



CITY OF SAN GABRIEL

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: **Marshall Community Park**
2. Lead agency name and address: **City of San Gabriel, 425 S. Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776**
3. Contact person and phone number: **Mark Gallatin: (626) 308-2806, ext. 4623**
4. Project location: **1817 Jackson Ave., San Gabriel, CA 91776**
5. Project sponsor's name and address: **City of San Gabriel, 425 S. Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776**
6. General plan designation: **Open Space and Public Facilities**
7. Zoning: **PF/OS (Public Facilities/Open Space)**
8. Description of project: *(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)*

The project proposes the development of a neighborhood park on the former campus of John Marshall Elementary School. The total campus area, including adjacent sidewalks and curbs, is 3.57 acres. The project will be on the portion of the campus formerly occupied by the playground and portable buildings used as classrooms, a library and storage, consisting of 2.35 acres. Planned park features, which will benefit the community, include: multi-purpose areas (pervious concrete game court (2,500 sq. ft.), synthetic turf (21,200 sq. ft.) and grass (6,800 sq. ft.)); a walking/jogging trail; and open space for public gatherings. Planned infrastructure elements include: restrooms, parking areas, seating areas and security features. The plan for the park will also include sustainability elements, demonstrating efficient use of water and other natural resources.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

North: Single Family and Multi Family Residences in the R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family Residence) zone.

West: Single Family Residences in the R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family Residence) zone.

South: Single Family and Multi Family Residences in the R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family Residence) zone.

East: Single Family and Multi Family Residences and a corner market in the R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family Residence) zone.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

Garvey School District (participation agreement), California Department of Parks and Recreation (financing approval)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology / Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population / Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation / Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities / Service Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:

Date: September 22, 2011

Printed Name:

Mark Gallatin, AICP, City Planner For: City of San Gabriel

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is 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 process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

- a.) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
- b.) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c.) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, including a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

- a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
- b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

QUESTION:

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. There is no scenic vista around the subject property. The project site and surrounding area are in an urbanized area, and no scenic vistas have been identified on or near the project site.

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

No Impact. No officially designated State scenic routes or highways occur near the project site.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. While the proposed project would change the character of the subject site from use as an elementary school to a park, the existing visual character and quality of the site will be enhanced due to the installation of a decorative entry feature, monument sign, access paving, decorative fencing, gates and bollards, mural wall, and demonstration garden with interpretative signage, in addition to the planting of a significant number of new trees and enhanced landscaping. Taken together, these measures will have a positive aesthetic impact on the neighborhood, rather than degrading the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. The project site and its surroundings are currently urbanized and contain various forms of on- and off-site lighting. As part of the project, new exterior lighting would be installed at the public sidewalks surrounding the site as well as at walkways on the interior of the site. It is anticipated that these lights will be equipped with either timers or photo-sensors to control the shut-off time. Additionally, a baseball field is proposed, which would be illuminated by four sports lighting fixtures at the perimeter of the field, along with a basketball court illuminated by four sports lighting fixtures at the corners of the court. To reduce the impact on adjacent properties, any new pedestrian or sports lighting will be directed away and/or shielded from adjacent properties as a mitigation measure and as part of the plan check review and construction process. Additionally, a lighting spread study and evening field test for light spillage will be conducted to address potential concerns. With these mitigation measures in place, the impact of light and glare will be less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. *Would the project:*

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site is urbanized and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project implementation would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to farmlands.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore no impacts would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

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

No Impact. The project site is urbanized and there are no farmland uses that are occurring on-site or in the immediate vicinity. Thus, the proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

Would the project:

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), monitored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has classified the SCAB as a non-attainment area for Federal and State air quality standards for Ozone, Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) and Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10) criteria pollutants. The proposed development of a park on the former elementary school campus is not expected to generate air pollutants in quantities substantially different from the prior use. Furthermore, the project will result in a significant increase in the number of trees on site, which should help to reduce the impact of air pollutants from vehicles coming to and from the site.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The project proposes no uses that would potentially create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project includes two 900 square foot picnic structures with tables, and may include barbeques. Construction activity associated with grading of the site for the proposed park may

generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, this impact would be short-term in nature and cease upon project completion.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site is predominantly urbanized and built out. Landscaping within the area consists of both native and non-native vegetation and no species that are candidate, sensitive or special status species are known to exist in the local vicinity due to the urbanized conditions. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to Federal or State listed or other designated species.

