Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning

Project title: "East Pasadena Hindu Temple"/Project No. R2015-02064-(5)/RCUP 201500080/RENV 201500138.

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Carl Nadela/213-974-6435

Project sponsor's name and address: <u>Hindu Temple and Heritage Foundation, Inc./</u> 676 S. Rosemead Blvd., Pasadena, CA 91107

Project location: <u>676 S. Rosemead Blvd.</u>, Pasadena, CA 91107

APN: <u>5378-013-019/006</u> USGS Quad: <u>Mt. Wilson</u>

Gross Acreage: 0.66 ac

General plan designation: H9 (Residential-9)

Community/Area wide Plan designation: N/A

Zoning: R-1 (Single Family Residence) / East Pasadena San Gabriel Community Standards District

Description of project: Development and maintenance of a two-story, 9,200 square foot temple with accessory uses, including a library/yoga hall, lecture/meditation hall and music/dance hall and 40 parking spaces and the modification of the development standards of the East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District (CSD) to allow less than the required front and side yards, more than the allowed maximum floor area, and less than the required setback of structure height.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The site is located in the northeast intersection of Rosemead Blvd and California Blvd, which are both major roadways that carries substantial amounts of traffic. The site is surrounded mostly by single family residences, except to the south where a number of churches are located.

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Yes. Consultation was requested by the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. Mitigation Measures recommended by the tribe have been incorporated into the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Consultation was concluded on April 30, 2021.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the

California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Public Agency Approval Required

Los Angeles County, Building Permits

Department of Public Works

Major projects in the area:

Project / Case No.
Project No. 2019-001137-(5) /
General Plan Amendment No.
RPPL2019002209 / Zone
Change No. RPPL2019002205
/ CUP RPPL2020004434 /
Parking Permit No.
RPPL2020004434

Description and Status

General Plan Amendment from H9 to MU and Zone Change from R-2 to MXD of a portion of a parcel to allow the development of a six-story mixed-use building with 104 apartment units and 2,985 sq ft of commercial space. Project site is located at 380 S. Rosemead Blvd., East Pasadena, CA 91107. Project design and review is currently ongoing.

Reviewing Agencies:		
Responsible Agencies	Special Reviewing Agencies	Regional Significance
None Regional Water Quality Control Board: Los Angeles Region Lahontan Region Coastal Commission Army Corps of Engineers LAFCO	 None Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy National Parks National Forest Edwards Air Force Base Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area 	 None SCAG Criteria Air Quality Water Resources Santa Monica Mtns. Area
Trustee Agencies None State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife State Dept. of Parks and Recreation State Lands Commission University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)	County Reviewing Agencies DPW Fire Department -Planning Division - Land Development Unit Sanitation District Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise) Sheriff Department Parks and Recreation	
	Subdivision Committee	

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The	environmental factors ch	iecke	d below would be potentially sign	nifican	t impacts affected by this project.
	Aesthetics		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Public Services
	Agriculture/Forestry		Hazards/Hazardous Materials		Recreation
	Air Quality		Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation
	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Services
	Energy		Noise		Wildfire
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	TERMINATION: (To be the basis of this initial eva		pleted by the Lead Department. on:)	
	1 1	_	oject COULD NOT have a sign <u>TION</u> will be prepared.	ificant	effect on the environment, and a
	will not be a significa:	nt eff	oposed project could have a sign ect in this case because revisions oponent. <u>A MITIGATED NEC</u>	in the	± /
	1 1	_	oject MAY have a significant eff PACT REPORT is required.	ect on	the environment, and an
	significant unless miti adequately analyzed in addressed by mitigation	gated n an e on m L IMI		at at le dicable ysis as	ast one effect 1) has been legal standards, and 2) has been described on attached sheets. An
	because all potentially NEGATIVE DECLA mitigated pursuant to	signi ARAT that	oposed project could have a sign ficant effects (a) have been analy TION pursuant to applicable star earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DE- te imposed upon the proposed p	yzed ac ndards CLAR	dequately in an earlier EIR or , and (b) have been avoided or ATION, including revisions or
(arl Nadela CVIII	<u>_</u>	-	: /5 /20	21
	nature (Prepared by)		Date	5/5/20	<u> </u>
7	Maria Masi Iaria Masis	is	_	. / 5 / 5 0	24
	<u>larıa Masıs</u> ature (Approved by)			5/5/20 :	

