

Appendix G
June 14, 2017
September 9, 2015

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
Revised 2009

1. Project Title: West Parcel Solar (WPS) Project
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Mt. San Antonio College, 1100 North Grand Avenue,
Walnut, California 91789
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Rebecca Mitchell, Facilities Planning and Management
(909) 274-5175
4. Project Location: City of Walnut, County of Los Angeles
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Mt. San Antonio College, 1100 North Grand Avenue,
Walnut, California 91789
6. General Plan Designation: Hillside Single Family Residential Identity
Maximum Density: 1.3 du/acre (City of Walnut)
2012 Facility Master Plan Future New Building
or Expansion Zone (Mt. SAC)
7. Zoning: Solar & Retail (Mt. SAC)
Residential Plan Development 28,500: 1.3 du (City of Walnut)
8. Description of the 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 site is undeveloped and contains primarily coastal sage scrub, habitat for the threatened coastal California gnatcatcher. Replacement and restored habitat will be implemented onsite and east of Grand Avenue. Grading will occur on 17.25 acres to create a 9.9 acre pad at 761 feet mean sea level for a 2.0 MW solar panel system. Earth import for the project is estimated as 139,000 cubic yards. The project will provide up to 4.6 million kwh of electricity for the campus during its first year of operation. The solar system is a design-build agreement for the purchase and installation of a ground-mount solar photovoltaic system, which will provide clean power for the campus. The 2.2-MW system; will have both fixed solar panels and panels that tilt to better capture sunlight while minimizing glare.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

The WPS Project is proposed on campus south of Temple Avenue and west of Grand Avenue in the City of Walnut. The Project site is undeveloped and includes Venturian coastal sage scrub, and agricultural land (initially classified as non-native grassland in 2008. The northern portion of the 23.0-acre triangular site is vacant and was used for Christmas tree sales.

The WPS project is bordered by City of Walnut residential land uses to the south and west, an office building at the southwest corner of Temple/Grand Avenues and the Mt. SAC Wildlife Sanctuary and Snow Creek east of Grand Avenue and south of Temple Avenue. A campus service road extends along the southeast edge of the Wildlife Sanctuary and terminates at Grand Avenue. South of this service road and east of Grand Avenue is a prominent landform known as MSAC Hill. A small rectangular undeveloped area occurs east of Grand Avenue south of MSAC Hill and east of the WPS site. Stonybrook Drive provides access to the residential land uses to the west, as does Regal Canyon Drive south from Temple Avenue.

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

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (SWRCB)
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- City of Walnut (grading plan)

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.

	Aesthetics		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Recreation
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation/Traffic
	Air Quality		Land Use/Planning		Utilities/Service Systems
	Biological Resources		Mineral Resources		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	Cultural Resources		Noise		
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Public Services		

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.	No
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.	No
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	No
I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potential 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.	Yes
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed 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.	No