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

No Impact. As previously stated, the project site is predominately urbanized and built out. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities exist on-site. According to Figure 8-1 of the Environmental Resources Element of the *General Plan*, the project site is not identified as having environmental resources.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. No federally protected wetlands occur on-site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. No migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nurseries exist in the project area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

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

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is currently comprised of non-native vegetation. There are 17 trees that are to remain and approximately 48 new trees that will be planted as part of the project. The project proposes to remove nine California Peppers in poor condition in the former school playground and four Moreton Bay Figs which are in front of the former school due to damage they are causing to sidewalks and curbs. Also slated for removal are a Deodar Cedar and a Mexican Fan Palm at the southeast corner of Norwood and Marshall Way. Of the existing trees proposed for removal, the Deodar Cedar and the California Peppers are protected under the City of San Gabriel’s tree protection and preservation ordinance. In order to mitigate the loss of these mature protected trees, the project will be conditioned to obtain an arborist’s report on all protected species to be removed and to obtain a tree removal permit, conditioned to comply with the recommendations of the arborist’s report.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts in this regard.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is currently developed with an elementary school, which ceased operation in June 2011. The proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. This section of the CEQA Guidelines defines a historical resource as one listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places (per state law), included in a local register of historical resources (as defined by state law) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey (meeting the requirements of state law) or determined by the lead agency (the City of San Gabriel) to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Places.

In this case, John Marshall Elementary School is listed in a “windshield survey” of historic and cultural resources in the Valley Boulevard neighborhoods done in 2003. The survey identifies the school as a “building of cultural value”. It describes the building as a 1920s Spanish Colonial Revival with 1940s and 1960s details and notes that the original exterior of the building that can be seen from the street survives intact although a small number of character defining features have been altered or new architectural details have been added. While important, the windshield survey does not rise to the level of a historical resource survey as defined by state law. Therefore, the school does not meet the definition of a historical resource contained in Section 15064.5. of the CEQA Guidelines. Furthermore, the proposed project is confined to the former school

playground area and none of the existing permanent school structures would be demolished or altered as part of the project.

No Impact. The project site is urbanized with land area that has been previously disturbed. No excavations are proposed as part of the project and proposed grading is not deep enough to potentially impact archaeological or paleontological resources.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. No known human remains occur on-site and due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project site.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse affects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X

No Impact. No active faults are known to traverse the project site and the project site is not located within, or immediately adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur within the project area. The only structures proposed as part of this project are two picnic shelters and a restroom/recreation building, all under 1,000 square feet in size.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

No Impact. Southern California has numerous active and potentially active faults that could produce strong ground shaking that could impact the project site. The City of San Gabriel is in proximity to the San Andreas and Sierra Madre Fault zone. The Raymond Fault is the closest active fault, and is located north of the City of San Gabriel. The only structures proposed as part of this project are two picnic shelters and a restroom/recreation building, all under 1,000 square feet in size. All new structures will be built to current California building code standards, including applicable seismic standards.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project area is not located within a portion of the City that is identified in the *General Plan* Public and Environmental Safety Element as being subject to liquefaction. Therefore, project implementation is not anticipated to result in the exposure of people or structures to potential impacts related to seismic ground failure or liquefaction.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

iv) Landslides?				X
-----------------	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site is characterized by relatively flat topography. Project implementation would not expose people or structures to landslides, therefore no impact would occur in this regard.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. Grading for construction of the park may expose soils to short-term wind and water erosion. Implementation of erosion control measures as stated in Chapter 98.02 of the *San Gabriel Municipal Code* and adherence to all requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities would reduce potential impacts.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not located in an area of the city that has been identified as subject to liquefaction. The scope of the project is such that it involves some grading of the site for a development of a park on an area of the campus now occupied by playgrounds and portable buildings, activities that are unlikely to result in soil instability, on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site is not located on expansive soil. Soil and bedrock materials on-site are expected to have a low expansion potential.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. *Would the project:*

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?"			X	
---	--	--	---	--

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of San Gabriel has adopted its own thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. For land use development projects, a threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO2 per year has been established, which is based on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7. An analysis prepared by Hogle-Ireland Inc. in September 2011 found that greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed park will be 22.49 MTCO2E/YR and therefore would not exceed the recently adopted City threshold of 1,100 MTCO2E/YR.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of San Gabriel has adopted its own thresholds of significance for

greenhouse gas emissions. For land use development projects, a threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂ per year has been established, which is based on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7. An analysis prepared by Hogle-Ireland Inc. in September 2011 found that greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed park will be 22.49 MTC₂O₂/YR and therefore would not exceed the recently adopted City threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂E/YR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Small amounts of hazardous materials may be found in solvents and chemicals used for cleaning, and landscaping. The materials would be similar to those found in common household products, such as cleaning products or pesticides. Hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and Federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed uses are not anticipated to result in the creation of health hazards following compliance with health and safety regulations. The proposed uses would not use, generate or dispose of hazardous materials in large quantities. As stated above, hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and Federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