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

1. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	•	•	•	1
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
There are no significant scenic resources that exist on the pro-	oject site and	in the surroun	ding area.	
b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail?				
There are also no trails in the vicinity of the project site.				
c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
There are also no scenic highway or hillside management are	as in the vicin	nity of the site.		
d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features and/or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point)				
The proposed new structure has the potential to have some area. However, the structure has been designed in community Standards District (CSD) and the Los Angeles to be appropriately setback from the property lot lines. Becauthe proposed structure will be less than significant.	npliance with County Zonia	the East Pang Code, which	sadena-San h requires st	Gabriel ructures
e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
The proposed new structure has the potential to create new structure has been set back from the property lot lines, so proposed structure will be less than significant.				

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
The project site is located in a fully developed, urbanized area of forest land, nor is it zoned for agriculture or designated as	- /		•	<u>armland</u>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Resource Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?				
The proposed project does not differ significantly from the conosignificant increases in impacts to air quality as a result of	_	le use at the sit	e. Thus, ther	e will be
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?				
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impaci
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?				
The project site is located in a fully developed, urbanized area	<u>l.</u>			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or other unique native woodlands (juniper, Joshua, southern California black walnut, etc.)?				

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances				\boxtimes
protecting biological resources, including Wildflower				
Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36),				
the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A.				
County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.174), the Significant				
Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22,				
Ch. 102), Specific Plans (L.A. County Code, Title 22,				
Ch. 22.46), Community Standards Districts (L.A.				
County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.300 et seq.), and/or				
Coastal Resource Areas (L.A. County General Plan,				
Figure 9.3)?				
There are no significant biological resources at the site or in t	he general v	icinity of the si	ite.	
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat				
Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation				
Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?				
•				

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impaci
Would the project:	•	•	•	-
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?				
The project site is located in a fully developed, urbanizarchaeological, paleontological and geologic resources at the				istorical,
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				

There are also no known cemeteries in the area, either formal or informal.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				
The project proposes the continuation of an existing temple cultural and fitness activities. These are not expected to const			•	such as
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				
The project will also comply with all applicable Green Buildestandards, which are required by the California and/or Los expected that the project will conflict with the Green Building of energy resources.	Angeles Cou	nty Building C	Codes. Thus,	it is not

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:	<i>T</i>	<i>T</i>	-	T
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the 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 active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
The project site is located within an Alquist-Priolo Quadrangle, Earthquake Fault Zone Map, March 25, 19 Fault.	_	,		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
The site is subject to strong seismic ground shaking as no The final structural, grading and drainage plan of the project Public Works Building and Safety Division to comply with any negative effects of these seismic hazards are adequated regulations.	ect will be re h all applicab	eviewed by the ole regulations.	Los Angeles This will ens	County oure that
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?				
The site is located within a potentially liquefiable area a Zone. The site is also in a liquefaction zone (California 1997-2005). The final structural, grading and drainage p Angeles County Public Works Building and Safety Division will ensure that any negative effects of these seismic haz State and County regulations.	Geological S lan of the p n to comply	urvey-Seismic roject will be with all applica	Hazard Zon reviewed by able regulatio	e Maps, the Los ns. This
iv) Landslides?				
The project site is not in a landslide zone, and does not co	ontain unstal	ble or expansiv	re soil.	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
The site has a very flat topography and is already developed not result in any substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.	with single-	family residen	ces. The Pro	ject will

