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1. Introduction

Smart Investments, In., the project applicant, is seeking approval of the Southwest San Jose Specific Plan from the City of Claremont, which would establish a land use, development and implementation framework to allow for the enhancement and redevelopment of a currently developed 3.96-acre site located near the southern end of the City. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Claremont, as lead agency, is preparing the environmental documentation for the proposed project to determine if approval of the discretionary actions requested and subsequent development would have a significant impact on the environment. As defined by Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study is prepared primarily to provide the lead agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration (ND), or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for the proposed project. This Initial Study has been prepared to support the adoption of an MND.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

Figures 1, Regional Location, and 2, Local Vicinity, illustrate the location of the Project Site within the regional and local contexts of Los Angeles County and the City of Claremont, respectively. The 3.96-acre Project Site is in the southern end of the City of Claremont (City) and lies within the Vista neighborhood of the Claremont General Plan; the site is comprised of three addresses (701, 721, and 747 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) and is bounded by San Jose Avenue to the north; Indian Hill Boulevard to the east; and Interstate 10 (I-10) to the south; and professional services uses and a pre-school to the west (see Figure 2).

The City is approximately 30 miles (48 kilometers) east of downtown Los Angeles at the base of the San Gabriel Mountains, south of the Angeles National Forest. The City is located along the eastern edge of Los Angeles County next to its border with San Bernardino County, and is surrounded by the cities of Upland and Montclair and unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County to the east; the City of Pomona to the south and southwest; and the City of La Verne and unincorporated area of Los Angeles County to the west and northwest (see Figure 1). Regional access to the Project Site is provided by I-10, with local access provided via Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.2.1 Existing Land Use and Conditions

Existing onsite and surrounding land uses are shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph. Figures 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, depict the existing conditions of the Project Site. As shown in Figures 3, 4a and 4b, the Project Site is developed and consists of a few buildings and site improvements associated with the existing commercial and lodging uses onsite. Specifically, the Project Site is occupied by three buildings: the first building (701 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) is occupied by a restaurant; the second building (721 S. Indian Hill Boulevard)
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Boulevard) is occupied by a two-story, 64-room Knights Inn motel; and the third building (747 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) is occupied by a Shell gas station. The Project Site is comprised of two parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 8316-019-009 and 8316-019-010), which are under separate ownership: the portion of the Project Site that contains the motel and restaurant is under one owner (the project applicant) and the gas station is under separate ownership (see Figure 5, Parcel and Ownership Map).

The motel consists of a two story building that houses the guest rooms and an attached single story building that houses the motel lobby, management offices, and dining area. Site improvements associated with the motel include asphalt-paved parking areas and drive aisles; a porte cochere (a porch where vehicles stop to discharge passengers) adjacent to the lobby and management offices; ground-level monument signs along the San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevards Project Site frontages; a 45-foot high freeway pylon sign abutting the I-10 on-ramp; a swimming pool and open lawn area, which are enclosed with chain-link fencing, green tarps, and shrubs; block walls; and other hardscape and landscape improvements. There is a small wood shed adjacent to the pool, which is used for storing pool and maintenance equipment (see Figures 3, 4a, and 4b).

The buildings of the restaurant and gas station are single story; site improvements associated with these two commercial uses include asphalt-paved parking areas and drive aisles, walkways, ground-level monument signs along the street frontage, and other hardscape and landscape improvements (see Figures 3, 4a, and 4b). In addition to the sale of gas, the gas station also includes a self-serve car wash and a convenience store.

Landscaping improvements throughout the Project Site include lawn areas, shrubs, and a number of trees internal to the Project Site and along the site boundaries; tree types include but are not limited to palms, pine, floss silk, ficus, and willow.

A California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) retaining concrete wall runs along almost the entire stretch of the southern site boundary. A sound wall (approximately 20 feet in height) mounted on top of the retaining wall commences near the southwestern portion of the Project Site and continues west along I-10. A few parking area light fixtures on metal poles are located along the southern site boundary and within the parking area fronting onto San Jose Avenue. Vehicular access to the Project Site is provided via four access driveways; two off of San Jose Avenue and two off of Indian Hill Boulevard.

The Project Site is relatively flat, with a change in elevation of approximately 15 feet; the low point (at approximately 1,030 feet above mean sea level [amsl]) is near the southwest corner of the Project Site and the high point (at approximately 1,045 amsl) is along the northern portion.

1.2.2 Surrounding Land Use

As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, land uses surrounding the Project Site consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard.
Figure 1 - Regional Location

1. Introduction
1. Introduction

This page intentionally left blank.
1. Introduction

Specific Plan Boundary

City Boundary

Source: ESRI, 2015
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Figure 3 - Aerial Photograph

Source: Google Earth Pro, 2015
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Specific Plan Boundary

Looking west along northern site boundary.

Looking south along eastern site boundary.

Looking west into project site from eastern site boundary.

Looking east along northern site boundary.

Key Map

San Bernardino Fwy

W San Jose Ave

S Indian Hill Blvd

Specific Plan Boundary

Photo Location and Direction

Looking west along southern site boundary.
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Looking south across project site; view of motel parking area, covered drop-off/pick-up area, and motel lobby and offices.

Looking west across project site; view of freeway pylon sign and motel parking area and building.

Looking south across project site; view of open lawn area and chain-link fence with tarp.

Looking west across project site; view of restaurant parking area and motel.

Looking west across project site; view of open lawn area and outdoor swimming pool.

Key Map

Key Map Source: Google Earth Pro, 2015
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1.2.3 General Plan and Zoning

General Plan

Per the Claremont General Plan land use plan, the Project Site is designated as Commercial with a Specific Plan Overlay. The Commercial land use designation provides opportunities for a broad range of uses. With adoption of the Southwest San Jose Specific Plan, the Commercial land use designation would remain.

Additionally, Claremont has many distinct neighborhoods that were developed during different periods of time, with each neighborhood having a character of its own in terms of housing styles, development patterns, streetscape design, and building scale and mass. The Project Site lies within the Vista neighborhood of the Claremont General Plan. Per the Claremont General Plan, the vision (in part) of the Vista neighborhood states:

“Allow for enhancement and redevelopment of commercial, industrial, and educational properties that complement the residential areas and which are consistent with General Plan intensity and density limits.”

Zoning

According to the City’s zoning map, the Project Site is zoned Specific Plan Area 12 (SP12). Per Chapter 16.081 (Specific Plan District) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, the areas designated as Specific Plan District are subject to the preparation and adoption of a specific plan. The Southwest San Jose Specific Plan would be adopted by the Claremont City Council as ordinance and function as the regulatory document that serves as the implementing zoning for the Project Site; the Specific Plan establishes the prevailing land use regulations for all development and redevelopment activities within the Project Site.

1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Project Site is occupied by a restaurant, motel and gas station, and has been since the site was first developed: the portion of the Project Site that contains the motel and restaurant is under one owner (the project applicant) and the gas station is under separate ownership (see Figure 5, Parcel and Ownership Map). The existing uses onsite were first proposed by a developer in the mid-1960s and constructed sometime in the late 1960s. At the time of their development, the existing commercial and lodging uses were developed in accordance with the commercial zoning standards that were applicable to the Project Site. The existing motel was originally developed as a Howard Johnson’s, which was designed and constructed in the standard Howard Johnson’s national trademark for architecture of that time. The Howard Johnson’s motel eventually changed to the Knights Inn motel in December 2014, at the time the project applicant purchased the motel; both brands are considered budget motels. The restaurant and gas station have also changed owners and business names since they first opened for business.
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The project applicant, who is also the owner of the parcel that contains the motel and restaurant (see Figure 5, Parcel and Ownership Map) purchased this portion of the property in December 2014; the project applicant also owns and operates the motel, while the restaurant is under lease to a tenant. The gas station and parcel it is located on are under separate ownership.

As a part of the City’s efforts in 2005 to update its General Plan, the zoning district of the Project Site, as well as various others throughout the City, were changed from their underlying conventional zoning districts (which varied) to Specific Plan, with each being designated a number from 1 to 14. Specifically, the Project Site was rezoned from Commercial Freeway to Specific Plan Area 12 (SP12). The numerated specific plans and a general description of their location were codified in Chapter 16.081 (Specific Plan District) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, while the City’s zoning map depicts their specific locations.

1.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.4.1 Statement of Objectives

The overall purpose of the Southwest San Jose Specific Plan (referred herein after as Specific Plan) is to provide comprehensive direction and the framework for enhancement and redevelopment of the Project Site while implementing the vision, goals and policies of the Claremont General Plan. The Specific Plan is guided by the following objectives, which will aid decision makers in their review of the Specific Plan and associated environmental impacts.

- Provide for greater specificity and flexibility in carrying out the goals and policies, as well as the Vista neighborhood vision, of the City’s General Plan for the Project Site.

- Allow for enhancement and redevelopment of the commercial uses onsite in accordance with the Vista neighborhood vision of the City’s General Plan.

- Allow for the existing commercial uses onsite to remain in their current condition, with the opportunity to undergo improvements or redevelopment in the future in accordance with the framework and provisions of the Specific Plan.

- Enhance the City’s lodging opportunities through replacement of the existing budget motel with an upscale hotel development.

- Increase the City’s revenue-generating tax base through transient occupancy tax (TOT) receipts, sales taxes, and property taxes.

- Provide an upscale hotel development that enhances the area and pronounces Claremont to travelers on Indian Hill Boulevard and I-10, as the Indian Hill Boulevard/I-10 intersection serves as the southern entry point into Claremont.
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- Allow land uses that are consistent with the City’s underlying land use and zoning districts and those that benefit the City and its residents.

- Allow for a development intensity that is consistent with that permitted under the Claremont General Plan land use designation of the Project Site.

- Build an upscale hotel that establishes the quality design threshold for future hotel development and/or redevelopment in other areas of the City.

1.4.2 Specific Plan and Land Use Plan

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 16.081 (Specific Plan District) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, the project applicant (Smart Investments, Inc.) is seeking approval of the Specific Plan in order to allow for enhancement and redevelopment of the Project Site, which is in a key area of the City due to its location near the southern entry point into Claremont. Under the Specific Plan, the project applicant proposes to demolish and replace the existing budget motel onsite with an upscale hotel development.

The Specific Plan provides a land use, development and implementation framework that not only enables the development of a new hotel on a portion of the Project Site, but provides the comprehensive direction and framework for enhancement and redevelopment of other areas of the Project Site in accordance with the vision, goals, and policies of the Claremont General Plan. The Specific Plan land use plan is guided by the objectives outlined in Section 1.4.1, Statement of Objectives.

The California Government Code (Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 2, Article 8, Sections 65450–65457 [Specific Plans]) provides authority for a city to adopt a specific plan by ordinance (as a regulatory plan) or resolution (as a policy plan). When a specific plan is adopted by ordinance, the specific plan effectively replaces portions or all of the current zoning regulations for specified parcels and becomes an independent set of zoning regulations that provide specific direction to the type and intensity of uses permitted or define other types of design and permitting criteria. The Specific Plan would be adopted by the Claremont City Council as ordinance and function as the regulatory document serving as the implementing zoning for the Project Site, thereby ensuring the orderly and systematic implementation of the City’s General Plan. The Specific Plan would act as a bridge between the City’s General Plan and development and redevelopment activities that would occur on the Project Site.

The Specific Plan divides the Project Site into planning areas (described below) and establishes the necessary plans; development standards and regulations; design guidelines; infrastructure systems (e.g., circulation, drainage, water, and wastewater); and implementation strategies/programs on which subsequent project-related development and redevelopment activities would be founded.

It is intended that design review plans, detailed site plans, grading and building permits, or any other action requiring ministerial or discretionary approval applicable to the Project Site be consistent with the intent of the Specific Plan. Subsequent projects determined to be consistent with the Specific Plan would likewise be determined to be consistent with the Claremont General Plan.
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Planning Areas and Land Use Designation

The Specific Plan divides the Project Site into three planning areas, as described below and shown in Figure 6, Specific Plan Land Use Plan. Figure 6 also shows the boundary of the Specific Plan, which comprises the entire 3.96-acre Project Site; 2.39 acres for Planning Area 1, 1.03 acres for Planning Area 2, and 0.54 acre for Planning Area 3. The 3.42-acres that make up Planning Area’s 1 and 2 are under one owner, while the 0.54-acre that makes up Planning Area 3 is under separate ownership (see Figure 5, Parcel and Ownership Map). Any enhancement, development or redevelopment activities that occur within the planning areas would be implemented, operated and maintained by the individual land owners and within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

The planning areas provide a framework that defines the enhancement and redevelopment potential, land use, and built form applicable to the underlying parcel of each planning area; they also reflect the ownership patterns of the Project Site. The land use plan consists of a single land use designation (Commercial) for all three planning areas. Permitted and prohibited uses are further detailed in Chapter 5 (Development Standards and Regulations) of the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Planning Area 1 comprises the largest area of the Project Site at 2.39 acres. The Commercial land use designation of the planning area would allow for a range of commercial uses. As specified in the Specific Plan, the uses would either be permitted by right or require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or Special Use and Development Permit (SUDP), or Not Permitted. As described in detail below in Section 1.4.3, Site Plan and Character, upon approval of the Specific Plan, the existing budget motel in this planning area would be replaced with an upscale hotel.

Planning Area 2

Planning Area 2 encompasses 1.03 acres. The Commercial land use designation of this planning area would allow for a range of commercial uses. As specified in the Specific Plan, the uses would either be permitted by right or required the approval of a CUP or SUDP, or Not Permitted. As described in Section 1.4.3, Site Plan and Character, the existing restaurant and some of its associated site improvements within Planning Area 2 will remain in place at this time and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, as shown in Figure 6, various hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant.

Planning Area 3

Planning Area 3 comprises the smallest of the three areas of the Project Site at 0.54 acre. The Freeway Commercial land use designation of this planning area would allow for a range of commercial uses. As specified in the Specific Plan, the uses would either be permitted by right or require the approval of a CUP or SUDP, or Not Permitted. As described below in Section 1.4.3, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within Planning Area 3 will remain in place at this time and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan.
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Figure 6 - Specific Plan Land Use Plan

- Planning Area 1: 2.39 Acres
- Planning Area 2: 1.03 Acres
- Planning Area 3: 0.54 Acre

Scale (Feet)

Source: Google Earth Pro, 2015
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1.4.3 Site Plan and Character

Planning Area 1

Site Uses, Design and Layout

Upon approval of and consistent with the objectives of the Specific Plan (See Section 1.4.1, Statement of Objectives), the project applicant proposes to demolish and replace the existing two-story budget motel in this planning area with an upscale hotel up to four stories (approximately 58 feet) in height. Specifically, the project applicant would develop a 121-room hotel. The increased building height reflects the project applicant’s proposal to develop a four-story hotel in this planning area.

Development of the new hotel requires demolition of the existing motel building and associated structures, parking area and drive aisles, and other hardscape improvements, as well as removal of a number of trees and other landscape improvements (site features to be demolished and removed are shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4b, Site Photographs). Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, illustrates the overall Project Site design and layout and how the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1 and existing restaurant and gas station in Planning Area’s 2 and 3, respectively, fit in to the overall site design and layout.

As shown in Figure 7, the hotel would be laid out in a rectangular-shaped design with parking and landscaped areas surrounding the hotel; the main hotel entry, front building façade, and hotel patron drop-off/pick-up area would face San Jose Avenue. The outdoor pool area would be placed just west of the hotel drop-off/pick-up area. An enclosed refuse area would be provided near the southeastern portion of the hotel site for convenient solid waste truck access and to shield the refuse area from public view; the refuse area would include separate bins for solid waste and recyclable materials. Additionally, a rectangular-shaped, single-story storage building would be located in the southwestern corner of the Project Site. It would be used for storing hotel maintenance equipment and materials (see Figure 7).

It should be noted that per the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, no living unit would be provided onsite for the resident manager of the hotel, or for any other hotel staff; the hotel would be used for transient occupancy purposes only and not as a permanent residence. In addition to the 121 rooms, the hotel would include office space for the hotel staff and management; a lobby and registration area; an elevator lobby with two elevators; a snack shop; a fitness center; conference and meeting rooms; a business center; an employee lounge and restrooms; a laundry and linen storage room; maintenance and storage rooms; a food preparation, pantry, and storage area; a dining room and patio with seating.

Other site improvements would include internal drive aisles, parking areas and associated landscaping; concrete walkways; a hotel patron drop-off/pick-up area; an outdoor pool area; and other hardscape and landscape improvements, which are discussed in detail below.
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Architectural Design and Character

Figure’s 8, Conceptual Hotel Perspective Rendering, and 9, Conceptual Hotel Building Elevations, illustrate the proposed building elevations and architectural style and elements of the proposed hotel. As shown in these figures, the proposed architectural style of the hotel creates a direct relationship between the community and the hotel. The elevations incorporate design features and materials representing Claremont’s unique and historic character; drawing inspiration from similar-sized and proportioned buildings at the Claremont Colleges, including the Smith Campus Center, Mason and Crookshank Halls, and the Carnegie building. This includes the use of high-quality materials and authentic design details, creating a design consistency on all sides of the building (360-degree design), utilizing natural colors and native materials commonly found in Claremont, and using roof styles and architectural details reflecting regional architecture and climate-appropriate design. The final design and architectural style of the building is subject to review and approval by the City’s Architectural Commission.

Planning Area’s 2 and 3

At this time, the existing restaurant building, gas station and some of their associated site improvements within these planning areas will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. As shown in Figure 7, various hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed although within the parking area serving the restaurant in Planning Area 2. However, no new buildings or structures are proposed in either planning area and the existing restaurant and gas station would remain in their current condition. If in the future any enhancements or expansions of the existing building or development of new buildings or structures occurs within these planning areas, they would be required to be implemented by the respective land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

1.4.4 Development Standards and Design Guidelines

Planning Area’s 1 through 3

Any enhancement, development or redevelopment activities proposed within Planning Areas 1 through 3 would be required to comply with the development standards and design guidelines contained in the Specific Plan. The development standards detail the permitted land uses, permitted development intensity (floor area ratio), building height, building placement (building separation and setback requirements), building site area and coverage, and parking and signage standards. Some of the development standards contained in the Specific Plan would be the same as or similar to those contained in the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. The Specific Plan does outline some development standards that are catered to the Project Site and different than those provided in the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code.
Figure 7 - Conceptual Site Plan
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Figure 8 - Conceptual Hotel Perspective Rendering
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Figure 9 - Conceptual Hotel Building Elevations
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1.4.5 Landscape Design, Lighting, and Amenities

Landscape design throughout the Project Site is intended to integrate the landscaping of the commercial uses onsite in a manner that complements and enhances the Project Site and its surroundings, while also creating a unique sense of identity for the commercial uses onsite. The Specific Plan includes landscape design guidelines that apply to all three planning areas of the Project Site, with an emphasis on providing planting species that are water-efficient, drought-tolerant and low-maintenance. All landscaped areas would be maintained by the owner or tenant of the individual commercial uses. The Specific Plan also includes development standards and design guidelines that apply to lighting improvements. Following is a discussion of these project components as they relate to each planning area.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, a comprehensive landscape plan would be included as a part of the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1. The landscape plan for the hotel includes the planting of a variety of new trees, shrubs, and groundcover along the planning area boundaries; around the hotel building footprint; around the outdoor pool and enclosed refuse areas; along the internal walkways; and within parking area planters. Proposed tree types would include palms, crape myrtle, Italian cypress, and hybrid madron. An 8- to 12-foot high landscaped buffer would be placed along the southern site boundary, abutting the I-10 on-ramp; the San Jose Avenue site boundary would feature a 3- to 4-foot high screen wall (described in more detail below). With the exception of the existing street trees (six in total) along the San Jose Avenue site boundary, the remainder of the trees onsite would be removed. Although development of the hotel would include removal of the majority of the existing trees within Planning Area 1 (approximately 30 to 35 trees), it would provide a greater number of trees (approximately 60 to 70 new trees) than currently exist.

Outdoor and indoor lighting would be provided for the proposed hotel. Outdoor lighting would consist of building-mounted light fixtures, ground-mounted decorative lighting for landscape and architectural features, parking area light poles, swimming pool and spa lighting, and security lighting.

As noted earlier and as an amenity to hotel patrons, the hotel would include an outdoor pool area featuring a swimming pool, spa, and enclosed pool equipment area. The outdoor pool area would be enclosed with wrought-iron fencing and pilasters and only accessible to patrons of the hotel. As shown in Figure 7, the outdoor pool area would be placed just west of the hotel pick-up/drop-off area and on the north side of the hotel building.

As a part of the hotel development in Planning Area 1, the existing block wall that runs along the western site boundary (which abuts the adjacent professional services and pre-school and varies in height) would be demolished and replaced with a new CMU (concrete masonry unit) block wall with stucco finish; the new wall would ranges between 6 to 10 feet in height, with the lower height occurring on the northern end and the taller towards the southern end. Additionally, a 3-to 4-foot high CMU screen wall with low shrub planting on both sides would be provided along the northern boundary abutting the public sidewalk along San Jose Avenue; the screen wall would act as a visual buffer for the onsite parking areas.
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Planning Area 2

At this time, some of the landscape improvements and areas associated with the existing restaurant within Planning Area 2 would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, as shown in Figure 7, some new landscaping improvements (e.g., landscape planters and fingers) would occur within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant in order to accommodate new landscape and hardscape improvements associated with the parking and circulation modifications proposed within this planning area and those needed to serve the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1. Additionally, as with Planning Area 1, a 3-foot high CMU screen wall with low shrub planting on both sides would be provided along the northern boundary abutting the public sidewalk along San Jose Avenue; the screen wall would act as a visual buffer for the onsite parking areas.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the landscape improvements and outdoor lighting associated with the existing gas station in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. If in the future any landscape enhancements or improvements occur within this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by respective the land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

1.4.6 Access, Circulation, and Parking

Vehicular Access and Circulation

As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, regional access to the Project Site is provided via I-10, with local access provided via Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue. Vehicular access into the Project Site is currently provided via two full access driveways (all turning movements permitted) off of San Jose Avenue and two restricted access driveways (only right-in/right-out movements permitted) off of Indian Hill Boulevard. The current internal vehicular circulation system consists of a number of north/south and east/west asphalt-paved drive aisles that serve the parking areas of the commercial and lodging uses of the Project Site. As shown in Figure 3, vehicular entry into the motel parking area is currently limited to one access point where all the internal drive aisles intersect just north of the gas station and west of the restaurant. Additionally, the southern east-west drive aisle that serves the motel dead ends along the southwestern site boundary (see Figure 3), requiring vehicles to conduct back-up maneuvers to turn around.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, primary vehicular access to the proposed hotel would be provided via a full-access driveway off of San Jose Avenue, with secondary access provided via the northern restricted-access driveway off of Indian Hill Boulevard; both are existing driveways. The existing full-access driveway adjacent to the restaurant in Planning Area 2 (see Figure 3) would be removed, as detailed below under the Planning Area 2 discussion and shown in Figure 7.
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The looped circulation system would also improve access for service and delivery trucks (e.g., trash trucks) and emergency vehicles (e.g., fire trucks, police vehicles). Additionally, it would eliminate the dead end drive aisle situation, which exists near the southwestern end of the existing motel (see Figure 3). As shown in Figure 7, the hotel patron drop-off/pick-up area would feature decorative paving, as well as a porte cochere.