Rebecca Mitchell

June 16, 2017

Signature

Date

Rebecca Mitchell

Mt. San Antonio College

Printed Name

For

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 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 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 “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis 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, include 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 analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
There are no designated scenic vistas in the Project area.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
The Project does not damage scenic resources. The site is not adjacent to a scenic highway.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
Grand Avenue declines from Temple Avenue toward Stonybrook Drive and the top-of-slope (i.e. to the building pad eastern edge ranges from 730-770 msl). Therefore, the top-of-slope increases in height as you drive south on Grand Avenue along the project frontage; shielding the solar panels from driver view.				
The building pad is at 761 feet msl and the natural habitat terrain along the western edge is up to 790 feet msl. The residential pads west of the project are probably at 790 feet msl or above. The site plan includes retention of portions of the natural habitat, has a lower elevation of the building pad, and distance separation for most offsite residential lots (10 of 12 units) from the building pad. The rear yards of the lots offsite provide additional separation from the Project site and the perimeter open grate metal fencing is six or more feet high. Therefore, there is no substantial degradation of the visual character or quality of the surroundings. The visual character of the site is maintained by completion of the Landscape Plan for the areas along Grand Avenue and the higher elevation of the site pad from Grand Avenue (i.e. up to 80 feet at the southeast). Therefore, the Project impact is Less than Significant. Concerns related to the solar panels are addressed later in this report.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
PV solar panels absorb sunlight to convert sunlight into electricity. A mono-crystalline silicon solar cell absorbs two-thirds of the sunlight reaching the panel's surface. An anti-reflective coating on the panel also reduces reflection and increases sunlight absorption. The "backtracking" design of the solar system, which is an operational system, combined with a tracked and tilt solar panel system will eliminate glare for adjacent properties.				
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project?				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?				X
The Project is not within an Agricultural Zone (Exhibit 7 in Final EIR).				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
The Project is not zoned for agriculture or subject to a Williamson Act contract (Exhibit 7 in Final EIR).				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 511040 (g))?			X	
The Project does not conflict with the Facilities Master Plan designation of Future New Building or Expansion Zone. The Project provides a necessary service (solar electrical power for heating and cooling systems) for campus buildings. The Project is exempt from the City of Walnut General Plan and zoning designations. The adjacent office use north of the Project site is Commercial Profession in the General Plan and zoned Light Commercial (C-1).				
d) Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
The Project is not within forest land.				
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?				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The Project is located in the Retail & Solar Zone, not an Agricultural Zone.				
3. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance 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
Grading of 17.25 acres for the Project and implementation of the WPS project will have no impact based on SCAQMD emission standards because of the small acreage and no traffic is associated with the Project upon buildout; other than service vehicles.				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.		X		X
The Draft EIR will evaluate the construction and operational air quality impacts of the project based on SCAGMD thresholds of significance and Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) requirements. It is anticipated that some mitigation measures will be required.				
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	
The Draft EIR will evaluate the construction and operational air quality impacts of the project based on SCAGMD thresholds of significance and Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) requirements. It is anticipated that the project's contribution to area and regional emissions effects will be less than cumulatively considerable.				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
The Draft EIR will evaluate the construction and operational air quality impacts of the project based on SCAGMD thresholds of significance and Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) requirements. It is anticipated that sensitive receptors will not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
The Project will not produce odors. There is no degradation of the solar panels that would produce odors. Some diesel odors may occur during construction but are not significant.				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
The Project site includes habitat of the California coastal gnatcatcher (CGN) which is a threatened species subject to CDFW and USFWS regulations. The District has processed all the required permits for Project impacts on the CGN. The permit conditions of approval will constitute the requirements and the impact will be Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.				
b) Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?			X	
There is a small stand of riparian trees onsite and riparian shrubs. The District has processed a 1603 Permit: Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). SAA are negotiated contractual agreements and should not be considered mitigation measures.				
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		
While the streambeds onsite are not significant under CEQA, a 404 permit has been issued by USACE.				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
No trees are being removed during Project construction. Therefore, no migratory birds will be impacted during the nesting season. Surveys of trees for active nesting sites are required from March-May if trees are being removed. The primary concern is disturbing raptors.				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
The campus has no tree preservation ordinance, but has a Land Use Management Plan to minimize impacts on California Black Walnuts (CBW) on campus. No CBWs are located within the Project site.				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, and other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
The Project site will not impact any habitat conservation plans.				
5. 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
The Project will not impact any historic features. The Draft EIR will include a cultural resource study which will confirm if cultural resources are present onsite. A cultural resource study was completed for the Project and the remnants of a cattle chute and loading corrals were found onsite. However these structures are not significant historical resources. (Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for West Parcel Solar Project, Applied Earthworks, December 2014). The Draft EIR will evaluate whether historical resources are present onsite. If found, appropriate mitigation measures will be required.				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
While archaeological resources are not anticipated onsite, the Draft EIR will recommend measures to assure that if discovered during grading, all state requirements will be followed.				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
While paleontological resources are not anticipated onsite, the Draft EIR will recommend measures to assure that if discovered during grading, all state requirements will be followed.				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
There are no known cemeteries on or near campus and the surrounding areas on campus have been graded and/or disked.				
e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (TCR) such as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either on, or eligible for inclusion in, the California Historic Register or a local historic register, or is a resource that the Lead Agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines should be treated as a Tribal Cultural Resource (PRC 21074 (a) (1-2)?				X
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
(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
