calculated in terms of passenger car equivalents (PCE) by using vehicle mix percentages provided for warehouse uses in the City of Fontana's "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003. A truck trip is generally equivalent to 2 or 3 passenger car

⁷⁷ Crown City Traffic Engineers. Greenstone Avenue Warehouse Project: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report. April, 2021.

trips depending on the type of trucks. Accordingly, a 2.0 factor was applied to the number of 2-axle and 3axle truck trips and a 3.0 factor was applied to the number of 4+-axle truck trips to estimate passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips generated by the trucks.

The traffic study indicated that the related projects will generate approximately 333 PCE trips per average day. The average weekday net new peak hour trips will be approximately 33 PCE trips during the AM peak hour, and 36 PCE trips during the PM peak hour. As the traffic study results indicate, all of the 6 study intersections will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service (i.e., LOS D or better) during the AM and PM peak hours.⁷⁸

MITIGATION MEASURES

Based on the results of the traffic impact analysis, the proposed project would not significantly impact any of the key intersections analyzed in the surrounding roadway system. The addition of project traffic will not increase the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios at these intersections beyond the significance thresholds of project related impacts as defined in the City's Traffic Study Guidelines. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary for the development of this project.

⁷⁸ Crown City Traffic Engineers. Greenstone Avenue Warehouse Project: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report. April, 2021.

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the resource to a California Native American Tribe5020.1(k)?		×		

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on tribal cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

• Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in

subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe? • Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

A Tribal Cultural Resource is defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 and includes the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following: included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
- A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
- A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "non-unique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms to the criteria of subdivision (a).

Adherence to the aforementioned mitigation presented above and in Subsection B under Cultural Resources will minimize potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential environmental impacts related to cultural resources are site-specific. Furthermore, the analysis herein determined that the proposed project would not result in any impacts on cultural resources. All of the related projects are located on properties that are developed. None of the properties were located on sites that were undisturbed. As a result, no cumulative tribal/cultural resources impacts will occur as part of the proposed project's implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The Gabrielino-Kizh indicated that the project area is located within the Tribe's ancestral territory. However, the Tribe considers the area to be sensitive for cultural resources, and requests the following mitigation measure be implemented:

Mitigation Measure No. 4 (Tribal Cultural Resources). The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground disturbing activities. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the monitor has indicated that the site has a low potential for archeological resources.

In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered by construction crews and/or the Native American Monitors, all excavation/grading activities shall be halted and the Whittier Police Department (which provided law enforcement services to the City of Santa Fe Springs) will be contacted (the Department will then contact the County Coroner). Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. Adherence to the abovementioned mitigation will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

3.19 UTILITIES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			×	
B. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?				×
C. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			×	
D. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			×	
E. Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				×
F. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on utilities if it results in any of the following:

- Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

 Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs is located within the service area of the Sanitation District 2 of Los Angeles County. The nearest wastewater treatment plant to Santa Fe Springs is the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) located in Cerritos. The Los Coyotes WRP is located at 16515 Piuma Avenue in the City of Cerritos and occupies 34 acres at the northwest junction of the San Gabriel River (I-605) and the Artesia (SR-91) Freeways. The plant was placed in operation on May 25, 1970, and initially had a capacity of 12.5 million gallons per day and consisted of primary treatment and secondary treatment with activated sludge. The Los Coyotes WRP provides primary, secondary and tertiary treatment for 37.5 million gallons of wastewater per day. The plant serves a population of approximately 370,000 people. Over 5 million gallons per day of the reclaimed water is reused at over 270 reuse sites. Reuse includes landscape irrigation of schools, golf courses, parks, nurseries, and greenbelts; and industrial use at local companies for carpet dying and concrete mixing. The remainder of the effluent is discharged to the San Gabriel River. Treated wastewater is disinfected with chlorine and conveyed to the Pacific Ocean. The reclamation projects utilize pump stations from the two largest Sanitation Districts' Water Reclamation plants includes the San Jose Creek WRP in Whittier and Los Coyotes WRP in Cerritos.⁹ The Los Coyotes WRP has a design capacity of 37.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently processes an average flow of 20.36 mgd. As indicated in Table 3-5, the future development is projected to generate 4,333 gallons of effluent on a daily basis which is well under the capacity of the aforementioned WRPs.79

Use	Floor Area	Factor	Generation		
Distribution	144,434 sq. ft.	0.03 gallons/day/sq. ft.	4,333 gals/day		
Total Consumption			4,333 gals/day		

Table 3-5Wastewater (Effluent) Generation (gals/day)

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning.