Planning Area 2

At this time, some of the vehicular access and circulation improvements associated with the existing restaurant in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, as shown in Figure 7, the existing full-access driveway adjacent to the restaurant (see Figure 3) would be removed in order to provide improved vehicular access into and out of the Project Site from San Jose Avenue; the area of the existing access driveway to be removed would be improved with landscaping and hardscape improvements. Other improvements would occur along the western portion of the parking area that serves the existing restaurant in order to accommodate new parking and circulation improvements necessary to serve the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the vehicular access and circulation improvements associated with the existing gas station in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. If in the future any vehicular access and circulation improvements occur within this this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by the individual land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

Pedestrian Access and Circulation

As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the current pedestrian circulation system serving the Project Site consists of a public sidewalk that runs along the Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue Project Site frontages, an internal concrete walkway that wraps around the restaurant, and a concrete walkway providing foot traffic with direct access to the main entrance to the hotel, which faces San Jose Avenue.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 7, the pedestrian circulation plan for the proposed hotel would include an improved system of walkways. Specifically, the pedestrian circulation plan includes a walkway system that would be accessible from and connect to all points of the hotel, as well as the proposed outdoor pool area. The proposed walkway system would also provide an improved internal connection to the restaurant in Planning Area 2 and the public sidewalks along Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue, as well as destinations beyond. Through a network of walkways, the proposed hotel reflects the owner’s commitment to developing a safe and efficient pedestrian environment within Planning Area 1 and the overall Project Site.
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Planning Area 2

At this time, most of the pedestrian access and circulation improvements associated with the existing restaurant within Planning Area 2 would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, as shown in Figure 7, and as discussed above, the area of the existing access driveway off of San Jose Avenue to be removed, which is adjacent to the restaurant (see Figure 3), would be improved with landscaping and hardscape improvements, including a new sidewalk. Additionally, some improvements would occur along the western portion of the parking area that currently serves the restaurant in order to accommodate the new pedestrian circulation improvements needed to serve the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the pedestrian access and circulation improvements associated with the existing gas station in Planning Area 3 would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. If in the future any pedestrian access and circulation improvements occur within this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by the respective land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

Bicycle Access and Circulation

Under current conditions and as shown in Exhibit 2-4 (Bike Plan) of the City’s General Plan Community Mobility Element, there is an existing bikeway (a Class II bike lane) on both sides of and along the entire stretch of San Jose Avenue that lies within the City’s boundaries. Additionally, as shown in Exhibit 2-4, proposed Class II and III bike lanes are called for on Indian Hill Boulevard from Auto Center Drive on the south to Base Line Road on the north. Per the Community Mobility Element, Class II facilities are a marked bike lane on the pavement adjacent to traffic and Class III facilities consist of posted riding areas. There are currently no bicycle facilities (e.g., bicycle racks) within any of the planning areas.

Planning Area 1

Patrons and employees traveling to the proposed hotel in bicycles would be able to access the hotel via the Project Site’s internal walkways and drive aisles, which connect to the public sidewalks along San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard and the Class II bike lane along San Jose Avenue. As shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Illustrative Site Plan, a bicycle rack would be placed near the main building entry of the proposed hotel. Any future bicycle facility and circulation improvements implemented as a part of the proposed hotel would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

Planning Area’s 2 and 3

There are no bicycle facilities within these planning areas and none are proposed under the Specific Plan. Any future bicycle facility and circulation improvements implemented as a part of future development proposals within Planning Areas 2 and 3 would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan.
1. Introduction

Parking

As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, the parking areas for the restaurant, hotel, and gas station are separated by hardscape and landscape improvements. The restaurant parking area is located in the north-central portion of the Project Site, the hotel parking area is located along the southern boundary of the Project Site, and the gas station parking area is located immediately south of the station. Although the parking areas for each of the commercial uses onsite are primarily used to serve patrons of that commercial use, there are currently no restrictions on parking throughout the Project Site. However, the current design and layout of the parking areas directs patrons of each commercial use to park in the respective parking areas.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 7, new and expanded parking area plan would be provided for the proposed hotel in this planning area. Specifically, a new parking area would be provided in the northern portion of this planning area and would wrap around the proposed outdoor pool area. Several new parking areas would also be provided along the southern end. Similar to the existing parking condition, the design and layout of the hotel parking area, as well as the overall Project Site parking area, would direct patrons of each commercial use to park in the respective parking areas.

Planning Area 2

At this time, some of the parking areas and improvements associated with the existing restaurant in Planning Area 2 would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, as shown in Figure 7 due to the closure of the existing access driveway access adjacent to the restaurant (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*), some parking improvements would occur within Planning Area 1. Specifically, a new parking area would be provided adjacent to the western portion of the existing restaurant and along the southwestern boundary of this planning area, just north of and adjacent to the proposed hotel in Planning Area 2. Other parking area improvements include new landscaped planters and fingers. Additionally, some improvements would occur along the western portion of the parking area that currently serves the restaurant in order to accommodate new parking and circulation improvements needed to serve the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the parking areas and improvements associated with the existing gas station in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. If in the future any parking area improvements occur within this this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by the respective land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

1.4.7 Infrastructure Facilities and Utilities

Water

The Golden State Water Company provides potable water service for the existing commercial and lodging uses onsite and would continue to do so for any future commercial and lodging uses that would be developed
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under the Specific Plan. Potable water to the uses onsite is provided via internal water lines that connect to the existing public water mains along San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard.

**Planning Area 1**

As a part of the proposed hotel in this planning area, the potable water lines that serve the existing motel would be removed and replaced with a series of new potable water lines that would connect to the existing public water main along San Jose Avenue. Proposed potable water infrastructure improvements would include trenching and exposing existing lines onsite for connections, trenching and installing new lines, and break-in connections to existing main lines. No offsite water line construction or upsizing would be required for the potable water system to accommodate the proposed hotel. However, some construction would occur within the public right-of-way of San Jose Avenue in order to make the necessary infrastructure connections. The public water main along San Jose Avenue is and will continue to be maintained by the City, while the proposed lateral connections and onsite water lines would be maintained by the property owner.

Fire hydrants would also be installed at key locations within the Project Site, as required by the Los Angeles County Fire Department to meet the hose-pull requirements and provide adequate fire access for the proposed hotel. The proposed hotel would also be fully sprinklered.

**Planning Area’s 2 and 3**

At this time, the potable water infrastructure associated with the existing restaurant and gas station within Planning Area’s 2 and 3, respectively, would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan.

**Wastewater**

The City’s Engineering Division provides wastewater service for existing commercial and lodging uses onsite and would continue to do so for any future commercial uses that would be developed under the Specific Plan. Wastewater service to the uses onsite is provided via internal sewer lines that connect to the existing sewer mains that run along San Jose Avenue and the southern boundary of the Project Site. Wastewater collected by the City flows through a system of regional trunk lines to the Pomona Water Reclamation Plant in the City of Pomona for treatment; the plant is owned and operated by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

As a condition of approval and prior to issuance of grading permits for development/redevelopment proposed within any of the planning areas and in order to determine which sewer main development projects will be connecting to, individual project applicants/developers would be required to conduct sewer flow metering at specific locations as directed by the Claremont City Engineer. The sewer flow metering would be required to be conducted in accordance with the City’s Engineering Division standards and methodology. Additionally, all proposed wastewater infrastructure improvements (on- and off-site) would be required to be designed and installed in accordance with the City’s Engineering Division standards. The condition of approval will be provided as a condition in the resolution.
Planning Area 1

As a part of the proposed hotel in this planning area, the sewer lines that serve the existing motel would be removed and replaced with a series of new sewer lines. Wastewater would be collected onsite via the new sewer lines and be gravity fed to a connection point with either the existing sewer main that runs along San Jose Avenue or the existing sewer main along the southern site boundary. Proposed wastewater infrastructure improvements would include trenching and exposing of existing lines onsite for connections, trenching and installation of new lines, and break-in connections to the existing mainline. No offsite sewer main construction or upsizing would be required for the sewer system to accommodate the proposed hotel. However, if the new sewer lines are connected to the sewer main along San Jose Avenue, some construction would occur within the public right-of-way of San Jose Avenue in order to make the necessary infrastructure connections. The sewer main within San Jose Avenue and along the southern site boundary would continue to be maintained by the City, while the proposed lateral connections and other onsite sewer lines would be maintained by the property owner.

Planning Area’s 2 and 3

At this time, the wastewater infrastructure associated with the existing restaurant and gas station within Planning Area’s 2 and 3, respectively, would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan.

Drainage

Under existing conditions, the overall Project Site is relatively flat and runoff from the majority of the site (Planning Area’s 1 and 2) surface flows and trends in a southwesterly direction towards the southwestern site boundary, to a low point in the existing parking lot of the motel. Existing runoff (which is untreated) from the uses in Planning Area’s 1 and 2 surface flows across paved areas and enters a catch basin near the southwestern corner of the Project Site, which then conveys runoff easterly along the public storm drain that runs along the southern site boundary. Runoff from the gas station area in Planning Area 3, which is also untreated, surface flows in an easterly direction into the curb and gutter that runs along Indian Hill Boulevard. Under existing conditions, there are no water quality treatment devices in any area of the Project Site to provide any treatment for runoff generated onsite.

Any site drainage improvements and modifications required for proposed development/redevelopment projects within any of the planning areas would be based on the requirements mandated by the Planning Development Document (e.g., Low Impact Development Report) that would be prepared by individual project applicants/developers, which is intended to comply with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. R4-2012-0175. Additionally, site drainage improvements within any of the planning areas would be required to be designed and installed in accordance with the City’s Engineering Division standards.

All proposed drainage infrastructure improvements would be required to be designed and installed in accordance with the City’s Engineering Division standards. Any new drainage infrastructure required to be provided onsite based on the Planning Development Document (e.g., Low Impact Development Report)
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would be maintained by the project developer/owner. Additionally, any site drainage improvements and modifications required for the proposed hotel would be based on the requirements mandated by the Planning Development Document, which is intended to comply with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water, Order No. R4-2012-0175.

**Planning Area 1**

Under proposed conditions, stormwater runoff from the proposed hotel in this planning area would be conveyed similar to existing conditions, continuing to flow southwesterly via a new onsite drainage collection and treatment system. Upon completion, approximately 76 percent of the hotel site would consist of impervious areas (e.g., buildings and structures, paving), with the remainder (approximately 24 percent) consisting of pervious areas (landscaping).

Potential site drainage improvements in this Planning Area needed to accommodate the proposed hotel may include drainage pipes, catch basins, and pretreatment devices. Under the preliminary drainage improvements, surface drainage on the south side of the hotel would be directed southerly/southeasterly toward a precast concrete catch basin in the southeastern portion of the parking area. Surface drainage on the north side of the hotel would surface flow towards the northern parking area of the hotel and also be collected in a precast concrete catch basin. Once it enters the catch basins, runoff would be conveyed via PVC (Polyvinyl Chloride) storm drain pipes to a mechanical pretreatment device before being sent to a buried, perforated 96-inch diameter CMP (corrugated metal pipe) storage pipe at the southwest corner of the Project Site. However, the final site drainage improvements for the proposed hotel would be determined by and outlined in the Planning Development Document.

At this time, the ownership of the public storm drain facility that runs along the southern site boundary is unknown; it could be under the ownership of Caltrans, City of Claremont, or Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. Therefore, connection to this facility would require review and approval by the applicable entity with ownership over the storm drain, including the issuance of an encroachment permit by the entity, if required. The ownership and any connection discharge restrictions/permit requirements would be determined during the design phase of the proposed hotel.

**Planning Area’s 2 and 3**

At this time, the storm drain improvements associated with the existing restaurant and gas station within Planning Area’s 2 and 3, respectively, would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan.

**Utilities and Service Systems**

**Planning Area 1**

Plans for utilities that would serve the proposed hotel would include the provision of electricity (Southern California Edison [SCE]), natural gas (Southern California Gas Company), telecommunications facilities (telephone lines [Verizon]), cable service (AT&T), and solid waste (City of Claremont Community Services
Department). All new utility infrastructure for electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and cable service would be installed underground.

Planning Area’s 2 and 3

At this time, the utilities infrastructure associated with the existing restaurant and gas station within Planning Area’s 2 and 3, respectively, would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan.

1.4.8 Sustainability

Planning Area’s 1 through 3

All proposed uses under the Specific Plan would be required to be designed using green building practices, including those of the most current California Green Building Standards Code (CAI-Green; incorporated by reference in Chapter 15.22 [Green Building Standards Code] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code), as well as be designed and constructed in adherence with the Claremont Sustainable City Plan. Following are specific green building practices and sustainability features that would be incorporated into the proposed hotel that would be developed in Planning Area 1.

Energy

- High-efficiency lighting and controls would be provided throughout.
- The exterior walls and windows would be specified to high energy-efficiency standards.

Interior Air Quality / Health

- Use of low volatile organic compound (VOC) exterior and interior paint would be used throughout.
- Use of materials that will guard against mold intrusion, such as physical barriers and extraction fans in all rooms with wet utilities.
- Installation of air conditioning units that have non-hydrochlorofluorocarbon refrigerants.

Resources

- Minimize waste created during construction and recycling of most construction debris.
- Use of recycled aggregate (crushed concrete) for fill, backfill and other uses.
- Use of materials with a recycled content.

Water

- Use of site design and landscape palettes (e.g., native drought tolerant planting) to conserve water and reduce runoff.
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- Group plant vegetation according to sun exposure and watering requirements to make efficient use of onsite water usage.

- Use of high-efficiency showerheads, faucets, and toilets.

Other sustainability features would be considered by the City as the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1 is refined during the design and construction phase.

1.4.9 Project Phasing and Construction

Planning Area 1

Upon approval of the Specific Plan by the City, development of the proposed hotel within this planning area is anticipated to be completed in three phases—demolition and site clearing, grading, and construction. Overall construction is estimated to take approximately 13 months, beginning in early to early/mid-2016. No soil export would be required; however approximately 5,000 cubic yards of soils import would be required to balance the site. Development of the proposed hotel would also require the hauling of demolition debris.

Planning Area 2

The existing restaurant and some of its associated site improvements in Planning Area 2 will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan at this time. However, as described above and shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, various hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. The proposed improvements would be implemented in conjunction with and within the timeframe noted above for the proposed hotel. Additionally, if in the future any other enhancement, development or redevelopment activities occur within this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by the respective land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 3

The existing gas station and its associated site improvements in this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan at this time. Therefore, there is no construction activity proposed within this planning area. However, if in the future any enhancement, development or redevelopment activities occur within this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by the respective land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan.
1.5 CITY ACTION REQUESTED

Lead Agency

The City of Claremont is the lead agency under CEQA and has the principal approval authority over the Specific Plan. As part of the Specific Plan, the following discretionary actions and approvals are required by the City of Claremont:

- Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Approval of the Southwest San Jose Specific Plan (15-SP01)
- Architectural Design Review Approval

Responsible Agency

A responsible agency is a public agency other than the lead agency that has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project (CEQA Guidelines § 15381 and PRC § 21069). As part of the Specific Plan, the following approvals from responsible agencies are required:

- **Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board:** Compliance with the Construction General Permit issued under Order No. 2009-009-DWQ and its subsequent revisions under Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ.

- **Los Angeles County Fire Department:** Plan check for building plan review and emergency access.

- **Caltrans or Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County:** If during the design phase of the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1 it is determined that the existing public storm drain that runs along the southern site boundary is under the ownership of either of these agencies, an encroachment permit and approval to connect to the storm drain will be required.
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2. Environmental Checklist

2.1 BACKGROUND

1. **Project Title:** Southwest San Jose Specific Plan

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
   City of Claremont
   207 Harvard Avenue
   Claremont, CA 91711

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
   Luke Seibert, Associate Planner
   909.399.5483

4. **Project Location:**
   The Project Site is comprised of three addresses (701, 721, and 747 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) and is bounded by San Jose Avenue to the north, Indian Hill Boulevard to the east, and Interstate 10 (I-10) to the south in the City.

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**
   Smart Investments, Inc.
   840 S. Indian Hill Boulevard
   Claremont, CA 91711

6. **General Plan Designation:** Commercial

7. **Zoning:** Specific Plan Area 12 (SP12)

8. **Description of Project:**
   Approval of the Southwest San Jose Specific Plan would not only enable the development of a new hotel on the Project Site, but would provide a framework for the enhancement and redevelopment of the commercial uses onsite in accordance with the vision, goals, and policies of the City of Claremont General Plan. A more detailed description of the proposed project is provided in Section 1.5, *Project Description*.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
   Surrounding land uses consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard.
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10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:
   - Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
   - Los Angeles County Fire Department
   - Caltrans
   - Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
2.2 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
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use / Planning
- [ ] Population / Housing
- [ ] Transportation / Traffic
- [ ] Agricultural and Forest Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities / Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology / Soils
- [ ] Hydrology / Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance

2.3 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.

- [X] 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: 6/8/2016

Printed Name: LUKE SEIBERT

For: BRIAN DESATNIK, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

June 2016
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2.4 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 would 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 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.

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 Analyses 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. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

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

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Section 3, Environmental Analysis, provided a checklist of environmental impacts. This section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.
2. Environmental Checklist

This page intentionally left blank.
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3.1 AESTHETICS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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

No Impact. Scenic vistas are views of features such as mountains, forests, the ocean, or urban skylines. The City of Claremont considers the Wilderness Park, natural hillside areas, San Gabriel Mountains, Sycamore Canyon Park, views from Thompson Creek Trail, and from City streets toward these hillside features to be scenic vistas or view corridors (Claremont 2006a). The Project Site is bordered by San Jose Avenue to the north, I-10 to the south, San Jose Avenue to the east, and professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) to the west (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). Partially obstructed views of limited portions of the San Gabriel Mountains are available to motorists and passersby traveling along San Jose Avenue and to motorists on I-10.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on scenic vistas as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not impact the partially obstructed views of the San Gabriel Mountains afforded to motorists and passersby traveling along San Jose Avenue, as the Project Site is on the south side of San Jose Avenue and views of the mountains from San Jose Avenue are to the north. Additionally, the hotel would not significantly obstruct views of the mountains afforded to motorists...
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traveling along I-10, as the Project Site is at a lower grade (approximately 15 feet lower) than the travel lanes of I-10. Furthermore, the height of the San Gabriel Mountains ensures that they will remain a scenic backdrop to Claremont without detriment from development of the hotel.

Therefore, no impacts on scenic vistas of the San Gabriel Mountains would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area currently serving the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not impact the partially obstructed views of the San Gabriel Mountains to a passerby traveling along San Jose Avenue or I-10 as the improvements only entail hardscape and landscape improvements to the exiting parking area. Therefore, no impacts on scenic vistas would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. According to the California Scenic Highway Mapping System of the California Department of Transportation, the Project Site is not on or near a state-designated scenic highway (Caltrans 2015). The nearest designated state scenic highway to the Project Site is State Route 2 (the Angeles Crest Highway) approximately 20 miles north of the Project Site. Additionally, per the City’s General Plan, there are no eligible or locally-designated scenic roads or highways within proximity of the Project Site.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on state-designated scenic highways as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, no impact on scenic resources along a state-designated scenic highway would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact on scenic resources along a state-designated scenic highway would occur as a result of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Existing onsite and surrounding land uses are shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph. Figures 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, depict the existing conditions of the Project Site. As shown in these figures, the Project Site is developed and consists of buildings and site improvements associated with the existing commercial and lodging uses onsite. Landscaping improvements throughout the Project Site include lawn areas, shrubs, and a number of trees internal to the Project Site and along the site boundaries; tree types include but are not limited to palms, pine, floss silk, ficus, and willow.

As shown in Figure 3, land uses surrounding the Project Site consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard.

The assessment of aesthetic impacts is subjective by nature. Aesthetics generally refers to the identification of visual resources and their quality, as well as an overall visual perception of the environment. A project is generally considered to have a significant aesthetic impact if it substantially changes the character of the Project Site such that the site becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected with its surroundings.

The potential aesthetic and visual impacts resulting from the construction and operational phases of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan are addressed below.

Construction Phase

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would result in site preparation and construction activities that could have short-term effects, which would temporarily change the visual character of the Project Site and its surroundings. Construction activities associated with the proposed hotel would involve site clearing, demolition, and grading activities. For example, the effects of grading activities include exposing a portion of the site to landform alteration associated with the use of heavy construction equipment and related activities. Construction staging areas, including earth stockpiling, storage of equipment and supplies, and related activities would contribute to a generally “disturbed site,” which may be perceived by some as a potential visual impact.

However, it is important to note that the potential effects resulting from the various construction activities would be similar to those that are typical of similar development sites in the City that undergo development and redevelopment. Additionally, while these activities may be unsightly during the site preparation and
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construction phases, they are not considered significant because they are temporary in nature and would cease upon completion of the proposed construction activities. Once completed, the visual character of the Project Site and general area would return to the existing character, which is characterized by residential uses to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west; commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard; and commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10. Therefore, construction-phase impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no construction-phase aesthetic impact would occur as a result of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing restaurant and gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Operation Phase

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would change but not deteriorate the visual character of the project site and its surroundings; development of the hotel includes redevelopment of a portion of the Project Site that currently contains a budget motel and its associated hardscape and landscape improvements. Development of the proposed hotel requires demolition of the existing motel and associated structures, parking area and drive aisles, and other hardscape improvements, as well as removal of a number of trees and other landscape improvements (site features to be demolished and removed are shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs).

Once the site is cleared and graded, and consistent with the objectives of the Specific Plan (see Section 1.4.1, Statement of Objectives, of this Initial Study; see above), the project applicant proposes to demolish and replace the existing two-story budget motel in this planning area with an upscale hotel up to four stories (approximately 58 feet) in height and featuring 121 rooms. The increased building height reflects the project applicant’s proposal to develop a four-story hotel in this planning area. Other features associated with the proposed hotel include an outdoor pool area that features a swimming pool and spa, a single-story storage building, internal drive aisles, walkways, parking areas, and other hardscape and landscape improvements.

Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, illustrates the overall Project Site design and layout and how the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1 and existing restaurant and gas station in Planning Area’s 2 and 3, respectively, fit in to the overall site design and layout. Figure’s 8, Conceptual Hotel Perspective Rendering, and 9, Conceptual Hotel Building Elevations, illustrate the proposed building elevations and architectural style and elements of the proposed hotel. As shown in Figure 7, the hotel would be laid out in a rectangular-shaped design with parking and
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landscaped areas surrounding the hotel; the main hotel entry, front building façade, and hotel patron drop-off/pick-up area would face San Jose Avenue.

As shown in Figures 8 and 9, the proposed architectural style of the hotel would encompass elevations incorporating design features and materials representing Claremont's unique and historic character; drawing inspiration from similarly-sized and proportioned buildings at the Claremont Colleges, including the Smith Campus Center, Mason and Crookshank Halls, and the Carnegie building. The buildings chosen from the Claremont Colleges for inspiration have floor plans and proportions similar to the proposed hotel. The following is a brief description of the design features of the proposed hotel and how they connect to the character of Claremont. Figures 8 and 9 provide illustration of these design features.

- The first floor of the hotel building includes a precast or stucco treatment designed to emulate masonry blocks and give a strong foundation to the hotel. This treatment was inspired by classical and Italian Renaissance architecture in general, as well as a variety of College buildings including the Carnegie Building, Mason Hall, and Crookshank Hall.

- The second, third and fourth floors of the hotel include a stucco finish with repeating window patterns tied horizontally by a belt course trim. This treatment, which is also found on several Claremont Colleges buildings, is intended to emphasize the horizontal lines of the building. A moderately-sized cornice caps the parapet located above the non-gabled or hipped portions of the top floor.

- Enhanced treatments around the main entry create a strong central focal element providing visual interest and breaks down the mass of the building. The enhanced treatment includes an oversized arched window capped with a gabled roof visually supported by shallow pilasters on each side. Two smaller towers, which feature dual, arched windows capped with fully-hipped roofs, provide secondary visual accents and additional visual interest to the north and south facades of the hotel. The narrow east and west ends of the building include smaller gabled roof and arched window features coordinating with the main entry gable. A flat roof porte-cochere is designed to complement the classical styling and enhance the main entry of the building. The building includes simple columns at each corner and a heavy cornice that matches the cornice located on the main gable.

The proposed site plan and hotel building also call for an appropriately scaled framework of site design and architectural and landscape architectural elements and design further enhancing and providing strength to the character of the Project Site and it surroundings (see Figure 7). The proposed architectural and landscape elements and design, as well as the development standards and design guidelines outlined in the Specific Plan, would ensure the orderly development of the proposed hotel and would ensure hotel is developed in a manner that is not detrimental to the surrounding uses.

Additionally, the hotel building and proposed landscaping would be designed to create a sense of cohesiveness on- and off-site and along the project boundaries, as the proposed architecture and landscaping, although newer than the surrounding uses, would complement each other and would not detract from the visual character of the site or surrounding area. The Specific Plan also includes provisions ensuring the
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The proposed hotel’s site design and circulation elements are designed and implemented in a manner maintaining cohesiveness and compatibility not only within the Project Site, but also along the Project Site frontages.