The Project site is not located within a currently designated State of California Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones) for surface rupture. No surface faults are known to project through or towards the site. The Draft EIR will include a geotechnical study which will confirm these preliminary conclusions.				
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
All project construction will comply with the 2013 California Building Code (CBC) to assure seismic safety.				
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
The soils at the Project site are not anticipated to be susceptible to liquefaction. The Draft EIR will include a geotechnical study which will confirm these preliminary conclusions.				
(iv) Landslides?				X
The WPS site ranges in elevation from 795 - 815 feet msl and is not known to be subject to landslides.				
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
The Project site is undeveloped. All construction activities, including grading will be subject to the Water Quality Management Plan for the WPS Project. Prior to grading, some topsoil and Duff materials will be collected for use in the habitat restoration areas				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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
The soils at the Project site are likely not susceptible to liquefaction				
(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		
The Draft EIR will include a geotechnical study which will confirm whether expansive soil is present onsite. However, some mitigation for expansive soils is likely.				
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposals are proposed. The Project site is serviced by public sewers.				
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project?				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment?				X
The Draft EIR will evaluate greenhouse gas emissions for the project. However, no significant effect is anticipated because of the type of project and its small scale.				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
The Project will not conflict with any GHG plan or regulation. GHG thresholds for mixed-use projects are 3,500 metric tons CO ₂ Eq/year and the Project will generate minimal GHE emissions.				
8. 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
No hazardous materials are being transported to or from the Project site.				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
No hazardous materials are being transported to or from the Project site. Temporary storage of fuel onsite for construction equipment is not a risk when stored properly.				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
No public schools are located within one-quarter mile of the Project site. Collegewood Elementary is located west of Grand Avenue and north of Collegewood Drive.				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials site 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
The Project site is not located in Section 65962.5 databases.				
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
The Project site is not within two miles of an airport.				
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
The Project site is not within two miles of an airport.				
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
The Project will not interfere with emergency plans.				
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
There are no wildland areas near the Project site.				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		
No water quality standards will likely be violated. All surface parking lots on campus must comply with an approved Water Quality Management Plan. The Draft EIR will include a hydrology study and water quality plan.				
b) Substantially degrade 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	
All reclaimed water will be obtained from Walnut Valley Water District. Upon bailout, the site will use water only for landscaping along Grand Avenue. Drought tolerant plants dominate the plant palette.				
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		
There are two streambeds onsite. The northern streambed is 585 linear feet in length and is an ephemeral stream classified as Waters of the United States (WUS) and subject to USACE jurisdiction. The southern stream is also WUS and is 414 linear feet in length. The Draft EIR will evaluate all project impacts on streambeds and either mitigation measures or a 1603 Agreement will likely be required.				
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 of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?			X	
See discussion for Item 9a and 9c.. With implementation of the grading plan and related storm drain and drainage ditches (Exhibit 1) the Project has a Less than Significant Impact on surface runoff rates. The existing storm drains along Grand Avenue along the project frontage have adequate capacity to serve the Project.				
e) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
The WPS site is currently undeveloped, but the slopes cause drainage to move quickly toward storm drains for Grand Avenue. A WQMP will assure water quality is maintained and the Project design includes two water drainage ditches and a storm drain.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
The Project will comply with all requirements of the WQMP (see Item 9a) so water quality will not be degraded.				
g) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
The Project does not propose new housing.				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
The Project site is not within a flood hazard area.				
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
The Project is not exposed to flooding from a dam.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
The Project site is not near oceans or subject to landslides and mud flows.				
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
The Project does not divide a community.				
b) Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The Project does not conflict with the prior Facilities Master Plan designation of Future New Building or Expansion Zone or the current campus zoning of Retail & Solar. The Project provides a necessary service (solar electrical power for heating and cooling systems) for campus buildings.</p>				
<p>The Project is not subject to the City's Zoning because of California Government Code 53091(e). See Item 12(a) below.</p>				
<p>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities' conservation plan?</p>				X
<p>The Project does not impact a conservation plan. The Project will obtain all required permits from the Responsible Agencies for impacts on the California coastal gnatcatcher (see Item 4).</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p>				X
<p>There are no known mineral resources within the Project site.</p>				
<p>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?</p>				X
<p>There are no plans designate the Project area a mineral resource recovery site.</p>				
<p>12. NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>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?</p>				X
<p>The District is not subject to the City's Noise Ordinance or noise standards.</p>				
<p>Per California Government Code 53091 (e): Water and electrical energy facilities: "Zoning ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, or for the production or generation of electrical energy, facilities that are subject to Section 12808.5 of the Public Utilities Code, or electrical substations in an electrical transmission system that receives electricity at less than 100,000 volts. Zoning ordinances of a county or city shall apply to the location or construction of facilities for the storage or transmission of electrical energy by a local agency, if the zoning ordinances make provision for those facilities."</p>				
<p>The Project(s) will not have a significant noise impact upon buildout. Only sporadic maintenance is needed for the solar project and no heavy equipment that generates noise is required. Therefore, the Project(s) has no noise impact after buildout.</p>				
<p>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</p>			X	
<p>No pile driving is proposed during construction of the Project. Any vibration due to grading near the property line is limited to conventional construction equipment, limited in duration and results in no safety or structural damage offsite. The Draft EIR will evaluate any vibration effects on offsite properties caused by construction equipment during grading of the project site.</p>				
<p>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>				X
<p>Upon buildout, the ambient noise level will not increase substantially. Periodic use of maintenance vehicles onsite will be the only noise source. Construction noise impacts are temporary in nature.</p>				
<p>d) A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>		X		