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

No Impact. The project site is the former campus of Marshall Elementary School. However, as previously stated, the proposed project would not involve the transport, use, handling, or disposal of notable quantities of hazardous materials, aside from normal custodial chemicals and landscaping applications. Therefore, the proposed project would not pose a health risk to nearby schools, and no significant impacts to schools would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 The project area is currently urbanized. The former elementary school use did not use, handle, or store hazardous materials aside from normal custodial chemicals and landscaping applications. Development of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment. Thus, less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is El Monte Airport, approximately five miles southeast of the project site. No impacts would occur in this regard.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is El Monte Airport, approximately five miles southeast of the project site. No impacts would occur in this regard.

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

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Emergency vehicles would continue to have access to project related and surrounding roadways upon completion of the proposed project. The project proposes to bulb out the curbs at each of the four intersections surrounding the site. This is a traffic calming measure but could potentially impact emergency response access, due to the width of the streets being reduced at those points. As mitigation for the impacts of the bulbouts, they will be required to be designed to be mountable by emergency vehicles, with a maximum curb height of four inches. Additionally, street parking will be prohibited by means of red curb at the following locations to ensure that emergency vehicles have an adequate turning radius to access all streets surrounding the park:

- Marshall Way: 28 feet south of the intersection of Norwood Place (both sides of the street), 28 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Street (both sides of the street)
- Jackson Avenue: 28 feet south of the intersection of Norwood Place (east side of the street), 28 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Street (east side of the street)
- Marshall Street: 28 feet west of the intersection of Jackson Avenue (north side of the street)

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site and surrounding areas are predominately built out and no wildlands occur within or adjacent to the project site. Future development as a result of project implementation would introduce additional ornamental landscaping, which is not anticipated to create hazardous fire conditions.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	

Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not be allowed to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) has adopted a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general Permit for storm water discharges associated with construction activity. Compliance with Statewide NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity which would prevent storm water pollution from impacting waters of the U.S. in the vicinity of the project area, will be required.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The level of the proposed grading will not reach the aquifer, thus the proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no streams or rivers nearby. The development of the proposed park will decrease the amount of impervious area on the site due to the addition of pervious concrete volleyball/handball/tetherball courts. While the project also includes a basketball court, the court will drain onto a turf area and into swales, basins, or dry well-type systems will allow storm water run-off to be retained on-site for ground infiltration, to potentially refill ground water basins, and reduce the project's impact on the existing storm drain system. Therefore, the proposed development will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project would also be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, and meet all National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB) and the City of San Gabriel.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no streams or rivers nearby. The development of the proposed park will decrease the amount of impervious area on the site due to the addition of pervious concrete volleyball/handball/tetherball courts. While the project also includes a basketball court, the court will drain onto a turf area and into swales, basins, or dry well-type systems will allow storm water run-off to be retained on-site for ground infiltration, to potentially refill ground water basins, and reduce the project’s impact on the existing storm drain system. Therefore, the proposed development will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project would also be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, and meet all National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB) and the City of San Gabriel.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. See Response a, c and d above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. See Response a, b, c and d above.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X

No Impact. According to the Public and Environmental Safety Element of the *General Plan*, the project site is not located within a flood zone. Additionally, the City of San Gabriel is not subject to any major flood hazards, or potential inundation due to nearby dam or levee failures. Furthermore, the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map designates the entire City as within a Flood Zone “C.” Flood Zone “C” is identified as no special flood hazard area. The proposed project would not involve the placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The proposed project site is 25 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and there are no large bodies of water within the vicinity of the project site that would cause inundation by seiche, tsumami, or mudflow. Therefore no impacts would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The proposed project site is the former campus of Marshall Elementary School, bounded by Marshall Street on the south, Marshall Way on the west, Norwood Place on the north and Jackson Avenue on the east. It is surrounded on all four sides by residential uses. No adjoining properties will be acquired as part of the project. Therefore the project will not physically divide an established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but to limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The proposed project site has a zoning designation of PF/OS (Public Facilities/Open Space) and a general plan land use designation of Open Space and Public Facilities. The proposed development of a neighborhood park on this site is consistent with both the zoning and general plan designations for the site.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

No Impact. The proposed project site is not included in any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site is currently developed and not identified as a site with known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to mineral resources.