Furthermore, the current appearance of this portion of the Project Site can be considered discordant with the surrounding commercial, office, and residential uses since the existing budget motel is in need of revitalization, and is surrounded by well-established residential neighborhoods, commercial, office, and professional services uses. As shown in Figures 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, and noted above, the existing motel and associated site improvements have aged over the years and are in need of major remodeling and revitalization. The sites existing conditions do not lend to the recent aesthetic upgrades (e.g., building remodels, landscaping upgrades) that have occurred with the commercial, professional services and office uses east and northeast (respectively) of the Project Site, across Indian Hill Boulevard. Instead, the existing condition of the motel detracts from the overall aesthetic and visual quality of not only this key area of the City, but also of the surrounding uses.

Development of the proposed hotel would not only enhance the overall character of the Project Site and its surroundings, but also help revitalize a key area of the City by redeveloping this portion of the Project Site with an upscale hotel. As stated in the Purpose and Intent section of Chapter 1 (Introduction) of the Specific Plan, the overall purpose of the Specific Plan (which includes development of the proposed hotel) is to provide comprehensive direction and the framework for enhancement and redevelopment of the Project Site (which is a commercial property) while implementing the vision, goals and policies of the Claremont General Plan, including the vision of the Vista neighborhood (Project Site lies within the Vista neighborhood), which in part states:

“Allow for enhancement and redevelopment of commercial, industrial, and educational properties that complement the residential areas and which are consistent with General Plan intensity and density limits.”

Development of the proposed hotel would also result in removal of the existing chain-link fencing and green tarp that runs along the northern and western site boundaries (see Figure 4a, Site Photographs); thereby, removing existing features detracting from the character of the Project Site and its surroundings.

Additionally, project implementation would provide similar and compatible uses to those existing onsite and surrounding the Project Site. For example, as noted above, the proposed hotel would replace an existing motel in need of revitalization. The proposed hotel would be compatible and consistent with the surrounding commercial, office, and residential uses. Placing the proposed hotel towards the rear of the Project Site (see Figure 5) also provides and appropriate buffer and greater separation to address any potential impacts (e.g., visual, natural light, air space, separation) that could arise from placing a four-story hotel within proximity of the single-story single-family residences north of the project site, across San Jose Avenue.

Further, as shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, a comprehensive landscape plan would be included as a part of the proposed hotel, which would enhance the visual character of the Project Site and surrounding area. The landscape plan for the hotel includes the planting of a variety of new trees, shrubs, and groundcover along the planning area boundaries; around the hotel building footprint; around the outdoor pool and spas; around the enclosed refuse areas; along the internal walkways; and within parking area planters.
Although development of the hotel would include removal of the majority of the existing trees within Planning Area 1 (approximately 30 to 35 trees), it would provide a greater number of trees (approximately 60 to 70 new trees) than currently exist.

An 8- to 12-foot high landscaped buffer would be placed along the southern site boundary, abutting the I-10 on-ramp; the northern site boundary (which is formed by San Jose Avenue) would feature a 3- to 4-foot high screen wall with low shrub planting on both sides (see Figure 7). The southern landscape buffer would help provide visual interest and soften the massing and height of the existing Caltrans wall, which runs along a portion of the southern edge of the property. The proposed screen wall and landscaping along the northern site boundary would act as a visual buffer for the onsite parking areas.

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not have a significant impact on the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site and its surroundings. In fact, development of the hotel would result in an improvement of the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as it would enhance and strengthen the character of the existing community through new architecture and new landscaping, hardscape, and other improvements onsite and along the site boundaries. Project development would also result in an improvement in the visual character and quality of the Project Site and its surroundings as it would redevelop a portion of the site in need of revitalization.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area currently serving the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site and its surroundings. Additionally, any future development or redevelopment proposals within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and in accordance with the development standards and design guidelines outlined in the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts visual character impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, any future development or redevelopment proposals within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and in accordance with the development standards and design guidelines outlined in the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Nighttime illumination and glare impacts are the effects of a project’s exterior lighting upon adjoining uses and areas. Glare can also be generated by light reflecting off passing cars and large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows) or other reflective surfaces. Excessive light and/or glare
can impair vision, cause annoyance, affect sleep patterns, and generate safety hazards when experienced by drivers.

As shown in Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4b, *Site Photographs*, the Project Site is developed with commercial uses in an urbanized area of the City. Existing onsite sources of nighttime illumination consist of interior and exterior building, security, and surface parking lighting. Other sources of light and glare in the project area include street lights along San Jose Avenue, Indian Hill Boulevard, and I-10, as well as lights from the surrounding residential, commercial, professional services, and office uses. The existing land uses sensitive to light and glare in the immediate vicinity are residential uses north of the Project Site, across San Jose Avenue, and residential uses to the west, beyond the abutting professional services uses and pre-school (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*).

Following is a discussion of the potential day and nighttime light and glare impacts in the project area as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

### Planning Area 1

**Architectural Treatments and Building Materials**

The architectural treatments of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would include style-appropriate architectural building materials, such as stucco walls, stacked stone veneer, and standing seam metal roofs painted brown (see Figures 8, *Conceptual Hotel Perspective Rendering*, and 9, *Conceptual Hotel Building Elevations*). These building materials and architectural treatments are not reflective in nature and would therefore not create substantial day or nighttime glare. They are similar to building materials used on other similar hotels in other areas of the City and surrounding region. Additionally, the design guidelines of Chapter 6 of the Specific Plan prohibit the use of reflective glass and building materials.

Furthermore, as shown in Figures 8 and 9, the proposed hotel would not include large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows). The hotel windows could however potentially increase sources of glare, because they would reflect sunlight during certain times of the day. In addition, vehicles parked onsite would increase the potential for reflected sunlight during certain times of the day. However, glare from these sources is typical of the surrounding area and would not increase beyond what is expected for an urban area. Therefore, daytime glare impacts from project-related architectural treatments and building materials would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

**Nighttime Lighting**

Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the existing budget motel and related site improvements would be replaced with an upscale hotel. Development of the hotel would result in new lighting sources to provide nighttime illumination for the hotel and related site improvements. Outdoor lighting would consist of building-mounted light fixtures, ground-mounted decorative lighting for landscape and architectural features, parking area light poles, swimming pool and spa lighting, and security lighting. Additional nighttime lighting would emanate from the hotels interior. These new sources of nighttime lighting have the potential to increase nighttime light and glare in the project area.
The nighttime light and glare created by the proposed hotel's lighting sources would not be visible to the residential uses to the west, as they are buffered from the Project Site by the existing professional services uses building that abuts the Project Site along the west (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph), as well as existing mature trees. However, nighttime lighting and glare emanating from the Project Site would be visible to the single-family residences (which are considered land use sensitive to light and glare) to the north, across San Jose Avenue; excessive light and/or glare can cause annoyance to and affect the sleep patterns of residents. Nighttime light and glare could also spill over onto the I-10 westbound on-ramp, which abuts the southern site boundary (see Figure 3); excessive light and/or glare can impair vision and generate safety hazards when experienced by drivers.

The lights associated with the proposed hotel would be directed toward the interior of the site so as not to create impacts to motorists on adjacent roadways or on surrounding uses, including the residential uses north of the Project Site. All exterior lighting would be designed, arranged, installed, directed, shielded, and maintained in such a manner as to contain direct illumination onsite, in accordance with the provisions of Section 16.154.030 (Outdoor Lighting and Glare) of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code; thereby, preventing excess illumination and light spillover onto adjoining land uses and/or roadways. For example, as outlined in Subsection 16.154.030.A, direct lighting of neighboring residential properties is prohibited, while indirect lighting of residential properties is not permitted to exceed 0.5 footcandle at the property line of the development site. Lighting would be installed to accommodate safety and security while minimizing impacts on surrounding land uses; parking area lighting would be the minimum necessary maintaining consistency with the City of Claremont's Municipal Code. Compliance with the City's light and glare provisions would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

Additionally, as outlined in Subsection 16.154.030.B (New Development and Remodeling), plans for new development projects subject to Architectural Commission review are also required to submit a lighting plan to the commission for review and approval as a part of the submittal package. The design of the proposed hotel would be subject to Architectural Commission review and therefore, would require the submittal of a lighting plan for consideration by the Architectural Commission.

Furthermore, development of the proposed hotel would be required to comply with California’s Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, which outlines mandatory provisions for lighting control devices and luminaires. For example, the proposed hotel’s lighting sources would be required to be installed in accordance with the provisions of Section 110.9 (Mandatory Requirements for Lighting Control Devices and Systems, Ballasts, and Luminaires) of the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. Compliance these provisions would be ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process.

Finally, the proposed hotel's light sources would be similar to those of the adjacent and surrounding commercial, professional services, and office uses. Because the Project Site and surrounding area are largely developed and considering existing sources of lighting in surrounding areas, including street lights on San Jose Avenue, Indian Hill Boulevard and I-10, and lighting from the surrounding commercial, office and residential uses, the amount and intensity of nighttime lighting proposed onsite would not be substantially
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greater than existing lighting in surrounding areas. The proposed hotel's perimeter landscaping, as shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, would also help soften and shield nighttime light and glare generated onsite.

Therefore, no significant nighttime light and glare impacts would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings, structures or light sources are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serving the restaurant. However, any future development or redevelopment proposals that include new light and glare sources within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and in accordance with the lighting standards and guidelines outlined in the Specific Plan and City of Claremont's Municipal Code. Therefore, no light and glare impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, any future development or redevelopment proposals that include new light and glare sources within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and in accordance with the lighting standards and guidelines outlined in the Specific Plan and City of Claremont's Municipal Code. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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?

No Impact. The Project Site is in an urbanized area of the City; additionally, the Project Site and surrounding area are not currently used for agricultural purposes. As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photographs, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the Project Site is developed and consists of a number of buildings and structures and other hardscape and landscape improvements. According to California Resource Agency’s Department of Conservation “Important Farmland Maps for Los Angeles County” (2008), no areas within the City of Claremont (including the Project Site) are designated Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance (DLRP 2009).

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to farmlands that could occur as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not result in the conversion of mapped farmland to nonagricultural use. Therefore, no impacts to farmland would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would not result in the conversion of mapped farmland to nonagricultural use. Therefore, no impact to farmland would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. Per the City’s General Plan land use plan, the Project Site is designated as Commercial. According to the City’s zoning map, the Project Site is zoned SP12. The Project Site is not designated or zoned for agricultural use, used for agriculture, or subject to a Williamson Act contract. Additionally, there are no designated agricultural land uses or Williamson Act contracts in use adjacent to or in proximity of the Project Site.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts that could occur as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, no impacts to agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact to agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
3. Environmental Analysis

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. Forest land is defined as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits” (California Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]). Timberland is defined as “land…which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees” (California Public Resources Code Section 4526).

As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the Project Site is developed and consists of a number of buildings and structures and other hardscape and landscape improvements. The Project Site is not designated or zoned for forest or timber land or used for forestry. As stated above, the Project Site’s General Plan land use designation is Commercial and is zoned SP12. Additionally, the Project Site is in an urbanized area of the City and land uses surrounding the Project Site consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). Furthermore, all trees onsite are ornamental trees and are not cultivated for forest resources.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to forest and timber land that could occur as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would have no impact on forest land or resources and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact on forest land or resources would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.2(c), above.
3. Environmental Analysis

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?

No Impact. See responses to Section’s 3.2(a), (b), and (c), above.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

This section addresses the impacts of the Specific Plan on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. A background discussion on the air quality regulatory setting, meteorological conditions, existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the Project Site, and air quality modeling can be found in Appendix A.

The primary air pollutants of concern for which ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been established are ozone ($\text{O}_3$), carbon monoxide ($\text{CO}$), coarse inhalable particulate matter ($\text{PM}_{10}$), fine inhalable particulate matter ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$), sulfur dioxide ($\text{SO}_2$), nitrogen dioxide ($\text{NO}_2$), and lead (Pb). Areas are classified under the federal and California Clean Air Act as either in attainment or nonattainment for each criteria pollutant based on whether the AAQS have been achieved. The South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), is designated nonattainment for $\text{O}_3$, and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for $\text{PM}_{10}$ under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS (CARB 2014a).

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Environmental Analysis

Analysis:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A consistency determination plays an important role in local agency project review by linking local planning and individual projects to the air quality management plan (AQMP). It fulfills the CEQA goal of informing decision makers of the environmental efforts of the project under consideration at an early enough stage to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed. It also provides the local agency with ongoing information as to whether they are contributing to clean air goals in the AQMP. The most recent adopted comprehensive plan is the 2012 AQMP, adopted on December 7, 2012 (see Appendix A for a description of the 2012 AQMP).

Regional growth projections are used by SCAQMD to forecast future emission levels in the SoCAB. For southern California, these regional growth projections are provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and are partially based on land use designations in city/county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect the regional growth projections. The Specific Plan is not considered a regionally significant project that would warrant Intergovernmental Review by SCAG under CEQA Guidelines section 15206.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts that could occur as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Development within Planning Area 1 entails demolition of the existing motel and subsequent development of the proposed hotel. The land use would remain the same and would be consistent with the City’s underlying General Plan land use designation. Therefore, it would not have the potential to substantially affect the regional growth projections. Additionally, the regional emissions generated by construction and operation of the proposed hotel would be less than the SCAQMD emissions thresholds (with mitigation for the construction phase only [Mitigation Measures AQ-1], as outlined below), and SCAQMD would not consider the project a substantial source of air pollutant emissions that would have the potential to affect the attainment designations in the SoCAB. Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not affect the regional emissions inventory or conflict with strategies in the AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

It should be noted that the mitigation measure (AQ-1) outlined below in Sections 3.3(b), although mentioned above for reference purposes, is strictly applicable to the analysis contained in Section 3.3(b), which relates to violation of an air quality standard. Therefore, the less “than significant with no mitigation measures necessary” conclusion provided above is the correct conclusion as the issue in question in this section (Section 3.3[a]) is related to the Proposed Project conflicting or obstructing implementation of the AQMP.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area currently serving the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The following describes impacts from short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Short-Term Construction-Related Air Quality Impact

Planning Area 1

Construction activities associated with the proposed hotel in this planning area would result in the generation of air pollutants. These emissions would primarily be 1) exhaust emissions from off-road diesel-powered construction equipment; 2) dust generated by grading, earthmoving, and other construction activities; 3) exhaust emissions from on-road vehicles and 4) off-gas emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from application of asphalt, paints, and coatings.

Construction activities would occur on approximately 3.42 acres of the 3.96-acre Project Site. Construction would involve building, asphalt, and pool demolition; site preparation; site grading; utility trenching, construction of the hotel building; asphalt paving; and architectural coating. Construction activities would start in the spring of 2016 and would take approximately 14 months. Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2013.2.2, based on the project's preliminary construction schedule, phasing, and equipment list provided by the project applicant. The construction schedule and equipment mix is based on preliminary engineering and is subject to changes during final design and as dictated by field conditions. Results of the construction emission modeling are shown in Table 1.
### Table 1  Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOₓ</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂·₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Asphalt Demo Debris Haul + Pool Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Building Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Rough Grading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Utility Trenching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fine Grading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Building Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction + Architectural Coating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Finishing/Landscaping</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Daily Emissions: 20 VOC, 132 NOₓ, 92 CO, <1 SO₂, 18 PM₁₀, 11 PM₂·₅

SCAQMD Regional Threshold: 75 VOC, 100 NOₓ, 550 CO, 150 SO₂, 150 PM₁₀, 55 PM₂·₅

Exceeds Regional Threshold?: No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOₓ</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂·₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Asphalt Demo Debris Haul + Pool Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Building Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Rough Grading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Utility Trenching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fine Grading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Building Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction + Architectural Coating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Finishing/Landscaping</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Daily Emissions: 20 VOC, 132 NOₓ, 92 CO, <1 SO₂, 18 PM₁₀, 11 PM₂·₅

SCAQMD Regional Threshold: 75 VOC, 100 NOₓ, 550 CO, 150 SO₂, 150 PM₁₀, 55 PM₂·₅

Exceeds Regional Threshold?: No

Source: CalEEMod, version 2013.2.2.

Notes:
- Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding. Bold = Exceed Threshold.
- The construction schedule is based on the preliminary information provided by the Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment and phasing for comparable projects.
- Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186-compliant sweepers.

As shown in Table 1, except for NOₓ, air pollutant emission generated from the hotel's construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. The highest NOₓ emissions would occur during the rough grading phase.

Table 2 shows the emissions that would be generated with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires using construction equipment with Tier 3 engines to reduce NOₓ emissions generated by off-road equipment onsite during rough grading. As shown in the table, rough grading's NOₓ emissions would be reduced to below the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds with implementation of the mitigation measure. Therefore, with incorporation of mitigation, impacts from project-related construction activities to the regional air quality would be less than significant.
3. Environmental Analysis

### Table 2  Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions - Mitigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Criteria Air Pollutants (lbs/day)(^{1,2})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Asphalt Demo Debris Haul + Pool Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Building Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Rough Grading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Utility Trenching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fine Grading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Building Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction + Architectural Coating</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Finishing/Landscaping</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod, version 2013.2.2
Notes: Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

1 The construction schedule is based on the preliminary information provided by the Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment and phasing for comparable projects.

2 Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant sweepers.

3 Incorporates Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires using Tier 3 construction equipment for engines 50 horsepower and higher; and Mitigation Measure AQ-2, which require Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters.

### Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, with incorporation of mitigation, impacts from project-related construction activities (associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements) to the regional air quality would be less than significant.

### Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
Mitigation Measures

Aquifer Protection (AQ-1) During rough grading, the construction contractor(s) shall use construction equipment that meets the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-Certified Tier 3 off-road emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment of 50 horsepower or more. Prior to rough grading, the project engineer shall ensure that all construction management and grading plans clearly show the requirement for EPA Tier 3 or higher emissions standards for construction equipment over 50 horsepower. During rough grading, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the project site for verification by the City's Community Development staff or their designee. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers of construction equipment onsite. A copy of each engine’s certified tier specification shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment to the City's Community Development staff. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations. Construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board’s Rule 2449.

Long-Term Operation-Related Air Quality Impact

Planning Area 1

Long-term air pollutant emissions generated by the proposed hotel in this planning area would be generated by area sources (e.g., landscape fuel use, aerosols, and architectural coatings), mobile sources from vehicle trips, water and wastewater generation, solid waste generation, and energy use (natural gas) associated with the proposed hotel. The primary source of long-term criteria air pollutant emissions generated by the proposed hotel would be emissions produced from project-generated vehicle trips. Development under the Specific Plan would generate a total of 989 average daily trips during a weekday, which is a net increase of 628 additional average daily trips compared to existing conditions. Criteria air pollutant emissions for the proposed hotel were modeled using CalEEMod. Table 3 identifies criteria air pollutant emissions from the proposed hotel.

As shown in the table, the net increase in project-related air pollutant emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s regional emissions thresholds for operational activities. Overall, long-term operation-related impacts to air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
3. Environmental Analysis

### Table 3 Net Increase in Maximum Daily Regional Operational Phase Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂.₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Hotel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2. Highest winter or summer emissions are reported. Totals may not total to 100 percent due to rounding.

---

**Planning Area 2**

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area currently serving the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

c) **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

**Less Than Significant.** The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for O₃ and PM₂.₅ under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM₁₀ under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead under the National AAQS (CARB 2014a). According to SCAQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values would not add significantly to a cumulative impact (SCAQMD 1993).
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 1

As demonstrated above in Sections 3.4(a), construction (with mitigation) and operational activities of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not result in emissions in excess of SCAQMD's significant thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Development under the Specific Plan could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated pollutant concentration levels. Unlike regional emissions, localized emissions are typically evaluated in terms of air concentration rather than mass so they can be more readily correlated to potential health effects.

Construction LSTs

Planning Area 1

Localized significance thresholds (LSTs) are based on the California AAQS, which are the most stringent AAQS that have been established to provide a margin of safety in the protection of public health and welfare. They are designated to protect sensitive receptors most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and people engaged in strenuous work or exercise. Construction LSTs are based on the size of the project site, distance to the nearest sensitive receptor, and Source Receptor Area. Receptors proximate to the Project Site are the day care center to the west and the residences to the north and west.

Air pollutant emissions generated by construction activities of the proposed hotel in this planning area are anticipated to cause temporary increases in air pollutant concentrations. Table 4 shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during onsite construction activities compared with the SCAQMD's LSTs.
Table 4  Localized Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>NOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>CO (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM10 (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Utility Trenching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Building Construction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction + Architectural Coating</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Finishing/Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD ≤1.00-acre LST</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds LST?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Asphalt Demo Debris Haul + Pool Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Building Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD 2.00-acre LST</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds LST?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fine Grading</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD 2.50-acre LST</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds LST?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Rough Grading</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD 5.00-acre LST</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds LST?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2. and SCAQMD 2008.

Notes: Bold: Exceed Threshold. In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, only onsite stationary sources and mobile equipment occurring on the Project Site are included in the analysis. LSTs are based on receptors within 82 feet (25 meters) of the Project Site in Source Receptor Area (SRA) 10.

1 The construction schedule is based on the preliminary information provided by the Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment and phasing for comparable projects.

2 Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant sweepers.

As shown in Table 4, the maximum daily NOx and CO construction emissions generated from onsite construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD LSTs. However, PM10 and PM2.5 emissions generated during the overlapping site preparation, demolition, asphalt demolition debris haul, and pool demolition debris haul phase and the rough grading phase would exceed the SCAQMD LSTs. Therefore, project-related construction activities would have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Table 5 shows the emissions that would be generated with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 through AQ-4. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would require newer, cleaner engines and installation of Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) on equipment over 50 horsepower during the rough grading phase. Mitigation Measure AQ-3 requires watering disturbed areas at least three times per day during rough grading...
3. Environmental Analysis

and Mitigation Measure AQ-4 limits the total overall daily haul truck miles traveled to 84 miles to reduce NOx emissions generated by trucks traveling offsite. As shown in the table, emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 would be reduced to below the SCAQMD LSTs for the overlapping site preparation, demolition, asphalt demolition debris haul, and pool demolition debris haul phase and the rough grading phase. Therefore, with incorporation of mitigation, construction LST impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 5  Localized Construction Emissions - Mitigated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Utility Trenching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Building Construction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Building Construction + Architectural Coating</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Finishing/Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCAQMD ≤1.00-acre LST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Asphalt Demo Debris Haul + Pool Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Asphalt Demo Debris Haul + Building Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Site Preparation + Demolition + Building Demo Debris Haul</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCAQMD 2.00-acre LST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fine Grading</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCAQMD 2.50-acre LST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Rough Grading</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCAQMD 5.00-acre LST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2., and SCAQMD 2008.

Notes: In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, only onsite stationary sources and mobile equipment occurring on the Project Site are included in the analysis. LSTs are based on receptors within 82 feet (25 meters) of the Project Site in Source Receptor Area (SRA) 10.

1 The construction schedule is based on the preliminary information provided by the Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment and phasing for comparable projects.

2 Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of three times per day (per Mitigation Measure AQ-3), reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186-compliant sweepers. Incorporates Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires using Tier 3 construction equipment for engines 50 horsepower and higher; and Mitigation Measure AQ-2 which require Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters.

3 Incorporates Mitigation Measure AQ-4, which limits the total overall daily haul truck miles traveled to 84 miles.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, construction LST impacts would be less than significant.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-2  During rough grading, the construction contractor(s) shall use construction equipment fitted with Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment of 50 horsepower or more. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by CARB regulations. Prior to rough grading, the project engineer shall ensure that all construction management and grading plans clearly show the requirement for Level 3 DPF for construction equipment over 50 horsepower.

AQ-3  Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the construction contractor(s) shall prepare a dust control plan (Plan) and implement the following measures during rough grading activities in addition to the existing requirements for fugitive dust control under South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 to further reduce PM_{10} and PM_{2.5} emissions. The Plan shall be submitted to and verified by the City’s Community Development staff. The City’s Community Development staff shall verify compliance that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.

- During rough grading, the construction contractor shall sweep streets with Rule 1186-compliant, PM_{10}-efficient vacuum units on a daily basis if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.
- During rough grading, the construction contractor shall water exposed ground surfaces and disturbed areas a minimum of every three hours on the construction site and a minimum of three times per day.
- During rough grading, the construction contractor shall limit onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to no more than 15 miles per hour.
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AQ-4  The construction contractor(s) shall limit the daily amount of asphalt and pool demolition debris haul to a maximum of 7 truckloads per day (14 truck trips per day) if approximately 16-cubic yard haul trucks are used, assuming a one-way haul distance of 6 miles (approximately 112 cubic yards of demolition debris haul per day). If the one-way haul distance is greater than 6 miles, total overall daily haul truck miles traveled shall not exceed 84 miles. These requirements shall be noted on all construction management plans.