In addition, the new plumbing fixtures that will be installed will consist of water conserving fixtures as is required by the current City Code requirements. No new or expanded sewage and/or water treatment

facilities will be required to accommodate the proposed project and as a result, the impacts are expected to be less than significant.

B. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? • No Impact.

As indicated in the previous section, the proposed project will generate approximately 21,684 gallons of wastewater a day. The future wastewater generation will be within the treatment capacity of the Los Coyotes and Long Beach WRP. Water in the local area is supplied by the Santa Fe Springs Water Utility Authority (SFSWUA). Water is derived from two sources: groundwater and surface water. The SFSWUA pumps groundwater from the local well and disinfects this water with chlorine before distributing it to customers. SFSWUA also obtains treated and disinfected groundwater through the City of Whittier from eight active deep wells located in the Whittier Narrows area. The proposed project is projected to consume approximately 7,222 gallons of water on a daily basis.

Witter consumption (guis/ duy)				
Use	Floor Area	Factor	Generation	
Distribution	144,434 sq. ft.	0.05 gallons/day/sq. ft.	7,222 gals/day	
Total Consumption			7,222 gals/day	

Table 3-6 Water Consumption (gals/day)

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning.

The existing water supply facilities can accommodate this additional demand. Therefore, no new water and wastewater treatment facilities will be needed to accommodate the excess effluent generated by the proposed project and no impacts are anticipated to occur.

C. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? • Less than Significant Impact.

The County of Los Angeles, acting as the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD), has the regional, County-wide flood control responsibility. LACFCD responsibilities include planning for developing and maintaining flood control facilities of regional significance which serve large drainage areas. The proposed project will be required to comply with all pertinent Federal Clean Water Act requirements. The site proposes new internal roadways and hardscape areas that will be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project will also be required to comply with the City's storm water management guidelines. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

Would the project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity
of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

 Less than
Significant Impact.

As previously indicated, Table 3-6 indicates the water consumption estimated for the proposed project. The proposed project is projected to consume approximately 32,526 gallons of water on a daily basis. The

existing water supply facilities can accommodate this additional demand. As a result, the impacts are considered to be less than significant.

E. Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? • No Impact.

The Sanitation Districts operate a comprehensive solid waste management system serving the needs of a large portion of Los Angeles County. This system includes sanitary landfills, recycling centers, materials recovery/transfer facilities, and energy recovery facilities. The two operational sites are the Calabasas Landfill, located near the City of Agoura Hills, and the Scholl Canyon Landfill, located in the City of Glendale. The Puente Hills Landfill was permanently closed in October 2013 and is only currently accepting clean dirt. The Sanitation Districts continue to maintain environmental control systems at the other closed landfills, which include the Spadra, Palos Verdes, and Mission Canyon landfills. Local municipal solid waste collection services are currently provided by Consolidated Disposal Services, CR&R Waste and Recycling, and Serv-Wel Disposal Company.⁸⁰ Operational waste that cannot be recycled or taken to area landfills will be transported to the Commerce incinerator. Trash collection is provided by the Consolidated Disposal Service, CR&R Waste and Recycling, and Serv-Well Disposal Company. Table 3-7 indicates the solid waste generation for the proposed project.

Use	Floor Area	Factor	Generation	
Distribution	144,434 sq. ft.	8.93 lbs/1,000/sq. ft.	1,290 lbs/day	
Total Generation			1,290 lbs/day	

Table 3-7 Solid Waste Generation (lbs./day)

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning.

The proposed project is projected to generate approximately 1,700 pounds of solid waste on a daily basis. The proposed project will contribute a limited amount to the waste stream. As a result, the impacts will be less than significant.

F. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ● No Impact.