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The proposed project will not 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, because the site contains no known mineral resources.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

Less Than Significant Impact. There will be a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the project, but it will not be substantial and must remain within noise limits established by the City. In compliance with the City’s noise standards, future construction activities shall be limited between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and between 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction activity is prohibited on Sundays and holidays.

Once the project is complete and the park is operational, it will be open to the public until 10:00 p.m. seven days a week. While some increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity are expected due to increased use of the site in the evening and on weekends, the noise levels should be comparable to those formerly found at the existing playground.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

No Impact. Construction of the proposed project would have no impact with regards to airports. The project area is not located within two miles of any public airport or within an airport land use plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The construction of the proposed project would have no impact with regards to private airstrips. The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

No Impact. The project would not result in an increase in population because no housing is proposed. No housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project, since the site is currently developed with an former elementary school campus which contains no housing.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: i) Fire protection? ii) Police protection? iii) Schools? iv) Parks? v) Other public facilities?		X X	X	X X
--	--	--------	---	--------

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. The project proposes to develop a neighborhood park on the site of the former elementary school playground. The project will involve construction of a play field, basketball/volleyball/handball/tetherball courts, two small picnic structures and a restroom/recreation building. The school ceased operation in June 2011. Existing portable school buildings used for classrooms, a library and storage will be relocated off site, hence there will be no impact on schools. The conceptual plan for the proposed park has been reviewed by the Fire and Police Departments in order to identify any potential public safety impacts and mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level (see the Hazard/Hazardous Materials and Transportation/Traffic sections).

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION.

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

No Impact. Because the project involves the creation of a new neighborhood park, it is unlikely to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To the extent that the lack of a conveniently located neighborhood park causes neighborhood residents to utilize other existing neighborhood and regional parks, the development of this project may cause a decrease in the use of those other recreational facilities.

Less Than Significant Impact. While the project does include the construction of recreational facilities, including sports courts and a play field, it is taking place on a former elementary school playground and as such represents an upgrade of the existing facilities which would have a less than significant adverse physical effect on the environment.

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

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is designed as a neighborhood park to serve the residents within the attendance area of the former elementary school. Once the project is complete and the park is operational, it will be open to the public until 10:00 p.m. seven days a week. While some increase in traffic may occur in the evening and on weekends as a result of the project, it is anticipated that most of the park users will come from the immediate neighborhood and may walk or bike to the site.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The site is surrounded by streets on all four sides. Norwood Place, Jackson Avenue and Marshall Way are designated as local residential streets. Marshall Street is designated as a collector street. None of the subject intersections are signalized (they are controlled by stop signs) and there are no level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for them. The proposed park is not expected to generate significantly greater traffic volumes in comparison to the former elementary school.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The proposed project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks because there is no airport nearby.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. The project proposes to bulb out the curbs at each of the four intersections surrounding the site. Although this is a traffic calming measure, it could potentially impact the safe flow of two way traffic and visibility at these intersections, due to the width of the streets being reduced at those points and the installation of planting areas on each side of the bulbouts. As mitigation for the impacts of the bulbouts, they will be required to be designed to be mountable by emergency vehicles, with a maximum curb height of four inches. Additionally, street parking will be prohibited by means of red curb at the following locations to ensure that the safe flow of two way traffic and visibility is maintained at all intersections surrounding the park:

- Marshall Way: 28 feet south of the intersection of Norwood Place (both sides of the street), 28 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Street (both sides of the street)
- Jackson Avenue: 28 feet south of the intersection of Norwood Place (east side of the street), 28 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Street (east side of the street)
- Marshall Street: 28 feet west of the intersection of Jackson Avenue (north side of the street)

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Emergency vehicles would continue to have access to project related and surrounding roadways upon completion of the proposed project. The project proposes to bulb out the curbs at each of the four intersections surrounding the site. This is a traffic calming measure but could potentially impact emergency response access, due to the width of the streets being reduced at those points. As mitigation for the impacts of the bulbouts, they will be required to be designed to be mountable by emergency vehicles, with a maximum curb height of four inches. Additionally, street parking will be prohibited by means of red curb at the following locations to ensure that emergency vehicles have an adequate turning radius to access all streets surrounding the park:

- Marshall Way: 28 feet south of the intersection of Norwood Place (both sides of the street), 28 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Street (both sides of the street)
- Jackson Avenue: 28 feet south of the intersection of Norwood Place (east side of the street), 28 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Street (east side of the street)