Operation LSTs

Planning Area 1

Operation of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not generate substantial quantities of emission from onsite, stationary sources. Land uses that have the potential to generate substantial stationary sources of emissions that would require a permit from SCAQMD include industrial land uses, such as chemical processing and warehousing operations where substantial truck idling could occur onsite. The proposed hotel does not fall within these categories of uses. While operation of the proposed hotel would result in the use of standard onsite mechanical equipment such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units in addition to occasional use of landscaping equipment for Project Site maintenance, air pollutant emissions generated from these activities would be nominal (see Table 3, Net Increase in Maximum Daily Regional Operational Phase Emissions). Therefore, localized air quality impacts related to stationary-source emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Planning Area 1

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds.
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The SoCAB has been designated attainment under both the national and California AAQS for CO. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2011). The proposed hotel in this planning area would result in approximately 989 average daily trips during a weekday, 64 trips during the morning peak hour, and 73 trips during the evening peak hour, which is substantially less than the volumes cited above. Furthermore, the SoCAB has since been designated as attainment under both the national and California AAQS for CO. The proposed hotel would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the Project Site. Localized air quality impacts related to mobile-source emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Health Risk Assessment

SCAQMD currently does not require health risk assessments to be conducted for short-term emissions from construction equipment. Emissions from construction equipment primarily consist of diesel particulate matter (DPM). The Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment (OEHHA) has recently adopted new guidance for the preparation of health risk assessments issued in March 2015. OEHHA has developed a cancer risk factor and non-cancer chronic reference exposure level for DPM, but these factors are based on continuous exposure over a 30-year time frame. No short-term acute exposure levels have been developed for DPM.

Planning Area 1

The proposed hotel in this planning area would be developed in approximately 14 months, which would limit the exposure to onsite and offsite receptors. SCAQMD currently does not require the evaluation of long-term excess cancer risk or chronic health impacts for a short-term project. In addition, construction activities would not exceed LST significance thresholds with mitigation, as shown above. For the reasons stated above, it is anticipated that construction emissions would not pose a threat to on- and offsite receptors at or near the proposed hotel, and project-related construction health impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in objectionable odors. The threshold for odor is if a project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which states:

“A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.”

Planning Area 1

The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. The proposed hotel in this planning area does not fall within the aforementioned land uses. Additionally, emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities, may generate odors. However, these odors would be low in concentration, temporary, and are not expected to affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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?

No Impact. Sensitive biological resources are habitats or species that have been recognized by federal, state, and/or local agencies as being endangered, threatened, rare, or in decline throughout all or part of their historical distribution. The Project Site is in an urbanized area of the City and land uses surrounding the site.
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consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a preschool adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). As shown in Figures 3, 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the Project Site is developed and consists of a number of buildings and structures and other hardscape and landscape improvements associated with the existing commercial and lodging uses onsite. Onsite vegetation includes a number of ornamental trees and shrubs along the site boundaries and internal to the site (see Figures 3, 4a, and 4b). Based on views of the Project Site and surrounding area from Google Earth maps and a site visit conducted by PlaceWorks personnel, there is no suitable habitat for sensitive species onsite, and no natural biological resources or communities exist on, adjacent to, or near the Project Site.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts that could occur as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would have no impact on or interfere with any species, habitat, natural community, riparian area, migratory fish or wildlife, or migratory wildlife corridor identified by any local, regional, state, or federal agency. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. See responses to Sections 3.4(a), above, and 3.4(c), below.

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?

No Impact. Wetlands are defined under the federal Clean Water Act as land that is flooded or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that normally does support, a prevalence of vegetation adapted to life in saturated soils. Wetlands include areas such as swamps, marshes, and bogs. The National Wetlands Mapper, which is operated and maintained by the U.S. Fish and
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Wildlife Service (USFWS), does not show any federally-protected streams, wetlands, or other water bodies or any riparian habitat onsite, adjacent to, or within proximity of the Project Site (USFWS 2014a). Per the National Wetlands Mapper, the nearest USFWS-designated wetland is a riverine (San Antonio Creek), approximately 0.9 mile east of the Project Site.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on wetlands a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not have any direct impacts on the San Antonio Creek through removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or any other means. However, the proposed hotel's construction and operation phases could have indirect impacts on this creek. Any runoff generated during the proposed hotel's construction and operational phases would discharge into the existing storm drain system near the southwestern boundary of the hotel site, which eventually discharge into San Antonio Creek further east of the Project Site. Construction and operation of the proposed hotel would generate pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality of San Antonio Creek, if effective measures were not used during both of these project phases to keep pollutants out of stormwater and remove pollutants from stormwater.

However, as concluded below in Sections 3.9(a) and (b), adherence to the BMPs in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Low Impact Development Report would reduce, prevent, minimize, and/or treat pollutants and prevent degradation of San Antonio Creek and other downstream receiving waters. Additionally, the San Antonio Creek does not provide habitat for riparian vegetation or for animals due to its channelization with a concrete bed and sides.

The City also protects the water quality of receiving waters through its stormwater and runoff pollution control ordinance (Chapter 8.28 [Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control] of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code). The purpose of this ordinance is to protect the health and safety of the residents of the City by protecting the beneficial uses, marine habitats, and ecosystems of receiving waters from pollutants carried by stormwater and non-stormwater discharges. The intent of this ordinance is to enhance and protect the water quality of receiving waters consistent with the Clean Water Act. Development of the proposed hotel would be subject to the provisions of this ordinance. For example, Section 8.28.030 (Discharge to the Storm Drain System) prohibits littering and other discharge of polluting or damaging substances into the City’s storm drain system or receiving waters; Section 8.28.040 (Runoff Management Requirements) requires owners or occupants of any property to comply with the good housekeeping requirements outlined in this section. Furthermore, Subsection 8.28.040.F (New Development and Redevelopment) requires that redevelopment or new development projects be evaluated by the City prior to construction for their potential to discharge pollutants to the storm drain system or to receiving waters based on the intended land use.

Therefore, no impact to wetlands would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact to wetlands would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing restaurant and gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. See response to Section 3.4(a), above.

The Project Site does, however, include a number of ornamental trees along the site boundaries and internal to the site (see Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs). Although ornamental, these trees may provide suitable habitat, including nesting habitat, for migratory birds under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3513 et seq, of the California Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Code. Section 3513 provides protection to the birds listed under the MBTA, essentially all native birds. Additionally, Section 3503 of the CDFW Code makes it unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird. The MBTA implements the United States’ commitment to four treaties with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia for the protection of shared migratory bird resources. The MBTA governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests. Under the provisions of the MBTA, it is unlawful “by any means or manner to pursue, hunt, take, capture (or) kill” any migratory birds except as permitted by regulations issued by USFWS. The term “take” is defined by USFWS regulation to mean to “pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect” any migratory bird or any part, nest or egg of any migratory bird covered by the conventions, or to attempt those activities. USFWS administers permits to take migratory birds in accordance with the MBTA.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on migratory birds as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The project applicant of the proposed hotel in this planning area would be required to comply with the MBTA by either avoiding site clearing, demolition or grading activities during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to September 1, as defined by CDFW) or conducting a site survey for nesting birds prior to commencing such activities during the nesting season, as outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-1. Adherence

---

1 Migratory birds include all native birds in the United States, as listed in 50 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 10.13 (List of Migratory Birds).
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to the MBTA regulations and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that if construction occurs during the breeding season, appropriate measures would be taken to avoid impacts to nesting birds, if any are found. Compliance with the MBTA requirements and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be ensured through the City’s development review process. With adherence to the MBTA requirements and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Planning Area 2

The hardscape and landscape improvements proposed within this planning area would include the removal of a couple of trees. As noted above, the project applicant would be required to comply with the MBTA by either avoiding site clearing, demolition or grading activities during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to September 1, as defined by CD FW) or conducting a site survey for nesting birds prior to commencing such activities during the nesting season, as outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-1. With adherence to the MBTA requirements and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur. However, if in the future any enhancement, development or redevelopment activities that would result in an impact to existing trees within this planning area, the project applicant/developer would be required to adhere to the provisions of Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

Mitigation Measures

BIO-1 Prior to the commencement of any proposed actions (e.g., site clearing, demolition, grading) during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to September 1, as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife), the monitoring biologist contracted by the project applicant shall conduct a pre-construction survey(s) to identify any active nests in and near the project area no more than three days prior to initiation of the action. If the biologist does not find any active nests that would be potentially impacted, the proposed action may proceed. However, if the biologist finds an active nest within or adjacent to the action area and determines that the nest may be impacted, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest using temporary plastic fencing or other suitable materials, such as barricade tape and traffic cones. The buffer zone shall range from a 300- to 500-foot radius at the discretion of the biologist and in coordination with the construction contractor. Only specified activities (if any) approved by the qualified biologist in coordination with the construction contractor shall take place within the buffer zone until the nest is vacated. Activities that may be prohibited within the buffer zone by the biologist may include but not be limited to grading and tree clearing. Once the nest is no longer active and upon final determination by the biologist, the proposed action may proceed within the buffer zone.
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Any active nests observed during the survey shall be mapped on a recent aerial photograph, including documentation of GPS coordinates.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As shown in Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, 4a and 4b, *Site Photographs*, onsite vegetation includes a number of ornamental trees internal to the Project Site and along the site boundaries; tree types include but are not limited to palms, pine, floss silk, ficus, and willow. All of the trees occur on private property within the confines of the Project Site; none of the trees are within the City's property or public right-of-way.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on trees as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan includes the removal of all existing trees within this planning area (approximately 30 to 35 trees), with the exception of five mature trees that abut the northern site boundary. However, the trees to be removed are ornamental and none are species that are considered sensitive and protected by local ordinances. Additionally, the City of Claremont's Municipal Code does not contain ordinances protecting trees or other biological resources on private property. Although the City does protect trees located on City property or within the City's public right-of-way under Chapter 12.26 (City Trees) of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code, as noted above, none of the trees to be removed are within the City's property or public right-of-way. Removal of the private trees onsite would not be considered a significant impact.

Furthermore, although the proposed hotel would include removal of the majority of the existing trees onsite, it would provide a greater number of trees (approximately 60 to 70 new trees, evergreen and/or deciduous) internal to the Project Site and along the site boundaries and (see Figure 7, *Conceptual Site Plan*).

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not conflict with any local tree preservation ordinance. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

The hardscape and landscape improvements proposed within this planning area would include the removal of approximately four trees; however, the trees to be removed are ornamental and none are species that are considered sensitive and protected by local ordinances. Additionally, as noted above, the City of Claremont's Municipal Code does not contain ordinances protecting trees or other biological resources on private property and none of the trees to be removed are within the City’s property or public right-of-way. Therefore, no significant impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans in the City of Claremont (USFWS 2014b; CDFG 2006). Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on conservation plans as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, no impact to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Environmental Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. Section 15064.5 defines historic resources as resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historical resources, or the lead agency. Generally a resource is considered to be “historically significant,” if it meets one of the following criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the Project Site is developed and consists of a couple of buildings and site improvements associated with the existing commercial and lodging uses onsite. Specifically, the Project Site is occupied by three buildings: the first building (701 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) is occupied by a restaurant; the second building (721 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) is occupied by a 64-room Knights Inn motel; and the third building (747 S. Indian Hill Boulevard) is occupied by a Shell gas station. The motel consists of a two story building that houses the guest rooms and an attached single story building that houses the motel lobby, management offices, and dining area. The restaurant and gas station are both single story.

The existing uses onsite were first proposed by a developer in the mid-1960s and constructed sometime in the late 1960s. The existing motel was originally developed as a Howard Johnson’s motel, which was designed and constructed in the standard Howard Johnson’s national trademark for architecture of that time. The Howard Johnson’s motel eventually changed to the Knights Inn motel in December 2014, at the time the
project applicant purchased the motel. The restaurant and gas station have also changed owners and business names since they first opened for business.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on historical resources as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan requires demolition of the existing motel. Although the motel was designed and constructed in the standard Howard Johnson's national trademark for architecture at the time it was constructed, the building does not include architectural elements or features to suggest unique design or construction (see Figure 4b, *Site Photographs*). The two-story building, housing the guest rooms, consists of white brick walls with concrete tile roofs; the single story building that houses the motel lobby, management offices, and dining area consists of white brick walls, wood shingle roofs, and a glass store front. The architectural style and construction materials of these buildings are typical of other budget motels in the region; there is nothing unique about the architectural style and construction materials.

Additionally, the existing buildings were assessed for historic significance and do not appear to meet any of the four criteria (A through D) for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources, nor do they appear to meet any criteria for local listing. The buildings were built as functional buildings for a local motel business, and therefore are not associated with events (A) that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history. The past and current motel businesses are not recognized locally and would not be considered historically significant, and therefore, the buildings are not associated with a person(s) (B) significant in the past. The buildings are not unusual or exceptional in any respect, and therefore they do not embody a distinctive characteristic of a type, period, or method of construction (C). Finally, the buildings are not capable of providing information important in prehistory or history (D).

Furthermore, the Project Site and existing building are not identified on any of these historic resource lists/databases—National Register of Historic Places; California State Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, and Register of Historic Places; and City of Claremont Register of Sites of Historic and Architectural Merit.

Therefore, no significant impacts to historical resources would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Development activity in this planning area only includes hardscape and landscape improvements within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. The existing restaurant would remain in its current condition. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the Project Site is in a developed, urbanized area of the City. The Project Site consists of, and is surrounded by, developed land that has been permanently altered due to the construction of below and aboveground improvements (i.e., buildings, driveways, hardscapes, and utilities).

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on archeological and paleontological resources as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Given the highly-disturbed condition of the Project Site and its surroundings, the potential for development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan to impact an unidentified archeological or paleontological resource is considered low. Additionally, because the Project Site has already been previously disturbed, it has already been subject to similar construction and ground-disturbing activities. No archaeological or paleontological resources were identified during prior development of the Project Site, and it is unlikely that any such resources would be uncovered or affected during project-related grading and construction activities. Furthermore, the Project Site and immediate surroundings are not recognized as an area having the potential for subsurface archeological or paleontological resources.

While unlikely, the presence of subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources on the Project Site remains possible and could be affected by ground-disturbing activities associated with grading and construction at the site. It is possible subsurface disturbance might occur at levels not previously disturbed (e.g., deeper excavation than previously performed in certain locations), or may uncover undiscovered archeological or paleontological resources at the site. Therefore, potential impacts to archeological and/or paleontological resources could occur as a result of project-related construction activities. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts to archeological and paleontological resources would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Additionally, there are no unique geological features onsite or adjacent to or surrounding the Project Site. The Project Site exhibits generally-flat topography with overall gentle inclination to the south. Therefore, development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan would not result in the destruction of any unique geological features.
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Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures, which generally involve extensive grading and soil disturbance, are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. However, as noted above, while unlikely, the presence of subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources on the Project Site remains possible and could be affected by ground-disturbing activities associated with grading and construction that would occur in this planning area. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts to archeological and paleontological resources would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur. However, if in the future any development or redevelopment activities would occur within this planning area, the project applicant/developer would be required to adhere to the provisions of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, and for any subsequent permit involving excavation to an increased depth, the project applicant shall retain a Los Angeles County-certified archaeologist and paleontologist who shall be on call during all grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities. Additionally, a certified aboriginal tribe of the Los Angeles basin Native American Monitor shall be onsite during any and all ground disturbances (including but not limited to pavement removal, post holing, auguring, boring, grading, excavation and trenching). The purpose of the onsite certified Native American Monitor is to protect any cultural resources which may be affected during construction or development. Evidence of the contracted professionals retained by the project applicant shall be provided to the City of Claremont Community Development Department. In the event archeological, Native American or paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, a professional archeological, Native American or paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant cultural resources until they can be formally evaluated. Suspension of ground disturbances in the vicinity of the discoveries shall not be lifted until the archaeological, Native American or paleontological monitor has evaluated discoveries to assess whether they are classified as significant cultural resources, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. If archaeological, Native American or paleontological resources are recovered, they shall be offered to a repository with a retrievable collection system and an educational and research interest in the materials, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History or the University of California at Riverside, or any other local museum or repository willing to and capable of accepting and housing the resource. If no museum or repository willing to accept the resource is found, the resource shall be considered the property of the City of
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Claremont, and may be stored, disposed of, transferred, exchanged, or otherwise handled by the City at its discretion. The archaeologist, Native American, or paleontologist shall prepare a final report describing all identified and curated resources (if any are found) and submit the report to the City’s Community Development Department.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** See response to Section 3.5(b), above.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on human remains as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

There are no known human remains on or near the Project Site, and there are no cemeteries within the vicinity of the Project Site. Additionally, the Project Site is in an urbanized area of the City and has already been previously disturbed and developed; it has already been subject to similar construction and ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan. Therefore, the likelihood human remains may be discovered during site clearing and grading activities is considered extremely low. However, development of the hotel would involve ground-disturbing activities that could have the potential to disturb previously undiscovered sub-surface human remains, if any exist. For example, the proposed hotel may involve deeper excavation than previously performed in certain locations of the Project Site.

In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that disturbance of the site shall remain halted until the Los Angeles Coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. The coroner is required to make a determination within two working days of notification of the discovery of the human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority or if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Compliance with existing law regarding the discovery of human remains would reduce potential impacts to human remains to less than significant levels. No mitigation measures are necessary.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impact on human remains would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur.

e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Assembly Bill 52 requires meaningful consultation with California Native American Tribes on potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074. A tribe must submit a written request to the relevant lead agency if it wishes to be notified of projects within its traditionally and culturally affiliated area. The lead agency must provide written, formal notification to the tribes that have requested it within 14 days of determining that a project application is complete, or deciding to undertake a project. The tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the notification if it wishes to engage in consultation on the project, and the lead agency must begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving the request for consultation. Consultation concludes when either 1): the parties agree to mitigation measures to avoid a significant effect, if one exists, on a tribal cultural resource, or 2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes mutual agreement cannot be reached. AB 52 also addresses confidentiality during tribal consultation per Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c).

To date, three tribes (Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, Gabrielleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, and Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians) requested to be included on the City’s AB 52 consultation list, which is a list of potential tribes the City maintains for consultation purposes for the purpose of mitigating potential impacts to tribal cultural resources under CEQA. A letter was sent to each tribe on May 19, 2016, which requested comments and responses from the tribes. On May 23, 2016, one tribe (Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation) responded to the City’s AB 52 consultation letter. The other two tribes have not responded to the City’s letter mailed to each.

Additionally, as concluded above in Section 3.1(b), potential impacts to archeological, Native American, and/or paleontological resources as a result of project-related construction activities would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.
3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix B to this Initial Study:

- Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, LGC Geo-Environmental, Inc., September 22, 2015.

Analysis:

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.
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**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. Surface rupture is the most easily avoided seismic hazard. Fault rupture generally occurs within 50 feet of an active fault line (that is, there is no evidence for surface displacement of the faults within the last 11,000 years and is limited to the immediate area of the fault zone where the fault breaks along the surface (CGS 2007). The main purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to prevent construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface of active faults, in order to minimize the hazard of surface rupture of a fault to people and habitable buildings. Before cities and counties can permit development within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, geologic investigations are required to show that the sites are not threatened by surface rupture from future earthquakes.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to earthquake fault ruptures as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, as the Project Site is not within or near a currently established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone (LGC 2015). Additionally, based on available data, no faults (active, potentially active, or inactive) are beneath the Project Site or projecting toward the site. The closest faults to the Project Site are the San Jose Fault at approximately 2.1 miles from the site; Elsinore-Chino Central Avenue Fault at approximately 4.8 miles; Sierra Madre Fault at approximately 5 miles; and Cucamonga Fault at approximately 5.2 miles (CGS 2015; LGC 2015). Additionally, as shown in Figure 6-1 (Faults) of the City’s General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element, the Indian Hill Fault is shown as traversing the central portion of the City (approximately 2 miles north of the Project Site), from west to east. Other active faults and fault zones in the region include the San Jacinto, San Andreas, and Whittier Faults.

However, none of these faults are in close proximity of the Project Site, and two of the faults (San Jose and Indian Hill Faults) are not considered active. Due to the distance to these faults and the fact that there are no faults that cross or are in proximity of the Project Site, the potential for surface rupture of a fault to occur on the Project Site is considered negligible. Therefore, no significant impacts from a fault rupture would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Therefore, based on the types of improvements proposed and the preceding, no impacts from a fault rupture would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to seismic ground shaking as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The most significant geologic hazard to the design life of the proposed hotel in this planning area is the potential for moderate to strong ground shaking resulting from earthquakes generated on the faults in seismically active southern California. It is anticipated that the Project Site will periodically experience ground shaking as the result of earthquakes. As noted above, no faults (active, potentially active, or inactive) are beneath the Project Site or projecting toward the site. The closest active faults to the Project Site are the Elsinore-Chino Central Avenue Fault at approximately 4.8 miles, Sierra Madre Fault at approximately 5 miles, and Cucamonga Fault at approximately 5.2 miles (CGS 2015; LGC 2015). These faults, as well as others in the region, are considered capable of producing earthquakes that would cause strong shaking at the Project Site, thereby, exposing people or structures on the site to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. The intensity of ground shaking on the Project Site would depend on the magnitude of the earthquake, distance to the epicenter, and the geology of the area between the epicenter and the Project Site.

However, the Project Site is not at greater risk of seismic activity or impacts than other sites in southern California. Seismic shaking is a risk throughout southern California. Additionally, the state and local jurisdictions regulate development in California through a variety of tools that reduce hazards from earthquakes and other geologic hazards. For example, the most current California Building Code (CBC; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2), adopted by reference in Chapter 10-28 (California Building Code) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, contains provisions to safeguard against major structural failures or loss of life caused by earthquakes or other geologic hazards. The CBC contains provisions for earthquake safety based on factors including occupancy type, the types of soil and rock onsite, and the strength of ground motion with specified probability of occurring at the site. Development of the proposed hotel would be required to adhere to the provisions of the CBC, which are imposed on project developments by the City of Claremont’s Building Division during the building permit and development review process. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC for structural safety during a seismic event would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking.
Furthermore, incorporation of the design recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix B), as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1, would also reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. For example, as stated in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, the proposed hotel would be designed and constructed to resist the effects of seismic ground motions as provided in Section 1613A (Earthquake Loads) of the CBC, and designed in accordance with the seismic design parameters presented in Table 1 (Seismic Design Soil Parameters) of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation.

Therefore, implementation of the design parameters outlined in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1, and compliance with the provisions of the CBC would reduce impacts resulting from strong seismic ground shaking to less than significant levels.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Therefore, based on the types of improvements proposed and the preceding, no impacts from strong seismic ground shaking would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Claremont Building Division that all design recommendations in the project’s Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation dated September 22, 2015, (incorporated herein by this reference) pertaining to strong ground shaking and site soils have been incorporated into the project design and grading plan. During grading and construction phases, the City’s Building Division staff shall verify that grading and construction activities comply with these recommendations.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Other seismic-related ground failures are discussed in their respective sections: ground rupture (see Section 3.6(a)(i)) and landslides (see Section 3.6(a)(iv)).
Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, granular soils behave similarly to fluid when subject to high-intensity ground shaking. When soil liquefies it behaves as a liquid and loses strength needed for supporting overlying structures. Liquefaction occurs when three general conditions exist: 1) shallow groundwater; 2) low density non-cohesive (granular) soils; and 3) high-density ground motion. Studies indicate that saturated, loose to medium dense, near surface cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dry, dense cohesionless and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential (LGC 2015).

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to liquefaction as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

### Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 6-2 (Earthquake Induced Landslides and Liquefaction) of the City’s General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element, the Project Site is not within an area susceptible to liquefaction. Additionally, as concluded in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix B), the liquefaction potential on the Project Site is considered negligible based on the laboratory testing conducted for site soils, field explorations conducted, and the absence of groundwater to the depths explored, as well as nearby groundwater levels in excess of 50 feet below the existing ground surface.

Further, development of the proposed hotel would be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with the design recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel, as outlined above in Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

Therefore, no impacts resulting from liquefaction would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts resulting from liquefaction would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### iv) Landslides?