The proposed project, like all other development in Los Angeles County and the City of Santa Fe Springs, will be required to adhere to City and County ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, no impacts related to State and local statutes governing solid waste are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The nearest related projects to the proposed project site include two related projects (Related Projects #3 and #4) located to the south of the project site on Greenstone Avenue. The potential for projects to have a cumulative impact depends on both their geographic location as well as the timing of development. The

⁸⁰ Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts.

http://www.lacsd.org/wastewater/wwfacilities/joint_outfall_system_wrp/los_coyotes.asp.

geographic area affected by cumulative projects will vary depending on the environmental topic. Both the proposed project and the two related projects will connect to water, and sewer lines located in Greenstone Avenue.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of utilities impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.20 WILDFIRE

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				×
B. If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				×
C. If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				×
D. If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				×

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on wildfire risk and hazards if it results in any of the following:

- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or

downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • No Impact.

The proposed project would not involve the closure or alteration of any existing evacuation routes that would be important in the event of a wildfire. As a result, no impacts will occur.

B. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones would the project due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? ● No Impact.

The project site is slated for development. The proposed project may be exposed to particulate emissions generated by wildland fires in the surrounding region. However, the potential impacts would not be exclusive to the project site since criteria pollutant emissions from wildland fires may affect the entire City as well as the surrounding cities and unincorporated county areas. As a result, no impacts will occur.

C. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? • No Impact.

The project will not require, nor will it involve the extension of new utility lines such as gas lines, water lines, etc. other that connections to the site itself. As a result, no impacts will result.

D. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? • No Impact.

There is no risk from wildfire within the project site or the surrounding area given the project site's distance from any area that may be subject to a wildfire event. Therefore, the project will not result in any impacts related to flooding or landslides facilitated by runoff flowing down barren and charred slopes and no impacts will occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The analysis herein determined that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to potential wildfire. In addition, none of the four related projects are located within an area located in a geographic area where there is a risk from wildfire. All four related projects occupy properties that are developed and are surround by urban development. As a result, no cumulative impacts related to wildfire will occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of wildfires impacts indicated that less than significant impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 3-6 FHSZ MAP Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				×
B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				×
C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				×

The following findings can be made regarding the Mandatory Findings of Significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines based on the results of this environmental assessment:

- **A.** The proposed project *will not* have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.
- **B.** The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The proposed project and the attendant environmental impacts will not lead to a cumulatively significant impact on any of the issues analyzed herein.
- **C.** The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.



SECTION 4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 FINDINGS

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project is not expected to have significant adverse environmental impacts. The following findings can be made regarding the Mandatory Findings of Significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines based on the results of this Initial Study:

- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, with the implementation of the required mitigation.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, with the implementation of the required mitigation.

4.2 MITIGATION MONITORING

In addition, pursuant to Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, findings must be adopted by the decision-maker coincidental to the approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. These findings shall be incorporated as part of the decision-maker's findings of fact, in response to AB-3180 and in compliance with the requirements of the Public Resources Code. In accordance with the requirements of Section 21081(a) and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the City of Santa Fe Springs can make the following additional finding that a mitigation monitoring and reporting program will be required for the proposed project.



THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

SECTION 5 REFERENCES

5.1 PREPARERS

Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning 16388 Colima Road, Suite 206J Hacienda Heights, CA 92240 (626) 336-0033

Marc Blodgett, Project Principal Andrea Withers, Project Manager Karla Nayakarathne, Project Planner and Geographer

5.2 References

All references have been identified using footnotes.



THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX A – AIR QUALITY WORKSHEETS

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 1 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

11401 Greenstone Ave

South Coast Air Basin, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
General Heavy Industry	144.43	1000sqft	3.32	144,434.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization Climate Zone	Urban 9	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Days) Operational Year	31 2023
Utility Company	Southern California Edison				
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	390.98	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.033	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.004

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use -

Construction Phase - Construction Characteristics

Grading - Site Plan

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	18.00	30.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	120.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	8.00	15.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	18.00	30.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	15.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	2/23/2023	11/18/2022

$\label{eq:constant} Initial \ Study \ and \ Mitigated \ Negative \ Declaration \\ Greenstone \ Avenue \ Industrial \ Development \ \bullet \ 11401 \ Greenstone \ Avenue \ \bullet \ City \ of \ Santa \ Fe \ Springs$

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 2 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/4/2023	8/26/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	2/16/2022	3/11/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/30/2023	10/7/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	2/4/2022	2/18/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/31/2023	10/8/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	2/17/2022	3/12/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	2/5/2022	2/19/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/5/2023	8/27/2022
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	15.00	8.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	22.50	7.50