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?			
The final grading and drainage plan shall be reviewed by the Lo Safety Division to comply with all applicable regulations (Califo Maps, 1997-2005).		•	_
d) 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?			
The Project is not located on expansive soil. e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			
The project also does not propose any onsite wastewater treatment of) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch.22.104)?	nent facility.		\boxtimes

The site is also not in a Hillside Management Area.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
The project proposes the continuation and expansion of an expa	0 1			<u>urtenant</u>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
This Project is consistent with the General Plan land use and the R-1 zone with a Conditional Use Permit zone as per the	0			

This Project is consistent with the General Plan land use and zoning because the proposed use is allowed in the R-1 zone with a Conditional Use Permit zone as per the Los Angeles County Zoning Code and in the H-9 land use designation as per the Los Angeles County General Plan Land Use Map. The project is also consistent with CAP, as it locates an assembly use near a bus route, a proposed bicycle trail and ample pedestrian facilities, which will help support the County's goals to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled and the resulting GHG's from these vehicle trips.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less I nan Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
The use proposed at the site includes various religious and of from the uses directly to the south of the site. No dangerous				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?				
The Project Site is currently developed with single-family materials or waste that may be released into the environment		t does not co	ntain any ha	zardous
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?				
There are no known hazardous materials at the site.				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
There are no known hazardous materials at the site.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				
The site is not in the vicinity of any airport.				
f) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
The proposed project is limited to a relatively small develop emergency or evacuation plan.	oment footp	rint and will n	ot interfere v	with any

inc	Expose people or structures, either directly or lirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death solving fires, because the project is located:				
	i) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?				
	The site is also not located within a Fire Hazard zone.				
	ii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?				
	The design and water pressure of the project are require	ed to meet the	Fire Code req	uirements.	
	iii) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?				
	The Project Site is located in an area primarily development of the vicinity as well. It is not in proximity to fire hazard.	•	· .		
h)	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?				
Τh	e Project is for a Hindu Temple, which is similar to two e	existing church	es located imn	nediately to th	ne south
of i	the site. It does not constitute a potentially dangerous fir	e hazard			

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporate d	Less Than Significan t Impact	No Impa ct
Would the project:	nt impact	u	t Impaci	Ci
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?				
The proposed uses associated with the project does not r discharge at the site.	esult in any	significant inc	crease in was	<u>tewater</u>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				
The proposed uses associated with the project does not resu	lt in any effe	ct on the grou	ndwater supp	oly.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain; the alteration of the course of a stream or river; or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
The final structural, grading and drainage plan of the p County Public Works Building and Safety Division to ensure that any potential erosion or siltation are adequategulations.	comply with	<u>all applicable r</u>	egulations. T	his will
(ii) Substantially increase the rate, amount, or depth of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?				
There are no streams or rivers in the vicinity which will of the associated parking lot may have some impacts. However, the site plan will be designed to ensure the mitigated.	s on the exi	sting drainage	pattern at t	he site.
(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned				\boxtimes

stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

There are no Areas of Special Significance as designated	by the State	Water Control	Board in the	general
vicinity of the site and there are no geological limitations	that would	affect the use o	of typical was	stewater
treatment facilities.				
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows which would expose existing housing or other insurable structures in a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain to a significant risk of loss or damage involving flooding?				
The area is not within a flood way, flood plain or flood housing or any type of structure in such a flood hazard to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flood	area, nor w			-
d) Otherwise place structures in Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain areas which would require additional flood proofing and flood insurance requirements?				
The Project Site is not located in a Federal 100-year flood ha	zard or Cou	nty Capital Flo	od floodplai	n area.
e) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development_Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?				
The final structural, grading and drainage plan of the project Public Works Building and Safety Division to comply with the Project complies with all applicable Low Impact Development.	all applicabl	e regulations.	This will ens	ure that
f) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?				
The Project site is connected to the public sewer system and	will not util	ize an onsite w	astewater tre	<u>eatment</u>
system.				
g) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				
The proposed project is located in a relatively flat area that is not place structures in areas that may be inundated by seiche			ater and thu	s would

h) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?		