**No Impact.** Landslides are the downslope movement of geologic materials. Slope failures in the form of landslides are common during strong seismic shaking in areas of steep hills. Landslides are not expected to occur at the Project Site, as the site is not in an area susceptible to landslides (see Figure 6-2.
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[Earthquake Induced Landslides and Liquefaction] of the City’s General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element. Additionally, review of geological literature conducted as a part of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the proposed hotel does not indicate the presence of landslides on or directly adjacent to the Project Site (LGC 2015). The Project Site and surrounding area are generally flat with gradual changes in elevation, and there are no major slopes or bluffs on or adjacent to the site.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to liquefaction as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not be exposed to or cause a landslide. Therefore, impacts resulting from landslides would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts resulting from landslides would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because not development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Erosion is the movement of rock and soil from place to place and is a natural process. Common agents of erosion in the project region include wind and flowing water. Significant erosion typically occurs on steep slopes where stormwater and high winds can carry topsoil down hillsides. Erosion can be increased greatly by earthmoving activities if erosion-control measures are not used.

Following is a discussion of the potential erosion impacts resulting from the construction and operational phases of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Construction Phase

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would involve excavation, grading, and construction activities that would disturb soil and leave exposed soil on the ground surface. Common means of soil erosion from construction sites include water, wind, and being tracked offsite by vehicles. These activities could result in soil erosion. However, development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan is subject to
local and state codes and requirements for erosion control and grading during construction. For example, development of the proposed hotel is required to comply with standard regulations, including South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules 402 and 403, which would reduce construction erosion impacts. Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emissions source. Rule 402 requires dust suppression techniques be implemented to prevent dust and soil erosion from creating a nuisance offsite. For example, as outlined in Table 1 (Best Available Control Measures) of Rule 403, control measures to reduce erosion during grading and construction activities include stabilizing backfilling materials when not actively handling, stabilizing soils during clearing and grubbing activities, and stabilizing soils during and after cut-and-fill activities.

Additionally, the Construction General Permit (CGP) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), effective July 7, 2012, regulates construction activities to minimize water pollution, including sediment. The proposed hotel improvements under the Specific Plan would be subject to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting regulations, including the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is further discussed in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. The proposed hotel’s construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement an SWPPP and associated BMPs in compliance with the CGP during grading and construction activities. For example, as outlined in Section 3.9, types of BMPs that are incorporated in SWPPPs and would help minimize impacts from soil erosion include:

- **Erosion controls.** Cover and/or bind soil surface, to prevent soil particles from being detached and transported by water or wind. Erosion control BMPs include mulch, soil binders, and mats.

- **Sediment controls.** Filter out soil particles that have been detached and transported in water. Sediment control BMPs include barriers, and cleaning measures such as street sweeping.

- **Tracking controls.** Tracking control BMPs minimize the tracking of soil offsite by vehicles; for instance, stabilizing construction roadways and entrances/exits.

- **Non-storm Water Management Controls.** Prohibit discharge of materials other than stormwater, such as discharges from the cleaning, maintenance, and fueling of vehicles and equipment. Conduct various construction operations, including paving, grinding, and concrete curing and finishing, in ways that minimize non-stormwater discharges and contamination of any such discharges.

- **Waste Management and Controls (i.e., good housekeeping practices).** Management of materials and wastes to avoid contamination of stormwater.

Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related grading and construction activities.
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Additionally, project-related grading activities would be required to adhere to the provisions of the City’s grading regulations and the most current CBC. Furthermore, Section 8.28.040 (Runoff Management Requirements) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code requires erosion-protection measures during all construction activities. Development of the proposed hotel would be subject to the measures outlined in Section 8.28.040. Compliance with the City’s established grading and construction measures would be ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process.

Therefore, soil erosion impacts from project-related grading and construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Operation Phase**

The Project Site and surrounding area are in an urbanized area and are relatively level and contain minimal rises or changes in elevation. The Project Site is relatively flat; topography across the site slopes gently down from the northeast (high point) toward the southwest (low point). No major slopes or bluffs are on or adjacent to the site. After completion of the project, the Project Site would be developed with a hotel use, parking areas and drive aisles, and other hardscape and landscape improvements. The Project Site would not contain exposed or bare soil. Upon completion of the proposed hotel, the potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be expected to be extremely low.

Additionally, a Low Impact Development Report (LIDR) was prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix E). Development of the proposed hotel would include a number of post-construction BMPs, as specified in the LIDR and described in detail in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of the BMPs in the LIDR would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related operational activities.

Therefore, soil erosion impacts from operation activities of the proposed hotel would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, soil erosion impacts from construction and operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing restaurant and gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Hazards from liquefaction and lateral spreading are addressed above in Section 3.6(a)(iii), and landslide hazards are addressed above in Section 3.6(a)(iv).

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to unstable geologic units and soil resulting from development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

*Compressible and Hydro-collapsible Soils*

The results of the subsurface exploration and laboratory testing conducted as a part of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix B) indicate that the Project Site is underlain by approximately two to seven feet of potentially compressible and/or hydro-collapsible soils, consisting of non-engineered artificial fill and topsoil. These materials exhibit the potential to settle or hydro-consolidate under the surcharge of proposed fill loads up to approximately five feet in depth and anticipated future structural loads of the proposed hotel (LGC 2015).

However, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would be required to incorporate the design recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix B), as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1. For example, as outlined in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, the compressible undocumented artificial fill and topsoil should be overexcavated to underlying competent alluvial fan deposits or alluvium and replaced as engineered compacted fill. Additionally, development of the proposed hotel would be required to adhere to the provisions of the City’s grading ordinances and most current CBC.

*Subsidence*

The results of the subsurface exploration and laboratory testing conducted as a part of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix B) indicate that subsidence of the alluvial fan deposits, because of the recompaclation of exposed soils prior to fill placement, and placement of proposed fills, is estimated to be approximately 0.05 to 0.10 feet.

However, as concluded in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, in consideration of the anticipated grading, recommended overexcavation, proposed structures and improvements, and subsurface material types and their conditions, unfavorable ground subsidence is not anticipated. Additionally, development of the proposed hotel would be required to incorporate the design recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1. Further, development of the proposed hotel would be required to adhere to the provisions of the City’s grading ordinances and most current CBC.
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Conclusion

Based on the preceding and with implementation of the design parameters outlined in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1, and compliance with the provisions of the City’s grading ordinances and CBC, impacts resulting from compressible and hydro-collapsible soils and subsidence would be reduced to a level of to less than significant.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, impacts resulting from compressible and hydro-collapsible soils and subsidence as they relate to the hardscape and landscape improvement proposed in this planning area would be reduced to a level of to less than significant.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils shrink or swell as the moisture content decreases or increases; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. Following is a discussion of the potential expansive soils impacts resulting from development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the laboratory testing of Project Site soils conducted by as a part of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix B), the testing indicated a very low to low expansion potential in accordance with Chapter 18 (Soils and Foundations) of the most current CBC. Additionally, development of the proposed hotel would be required to incorporate the design recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Proposed Project, as outlined above in Mitigation Measure GEO-1, and adhere to the provisions of the City’s grading ordinances and CBC. For example, as outlined in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, any potential expansive soil conditions encountered in the near-surface finish grade soils should be evaluated and tested for individual building pads on a pad-by-pad basis during and at the completing of rough grading to verify and/or modify the anticipated conditions.

Therefore, with implementation of the design recommendations of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and compliance with the provisions of the City’s grading ordinances and CBC, no significant impacts from expansive soils would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, no significant impacts from expansive soils as they relate to the hardscape and landscape improvement proposed in this planning area would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?**

**No Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on alternative wastewater disposal systems as a result of development or redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would require connection to existing sewer mainlines, which are currently available in the surrounding roadways. The proposed hotel would not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

No new buildings or structures requiring wastewater disposal systems are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Additionally, any future development or redevelopment activities proposed within this planning area would not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, any future development or redevelopment activities proposed within this planning area would not involve the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHG is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and ozone (O₃)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHG identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), hydro fluorocarbons, per fluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.², ³

This section analyzes the project’s contribution to global climate change impacts in California through an analysis of project-related GHG emissions. Information on manufacture of cement, steel, and other “life cycle” emissions that would occur as a result of the project are not applicable and are not included in the analysis.⁴ A background discussion on the GHG regulatory setting and GHG modeling can be found in Appendix A.

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.

² Water vapor (H₂O) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant, but part of the feedback loop rather than a primary cause of change.

³ Black carbon contributes to climate change both directly, by absorbing sunlight, and indirectly, by depositing on snow (making it melt faster) and by interacting with clouds and affecting cloud formation. Black carbon is the most strongly light-absorbing component of PM emitted from burning fuels. Reducing black carbon emissions globally can have immediate economic, climate, and public health benefits. California has been an international leader in reducing emissions of black carbon, with close to 95 percent control expected by 2020 due to existing programs that target reducing PM from diesel engines and burning activities (CARB 2014b). However, state and national GHG inventories do not yet include black carbon due to ongoing work resolving the precise global warming potential of black carbon. Guidance for CEQA documents does not yet include black carbon.

⁴ Life cycle emissions include indirect emissions associated with materials manufacture. However, these indirect emissions involve numerous parties, each of which is responsible for GHG emissions of their particular activity. The California Resources Agency, in adopting the CEQA Guidelines Amendments on GHG emissions found that lifecycle analyses was not warranted for project-specific CEQA analysis in most situations, for a variety of reasons, including lack of control over some sources, and the possibility of double-counting emissions (see Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, December 2009). Because the amount of materials consumed during the operation or construction of the proposed project is not known, the origin of the raw materials purchased is not known, and manufacturing information for those raw materials are also not known, calculation of life cycle emissions would be speculative. A life-cycle analysis is not warranted (OPR 2008).
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact.

**Planning Area 1**

The proposed hotel in this planning area would generate GHG emissions from vehicle trips generated by the hotel, energy use (indirectly from purchased electricity use and directly through fuel consumed for building heating) and area sources (e.g., equipment used on-site, consumer products, coatings), water/wastewater generation, and waste disposal. Annual GHG emissions were calculated for construction and operation of the proposed hotel. Annual average construction emissions were amortized over 30 years and included in the emissions inventory to account for GHG emissions from the construction phase of the project. Project-related GHG emissions are shown in Table 6. As shown in the table, development of the proposed hotel would generate a net of 788 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (MTCO₂e) emissions per year; the total net increase of GHG emissions onsite from the project would not exceed the SCAQMD’s bright-line threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e⁵. Therefore, the proposed hotel’s cumulative contribution to GHG emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

---

⁵ This threshold is based on a combined threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e for all land use types, proposed by SCAQMD’s Working Group based on a survey of the GHG emissions inventory of CEQA projects. Approximately 90 percent of CEQA projects’ GHG emissions inventories exceed 3,000 MTCO₂e, which is based on a potential threshold approach cited in CAPCOA’s white paper, “CEQA and Climate Change.”
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Table 6  Net Increase in Project-Related GHG Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MTCO2e/year 1</th>
<th>Percent of Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>532</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Hotel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy 1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction Emissions 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy 1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction Emissions 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Emissions</strong></td>
<td>788</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD’s Bright-Line Threshold</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceeds Bright-Line Threshold</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2.
MTCO2e: metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent

Note: Percent changes from each source may not total to 100 percent due to rounding.
1 Assumes implementation of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) and 2013 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards. The 2013 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards are 30 percent more energy efficient than the 2008 Standards for non-residential buildings and 25 percent more energy efficient for residential buildings than the 2008 Standards. Modeling assumes all structures onsite would be 30 percent more energy-efficient than the 2008 building code for non-residential structures.
2 Construction emissions are amortized over a 30-year project lifetime per recommended SCAQMD methodology.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) Scoping Plan is California’s GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state’s GHG emissions reduction target established by Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which is to return to 1990 emission levels by year 2020. To estimate the reductions necessary, CARB projected statewide 2020 business-as-usual (BAU) GHG emissions and identified that the state as a whole would need to reduce GHG emissions by 28.5 percent from year 2020 BAU to achieve the target of AB 32 (CARB 2008). The GHG emissions forecast was updated as part of the First Update to the Scoping Plan. In the First Update to the Scoping Plan, CARB projected that statewide BAU emissions in 2020 would be approximately 509 million MTCO₂e. Therefore, to achieve the AB 32 target of 431 million MTCO₂e (i.e., 1990 emissions levels) by 2020, the State would need to reduce emissions by 78 million MTCO₂e compared to BAU conditions, a reduction of 15.3 percent from BAU in 2020 (CARB 2014b).

Planning Area 1

Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), California Appliance Energy Efficiency regulations, California Renewable Energy Portfolio standard, changes in the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, and other early action measures as necessary to ensure the state is on target to achieve the GHG emissions reduction goals of AB 32. In addition, new buildings, which include the proposed hotel in this planning area, are required to comply with the current Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Code (CALGreen). The project’s GHG emissions would be reduced from compliance with statewide measures that have been adopted since AB 32 was adopted.

In addition to AB 32, the California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region, the SCS was adopted in April 2012 (SCAG 2012) and SCAG is currently updating the SCS. The SCS does not

---

6 The BAU forecast includes GHG reductions from Pavley and the 33% Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).
7 If the GHG emissions reductions from Pavley I and the Renewable Electricity Standard are accounted for as part of the BAU scenario (30 million MTCO₂e total), then the State would need to reduce emissions by 108 million MTCO₂e, which is a 20 percent reduction from BAU.
8 In May 2014, CARB completed a five year update to the 2008 Scoping Plan. CARB recalculated the 1990 GHG emission levels with the updated global warming potential (GWP) in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s Fourth Assessment Report, and the 427 MMTCO₂e 1990 emissions level and 2020 GHG emissions limit, established in response to AB 32, is slightly higher, at 431 MMTCO₂e (CARB 2014c).
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require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but provides incentives for consistency for governments and developers. The proposed hotel is consistent with the underlying General Plan land use designation and would not interfere with SCAG’s ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Environmental Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix C to this Initial Study:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, PlaceWorks, September 2015

**Analysis:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The term “hazardous material” is defined in different ways by different regulatory programs. For purposes of this environmental document, the definition of “hazardous material” is the same as that outlined in the California Health and Safety Code, Section 25501:

> “Hazardous materials that, because of their quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, pose a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material that a handler or the unified program agency has a reasonable basis for believing that it would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.”

“Hazardous waste” is a subset of hazardous materials, and the definition is essentially the same as that in the California Health and Safety Code, Section 25117, and in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.2:

> “Hazardous wastes are those that, because of their quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may either cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.”
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Hazardous materials can be categorized as hazardous nonradioactive chemical materials, radioactive materials, and biohazardous materials (infectious agents such as microorganisms, bacteria, molds, parasites, viruses, and medical waste).

Exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials could occur through the following: improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes, particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; and/or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors.

Following is a discussion of the Specific Plan’s potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during the operational and construction phases.

Planning Area 1

Project Operation

Operation of the proposed hotel in this planning area would involve the use of small quantities of hazardous materials for cleaning and maintenance purposes, such as cleaning and maintenance products, paints, solvents and degreasers, fertilizers, and pesticides. Hotels are not associated with uses that use, generate, store, or transport large quantities of hazardous materials; such uses generally include manufacturing, industrial, medical (e.g., hospital) other similar uses.

Additionally, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials associated with the proposed hotel would be required to comply with existing regulations of several agencies, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, US Environmental Protection Agency, California Division of Occupational Safety and Health, California Department of Transportation, County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health, and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD). The City of Claremont has also adopted by reference the 2014 Los Angeles County Fire Code for the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (Title 32, Los Angeles County Code) in Chapter 15.20 (Fire Prevention) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, for the purpose of prescribing regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and property from hazardous materials or explosion (as well as fire).

Project compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. Additionally, the proposed hotel would be constructed and operated with strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the City and LACFD.

---

9 The Los Angeles County Fire Department is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for most of Los Angeles County including the City of Claremont. The Certified Unified Program coordinates and makes consistent enforcement of several federal and state regulations governing hazardous materials.
Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during long-term operation of the proposed hotel would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Project Construction

Construction activities of the proposed hotel would involve the use of larger amounts of hazardous materials than would be used during the operation phase. Construction activities would include the use of materials such as fuels, lubricants, and greases in construction equipment and coatings used in construction. However, the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. These activities would also be short term or one time in nature, and project construction workers would also be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use.

Additionally, as with project operation, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials would be required to conform to existing laws and regulations of the federal, state, and local agencies noted above. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. For example, all spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities are required to be immediately contained, the hazardous material identified, and the material remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations for the cleanup and disposal of that contaminant. All contaminated waste encountered would be required to be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility.

Furthermore, the removal and disposal of any contaminated building materials (e.g., lead-based paint and asbestos containing materials), if any are encountered during the demolition phase, would be handled in accordance with existing laws and regulations and applicable mitigation measures, as discussed below in detail in Section 3.8(b). Finally, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the City and LACFD would be required throughout the duration of the construction phase.

Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous materials during construction and operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Hazardous Materials Associated with Project Construction and Operation

See response to Section 3.8(a), above.

Hazardous Materials Existing Onsite

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development or redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Recognized Environmental Conditions

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the area of the existing motel (see Appendix C). The purpose of the Phase I ESA was to identify, to the extent feasible pursuant to the processes prescribed in ASTM International (ASTM) E1527-13, recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical RECs (HRECs), and controlled RECs (CRECs) in connection with the existing motel. As a part of the Phase I ESA, a site reconnaissance was conducted to evaluate the site and its surroundings for evidence of current or previous activities that may have resulted in adverse environmental impacts. Based on the results of the Phase I ESA, no RECs, HRECs, or CRECs were identified. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment due to RECs would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Suspect Environmental Conditions

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area requires demolition of the existing buildings, parking areas and drive aisles, and other site improvements associated with the existing motel (site buildings and improvements to be demolished are shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4b, Site Photographs). Due to the age of the buildings (developed sometime in the late 1960s), suspect asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints (LBP) may be present in the construction materials of these buildings; ACMs may include drywall, acoustical ceiling tiles, and linoleum flooring. Demolition of these buildings can cause encapsulated ACMs (if present) to become friable and, once airborne, they are considered a carcinogen. A carcinogen is a cancer-causing substance or helps cancer grow. Demolition of the existing buildings and structures can also cause the release of lead into the air if not properly removed and handled. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has classified lead and inorganic lead compounds as

---

10 According to the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations, any material that contains more than one percent of any type of asbestos is considered an asbestos-containing material.

11 Lead-based paint is defined by OSHA and EPA as paint containing 0.5 percent lead by weight.
"probable human carcinogens" (EPA 2013). Such releases could pose significant risks to persons living and working in and around the Project Site, as well as to project construction workers.

Abatement of all ACM and LBP encountered during building demolition (if any) would be required to be conducted in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including those of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA; which regulates disposal); US Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); US Department of Housing and Urban Development; California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA; which regulates employee exposure); and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

For example, Cal/OSHA's regulations for exposure of construction employees to ACMs requires demolition materials be handled and transported the same as other, non-friable ACMs. EPA requires all asbestos work performed within regulated areas be supervised by a competent person who is trained as an asbestos supervisor (EPA Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act, 40 CFR 763). SCAQMD's Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities) specifies work practice requirements to limit asbestos emissions from building demolition and renovation activities; the rule requires that buildings undergoing demolition or renovation be surveyed for ACM prior to any demolition or renovation activities. Should ACM be identified, Rule 1403 requires that ACM be safely removed and disposed of at a regulated site, if possible. If it is not possible to safely remove ACM, Rule 1403 requires that safe procedures be used to demolish the building with asbestos in place without resulting in a significant release of asbestos. Additionally, during demolition, grading, and excavation, all construction workers would be required to comply with the requirements of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 1529 (Asbestos), which provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, respiratory protection, and good working practices by workers exposed to asbestos.

OSHA Regulation 29 (CFR Standard 1926.62) regulates the demolition, renovation, or construction of buildings involving lead-based materials. It includes requirements for the safe removal and disposal of lead, and the safe demolition of buildings containing LBP or other lead materials. Additionally, during demolition, grading, and excavation, all construction workers would be required to comply with the requirements of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 1532.1 (Lead), which provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, respiratory protection, and good working practice by workers exposed to lead.

However, to prevent impacts from the potential release of ACM or LBP during building demolition activities, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is provided. With implementation of this mitigation measure and compliance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Compliance with these measures, laws and regulations would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

**Planning Area 2**

Development activity in this planning area only includes hardscape and landscape improvements within the parking area serving the restaurant, which require the demolition of existing hardscape improvements (e.g., asphalt paving, cement curb faces) and removal of existing landscape improvements. No building demolition would occur as the existing restaurant would remain in its current condition. Therefore, no impacts involving
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the release of hazardous materials into the environment would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Mitigation Measures**

HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of demolition permits for any buildings or structures onsite, the project applicant shall have implemented the following measures:

- Have retained a California Certified Asbestos Consultant (CAC) to perform abatement project planning, monitoring (including air monitoring), oversight, and reporting of all asbestos-containing materials (ACM) encountered. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all ACM shall be conducted in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Rule 1403 and California Code of Regulation Title 8, Section 1529 (Asbestos).

- Have retained a licensed or certified lead inspector/assessor to conduct the abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered. The contracted lead inspector/assessor shall be certified by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). All lead abatement shall be performed by a CDPH-certified lead supervisor or a CDPH-certified worker under the direct supervision of a lead supervisor certified by CDPH. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered shall be conducted in accordance with the US Occupational Safety and Health Administration Rule 29, CFR Part 1926, and California Code of Regulation, Title 8, Section 1532.1 (Lead).

- Evidence of the contracted professionals retained by the project applicant shall be provided to the City of Claremont Community Development Department. Additionally, contractors performing ACM and lead waste removal (if any is performed) shall provide evidence of abatement activities to the City’s Community Development Department.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The nearest school to the Project Site is Vista Del Valle Elementary School at approximately 0.15 mile northwest of the Project Site. Additionally, as shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) is west of and adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the Project Site. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to nearby schools as a result of development or redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
Planning Area 1

As discussed above in Section 3.8(a), hazards to the public or the environment, which would include nearby schools, arising from the routine use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials during project construction and operation phases would not occur. Additionally, the transport of any hazardous materials during the proposed hotel’s construction phase would generally occur along Indian Hill Boulevard, San Jose Avenue and I-10. The transport of such materials would not occur northwest of the Project Site along or around the residential streets that surround the elementary school site, nor would they occur along the access driveway serving the adjacent pre-school.

Furthermore, as discussed above in Section 3.8(b), hazards to the public or the environment, which would include nearby schools, arising from the release of ACMs or LBP during demolition of the buildings associated with the existing motel would not occur, as demolition activities of these buildings would be required to comply with all required federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to ACMs and LBP.

Finally, development in this planning area consists of a new hotel, which would not result in the generation of air toxics that would require a permit by SCAMQD. Therefore, no significant impacts to nearby schools would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning would not result in any significant impacts to nearby schools and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. A search of regulatory agency databases (state and federal) containing known and suspected sites of environmental contamination was conducted as a part of the Phase I ESA prepared for the Project Site (see Appendix C). As concluded in the Phase I ESA, only one of the commercial uses onsite was listed on a regulatory agency database: the previous Mobile gas station at 747 Indian Hill Boulevard. The site of the previous Mobile gas station is now occupied by the current Shell gas station, within Planning Area 3 of the Specific Plan. Specifically, the Mobile gas station was listed as being a LUST (Leaking Underground Storage Tank) cleanup site. However, cleanup of the gas station was completed and the Mobile gas station received regulatory closure in 2007, the same year cleanup was completed.
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Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this specific plan will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest airports to the Project Site are Cable Airport in the City of Upland, a private airstrip located approximately 2.7 miles northeast of the site; Brackett Field in the City of La Verne, a general aviation airport located approximately 3.2 miles northwest of the site; and Ontario International Airport in the City of Ontario, approximately 8 miles southeast of the site. As shown in Figure 6-5 (Cable Airport Safety Zones) of the City’s General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element, and per the Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (WVPA ALUC 1981), the Project Site is not within the Cable Airport land use plan. Additionally, the Project Site is not within the airport land use plan for Bracket Field (LAC ALUC 2004).