2.0 Emissions Summary
Page 3 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission) <u>Unmitigated Construction</u>

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
2022	44.8756	33.1269	21.1624	0.0403	18.7977	1.6138	20.4115	10.0413	1.4847	11.5260	0.0000	3,899.952 9	3,899.952 9	1.1970	0.0869	3,927.453 7
Maximum	44.8756	33.1269	21.1624	0.0403	18.7977	1.6138	20.4115	10.0413	1.4847	11.5260	0.0000	3,899.952 9	3,899.952 9	1.1970	0.0869	3,927.453 7

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year		lb/day											lb/o	day		
2022	44.8756	33.1269	21.1624	0.0403	18.7977	1.6138	20.4115	10.0413	1.4847	11.5260	0.0000	3,899.952 9	3,899.952 9	1.1970	0.0869	3,927.453 7
Maximum	44.8756	33.1269	21.1624	0.0403	18.7977	1.6138	20.4115	10.0413	1.4847	11.5260	0.0000	3,899.952 9	3,899.952 9	1.1970	0.0869	3,927.453 7

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Page 4 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.2 Overall Operational Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/	day		
Area	3.2280	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337
Energy	0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797
Mobile	3.2390	3.7870	36.2988	0.0841	8.6505	0.0584	8.7089	2.3050	0.0543	2.3594		8,574.543 8	8,574.543 8	0.4964	0.3356	8,686.954 5
Total	6.5436	4.4839	36.8989	0.0883	8.6505	0.1114	8.7619	2.3050	0.1073	2.4124		9,410.686 5	9,410.686 5	0.5125	0.3509	9,528.067 8

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	3.2280	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337
Energy	0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797
Mobile	3.2390	3.7870	36.2988	0.0841	8.6505	0.0584	8.7089	2.3050	0.0543	2.3594		8,574.543 8	8,574.543 8	0.4964	0.3356	8,686.954 5
Total	6.5436	4.4839	36.8989	0.0883	8.6505	0.1114	8.7619	2.3050	0.1073	2.4124		9,410.686 5	9,410.686 5	0.5125	0.3509	9,528.067 8

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 5 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Demolition	Demolition	1/1/2022	1/28/2022	5	20	
2	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	1/29/2022	2/18/2022	5	15	
3	Grading	Grading	2/19/2022	3/11/2022	5	15	
4	Building Construction	Building Construction	3/12/2022	8/26/2022	5	120	
5	Paving	Paving	8/27/2022	10/7/2022	5	30	
6	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	10/8/2022	11/18/2022	5	30	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 7.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 8

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 216,651; Non-Residential Outdoor: 72,217; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	6.00	9	0.56
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Demolition	Excavators	3	8.00	158	0.38

$\label{eq:constant} Initial \ Study \ and \ Mitigated \ Negative \ Declaration \\ Greenstone \ Avenue \ Industrial \ Development \ \bullet \ 11401 \ Greenstone \ Avenue \ \bullet \ City \ of \ Santa \ Fe \ Springs$

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 6 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	6.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	6.00	80	0.38
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	61.00	24.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	12.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Page 7 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Demolition - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	2.6392	25.7194	20.5941	0.0388		1.2427	1.2427		1.1553	1.1553		3,746.781 2	3,746.781 2	1.0524		3,773.092 0
Total	2.6392	25.7194	20.5941	0.0388		1.2427	1.2427		1.1553	1.1553		3,746.781 2	3,746.781 2	1.0524		3,773.092 0

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616
Total	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616

Page 8 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Demolition - 2022 Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	2.6392	25.7194	20.5941	0.0388		1.2427	1.2427		1.1553	1.1553	0.0000	3,746.781 2	3,746.781 2	1.0524		3,773.092 0
Total	2.6392	25.7194	20.5941	0.0388		1.2427	1.2427		1.1553	1.1553	0.0000	3,746.781 2	3,746.781 2	1.0524		3,773.092 0

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616
Total	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616

Page 9 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Site Preparation - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					18.5965	0.0000	18.5965	9.9879	0.0000	9.9879			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380		1.6126	1.6126		1.4836	1.4836		3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5
Total	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380	18.5965	1.6126	20.2091	9.9879	1.4836	11.4715		3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5