Marshall Street: 28 feet west of the intersection of Jackson Avenue (north side of the street)

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The former elementary school has no on-site parking. All parking is provided by parallel street parking on the four streets surrounding the site. The proposed project will maintain this existing parking pattern, and will include the provision of four disabled-accessible street parking spaces.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a small restroom/recreation building in which the restroom portion is approximately 300 square feet. Given the small scale of the proposed restroom facilities, the amount of additional wastewater generated by the project is expected to be relatively minimal. The project, therefore, would not result in significant impacts that would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board and would have a less than significant impact on the need to construct new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The development of the proposed park will decrease the amount of impervious area on the site due to the addition of pervious concrete volleyball/handball/tetherball courts. While the project also includes a basketball court, the court will drain onto a turf area and into swales, basins, or dry well-type systems will allow storm water run-off to be retained on-site for ground infiltration, to potentially refill ground water basins, and reduce the project's impact on the existing storm drain system.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is served by the Golden State Water Company. GSWC, a subsidiary of the American States Water Company, is a public utility company engaged principally in the purchase, production, distribution, and sale of water to over 240,000 customers. A few years ago, GSWC completed a mainline replacement program, which involved upsizing 14,000 feet of 4-inch lines to 8-inch lines. Thus, there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, without the need for new or expanded entitlements. Furthermore, the project will incorporate various sustainable techniques and features such as creative drainage, synthetic turf sports field, drought tolerant plant material, 'Smart Irrigation' equipment for water conservation and recycled materials for paving and site furnishings. Drainage techniques that include swales, basins, or dry well-type systems will allow storm water run-off to be retained on-site for ground infiltration, to potentially refill ground water basins, and reduce the project's impact on the existing storm drain system. The site will be planted with native and other climate appropriate plants that require less water, maintenance and green waste when compared to non-native ornamental plants. A highly efficient water-conserving "Smart Irrigation" system could use equipment such as matched-precipitation low-angle rotors for turf while trees and shrub beds will be irrigated with low-flow point-source irrigation such as drip emitters, drip line, or bubblers. Doing so will reduce water loss through evaporation and reduce water consumption by 50% compared to conventional irrigation systems and will

encourage deep root growth for the plant material. Furthermore, the use moisture sensors, if applicable, can recognize the abundance of water in certain areas and adjust the irrigation watering schedule to accommodate further reducing the consumption of potable water.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a small restroom/recreation building in which the restroom portion is approximately 300 square feet. Given the small scale of the proposed restroom facilities, the amount of additional wastewater generated by the project is expected to be relatively minimal. The project, therefore, should result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of San Gabriel is served by Athens Disposal Company. The company hauls nonrecyclable solid waste to the Puente Hills Landfill. This facility has enough capacity to accept solid waste until the year 2020, according to the disposal company. Contribution to the City’s solid waste stream from this project will not be significant enough to cause noncompliance with federal, state, or local solid waste statutes or regulations.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No Impact. The project site does not contain the habitat of a fish or wildlife species and therefore construction of the proposed project would not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Likewise, approval of the proposed project is not anticipated to eliminate examples of 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)?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project has the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts; however these are reduced to a level of less than significant by the mitigation measures that have been applied to the project's individual impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Any potential substantial adverse effects from the project will be mitigated below a level of significance by the proposed mitigation measures.

Mark Gallatin
Name

September 22, 2011
Date

Signature

City Planner, San Gabriel Planning Division
Title

SOURCES CITED IN THE EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Marshall Community Park 1817 S. Jackson Ave., San Gabriel, CA

1. *Ingredients for Success*, the Comprehensive General Plan of the City of San Gabriel, 2004
2. The Comprehensive General Plan Background Report of the City of San Gabriel, 2004
3. Environmental Evaluation, City of San Gabriel General Plan, 2004
4. *Valley Vision: The Valley Boulevard Neighborhoods Sustainability Plan*, City of San Gabriel, 2006
5. Environmental Impact Report for *Valley Vision: The Valley Boulevard Neighborhoods Sustainability Plan*, City of San Gabriel, 2006
6. Zoning Ordinance, City of San Gabriel
7. Conceptual Plan for Marshall Community Park
8. Marshall Community Park Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis, Hogle-Ireland Inc., September 7, 2011

All documents cited above are available for review at the City of San Gabriel Community Development Department, 425 South Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776. The office hours are Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except Tuesday until 6:30 p.m.