However, based on the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (OIALUCP) and as shown in Policy Map 2-1 (Airport Influence Area)12 of the OIALUCP, the Project Site falls within the airport influence area of the Ontario International Airport (City of Ontario 2011). Additionally, the Project Site lies with the airport protection zone, as shown in Policy Map 2-4 (Airspace Protection Zones) of the OIALUCP. Per Policy Map 2-4, the permitted building height for the sites that lie within the airport protection zone is greater than 200 feet above ground level. Furthermore, per Policy Map 2-5 (Overflight Notification Zones), the Project Site lies within the overflight notification zone of the OIALUCP. Per Policy Map 2-5, real estate transaction disclosures are required to be provided to purchasers, residents or tenants of all properties that fall within the airport influence area.

12 Airport influence are includes the areas in which current or future airport-related safety, noise, airspace protection, or overflight factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses.
Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to airport safety hazards as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Although the Project Site lies within the airport influence area of the Ontario International Airport, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not expose hotel workers or guests to excessive levels of airport-related noise or to airport-related safety hazards. As shown in Policy Map 2-3, the project site does not lie within any of the airports established noise impacts zones. The airport also does not direct heavy air traffic over the Project Site. Additionally, per Policy Map 2-2, the project site does not lie within any of the airports established safety zones, which limit the type of development that can occur within these zones. The building height of the proposed hotel would be just under 60 feet above ground level, well within the permitted height limits (greater than 200 feet above ground level) noted in Policy Map 2-4.

Furthermore, as a part of the disclosure forms the project applicant received when the applicant purchased the existing motel in December 2014, the project applicant was provided with The Natural Hazard Disclosure Report for Los Angeles County, which notified the project applicant of the sites location within the airport influence area of the Ontario International Airport.

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not expose workers or guest on or near the Project Site to airport-related noise or safety hazards. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Development activity in this planning area only includes hardscape and landscape improvements within the parking area serving the restaurant. The existing restaurant would remain in its current condition; no new habitable buildings or structures are proposed. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

**No Impact.** See response to Section 3.8(e), above.

Additionally, there are no heliports adjacent to or within the vicinity of the Project Site; the closest heliport to the Project Site is San Antonio Regional Hospital Heliport in the City of Upland (Airnav.com 2015), approximately five miles northeast of the site. Over congested areas, helicopters are required to maintain an altitude of at least 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within 2,000 feet of the aircraft, except as needed for
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takeoff and landing (Code of Federal Regulations Title 14 Section 91.119). Additionally, helicopter takeoffs and landings are at a sufficient distance from the Project Site and would not pose a hazard to workers or guests of the proposed hotel that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan. Furthermore, the Project Site is not within the flight path of the heliport and helicopter takeoffs and landings at this private airstrip are infrequent.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts related to hazards from private air strips as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not cause any hazards related to aircraft operating to or from private airstrips or heliports. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Development activity in this planning area only includes hardscape and landscape improvements within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. The existing restaurant would remain in its current condition; no new habitable buildings or structures are proposed. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. The state requires use of Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) plans for responding to any large-scale disaster requiring multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional response. The five functions of SEMS include: management, operations, planning and intelligence, logistics, and finance and administration. The County of Los Angeles All-Hazard Mitigation Plan (AHMP) was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in June 2005 (LACEO 2005). The AHMP includes a vulnerability analysis for many types of hazards, including earthquakes, floods, fires, and manmade hazards, including terrorism and civil unrest; goals and objectives for strategies for mitigating hazards; proposed strategies and actions for reducing vulnerability to identified hazards; and lists of facilities and equipment available for responding to disasters.

The City of Claremont has also adopted a SEMS Multi-Hazard Functional Plan (MHFP). The MHFP works in concert with the County of Los Angeles’ AHMP and ensures the most effective allocation of resources for the protection of people and property in time of an emergency. Furthermore, the City recently submitted its Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP) to the Federal Emergency Management Agency and California Emergency Management Agency and received approval of the NHMP in 2015. The City maintains an
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Emergency Operations Center (EOC) at City Hall, which is the primary coordination point for disasters and major emergencies, and also maintains an alternative EOC at the Community Service Facility. Additionally, the Claremont Police Department is capable of providing a field Mobile Command Post in conjunction with the City’s Emergency Response Team. These EOC facilities ensure that communications and emergency management is maintained in the event of a disaster.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on the City’s emergency response plans as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would have no adverse impact on implementation of the adopted NHMP. During the construction and operation phases, the proposed hotel would not interfere with any of the daily operations of the City’s EOC, Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD), or Claremont Police Department. All construction activities would be required to be performed per the City’s and LACFD’s standards and regulations. For example, the proposed hotel would be required to provide the necessary on- and offsite access and circulation for emergency vehicles and services during both the construction and operation phases. The proposed hotel would also be required to go through the City’s development review and permitting process and would be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety standards and regulations as set forth by LACFD and in the CBC and City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, to ensure that they do not interfere with the provision of local emergency services (e.g., adequate access roads to accommodate emergency response vehicles, adequate numbers/locations of fire hydrants, etc.).

Additionally, the proposed hotel is not considered a “critical facility” as defined by the Essential Services Building Seismic Safety Act, that is, a building that provides essential services after a disaster; the act includes requirements that such buildings shall be "designed and constructed to minimize fire hazards and to resist the forces of earthquakes, gravity and winds."

Furthermore, development of the proposed hotel would not require road closures or otherwise impact the functionality of Indian Hill Boulevard or San Jose Avenue as public safety access routes, nor would it introduce any roadways or infrastructure that would bisect or transect surrounding uses. The proposed hotel also does not have any characteristics that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with the City’s designated emergency evacuation routes, including I-10.

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the adopted NHMP, or any other emergency response plan. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Development activity in this planning area only includes hardscape and landscape improvements within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Due to the type of improvements proposed and based on
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the preceding, the proposed improvements would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with
the adopted NHMP, or any other emergency response plan and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in
place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no
mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. As shown in Figure 6-4 (High Fire Areas) of the City's General Plan Public Safety and Noise
Element, the Project Site and surroundings are not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.
Additionally, the Project Site is not in a fire hazard zone as designated by the California Department of
Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire 2011). Furthermore, the Project Site is in a developed, urbanized area
of the City; there is no wildland vegetation on the site, and the site is not adjacent to or near wildlands that
could be subject to wildland fires.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts involving wildland fires as a result of development and
redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, impacts related to wildland fires would not occur as a result of development of the
proposed hotel under the Specific Plan and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, impacts related to wildland fires would not occur as a result of implementation of
the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are
necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in
place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no
mitigation measures are necessary.
### 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) During project construction, will it create or contribute runoff water that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including the terms of the City's municipal separate stormwater sewer system permit?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) After the project is completed, will it create or contribute runoff water that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including the terms of the City's municipal separate stormwater sewer system permit?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff from delivery areas; loading docks; other areas where materials are stored, vehicles or equipment are fueled or maintained, waste is handled, or hazardous materials are handled or delivered; other outdoor work areas; or other sources?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Discharge stormwater so that one or more beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit are impaired? Beneficial uses include commercial and sportfishing; shellfish harvesting; provision of freshwater, estuarine, wetland, marine, wildlife or biological habitat; water contact or non-contact recreation; municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; and groundwater recharge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Discharge stormwater so that significant harm is caused to the biological integrity of waterways or water bodies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Significantly increase erosion, either on or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Environmental Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l) Significantly alter the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that results in environmental harm?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical studies, included as Appendices D and E to this Initial Study:

- Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, Kimley Horn, October 16, 2015 (Appendix D).

**Analysis:**

a) During project construction, will it create or contribute runoff water that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including the terms of the City's municipal separate stormwater sewer system permit?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential construction-phase water quality impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

The proposed hotel’s construction phase would result in the generation of pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality of downstream receiving waters if effective measures are not used to remove pollutants from site runoff. Construction-related runoff pollutants are typically generated from waste and hazardous materials handling or storage areas; outdoor work areas; material storage areas; and general maintenance areas (e.g., vehicle or equipment fueling and maintenance, including washing).

If effective measures are not used, site runoff generated during grading and construction activities of the proposed hotel could discharge into the existing catch basin near the southwestern corner of the Project Site, which then conveys runoff easterly along the public storm drain that runs along the southern site boundary. If effective measures are not used, construction runoff could also enter the curb-and-gutter that runs along
San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard, which eventually connect to a public storm drain south of the Project Site, near the Indian Hill Boulevard/Auto Center Drive intersection. These public storm drains discharge into San Antonio Creek, approximately 0.5 mile east of the Project Site; the San Antonio Creek discharges into Chino Creek further south (at a location just north of Chino Avenue), which then discharges into the Santa Ana River and ultimately into the Pacific Ocean.

Currently, Chino Creek (Reaches 1 and 2; impacted reaches that would be affected by the proposed hotel development) has pre-existing water quality problems that are identified on the most recent list of impaired water bodies, California 2010 303(d) list for nutrients, pathogens, oxygen-demanding substances, and pH. Additionally, the Santa Ana River (Reaches 4 and 6; impacted reaches that would be affected by the proposed hotel development) has pre-existing water quality problems that are identified on the 303(d) list for pathogens, metals, and salinity (SWRCB 2010).

Development of the proposed hotel may cause water quality deterioration of these impaired downstream receiving waters if construction-related sediments or pollutants wash into the existing public storm drain system and facilities, which as noted above, discharge into the Chino Creek and Santa Ana River.

The 2009 Construction General Permit (CGP; Order No. 2009-009-DWQ) and its subsequent revisions (Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, effective July 17, 2012) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), regulate construction activities for construction projects of one acre or more to minimize water pollution, including sediment and pollutants. The proposed hotel’s improvements would be subject to the CGP, as the site is greater than one acre. Projects obtain coverage by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), estimating sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters, and specifying Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented as a part of the project’s construction phase to minimize pollution of stormwater prior to and during grading and construction. Section A of the CGP describes the elements that must be contained in an SWPPP.

In accordance with the CGP, a preliminary SWPPP was prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix D). Per Section XIV (SWPPP Requirements) of the CGP, the SWPPP is designed to address the following:

- Pollutants and their sources, including sources of sediment associated with construction, construction site erosion and other activities associated with construction activity are controlled.

- Where not otherwise required to be under a Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) permit, all non-stormwater discharges are identified and either eliminated, controlled, or treated.

- Site BMPs are effective and result in the reduction or elimination of pollutants in stormwater discharges and authorized non-stormwater discharges from construction activity to the Best Available Technology/Best Control Technology (BAT/BCT) standard.

Types of BMPs that are incorporated into the SWPPP and would help minimize impacts from sediments and other pollutants during the grading and construction phases of the proposed hotel include those listed in Table 7.
3. Environmental Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Construction BMPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Erosion Controls and Wind Erosion Controls | Cover and/or bind soil surface, to prevent soil particles from being detached and transported by water or wind | **Scheduling:** Measures include construction contractor monitoring of the weather forecast for rainfall and wind.  
**Hydraulic Mulch:** Consists of various types of fibrous materials mixed with water and sprayed onto the disturbed soil surface to provide temporary protection from wind and water erosion.  
**Wind Erosion Control:** Includes covering or applying water to exposed soil and stockpiles as needed to prevent dust nuisance; covering stock piles in plastic to prevent wind erosion. |
| Sediment Controls | Filter out soil particles that have been detached and transported in water. | **Sandbag Barriers:** A sandbag barrier is a series of sand-filled bags placed on a level contour to intercept or to divert sheet flows.  
**Storm Drain Inlet Protection:** Protection measures would be placed on all inlets receiving runoff from unstabilized or otherwise active work areas.  
**Street Sweeping:** Contractor would arrange for regular street sweeping or vacuuming, to prevent sediment from leaving site. |
| Tracking Controls | Minimize the tracking of soil offsite by vehicles | **Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit:** A stabilized entrance consisting of shaker plates and gravel would be installed, and all construction traffic would utilize this entrance/exit.  
**Entrance/Outlet Tire Wash:** A tire wash may be installed to spray down vehicles before exiting the site. |
| Non-Stormwater Controls | Prohibit discharge of materials other than stormwater, such as discharges from the cleaning, maintenance, and fueling of vehicles and equipment. Conduct various construction operations, including paving, grinding, and concrete curing and finishing, in ways that minimize non-stormwater discharges and contamination of any such discharges. | **Water Conservation Practices:** Activities that use water during the construction of a project in a manner that avoids causing erosion and the transport of pollutants offsite.  
**Paving and Grinding Operation:** Such operations would be carried out in such a manner that prevents materials from being discharged offsite.  
**Illicit Connection-Illegal Discharge Connection:** Contractors enact procedures and practices designed to recognize illicit connections or illegally dumped or discharged materials on a construction site and report incidents.  
**Potable Water Irrigation:** Consists of practices and procedures to manage the discharge of potential pollutants generated during discharges from potable water sources.  
**Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning, Fueling, and Maintenance:** Includes procedures and practices that eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants to storm water from vehicle and equipment cleaning operations; |
Table 7  Construction BMPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Spills and Leaks, and Reduce or Eliminate Contamination of Storm Water, and Prevent or Reduce the Contamination of Stormwater Resulting from Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance by Running a “Dry and Clean Site”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Curing and Finishing: Proper Procedures and Implementation of BMPs Reduce or Eliminate the Contamination of Stormwater Runoff During Concrete Curing and Finishing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Waste Management and Controls</td>
<td>Management of materials and wastes to avoid contamination of stormwater.</td>
<td>Material delivery, storage and use; stockpile management; spill prevention and control; solid, hazardous, soil, concrete, liquid, and sanitary septic waste management; contaminated soil management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KH 2015a.

The proposed hotel’s construction contractor would be required to implement the BMPs outlined in the SWPP during all grading and construction activities in compliance with the CGP. Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, minimize, and/or treat all potential pollutants and prevent degradation of downstream receiving waters, including the Chino Creek and Santa Ana River. BMPs identified in the SWPPP would reduce or avoid contamination of stormwater with sediment and would also reduce or avoid contamination with other pollutants such as trash and debris; oil, grease, fuels, and other toxic chemicals; paint, concrete, asphalt, bituminous13 materials, etc.; and nutrients.

With implementation of the BMPs in the SWPPP, water quality and waste-discharge impacts from all project-related grading and construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, water quality and waste-discharge impacts from grading and construction activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

13 Bituminous – resembling or containing bitumen; bitumen - any of various viscous or solid impure mixtures of hydrocarbons that occur naturally in asphalt, tar, mineral waxes, etc.; used as a road surfacing and roofing material.
3. Environmental Analysis

b) After the project is completed, will it create or contribute runoff water that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including the terms of the City's municipal separate stormwater sewer system permit?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential operation-phase water quality impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The proposed hotel's operational phase would result in the generation of pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality of downstream receiving waters if effective measures are not used to remove pollutants from site runoff. Some site runoff during operational activities of the propose hotel could discharge into the existing catch basin near the southwestern corner of the Project Site, which then conveys runoff easterly along the public storm drain that runs along the southern site boundary. This public storm drain discharges into San Antonio Creek, approximately 0.5 mile east of the Project Site; the San Antonio Creek discharges into Chino Creek further south (at a location just north of Chino Avenue), which then discharges into the Santa Ana River and ultimately into the Pacific Ocean.

As noted above, Chino Creek (Reaches 1 and 2; impacted reaches that would be affected by the proposed hotel) has pre-existing water quality problems that are identified on the 303(d) list for nutrients, pathogens, oxygen-demanding substances, and pH. Additionally, the Santa Ana River (Reaches 4 and 6; impacted reaches that would be affected by the proposed hotel) has pre-existing water quality problems that are identified on the 303(d) list for pathogens, metals, and salinity (SWRCB 2010).

Development of the proposed hotel may cause deterioration of the water quality of these impaired downstream receiving waters if operational-related pollutants wash into the existing storm drain system and facilities, which as noted above, discharge into the Chino Creek and Santa Ana River. Anticipated and potential pollutants that would be generated by the proposed hotel include: vehicle fluids from hotel patron and employee vehicles (e.g., oil, grease, petroleum, coolants); landscaping materials (e.g., topsoil, plant materials, herbicides, fertilizers, mulch, pesticides); and general trash debris and litter. The proposed hotel's primary pollutants of concern are nutrients, pathogens, oxygen-demanding substances, and pH due to impairments to the Chino Creek and Santa Ana River. Mitigation of these pollutants of concern is accomplished through the implementation of post-development (operation phase) BMPs, as discussed below.

Waste discharge requirements for discharges to municipal storm drain systems in the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (LARWQCB) region, which includes the City of Claremont, are set forth in LARWQCB’s Order Number R4-2012-0175 (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] Permit No. CAS004001), Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water System (MS4) Discharges within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County, Except those Discharges Originating from the City of Long Beach (also known as the MS4 Permit), which was adopted by LARWQCB on November 8, 2012, and became effective December 28, 2012. The MS4 Permit designates the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD), County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, and 84 incorporated cities.
as Permittees. The Permittees coordinate and facilitate activities necessary to comply with the requirements of the MS4 Permit and are responsible for ensuring compliance with the MS4 Permit.

In accordance with the MS4 Permit, the City of Claremont, as a Permittee, requires that a Planning Development Document in the form of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), or Low Impact Development Report (LIDR) be prepared for certain categories of development projects, including all redevelopment projects that result in the addition or creation of 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area.

In accordance with this requirement, a preliminary LIDR was prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix E). As a part of the LIDR, a number of structural and non-structural BMPs would be incorporated into the proposed hotel to minimize water pollution (including pollutants of concern) from the Project Site during the operation phase. For example, structural BMPs include a hydrodynamic mechanical pretreatment device and a storage/infiltration pipe. Once site runoff enters the proposed catch basins, runoff would be conveyed via PVC (Polyvinyl Chloride) storm drain pipes to the hydrodynamic mechanical pretreatment device before being sent to a buried, perforated 96-inch diameter CMP (corrugated metal pipe) storage pipe at the southwest corner of the Project Site (potential site drainage improvements are illustrated in the Preliminary LID Exhibit provided in the preliminary LIDR). The mechanical pretreatment device would be placed just west of the storage pipe. The mechanical pretreatment device would be sized to remove sediments from the peak flow generated from the 85th percentile, 24-hour rain event (i.e., the storm event that is greater than 85 percent of the storms that occur). The perforated storage pipe functions as a stormwater detention and infiltration system; it would be sized to store and infiltrate the volume generated by the 85th percentile, 24-hour rain event.

Non-structural BMPs include but are not limited to (see preliminary LIDR in Appendix E for a complete list of non-structural BMPs):

- Regular sweeping of all parking area surfaces.
- Annual training of employees on chemical management and proper methods of handling and disposal of waste shall be provided.
- Minimizing to the maximum extent practical the use of pesticides and fertilizers.
- Maintaining the drainage system and the associated structures and BMPs in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications and to ensure maximum pollutant removal efficiencies.

The final BMPs to be implemented for the proposed hotel will be determined through the City’s review of the final LIDR, which will occur during the City’s development review and building plan check process.

Additionally, once project development is completed, implementation, maintenance, and management of all BMPs would be the responsibility of the land owner. For example, as standard practice, the land owner would be required to schedule periodic inspections and maintenance based on the established operation and maintenance schedule outlined in the preliminary LIDR.
3. Environmental Analysis

Furthermore, in accordance with Section 8.28.040.F (New Development and Redevelopment) of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code, prior to construction of new development, BMPs integrated into development projects would be evaluated by the City for their potential to impact receiving water bodies in accordance with the development planning requirements established by LARWQCB pursuant to the MS4 Permit. The City requires that BMPs identified in the preliminary LIDR be implemented during construction and following project completion.

Operation of the proposed hotel would also be required to operate in accordance with the good housekeeping provisions outlined in Section 8.28.040 (Runoff Management Requirements) of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code, which include:

- No person shall leave, deposit, discharge, dump, or otherwise expose any chemical, fuel, animal waste, garbage, batteries and/or septic waste in an area where actual or potential discharge to the city streets or the storm drain system may occur. Any spills, discharge, or residues shall be removed as soon as possible and disposed of properly.

- Runoff from landscape irrigation, air conditioning condensate, water line flushing, foundation/footing drains, individual residential car washing, dechlorinated swimming pool discharges and sidewalk washing shall be conducted in a manner which minimizes or eliminates the possibility of pollutant discharges reaching the city storm drain system or receiving waters.

- Objects, such as motor vehicle parts, containing grease, oil, or other hazardous materials, and unsealed receptacles containing hazardous materials, shall not be stored in areas exposed to stormwater or otherwise susceptible to runoff.

Finally, development of the proposed hotel would be an improvement over existing conditions. Specifically, under existing conditions, there are no water quality treatment devices in any area of the Project Site to provide any treatment for runoff generated onsite. As outlined in the preliminary LIDR, a number of structural and non-structural BMPs would be incorporated into the proposed hotel to minimize water pollution.

Based on the preceding, water quality and waste-discharge impacts from operation activities associated with the proposed hotel would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, water quality and waste-discharge impacts from operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

c) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff from delivery areas; loading docks; other areas where materials are stored, vehicles or equipment are fueled or maintained, waste is handled, or hazardous materials are handled or delivered; other outdoor work areas; or other sources?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

See response to Section 3.9(a), above, for a discussion regarding the potential for the discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage and general maintenance during the proposed hotel's construction and operation phases. As demonstrated in Section 9(a), implementation of the BMPs outlined in the SWPPP and preliminary LIDR during the construction and operation phases, respectively, would reduce potential water quality impacts to a level of less than significant.

Additionally, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not include delivery areas; loading docks; outdoor materials storage areas; vehicle fueling or maintenance facilities; hazardous materials handling or delivery areas; or other outdoor work areas, which are features/activities typically associated with commercial and industrial uses. Therefore, the proposed hotel would not create substantial amounts of polluted runoff from any of the types of sources specified above. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

The hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning do not include delivery areas; loading docks; outdoor materials storage areas; vehicle fueling or maintenance facilities; hazardous materials handling or delivery areas; or other outdoor work areas. Therefore, the proposed improvements would not create substantial amounts of polluted runoff from any of the types of sources specified above. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Discharge stormwater so that one or more beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit are impaired? Beneficial uses include commercial and sportfishing; shellfish harvesting; provision of freshwater, estuarine, wetland, marine, wildlife or biological...
3. Environmental Analysis

habitat; water contact or non-contact recreation; municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; and groundwater recharge.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Beneficial uses are the ways that water can be used for the benefit of people and/or wildlife. The Project Site is in the Santa Ana River Basin, Region 8, in the Upper Santa Ana Watershed. The basin plan for this region was adopted in 1995 and updated in February 2008 (SARWQCB 1995). It gives direction on the beneficial uses of the state waters in Region 8, describes the water quality that must be maintained to support such uses, and provides programs, projects, and other actions necessary to achieve the standards established in the basin plan.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to beneficial uses of receiving waters as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

It is anticipated that some site runoff from this planning area would discharge into the existing catch basin near the southwestern corner of the Project Site, which then conveys runoff easterly along the public storm drain that runs along the southern site boundary. This public storm drain discharges into San Antonio Creek, approximately 0.5 mile east of the Project Site; the San Antonio Creek discharges into Chino Creek further south (at a location just north of Chino Avenue). Present or potential beneficial uses of San Antonio Creek include municipal and domestic water supply; agricultural supply; groundwater recharge; industrial process supply; hydropower generation; water contact and non-water contact recreation; cold freshwater habitat; and wildlife habitat. Present or potential beneficial uses of Chino Creek include groundwater recharge; water contact and non-water contact recreation; warm freshwater habitat; limited warm freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; and rare, threatened, or endangered species. Additionally, one expected beneficial use of Chino Creek is municipal and domestic water supply (SARWQCB 1995).

Development of the proposed hotel would not have any direct impacts on the beneficial uses of the San Antonio Creek or Chino Creek. However, the proposed hotel’s construction and operation phases could have indirect impacts on these creeks. Construction and operation of the proposed hotel would result in the generation of pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality and beneficial uses of San Antonio Creek and Chino Creek, if effective measures were not used to keep pollutants out of and remove pollutants from site runoff. However, as concluded above in Sections 3.9(a) and (b), adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP and preliminary LIDR would reduce, prevent, minimize, and/or treat pollutants and prevent degradation of these creeks, and any other downstream receiving waters.