The final structural, grading and drainage plan of the project will be reviewed by the Los Angeles County Public Works Building and Safety Division to comply with all applicable regulations. This will ensure that the Project complies with any and all applicable development standards and requirements as prescribed by State and County regulations.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:	impaci	incorporated	impaci	mpaci
a) Physically divide an established community?				
The project site is located immediately adjacent to Rosemead outskirts of a residential community. Thus, it does not physical		,		nd at the
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any County land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
The Los Angeles County General Plan designates the site as family residences However, this designation provides only ge and actual land uses at the site are not limited to the general in uses that are allowed through zoning may be deemed incomp	neral intende tended uses l	ed uses and devisted under eac	velopment in ch designation	tensities
The site is zoned Single-family Residence (R-1), which allows with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The proposed project negative impacts on the surrounding areas. The design of the Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District (CSD).	et has been o	designed to av	oid and miti	gate any
c) Conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas?				
Finally, the project site is not located within a Hillside Managother special management areas, as designated by the General		, Significant E	cological Are	<u>a or any</u>

Revised 07/18/19

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
The Project Site is located in a developed urban - suburban the area.	area. There	are no known	mineral reso	ources in
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
The project site is not located in, nor is it in the vicinity of,	any Mineral	Resource Zone	es as indicate	ed in the
General Plan or the State of California's Geological Survey.				

<u>13. NOISE</u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:	1	1	1	1
a) 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 County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?				
While the proposed project will result in some noise impact	s, it will not b	oe substantially	different fro	om what
is already occurring at the site or at the other churches loca		•		
use will also need to comply with the Los Angeles County				<u>se added</u>
into the permit ensuring that no amplified sounds are heard	outside of th	<u>e enclosed buil</u>	<u>lding.</u>	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
The Project will comply with all applicable maximum noise	standards pre	scribed by Cou	anty Code.	
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?				
The project site is not located within the vicinity of any air				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
The proposed project is located in the West San Gabriel Valle	•	-		
were 34,765 housing units in the Planning Area and the project				
also established the County's RHNA allocation at 30,145 unit	s. The prop	<u>osed project w</u>	<u>rill not any ao</u>	<u>lditional</u>
housing units to the area but will convert one existing Single proposed temple.	Family Res	idence into a a	accessory use	e for the
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

This residence is currently in a state of disrepair with a renter-occupant that is expected to move out in the near future. The conversion of this residence into a temple use as part of the proposed project does not have any significant effects on the existing housing in the area nor will it displace substantial numbers of people.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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?				
The project site is not located in a Fire Hazard zone and is so 5.	erved by the I	LA County Fire	<u>Departmen</u>	t Station
Sheriff protection?				
The project is also served by the LA County Sheriff's Depart	tment Templ	e Station		
Schools?				
The project is located within the Pasadena Unified School I Parks?	District.		\boxtimes	
The nearest park is the Michillinda County Park which has a	a total area of	2.2 ac and is lo	ocated appro	ximately
half a mile to the southeast. Libraries?				
The nearest county library to the site is the Temple City Lib	rary.			
Other public facilities?				
The project is not proposing any additional dwelling units at the same as the existing use at the site as well as across the churches are located. Thus, it is not expected that the project	street from	California Blvd	l, where seve	eral large

and facilities in the area.

16. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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?				
The project does not propose any new dwelling unit at the state area and this will not impact the use of existing neighborhacilities.				
b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
The project also does not include the development of any natrails or other recreational facilities.	ew neighbor	hood and regi	onal parks, n	<u>nulti-use</u>
c) Would the project interfere with regional trail connectivity?				
The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of any regional	trails.			