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Upon buildout, the ambient noise level will not increase substantially. Periodic use of maintenance vehicles onsite will be the only noise source. Construction noise impacts are temporary in nature.

The Project will have a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above ambient noise levels during some phases of construction (i.e. grading) depending on distance from the sensitive receptors, the type of construction equipment being used, and the noise volume generated by that equipment at full power. The increase from ambient noise levels is more pronounced outside of peak periods when background traffic noise is less. Therefore, the most effective means of reducing temporary noise impacts during construction is to minimize the time construction occurs (i.e. complete it quickly to limit the noise duration or limit the hours of construction). The following mitigation measure (included as MM 5a in the 2012 Mitigation Monitoring Program for the certified 2012 Final EIR (SCH 2002041161)) is feasible and effective in reducing Project construction noise from significant to Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

All construction and general maintenance activities, except in emergencies or special circumstances, shall be limited to the hours of 7 am to 7 pm Monday-Saturday. Staging areas for construction shall be located away from existing offsite residences. All construction equipment shall use properly operating mufflers. These requirements shall be included in construction contracts and implemented. Facilities Planning & Management shall monitor compliance.

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
--	--	--	--	---

The Project site is not within two miles of an airport.

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
--	--	--	--	---

The Project site is not within two miles of an airport.

13. 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
--	--	--	--	---

The Project does not induce population growth. Temporary minor increases in employment due to the Project do not induce growth. The circulation network is established and the campus does not require extension of roads or other major infrastructure.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The Project does not include housing or displace housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The Project does not include displacement of people.

14. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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:

a) Fire protection?				X
---------------------	--	--	--	---

Existing fire services can protect the WPS without new facilities.

b) Police protection?				X
-----------------------	--	--	--	---

Mt. San Antonio College Department of Police/Public Safety (DPS) is responsible for the Project. The County of Los Angeles Sheriff Department also serves the campus.

c) Schools?				X
-------------	--	--	--	---

The project has no impact on schools.

d) Parks?				X
-----------	--	--	--	---

The Project has no impact on parks.

e) Other public facilities?				X
-----------------------------	--	--	--	---

The Project has no impact on other public facilities (e.g. libraries, community center, etc).

15. RECREATION. a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks				X
--	--	--	--	---

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
The Project has no residents and no impacts on parks or recreational facilities.				
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
The project does not include recreational facilities.				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure 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		
Minimal sporadic and low maintenance vehicle trips will occur for the Project upon buildout. Construction traffic will occur during non-peak hours. The Project includes 139,000 cy of earth import from the Physical Education Project (Phase 1) project, and the haul route will include Temple Avenue and Grand Avenue.				
The District is required to submit a Truck Haul Plan to the City of Walnut for review and approval. This is a ministerial action and not subject to CEQA. However, it is a Condition of Approval for the project. Depending on the results of the Truck Haul Plan analysis, intermittent sporadic congestion may occur and further Conditions of Approval may not be feasible. In this case, the plan may be subject to environmental review.				
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	
Minimal sporadic and low maintenance vehicle trips will occur for the Project upon buildout. Construction traffic will be in non-peak hours. The Project has no impact on CMP intersections. . The Truck Haul Plan (see Item 16a) will include evaluation of truck haul traffic at area intersections, using the LOS standard. A Less than Significant Impact is anticipated.				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				X
The Project does not impact air traffic patterns.				
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X
The Project has no impact on the design of Grand Avenue. The service road into the site will have minimal use.				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
The Project does not result in inadequate emergency access.				
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
The Project has no impacts on the facilities cited and does not decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.				
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
The Project does not generate wastewater, only drainage flows.				
b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
No new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities are likely required for the Project.				
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

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
No new storm drains offsite are required for the Project. A new storm drain will be installed onsite but does not cause significant effects.				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
The Three Valleys Municipal Water District has ample supplies for the Project. Water supplies for the campus are provided under an agreement with TVMWD and its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
The Project produces no wastewater.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
The Project has no solid waste steam upon buildout. Minimal constructions debris will be disposed of in area landfills.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?				X
The Project will comply with all applicable statues and regulations for solid waste.				
18. 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
The Project has no impact on all issues listed, except for the potential impact on migratory birds, which is reduced to Less than Significant by Mitigation Measure 9e in the 2012 Final EIR. All biological impacts will be resolved through the conditions of the permits from the Responsible Agencies (i.e., SWRCB, USACE, CDFG, USFWS).				
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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
The Project is not anticipated to have cumulatively considerable impacts. The cumulative impacts for the 2012 FMP were adequately evaluated in the Final EIR. No new projects near the Project site have been identified.				
While Project construction traffic may use the Grand Avenue/Temple intersection (i.e. where the FMP has an unavoidable adverse impact) the Project's incremental contribution to that adverse impact is minima (i.e. less than cumulatively considerable). Project trip volumes are too small in proportion to the total trips on any intersection leg to cause an impact. (A cumulative unavoidable impact of the FMP at the Grand Avenue/Temple Avenue intersection was first identified in Table 1 of the 2008 Master Plan Update Final EIR).				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
The Project is not anticipated to violate any air quality, noise or construction threshold or ordinance. All construction impacts are anticipated to not be adverse and the Project has minimal impacts upon buildout.				
Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code: Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Public Resources Code; Eureka Citizens for Responsible Government v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal.App.4 th 357; Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4 th at 1109; San Franciscans' Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4 th 656.				