The City also protects the water quality of receiving waters through its stormwater and runoff pollution control ordinance (Chapter 8.28 [Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code). The purpose of this ordinance is to protect the health and safety of the residents of the City by protecting the beneficial uses, marine habitats, and ecosystems of receiving waters from pollutants carried by stormwater and non-stormwater discharges. The intent of this ordinance is to enhance and protect the water quality of receiving waters consistent with the Clean Water Act. Development of the proposed hotel would be subject to the provisions of this ordinance.
3. Environmental Analysis

For example, Section 8.28.030 (Discharge to the Storm Drain System) prohibits littering and other discharge of polluting or damaging substances into the City’s storm drain system or receiving waters, and Section 5.28.040 (Runoff Management Requirements) requires owners or occupants of any property to comply with the good housekeeping requirements outlined in this section. Furthermore, Section 8.28.040.F (New Development and Redevelopment) requires that redevelopment or new development projects be evaluated by the City prior to construction of a development for its potential to discharge pollutants to the storm drain system or to receiving waters based on its intended land use.

Therefore, implementation of the SWPPP and LIDR and compliance with the City’s stormwater and runoff pollution control ordinance would reduce, prevent, minimize, and/or treat pollutants and prevent degradation of downstream receiving waters and their beneficial uses. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, impacts to beneficial uses of receiving waters from construction and operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

e) Discharge stormwater so that significant harm is caused to the biological integrity of waterways or water bodies?

Less Than Significant Impact. See response to Section 3.9(d), above.

f) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact. See responses to Sections 3.9(a) and 3.9(b), above.

g) 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)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 1

The proposed hotel in this planning does not have the potential to diminish groundwater supplies or the groundwater recharge capabilities of lands where development occurs. The Project Site would have a minimal effect on usable groundwater reserves because the site is located in a largely developed area of the City (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*), and is not used for groundwater recharge. As noted in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix B), groundwater was not encountered in any of the subsurface explorations up to 20 feet below the existing surface. A review of the Chino Basin Watermaster “Depth to Groundwater Contour Map, Fall 2006”, indicates that groundwater in the general area of the Project Site varies from approximately 400 feet or more below the existing ground surface (LGC 2015).

Additionally, the project lies within the Chino Basin (CBW 2014a). There are a number of basins for recharging water into the Chino Basin; the closest recharging basins to the Project Site are the Montclair Basins, which are approximately 0.9 mile east of the Project Site, adjacent to the San Antonio Creek and north and south of I-10 (CBW 2014b). Groundwater recharge at these recharge basins occurs quite a ways east of the Project Site and the site is not in or near any other groundwater recharge basin.

Therefore, the proposed hotel would not substantially interfere with groundwater supplies or recharge and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Impacts to groundwater supplies are further discussed in Section 3.17(d), below.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, impacts to groundwater supplies or recharge from construction and operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

h) 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Erosion and siltation impacts potentially resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan, for the most part, would occur during the preparation and grading phases of the commercial uses accommodated under the Specific Plan. However, there is also a potential for erosion and siltation to occur during the operation phase. Following is a discussion of the potential construction- and operational-related erosion impacts resulting from development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
Planning Area 1

Construction Phase

As discussed above in Section 3.9(a), the project applicant would be required to implement the SWPPP during the grading and construction phases. The SWPPP specifies BMPs the project applicant would implement prior to and during grading and construction to minimize erosion and siltation impacts on- and offsite. BMPs that would be implemented during the proposed hotel's construction phase are discussed in Section 3.9(a) and detailed in the SWPPP (see Appendix D). For example, as outlined in the SWPPP, BMPs that provide effective temporary and final erosion control during construction would include but are not limited to:

- Preserve existing vegetation where required and when feasible.
- Stabilize non-active areas within 14 days of cessation of construction activities or sooner if stipulated by local requirements.
- Control erosion in concentrated flow paths by applying erosion control blankets, check dams, erosion control seeding or alternate methods.
- Prior to the completion of construction, apply permanent erosion control to remaining disturbed soil areas.

Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related grading and construction activities. Therefore, the proposed hotel's grading and construction activities would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Construction-related impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Operation Phase

At project completion, there would be no substantial areas of bare or disturbed soil onsite that would be vulnerable to erosion or siltation. All areas would either be paved or landscaped. Additionally, the proposed hotel includes implementation of post-development BMPs as a part of the preliminary LIDR, which would ensure that erosion and siltation on- or offsite would not occur. For example, as outlined in the preliminary LIDR and discussed above in Section 3.9(b), all site drainage would be captured and treated (including siltation) onsite via the proposed post-development BMPs.

Furthermore, the project applicant would be required to submit grading plans to the City per the provisions outlined in Section 17.013.010 (Slopes and Grading) of the City of Claremont's Municipal Codes. During their review of submitted grading plans, City staff would ensure that the minimum requirements to regulate grading and earthwork are incorporated into the proposed hotel in order to control the quality of drainage and runoff (including erosion and siltation) from the project site.
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Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Operation-related impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, erosion and siltation impacts from construction and operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

i) Significantly increase erosion, either on or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. See responses to Sections 3.6(b), 3.9(a), 3.9(b) and 3.9(h), above.

j) 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?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Under existing conditions, the overall Project Site is relatively flat and runoff from the majority of the site (Planning Area’s 1 and 2) surface flows and trends in a southwesterly direction towards the southwestern site boundary, to a low point in the existing parking lot of the motel. Approximately 71 percent of the overall Project Site consists of impervious areas (e.g., buildings and structures, paving), with the remainder (approximately 29 percent) consisting of pervious areas (landscaping). The percentage of impervious and pervious area for the hotel portion of the Project Site is approximately 60 and 40 percent, respectively. Existing runoff from the uses in Planning Area’s 1 and 2 surface flows across paved areas and enters a catch basin near the southwestern corner of the Project Site, which then conveys runoff easterly along the public storm drain that runs along the southern site boundary. Runoff from the gas station area in Planning Area 3, surface flows in an easterly direction into the curb and gutter that runs along Indian Hill Boulevard. Under existing conditions, there are no drainage devices in any area of the Project Site that provide onsite retention and infiltration from runoff generated onsite. All existing runoff enters the aforementioned catch basin or curb and gutter.

Following is a discussion of the potential construction- and operational-related erosion impacts resulting from development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel is not anticipated to substantially change the drainage pattern onsite. Under proposed conditions, stormwater runoff from the proposed hotel in this planning area would be
conveyed similar to existing conditions, continuing to flow southwesterly via a new onsite drainage collection and treatment system. Upon completion, approximately 76 percent of the hotel site would consist of impervious areas (e.g., buildings and structures, paving), with the remainder (approximately 24 percent) consisting of pervious areas (landscaping).

In accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175), which requires the preparation of a Planning Development Document (e.g., LIDR), and the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Standards Manual (LAC-LIDSM), a preliminary LIDR was prepared for the proposed hotel (see Appendix E). The potential site drainage improvements that may be provided within this planning area are shown in the Preliminary LID Exhibit of the preliminary LIDR. As called for in the LIDR, potential site drainage improvements in this Planning Area needed to accommodate the proposed hotel may include drainage pipes, catch basins, and pretreatment devices. Under the preliminary drainage improvements, surface drainage on the south side of the hotel would be directed southerly/southeasterly toward a precast concrete catch basin in the southeastern portion of the parking area. Surface drainage on the north side of the hotel would surface flow towards the northern parking area of the hotel and also be collected in a precast concrete catch basin. Once it enters the catch basins, runoff would be conveyed via PVC (Polyvinyl Chloride) storm drain pipes to a mechanical pretreatment device before being sent to a buried, perforated 96-inch diameter CMP (corrugated metal pipe) storage pipe at the southwest corner of the Project Site. However, the final site drainage improvements for the proposed hotel would be determined by and outlined in the Planning Development Document.

As concluded in the preliminary LIDR, under proposed conditions, onsite runoff would be mitigated per the LAC-LIDSM requirements. Specifically, the proposed perforated storage pipe would function as a stormwater detention and infiltration system; it would be sized to store and infiltrate the volume generated by the 85th percentile, 24-hour rain event. The perforated storage pipe would be designed to completely infiltrate into the surrounding soil within the 96-hour maximum drawdown time. Any overflow would outlet westerly into the public storm drain system that runs along the southern site boundary. If any overflow does outlet into the public storm drain, it would be minimal and less than existing conditions. Therefore, drainage runoff from the hotel site would be more than adequately handled by the proposed drainage system.

However, if onsite discharge values are restricted into the public storm drain system by the entity that owns the storm drain, additional onsite storage would be required to hold the excess volume, as outlined in Mitigation Measure HYD-1. Additionally, at this time, the ownership of the public storm drain facility that runs along the southern site boundary is unknown; it could be under the ownership of Caltrans or Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. Therefore, connection to this facility (if permitted by the entity) would require review and approval by the applicable entity with ownership over the storm drain, including the issuance of an encroachment permit by the entity, if required. The ownership and any connection discharge restrictions/permit requirements would be determined during the design phase of the proposed hotel.

Additionally, project-related landscaping and irrigation plans would be required to be designed and installed in accordance with the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Chapter 16.131 [Water Efficient Landscape Requirements] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code) and the City’s Guidelines for Implementation of
the City of Claremont Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. For example, all irrigation systems are required to be designed to prevent runoff, overspray, low head drainage, and similar conditions.

Therefore, based on the preceding and with implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, development of the proposed hotel would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project Site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or offsite. Impacts would be less than significant.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, erosion and siltation impacts from construction and operation activities associated with the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation Measures

HYD-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1, the project applicant’s civil engineer (in coordination with the City of Claremont’s Engineering Division staff) shall have determined the ownership of the public storm drain that runs along the southern boundary of the project site. If it is determined that either Caltrans or the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County is the owner of the public storm drain, the project applicant shall acquire all necessary approvals and encroachment permits necessary to connect to the storm drain; the project applicant shall provide evidence to the City’s Engineering Division staff of all approvals and permits obtained.

However, if onsite discharge values are restricted into the public storm drain system by the entity that owns the storm drain, additional onsite storage volume shall be required to hold all runoff generated onsite. In this case, the project applicant shall provide the City’s Engineering Division staff with a final Low Impact Development Report (LIDR) demonstrating that all onsite runoff will be stored and infiltrated onsite and that no offsite runoff would occur. The final LIDR shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Claremont and Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Standards Manual requirements.

k) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
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Planning Area 1

See responses to Section 3.9(j), above, and 3.17(c), below. As concluded in these sections, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

See responses to Section 3.9(j), above, and 3.17(c), below. As concluded in these sections, implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

1) Significantly alter the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that results in environmental harm?

Less Than Significant Impact. See responses to Sections 3.9(h) and 3.9(j), above.

m) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. See responses to Sections 3.9(a) through 3.9(f), above.

n) 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?

No Impact. The Project Site is not located within a 100-year flood zone as indicated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Number 06037C1750F (effective September 26, 2008) covering the project area. The Project Site is located in Zone X, indicating that it is out of 100-year and 500-year flood zones (FEMA 2015).

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not place people or structures at risk of flooding in a 100-year flood zone and would not place structures in 100-year flood zones that would redirect flood flows. No flooding impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Because no habitable structures are proposed and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

o) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.9(n), above.

p) 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Loss of life and damage to structures, roads, and utilities may result from a dam failure. As shown in Figure 6-3 (San Antonio Dam Inundation) of the City's General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element, the Project Site is within the 45-minute floodwater-arrival time zone of the San Antonio Dam. Therefore, the Project Site could face the danger of inundation if the San Antonio Dam failed with heavy rainfall. However, given seismic safety requirements for dams (e.g., design, frequent inspections and monitoring) outlined in the California State Water Code, the minimum amount of water that is commonly behind the dam (the dam does not impound a full reservoir most of the time) and the capacity of channels below the dam, dam failure is very unlikely. Additionally, as noted in Figure 6-3, the inundation areas shown on the map reflect events of extremely remote nature.

Furthermore, because dam failure can have severe consequences, FEMA requires that all dam owners develop Emergency Action Plans (EAP) for warning, evacuation, and post-flood actions. The responsibility for facilitation of emergency response is the responsibility of the owner; the San Antonio Dam is owned, operated, and maintained by the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). As a part of their Dam Safety Program, the Corps conducts routine inspections and operation of the dam and has developed an EAP for the San Antonio Dam in coordination with local emergency management officials. The primary objective of our the Corps Dam Safety Program is to maintain public safety by making sure the dams owned and operated by the Corps are safe, and risks to the public are minimized (Corps 2015).

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would not expose people or structures to flooding hazards of a dam failure. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Because no habitable structures are proposed and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

q) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The following describes potential impacts to people and structures from seiches, tsunamis, and mudflows.

Planning Area 1

As demonstrated below, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Seiche.

A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam, or other artificial body of water. There are no water storage facilities or bodies of water on or near the Project Site that could pose a flood hazard to the site due to a seiche or failure of an aboveground reservoir. Therefore, impacts from a seiche would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Potential inundation impacts due to a dam failure are discussed in Section 3.9(p), above.

Tsunami

A tsunami is a series of ocean waves caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. The Project Site is approximately 32 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and is over 1,000 feet above mean sea level. Therefore, the possibility of the Project Site being affected by a tsunami is negligible. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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**Mudflow**

A mudflow is a landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. The Project Site and surrounding area are in an urbanized area and are relatively level and contain minimal rises or changes in elevation. The Project Site is relatively flat; topography across the site slopes gently down from the northeast (high point) toward the southwest (low point). No major slopes or bluffs are on or adjacent to the site. Therefore, impacts from a mudflow would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Because no habitable structures are proposed and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, land uses surrounding the Project Site consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard.
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Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on established communities as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

While there are established residential communities north of the Project Site, across San Jose Avenue (see Figure 3), development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not physically divide these communities. The proposed hotel would be developed within the confines of the Project Site and would not introduce roadways or other infrastructure improvements that would bisect or transect the residential communities. Additionally, access to the existing residential communities would not be interrupted as a result of the project development, as residents of these communities do not have to cross the Project Site to access their community. The proposed hotel would also be compatible with and similar to the existing uses onsite (which consists of a motel, restaurant and gas station) and the surrounding land uses (which consist of commercial and residential uses (see Figure 3).

Therefore, the proposed hotel would not create any land use barriers or otherwise divide or disrupt the physical or visual arrangement of the existing residential communities. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would not create any land use barriers or otherwise divide or disrupt the physical or visual arrangement of the existing residential communities north of the Project Site. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) **Conflict with any 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?**

**No Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential land use impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**General Plan Consistency**

The Claremont General Plan, as required by the California Government Code, establishes direction for future growth and development within the City of Claremont. The California Government Code (under Sections 65451.b and 65454) states that a “specific plan shall include a statement of the relationship of the Specific Plan to the General Plan, and further, that it may not be adopted or amended unless found to be consistent
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with the General Plan.” The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research defines consistency with a General Plan as “a program or project that will further the objective and policies of the General Plan”. A discussion of the Specific Plan’s consistency is provided below.

Per the Claremont General Plan land use plan, the project site is designated as Commercial with a Specific Plan Overlay; this land use designation provides opportunities for a broad range of retail, professional, office, and service-oriented businesses, including supermarkets, theaters, restaurants, specialty retail stores, and lodging. With adoption of the Specific Plan, the Commercial land use designation would remain.

Additionally, the Specific Plan (see Figure 6, Specific Plan Land Use Plan, of this Initial Study) would be consistent with the City of Claremont’s General Plan land use designation (Commercial) of the Project Site; it would also be consistent with the Commercial Freeway zoning district of the City’s Zoning Map, which was the zoning district of the Project Site prior to 2005 and is currently designated for two areas just south and southeast of the Project Site, across I-10. As stated above under Section 1.3, Project Background, as a part of the City’s efforts in 2005 to update its General Plan, the Project Site was rezoned from Commercial Freeway to Specific Plan Area 12 (SP12). Therefore, the Commercial Freeway land use designation of the Specific Plan is appropriate for the Project Site. Furthermore, the commercial uses permitted under the Specific Plan would be consistent with those permitted under the Commercial land use designation of the Project Site.

Additionally, Claremont has many distinct neighborhoods that were developed during different periods of time, with each neighborhood having a character of its own in terms of housing styles, development patterns, streetscape design, and building scale and mass. The Project Site lies within the Vista neighborhood of the Claremont General Plan. The Specific Plan implements the vision of the Vista neighborhood, which in part states:

“Allow for enhancement and redevelopment of commercial, industrial, and educational properties that complement the residential areas and which are consistent with General Plan intensity and density limits.”

As stated in the Purpose and Intent section of Chapter 1 (Introduction) of the Specific Plan, the overall purpose of the Specific Plan is to provide comprehensive direction and the framework for enhancement and redevelopment of the Project Site (which is a commercial property) while implementing the vision, goals and policies of the Claremont General Plan. In addition to the Vista Neighborhood vision, the Specific Plan would help implement and further the following goals and policies of the General Plan Land Use and Economic Development Elements:

- **Goal 2-1**: Make Claremont a model for the application of sustainable development practices.

- **Goal 2-2**: Preserve the City’s distinctive residential character by maintaining land use patterns that strengthen our neighborhoods.
  - **Policy 2-2.4**: Protect neighborhoods from impacts from non-residential development.

- **Goal 2-3**: Accommodate a range of land uses that meet the economic, environmental, educational and social needs of the City while remaining sensitive to the community’s residential character.
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- **Goal 2-5:** Maintain and enhance Claremont’s unique character.
  - **Policy 2-5.1:** Insist on excellence in architectural design of new construction in City.

- **Goal 2-7:** Create distinctive gateways at all entry points into Claremont.

- **Goal 2-11:** Promote community identity and local history by encouraging context sensitive design and development.

- **Goal 2-12:** Create distinctive places throughout Claremont.

- **Goal 2-13:** Achieve a city wide network of streetscapes that are interesting and attractive.

- **Goal 3-1:** Maintain a strong diversified economic base.
  - **Policy 3-1.4:** Pursue new developments and businesses that add to the City’s economic base particularly those that generate sales tax and property tax increment revenue. The City’s target is to achieve a balance between the retail sales of Claremont residents in other communities with the retail sales in Claremont by non-residents.

- **Goal 3-2:** Revitalize aging and underperforming commercial and industrial areas.

- **Goal 3-4:** Develop a stronger visitor and tourism base.
  - **Policy 4-2.1:** Require new development to minimize traffic impacts created by the development and to incorporate mitigation measures which are acceptable to the City.

- **Goal 6-1:** Work to promote a safe community in which residents can live work and play.

The Specific Plan is also guided by the objectives outlined above in Section 1.4.1, *Statement of Objectives*. Through the proposed objectives, the Specific Plan would ensure the orderly and systematic implementation of the Claremont General Plan; it would act as a bridge between the Claremont General Plan and development and redevelopment activities that would occur on the Project Site.

Furthermore, future site plan approvals, building permits, or any other action requiring ministerial or discretionary approval applicable to the Project Site would be required to be consistent with the intent and objectives of the Specific Plan (California Government Code Sections 65455, 66473.5, 65860, and 65401). Subsequent projects determined to be consistent with the Specific Plan would likewise be determined to be consistent with the Claremont General Plan.

Based on the proceeding, the Proposed Project is consistent with the City of Claremont’s General Plan implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with the General Plan. Therefore, no land use impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not result in any land use impacts. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would not result in any land use impacts. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Zoning Consistency

According to the City’s zoning map, the project site is zoned Specific Plan Area 12 (SP12). Per Chapter 16.081 (Specific Plan District) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, the areas designated as Specific Plan District are subject to the preparation and adoption of a specific plan. The California Government Code provides authority for a city to adopt a specific plan by ordinance (as a regulatory plan) or resolution (as a policy plan). The Specific Plan would be adopted by the Claremont City Council as ordinance and functions as the regulatory document that serves as the zoning for the project site; the Specific Plan establishes the prevailing land use regulations for all development and redevelopment activities within the Project Site.

Proposed site development and redevelopment plans or other similar entitlements would be required to be consistent with the regulations set forth in this Specific Plan. As also noted above, future site plan approvals, building permits, or any other action requiring ministerial or discretionary approval applicable to the Project Site would be required to be consistent with the intent and objectives of the Specific Plan.

Although the Specific Plan is generally consistent with the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, the Specific Plan includes zoning and development standards specifically tailored to the Project Site and proposed land uses. The development procedures, regulations, and standards outlined in the Specific Plan would supersede the relevant provisions of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. In instances where the Specific Plan is silent or for any development regulation not directly addressed within the Specific Plan, the provisions of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code would prevail.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would not result in any land use impacts and would maintain consistency with the land use plan and zoning. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area would not result in any land use impacts and would maintain consistency with the land use plan and zoning. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** See response to Section 3.4(f), above.

### 3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is classified by the California Geologic Survey as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2; see Figure 5-3 [Mineral Resource Zones] of the City's General Plan Open Space, Parkland, Conservation, and Air Quality Element), which is the case for the majority of the City. This designation indicates that either aggregate resources exist on the Project Site, or that there is a high likelihood that such resources exist. However, the Project Site is not used for mining and no locally important mineral resource recovery sites are located on or near the Project Site. The nearest mineral resource recovery site to the Project Site is Holliday Rock Company's surface mining operations site (1975 N. Benson Avenue) in the City of Upland, approximately 4.2 miles northeast of the Project Site. There is also no evidence to indicate that the Project Site was ever utilized for mining operations based on the review of historical sources (aerial...
photographs and topographic maps) conducted as a part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (see Appendix C).

Additionally, several aggregate mining sites occur in the Claremont-Upland Production region, two of which include large mining operations just east of Claremont. Local area mining occurs just north of the City, upstream from the San Antonio Creek Flood Control Dam (Claremont 2006b). However, these areas of locally significant mineral resources are not within the vicinity of the Project Site.

Furthermore, the Project Site is developed with commercial uses and does not support mineral extraction operations. Mining would also be incompatible with the surrounding urban uses, especially the residential uses north and west of the Project Site; mining is also not a permitted use under the zoning district of the Project Site.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to mineral resources as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would not cause a loss of availability of mineral resources of known value to the region or state, nor would it result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact to mineral resources would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, no impacts to mineral resources would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.11(a), above.

### 3.12 NOISE

**Introduction**

Noise is often defined as unwanted, unexpected, or unpleasant sound, and is known to have several adverse effects on people, including hearing loss, speech and sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Based on these known adverse effects of noise the federal government, State of California, and
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City of Claremont have established criteria to protect public health and safety and to prevent disruption of certain human activities. Characterization of noise and vibration, existing regulations, and calculations for construction noise and vibration levels can be found in Appendix F.

**Terminology and Noise Descriptors**

The following are brief definitions of terminology used in this section:

- **Noise.** Sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or otherwise undesirable.

- **Decibel (dB).** A unitless measure of sound on a logarithmic scale.

- **A-Weighted Decibel (dBA).** An overall frequency-weighted sound level in decibels that approximates the frequency response of the human ear.

- **Equivalent Continuous Noise Level (L_{eq}).** The mean of the noise level, energy-averaged over the measurement period; regarded as an average level.

- **Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).** The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period with 5 dB added to the sound levels occurring during the period from 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 10 dB added to the sound levels occurring during the period from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM.

**Existing Noise Environment**

The nearest existing noise-sensitive areas to the Project Site are residences to the north and west; educational uses (a pre-school; Kinder Kountry) to the immediate west; and office and hotel uses to the east. Access to the Project Site will continue to be provided via San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard. Interstate 10 is immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the Project Site. Traffic on I-10 is the primary source of noise in the site vicinity, with San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard also contributing notable sound energy to the Project Site. According to the then-current (2005) and future-scenario (Year 2025) noise level contours in the City’s General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element, the Project Site is and will remain within the range of 70 to 75 dBA CNEL (primarily from I-10 traffic flows). Note that there is a freeway sound wall near the Project Site, but this wall does not start until the very western portion of the site boundary and is intended to reduce noise for the multi-family residential complexes to the west of the Project Site. Nonetheless, some noise barrier benefits will come about at the Project Site, relative to the portions of I-10 vehicle flows that are west of the western site boundary.

For the City of Claremont, commercial and office land uses within the Commercial Professional, Commercial Highway, and Commercial Freeway zoning designations should have maximum exterior L_{dn} or CNEL noise.