	ROG	NOx	co	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/c	Jay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0614	0.0434	0.6820	1.8200e- 003	0.2012	1.2000e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1100e- 003	0.0545		183.8060	183.8060	4.8100e- 003	4.3900e- 003	185.2340
Total	0.0614	0.0434	0.6820	1.8200e- 003	0.2012	1.2000e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1100e- 003	0.0545		183.8060	183.8060	4.8100e- 003	4.3900e- 003	185.2340

Page 10 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Site Preparation - 2022 Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/o	day		
Fugitive Dust					18.5965	0.0000	18.5965	9.9879	0.0000	9.9879			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380		1.6126	1.6126		1.4836	1.4836	0.0000	3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5
Total	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380	18.5965	1.6126	20.2091	9.9879	1.4836	11.4715	0.0000	3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0614	0.0434	0.6820	1.8200e- 003	0.2012	1.2000e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1100e- 003	0.0545		183.8060	183.8060	4.8100e- 003	4.3900e- 003	185.2340
Total	0.0614	0.0434	0.6820	1.8200e- 003	0.2012	1.2000e- 003	0.2024	0.0534	1.1100e- 003	0.0545		183.8060	183.8060	4.8100e- 003	4.3900e- 003	185.2340

Page 11 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Grading - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust					6.5877	0.0000	6.5877	3.3713	0.0000	3.3713			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297		0.9409	0.9409		0.8656	0.8656		2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4
Total	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297	6.5877	0.9409	7.5285	3.3713	0.8656	4.2369		2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616
Total	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616

Page 12 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Grading - 2022

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Fugitive Dust					6.5877	0.0000	6.5877	3.3713	0.0000	3.3713			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297		0.9409	0.9409		0.8656	0.8656	0.0000	2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4
Total	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297	6.5877	0.9409	7.5285	3.3713	0.8656	4.2369	0.0000	2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/c	Jay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616
Total	0.0512	0.0361	0.5683	1.5200e- 003	0.1677	1.0000e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.2000e- 004	0.0454		153.1717	153.1717	4.0100e- 003	3.6600e- 003	154.3616

Page 13 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Building Construction - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0438	1.1324	0.3788	4.6000e- 003	0.1537	0.0115	0.1652	0.0442	0.0110	0.0553		495.7121	495.7121	0.0182	0.0720	517.6213
Worker	0.2081	0.1469	2.3111	6.1600e- 003	0.6818	4.0800e- 003	0.6859	0.1808	3.7600e- 003	0.1846		622.8982	622.8982	0.0163	0.0149	627.7373
Total	0.2519	1.2794	2.6899	0.0108	0.8355	0.0156	0.8511	0.2251	0.0148	0.2399		1,118.610 4	1,118.610 4	0.0345	0.0869	1,145.358 6

Page 14 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Building Construction - 2022 Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/o	day		
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0438	1.1324	0.3788	4.6000e- 003	0.1537	0.0115	0.1652	0.0442	0.0110	0.0553		495.7121	495.7121	0.0182	0.0720	517.6213
Worker	0.2081	0.1469	2.3111	6.1600e- 003	0.6818	4.0800e- 003	0.6859	0.1808	3.7600e- 003	0.1846		622.8982	622.8982	0.0163	0.0149	627.7373
Total	0.2519	1.2794	2.6899	0.0108	0.8355	0.0156	0.8511	0.2251	0.0148	0.2399		1,118.610 4	1,118.610 4	0.0345	0.0869	1,145.358 6

Page 15 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Paving - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.9765	9.5221	12.1940	0.0189		0.4877	0.4877		0.4504	0.4504		1,805.129 7	1,805.129 7	0.5672		1,819.309 1
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.9765	9.5221	12.1940	0.0189		0.4877	0.4877		0.4504	0.4504		1,805.129 7	1,805.129 7	0.5672		1,819.309 1

	ROG	NOx	co	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/d	Jay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0682	0.0482	0.7577	2.0200e- 003	0.2236	1.3400e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2300e- 003	0.0605		204.2289	204.2289	5.3400e- 003	4.8800e- 003	205.8155
Total	0.0682	0.0482	0.7577	2.0200e- 003	0.2236	1.3400e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2300e- 003	0.0605		204.2289	204.2289	5.3400e- 003	4.8800e- 003	205.8155