Revised 07/18/19

17. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:	<i>F</i>			<i>F</i>
a) Conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				
The project site is located northeast of the intersection of Roboth heavily travelled roadways. The driveway to the site is pan existing private alley, which is the existing ingress and egrefurther up along the alley. The driveway is adequately setback negative impacts on traffic patterns in the area.	roposed to b ess access to	e on California the site as well	a Blvd, adjac as the reside	ent to ences
Since the project proposes to locate a commercial/assembly Class II Bike Path, the project will help promote the use of p walkways. This supports General Plan policies and other plan pedestrian facilities.	ublic transpo	ortation, bicycl	<u>e or pedestri</u>	<u>an</u>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?				
The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has reproposed design of the project adequately addresses the traff	-	project and has	s determined	that the
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a road design feature (e.g., sharp curves) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
The proposed building is also located near the corner of the of-site obstruction. However, the structure is appropriately swhich addresses this concern.				
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
The Los Angeles County Fire Department has also reviewed has adequate emergency access.	the project a	and has determ	nined that the	e project

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Less Than

	Potentially Significant Impact	Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impaci
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §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:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or				
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation ("Tribe") has indicated that the Project Site is located within the Gabrieleno community of Hahamonga / Acurangna. All of the Tribe's mainland villages overlapped each other to help facilitate the movement of tribal cultural resources (TCR) throughout the landscape and also to their sister tribes outside of their traditional ancestral territory. Village use areas were usually shared between village areas and were commonly used by two or more adjoining villages depending on the type, quantity, quality, and availability of natural resources in the area. Therefore, human activity can be pronounced within the shared use areas due to the combined use by multiple villages and TCR's may be present in the soil layers from the thousands of years of human activity within that landscape.

The Tribe also indicated that the there were many tribal trade routes around the Project Area. Trade routes were heavily used by their Tribe for movement of trade items, visiting of family, going to ceremony, accessing recreation areas, and accessing foraging areas. Within and around these routes contained seasonal or permanent ramadas or trade depots, seasonal and permanent habitation areas, and often still contain isolated burials and cremations from folks who died along the trail. These isolated burials are not associated with a village community burial site or ceremonial burial site, rather the location is simply where the person died and was buried where they died. Therefore, isolated burials are more concentrated and likely to occur in proximity to our trade routes, especially the major trade routes.

The Tribe has recommended several Mitigation Measures to address these issues, which have been incorporated into the Project's Mitigation and Monitoring Program (MMRP).

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impaci
Would the project:	1	1	1	1
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
The project site will utilize existing public utilities at the site, provided by East Pasadena Water Company; electricity wil wastewater treatment services will be provided by the Sanita waste management service is provided by Burrtec Waste Indu indicating their Intent to Serve the site.	l be provide tion Districts	ed by Southers s of Los Angel	n California es County; a	Edison nd solid
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
The project site will utilize existing water services at the site a the East Pasadena Water Company, which serves the project		f Intent to Serv	e has been is	ssued by
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
The project site will utilize existing wastewater treatment serv	vices at the si	te.		
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
Conditions of Approval of the project will include the deve				
segregation and collection program at the site. It is not expect of a demand for solid waste management in the area.	ted that the p	proposed proje	ct will add th	at much
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

20. Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
The proposed project is located in an urban area that is outsic	<u>le a high fire</u>	<u>hazard area wi</u>	th inadequate	e access.
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
The proposed project is located in an urban area that is outsi	de a high fire	e hazard area.		
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
The proposed project is located in an urban area that is outsi	<u>de a high fire</u>	e hazard area.		
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				
The proposed project is located in a level area and not within	an area pro	ne to flooding.		
e) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				
The proposed project is located in an urban area that is not a	t high risk of	f wildfires.		

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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?				
The project site is located in a developed, urbanized area and to species or plants in the general vicinity. Thus, the project is a these species.		_		
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)?				
The proposed site is in the vicinity of several existing chu considerable effects, even though the individual effects are li to meet existing Zoning Code, Building Code and Fire Code less than significant levels.	mited. How	ever, the proje	ct has been o	designed
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				
The proposed project is a typical and compatible use for the aron human beings, either directly or indirectly.	ea. It is not e	expected to have	ve any advers	<u>e effects</u>