Page 16 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Paving - 2022 Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.9765	9.5221	12.1940	0.0189		0.4877	0.4877		0.4504	0.4504	0.0000	1,805.129 7	1,805.129 7	0.5672		1,819.309 1
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.9765	9.5221	12.1940	0.0189		0.4877	0.4877		0.4504	0.4504	0.0000	1,805.129 7	1,805.129 7	0.5672		1,819.309 1

	ROG	NOx	co	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/d	Jay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0682	0.0482	0.7577	2.0200e- 003	0.2236	1.3400e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2300e- 003	0.0605		204.2289	204.2289	5.3400e- 003	4.8800e- 003	205.8155
Total	0.0682	0.0482	0.7577	2.0200e- 003	0.2236	1.3400e- 003	0.2249	0.0593	1.2300e- 003	0.0605		204.2289	204.2289	5.3400e- 003	4.8800e- 003	205.8155

Page 17 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.7 Architectural Coating - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Archit. Coating	44.6301					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	44.8347	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0409	0.0289	0.4546	1.2100e- 003	0.1341	8.0000e- 004	0.1349	0.0356	7.4000e- 004	0.0363		122.5374	122.5374	3.2100e- 003	2.9300e- 003	123.4893
Total	0.0409	0.0289	0.4546	1.2100e- 003	0.1341	8.0000e- 004	0.1349	0.0356	7.4000e- 004	0.0363		122.5374	122.5374	3.2100e- 003	2.9300e- 003	123.4893

Page 18 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.7 Architectural Coating - 2022 Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/o	lay		
Archit. Coating	44.6301					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	44.8347	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/d	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0409	0.0289	0.4546	1.2100e- 003	0.1341	8.0000e- 004	0.1349	0.0356	7.4000e- 004	0.0363		122.5374	122.5374	3.2100e- 003	2.9300e- 003	123.4893
Total	0.0409	0.0289	0.4546	1.2100e- 003	0.1341	8.0000e- 004	0.1349	0.0356	7.4000e- 004	0.0363		122.5374	122.5374	3.2100e- 003	2.9300e- 003	123.4893

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 19 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	lay		
Mitigated	3.2390	3.7870	36.2988	0.0841	8.6505	0.0584	8.7089	2.3050	0.0543	2.3594		8,574.543 8	8,574.543 8	0.4964	0.3356	8,686.954 5
Unmitigated	3.2390	3.7870	36.2988	0.0841	8.6505	0.0584	8.7089	2.3050	0.0543	2.3594		8,574.543 8	8,574.543 8	0.4964	0.3356	8,686.954 5

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Avei	rage Daily Trip Ra	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
General Heavy Industry	567.63	927.27	735.17	2,847,106	2,847,106
Total	567.63	927.27	735.17	2,847,106	2,847,106

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
General Heavy Industry	16.60	8.40	6.90	59.00	28.00	13.00	92	5	3

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
General Heavy Industry	0.544109	0.060768	0.184625	0.129879	0.023845	0.006339	0.011719	0.008584	0.000815	0.000515	0.024285	0.000743	0.003774

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 20 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
General Heavy Industry	7106.94	0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797
Total		0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797

Page 21 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas <u>Mitigated</u>

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
General Heavy Industry	7.10694	0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797
Total		0.0766	0.6968	0.5853	4.1800e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0530	0.0530		836.1111	836.1111	0.0160	0.0153	841.0797

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Mitigated	3.2280	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337
Unmitigated	3.2280	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337

Page 22 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

6.2 Area by SubCategory Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/	day							lb/	day		
Architectural Coating	0.3668					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	2.8598					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.3700e- 003	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337
Total	3.2280	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337

Page 23 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

6.2 Area by SubCategory Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/	day							lb/	day		
Architectural Coating	0.3668					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	2.8598					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.3700e- 003	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337
Total	3.2280	1.3000e- 004	0.0147	0.0000		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		5.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005		0.0316	0.0316	8.0000e- 005		0.0337

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION GREENSTONE AVENUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT • 11401 GREENSTONE AVENUE • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Page 24 of 24

Date: 7/22/2021 9:06 AM

11401 Greenstone Ave - South Coast Air Basin, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type Number Hours/Day Hours/Year Horse Power Load Factor Fuel Typ							
	Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
User Defined Equipment					
Equipment Type	Number				

11.0 Vegetation