---

14 Presented as Figures 6-6 (Noise Contour 2005) and 6-8 (Future Noise Contours), respectively, of Chapter 6, Public Safety and Noise Element, of the City's General Plan.
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environments of 70 dBA. The 70 dBA CNEL maximum also applies to the RM (Medium Density Residential) and HDR (High Density Residential) zoning designations; both regarding a multi-family housing attribute. For interior environments, there are no guidelines for commercial and office uses, but all residential uses – regardless of location or density – have an interior limit of 45 CNEL (or $L_{dn}$).

While the City’s Public Safety and Noise Element states that “The City will maintain a peaceful environment by identifying noise impacts and mitigation noise problems through acoustical treatments and appropriate land use policies”, there are no specific directives for how those acoustical treatment mitigations are to be implemented or by whom.

Methodology

The analysis of noise impacts considers project-related construction and operational phase noise, as defined by the City of Claremont, State of California, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The proposed project would have a significant adverse noise impact if the project would result in any of the following:

*Noise*

- Project-related construction activities occur outside of the hours of 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM on weekdays and Saturdays, or exceed 65 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any one hour, 70 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 10 minutes in any one hour, 79 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any one hour or 80 dBA at any time, as specified in the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, Section 16.154.020 (Noise and Vibration Standards), Sub-section F.4.

- For noise compatibility, long-term impacts to residents at noise-sensitive areas would exceed the City of Claremont exterior noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL for low- to medium-density and 70 dBA CNEL for medium- to high-density, and interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL.

- For a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, the project would increase the ambient noise levels by 3 dBA or more and ambient noise levels under with-project conditions must exceed 65 dBA CNEL.

- Expose existing residences to noise levels from stationary sources that exceed the permissible exterior noise standards, as specified in Section 16.154.020 (Noise and Vibration Standards) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. Specifically, base ambient noise levels are 60 dBA during the daytime and 55 dBA during the nighttime, with adjustments to allow for briefly elevated levels.

---

15 The City’s Public Safety and Noise Element does not contain acceptability classifications such as “normally acceptable”, “conditionally acceptable”, “normally unacceptable”, and/or “clearly unacceptable”.

16 The City of Claremont’s Municipal Code limit for vibration levels is in in/sec RMS, while annoyance and architectural damage calculations are typically done in VdB and in/sec PPV. FTA thresholds are equivalent or more restrictive than the equivalent level stated in the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. Therefore, for purposes of conservatism, the vibration thresholds for architectural damage and annoyance promoted by the FTA are used in this assessment (FTA 2006).
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Groundborne Vibration

- Expose adjoining properties to perceptible levels of vibration, presumed to be more than 0.05 inches per second RMS vertical velocity, as specified in Section 16.154.020 (Noise and Vibration Standards), Subsection J (Vibration) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code.

- Project-related construction activities that would generate vibrations that are strong enough to cause vibration-induced architectural damage to existing residences based on the FTA Noise and Vibration Impact Guideline (FTA 2006), which is 0.2 peak particle velocity (PPV) in inches per second (in/sec) for typical wood-framed buildings.

- Project-related construction activities that would generate vibrations that are strong enough to exceed the threshold for vibration annoyance. The FTA standard is 78 VdB for residential uses and 84 VdB for office uses. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold for extended periods of time.

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential noise impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
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Planning Area 1

The following describes the exterior and interior noise environments for the proposed hotel (considered to be a commercial use for this analysis), as well as the hotel's stationary-source noise impacts to surrounding noise-sensitive uses.

Exterior Noise Compatibility

The City's exterior noise compatibility standard for commercial uses is 70 dBA CNEL. The proposed hotel would primarily be affected by traffic on I-10, which borders the Project Site to the south. The nearest rooms of the hotel to I-10 are approximately 220 feet from the freeway centerline. San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard also contribute to traffic noise at the Project Site, but to a much lesser degree. Operations at nearby commercial uses would not substantially increase overall noise levels at the Project Site, as compared to the noise from on-going traffic flows on I-10.

As presented above, the exterior noise levels at the rooms facing I-10 would be between 70 and 75 dBA CNEL, as would the exterior noise levels at the proposed outdoor pool area. These noise levels would exceed the City's exterior noise standard of 70 dBA CNEL for commercial developments. Therefore, the City's Public Safety and Noise Element calls for “acoustical treatments and appropriate land use policies” so as to mitigate noise problems.

However, from a broader viewpoint, it is important to note that with the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the assessment of the environment's impacts onto proposed projects (CBIA v BAAQMD, issued December 17, 2015), it is generally no longer the purview of the CEQA process to evaluate the impact of existing environmental conditions onto any given project. For noise, the application of this ruling means that the analysis of traffic, rail, and aircraft noise effects at the Project Site – regarding land use compatibility issues – is no longer part of CEQA. Therefore, exterior noise effects from nearby roadways relative to land use compatibility of the proposed hotel is no longer a topic for impact evaluation under CEQA and no statement of impact significance for external noise intrusion is germane.

Nonetheless, the demonstration of adherence to the City's exterior noise compatibility standard of 70 dBA CNEL is necessary prior to the issuance of building permits by the City's Community Development Department. As such, a detailed acoustical analysis would need to be conducted for the Proposed Project to ensure that the City's exterior noise compatibility standard of 70 dBA CNEL is met. However, this detailed acoustical analysis is not provided or required as mitigation for the Proposed Project, as it would be included as a condition of approval and required by City staff during the City's development review and building plan check process.

Furthermore, as a part of Caltrans' I-10 Corridor Project, Caltrans would be extending the existing sound wall that runs along a small portion of the southern Project Site boundary. Currently, a sound wall

---

17 Note that the 70 dBA CNEL maximum also applies to multi-family residential developments in either the Medium or High zoning designations.
(approximately 20 feet in height) mounted on top of a retaining wall commences near the southwestern portion of the Project Site and continues west along I-10. From the point where the soundwall currently ends, the retaining wall continues east along the I-10 on-ramp, terminating approximately 30 feet before the on-ramp intersects with Indian Hill Boulevard. Under the I-10 Corridor Project, Caltrans would be extending the existing soundwall by constructing a new soundwall that would range between 16 to 20 feet in height; the new soundwall would terminate approximately 30 feet from Indian Hill Boulevard, at the current location of where the retaining wall ends. Extending the soundwall would have a beneficial noise impact for not only residents to the west and north of the Project Site, but also for the existing commercial uses and proposed hotel of the Project Site. Per the Caltrans’ I-10 Corridor Project, construction of the new sound wall is anticipated to reduce freeway vehicular noise levels onsite and in the area by -2 to -8 dBA.

**Interior Noise Compatibility**

The City’s interior noise standard for residential uses is 45 dBA CNEL in habitable rooms, but there are no similar standards for commercial developments or hotels. Standard windows and doors in a warm-weather climate typically achieve a minimum of 12 dB of noise reduction with windows open and a minimum of 24 dB of noise reduction with windows closed (USEPA 1978). The interior noise level is the exterior noise level at the building façade, minus the exterior-to-interior noise reduction provided by building insulation.

Assuming that the exterior noise levels at the nearest hotel building façades oriented towards I-10 are in the range of 73 to 74 dBA CNEL, standard building construction materials and techniques would be expected to result in interior environments of approximately 49 to 50 dBA CNEL. This applies to a windows-closed configuration (including provisions for appropriate fresh air supply systems). A windows-open configuration would be approximately 12 dB louder.

As discussed above for exterior noise environments (with respect to the City’s land use compatibility guidelines), from a broader viewpoint, this interior issue is also no longer under the purview of the CEQA process (as it is an impact from the environment onto the project). Therefore, noise effects from nearby roadways relative to state building code standards for interior noise acceptability of the proposed hotel is no longer a topic for impact evaluation under CEQA and no statement of impact significance is germane.

Nonetheless, the demonstration of adherence to the City’s interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL is necessary prior to the issuance of building permits by the City’s Community Development Department. As such, a detailed acoustical analysis would need to be conducted for the Proposed Project to establish a sufficient level of exterior-to-interior noise reduction (along with the adequacy of the associated ventilation system) in order to meet the City’s interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL. However, this detailed acoustical analysis is not provided or required as mitigation for the Proposed Project, as it would be included

---

19 That is, an exterior CNEL of 74 dBA minus 24 dB for exterior-to-interior noise reduction would yield an interior result of 50 dBA CNEL. 
20 These ventilation must conform to the 2013 California Building and Mechanical Code as well as the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standards. Additionally, such ventilation systems and the associated HVAC units must be selected and installed to comply with the noise standards contained within the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code.
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as a condition of approval and required by City staff during the City’s development review and building plan check process.

Furthermore, as noted above, per the Caltrans’ I-10 Corridor Project, construction of the new sound wall is anticipated to reduce noise levels onsite and in the area by -2 to -8 dBA, resulting in a beneficial noise impact for not only residents to the west and north of the Project Site, but also for the existing commercial uses and proposed hotel of the Project Site.

**Traffic Noise**

The proposed hotel would generate noise associated with additional vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site on local roadways. However, community noise environments would not appreciably change as a result of project implementation. That is, per the project’s Traffic Impact Analysis (see Appendix G), the proposed hotel is estimated to generate 989 net daily trips.\(^{21}\) Worst-case conditions would be 64 trips occurring during the AM peak hour (38 in and 26 out) and 73 trips occurring during the PM peak hour (37 in and 36 out). As a portion of the Project Site is presently used as a motel, these project-related flows are roughly comparable to the existing motel flow rates. More importantly, in comparison to existing daily traffic flows on I-10 (210,000 to 250,000), Indian Hill Boulevard (25,000 to 35,000), and San Jose Avenue (9,000)\(^{22}\), the project contribution represents a worst-case increment of less than 11 percent. This small increment in flows translates into less than one-half dB of traffic-generated noise. This increase would be well below the threshold of audibility and well below the 3 dB threshold of significance.

Therefore, for both existing and project build-out conditions, no roadways in the vicinity of the Project Site would experience project-generated increases in traffic noise levels that would be significant. Traffic noise increases would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Stationary Noise**

Section 16.154.020 (Noise and Vibration Standards) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code limits stationary-source sound levels from exceeding 55 dBA for extended periods at neighboring residential properties, or 60 dBA at neighboring commercial properties. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and other noise sources would comply with the provisions of Section 16.154.020 of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. Stationary noise sources associated with hotel uses include HVAC, landscaping, trash removal, and truck deliveries. Stationary noise from the proposed hotel would likely be indistinguishable within the ambient noise environment due to the traffic noise from I-10, San Jose Avenue, and Indian Hill Boulevard, as well as from operational noise from nearby commercial and residential uses. In addition, the types and levels of noise generated from the proposed hotel would be similar to the systems associated with the existing motel. Therefore, stationary noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

\(^{21}\) These figures include a trip credit for existing uses on the site.

\(^{22}\) Estimates from Google-Earth Pro’s U.S. Daily Traffic Counts function.
Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential groundborne vibration and noise impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The proposed hotel in this planning area would not include any long-term vibration sources during on-going operations. Project construction, however, can generate varying degrees of ground vibration depending on the type of construction and equipment. Construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The effect on buildings near the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor building construction. Vibration can result in no perceptible effects at the lowest levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight building damage at the highest levels. Ground vibration from construction activities rarely reaches levels that can significantly damage structures, but it can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to a construction site. Groundborne vibration is usually highest during the demolition and grading phases of construction, when the heaviest equipment is utilized. Table 8 lists vibration levels for different types of construction equipment.
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### Table 8  Construction Equipment Vibration Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Approximate RMS(^1) Velocity Level at 25 Feet (VdB)</th>
<th>Approximate PPV Velocity at 25 Feet (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson Drilling</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Criteria – Annoyance</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Criteria – Architectural Damage</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.200 for Wood-Framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.500 for Reinforced Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FTA 2006.

\(^1\) RMS velocity calculated from vibration level (VdB) using the reference of 1 microinch/second and a crest factor of 4.

Section 16.154.020 (Noise and Vibration Standards), Sub-section J (Vibration) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code establishes a vibration threshold of 0.05 in/sec RMS to prevent annoyance at adjacent properties. Assuming a crest factor of 4, this is equivalent to 0.20 PPV or 106 VdB. Claremont’s threshold is equivalent to the FTA threshold for architectural damage, and is significantly higher than the FTA threshold for annoyance. Since the intention of Claremont’s vibration limit is to prevent annoyance, the FTA threshold was used in this analysis for vibration annoyance, to provide a conservative limit.

**Vibration Annoyance**

Vibration is typically noticed nearby when objects in a building generate noise from rattling windows or picture frames. It is typically not perceptible outdoors, and therefore, impacts are normally based on the distance to the nearest building (FTA 2006). Although the maximum vibration levels\(^{23}\) associated with certain construction activities could be perceptible in certain instances, the impact would be limited because those activities would not occur frequently throughout the day. Project construction would occur in the daytime when people are least sensitive to vibration levels and annoyance would only occur for a very limited duration when equipment would be working in close proximity. Further, construction activities would typically be distributed throughout the Project Site. Therefore, vibration annoyance impacts are based on average vibration levels (levels that would be experienced by sensitive receptors the majority of the time) that exceed the FTA’s significance threshold for vibration-induced annoyance of 78 VdB for residential land uses and 84 VdB for office uses.

Table 9 lists the average vibration levels for construction equipment anticipated to be used at the Project Site as measured to the nearest vibration-sensitive receptors.

\(^{23}\) Maximum vibration is based on construction equipment operating directly adjacent to the property line.
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Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration-Sensitive Equipment</th>
<th>Single-family residences to the north across San Jose Ave (250 feet)</th>
<th>Commercial building(^2) to west (280 feet)</th>
<th>Apartments to west beyond the adjacent commercial building (370 feet)</th>
<th>Dental office to the east across Indian Hill Boulevard (450 feet)</th>
<th>Claremont Lodge to the east across Indian Hill Boulevard (700 feet)</th>
<th>Motel 6 to the southeast across I-10 (870 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson Drilling</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold (VdB)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FTA 2006.

\(^1\) Distance measured from center of general construction area to nearest structure.

\(^2\) Existing uses include a dentistry office and pre-school.

As shown in Table 9, construction activity at the nearest sensitive receptors would not have the potential to exceed the vibration annoyance threshold of 78 VdB for residential/hotel uses or 84 VdB for office uses. More distant sensitive receptors would experience still lower levels of vibration. Therefore, vibration annoyance impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Vibration-Induced Architectural Damage**

In addition to vibration-induced annoyance, project-related construction vibration was evaluated for its potential to cause structural damage based on FTA’s architectural damage criteria. The FTA threshold of 0.20 PPV inch per second is the point at which there is a risk of architectural damage\(^{24}\) to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings. Typically, only construction equipment generating extremely high levels of vibration, such as pile drivers, has the potential for vibration-induced structural damage. No pile driving is expected to be required during project construction.

Table 10 shows the potential vibration levels (in PPV in inches/sec) that can be generated by heavy construction equipment at the nearest offsite sensitive receptors.

\(^{24}\) The term architectural damage is typically used to describe effects such as cracked plaster, cracks in drywall seams, sticking doors or windows, loosened baseboard/crown moldings, and the like.
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### Table 10  Construction Equipment Vibration Levels: Potential for Architectural Damage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Mobil Gas Station to the east (60 feet)</th>
<th>Commercial Building¹ to the west (75 feet)</th>
<th>BC Café to the east (100 feet)</th>
<th>Single-family residences to the north across San Jose Avenue (170 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson Drilling</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Architectural Damage Criteria²</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Existing uses adjacent to the Project Site to the west include a dentistry office and pre-school.
² FTA 2006.

As shown in Table 10, project-related construction activities would not result in vibration levels at nearby structures that exceed the FTA's pertinent criteria for vibration-induced architectural damage (i.e., 0.20 PPV in/sec for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings), which is the equivalent of the 0.05 in/sec RMS limit in the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. Therefore, construction activities are not expected to result in levels causing vibration-induced damage and these types of impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential noise impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 1

As described above in Section 3.12(a), operational noise levels related to the proposed hotel would not substantially increase the existing noise environment. Similarly, noise from project-related traffic along local roadways would not significantly increase noise levels in the project area and would likewise not result in a significant impact. Therefore, permanent noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Following is a discussion of the potential temporary noise impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Noise levels generated during construction are based on the type of equipment operating and the amount of equipment operating at the same time. Sensitivity to noise is based on the location of the equipment relative to sensitive receptors, time of day, and the duration of the noise-generating activities. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction: (1) mobile-source noise from the transport of workers, material deliveries, and debris/soil hauling and (2) onsite noise from use of construction equipment. Construction activities of the proposed hotel would last approximately 14 months in total, with demolition, grading, and utility trenching activities lasting approximately 4 months. The following discusses construction noise impacts to the nearby offsite sensitive receptors.

Construction Vehicles

The transport of workers and equipment to the construction site would incrementally increase noise levels along site access roadways; principally, San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard. Project-related construction worker vehicles, haul trucks, and vendor trucks would pass by existing residential uses along San Jose Avenue. It is anticipated that construction-related activities would generate, as a worst-case, a total of
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132 construction trips per day.\textsuperscript{25} The existing roadway volumes along the segments of San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard (in the vicinity of the Project Site) average approximately 9,000 to 30,000 daily vehicle trips, respectively.\textsuperscript{26} Thus, the number of construction worker and vendor trips would represent increases of one percent or less when compared to the volumes of traffic currently generated. This would equate to noise level increases of less than $\frac{1}{10}$ dB due to construction traffic increases. In addition, these truck trips would be spread throughout the work day and would primarily occur during non-peak traffic periods. Therefore, noise impacts from construction-related truck traffic would be less than significant at noise-sensitive receptors along the construction routes. No mitigation measures are necessary.

\textit{Construction Noise}

Noise generated during construction is based on the type of equipment used, the location of the equipment relative to sensitive receptors, and the timing and duration of the noise-generating activities.

\textit{Construction Equipment Sound Levels: General Construction}

Each stage of construction involves the use of different kinds of construction equipment and, therefore, has its own distinct noise characteristics. Noise levels from construction activities are dominated by the loudest piece of construction equipment, and the dominant noise source is typically the engine, although work piece noise (such as dropping of materials) can also be noticeable. Noise levels from project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (using the center of the general construction area) to the property line of the nearest sensitive receptors. These calculations are based on the expected construction equipment mix, are categorized by activity phase, and are consistent with the equipment mix used in the air quality assessment conducted for the propose hotel. The sound propagation portion of the calculations conservatively accounted for only spherical spreading loss (i.e., 6 dB per distance-doubling), while neglecting air absorption, attenuation from ground effects, and other potential sound losses.

\textit{Construction Noise: Nearest Residences}

Overall construction of the proposed hotel would occur over an approximately 14-month period. It is anticipated that of that time, the total duration for demolition, grading, and utility trenching activities would be 4 months. Therefore, the activities that would generate the highest noise levels would be would be relatively short in duration. In addition, completion of the exterior shell of the buildings would attenuate noise from interior construction activities. The results of the construction noise calculations for the indicated phases of construction are provided in Table 11.

\textsuperscript{25} The 132 trips per day comprise total worker and vendor trip ends generated during overlap of building demo, asphalt demo, and pool demo phases. This estimation was based on the methodology in CalEEMod (ver. 2013.2.2) for calculating construction worker and vendor trips and it is consistent with the air quality assessment.

\textsuperscript{26} Estimates from Google-Earth Pro’s U.S. Daily Traffic Counts function.
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Table 11  Exterior Construction Noise Levels at Nearby Sensitive Receptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Single-family residences to the north across San Jose Avenue (250 feet)</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Levels (dBA L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial building&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; to the west (280 feet)</td>
<td>Apartments to the west beyond adjacent commercial building (370 feet)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building + Asphalt + Pool Demo+ Site prep</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Demo + site Prep</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Grading</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Grading</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Trenching</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing /Landscaping</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: The predicted noise levels at the nearest residential receptors are calculated based on conservatively assuming only sound attenuation due to distance (i.e., neglecting atmospheric attenuation, ground absorption effects, or reductions due to barriers or intervening buildings).

1. Average distance measured from center of the general construction area to the property line of the receptor.

2. Existing uses include a dentistry office and preschool.

As shown in Table 11, average noise levels from construction activities at the nearest residences would range from 61 to 72 dBA L<sub>eq</sub>. Additionally, average noise levels from construction activities at the adjacent preschool would range from 60 to 71 dBA L<sub>eq</sub>. There may be instances where noise-sensitive receptors would be exposed to higher levels of noise from construction equipment operation. However, these moments would be sporadic and limited during the demolition, grading, and site preparation phases of construction; primarily when large construction equipment passes by. Moreover, exposure time from such pass-bys would be brief, and the maximum noise levels at the residential property line would lessen as the passing piece of construction equipment moved farther away. Additionally, the project applicant would be required to comply with Section 16.154.020 (Noise and Vibration Standards) of the City’ Municipal Code, which limits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM, provided that noise levels on residential properties, do not exceed 65 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any one hour, 70 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 10 minutes in any one hour, 79 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any one hour or 80 dBA at any time.

Although construction activities would generally be restricted to the least noise-sensitive portions of the day, they could potentially exceed the construction noise level limits set by the City. Therefore, without mitigation, project-related construction noise impacts to the surrounding residences and adjacent preschool would be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, impacts due to construction noise would be reduced to less than significant.
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Mitigation Measures

NOI-1 Prior to the issuance of demolition and grading permits, the project applicant shall conduct a construction noise analysis once the final construction equipment list that will be used for demolition and grading activities is determined. The construction noise analysis shall be submitted to the Claremont’s Community Development staff for review and approval. If the analysis determines that demolition and grading activities would exceed the City’s construction noise standards, as outlined in Subsection 16.154.020.F.4 of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, then specific measures to attenuate the noise impact and meet the City's noise standards shall be outlined in the construction-noise analysis, reviewed and approved by the City, and implemented by the project applicant. Due to the sensitive nature of the pre-school adjacent to the southwestern site boundary (which includes an outdoor play area), as well as the residential uses to the north across San Jose Avenue, potential noise-reduction measures to be implemented may include a temporary noise barrier along the western and/or northern boundary of the construction site. The actual height and material of the noise barrier(s), as well as any other type of noise-reduction measure(s) to be implemented, shall be determined by the specific construction noise analyses and designed so as to achieve the aforementioned noise standards. Additionally, the final measures shall be placed on the cover sheet of all demolition and grading plans and shall be discussed at the pre-demolition and pre-grading meetings. The noise-reduction measures to be implemented herein are in addition to the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure NOI-2.

NOI-2 Prior to the issuance of demolition and grading permits, the following noise-reduction measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of the construction phase. The measures shall be placed on the cover sheet of all demolition and grading plans and shall be discussed at the pre-demolition and pre-grading meetings. The noise-reduction measures to be implemented herein are in addition to the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

- Construction activities shall comply with all requirements of the City’s Noise Ordinance (Subsection 16.154.020.F.4 [Noise and Vibration Standards, Exemptions] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code), as well as the following:
  - Restrict construction activities to daily operation between 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM Monday through Friday and 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays. There shall be no work on Sundays and federal holidays.
  - Noise levels, as measured on residential properties, do not exceed 65 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour, 70 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 10 minutes in any hour, and 79 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 10 minutes in any hour, or 80 dBA at any time.
  - A construction site notice shall be posted near the construction site access point or in an area that is clearly visible to the public. The notice shall include the following:
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job site address; permit number, name, and phone number of the contractor and owner; dates and duration of construction activities; construction hours allowed; and the City and construction contractor phone numbers where noise complaints can be reported and logged. If a credible complaint is received regarding construction noise levels at nearby sensitive uses (e.g., residential properties, preschool), the complaint shall be investigated by the City. If this initial investigation indicates a potential violation of the City’s noise standards, the City shall retain a noise monitoring professional – at the project applicant’s sole expense – to monitor construction noise levels periodically for two days (as soon as reasonable following the day the complaint is received) to ensure that the construction activities are being conducted in accordance with the noise standards outlined in Subsection 16.154.020.F.4 of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code.

- Ensure that all construction equipment is monitored and properly maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations to minimize noise.
- Fit all construction equipment with properly-operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds, no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer, to minimize noise emissions.
- If construction equipment is equipped with back-up alarm shut offs, switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters, as feasible.
- Stationary equipment (such as generators and air compressors) and equipment maintenance and staging areas shall be located as far from existing noise-sensitive land uses, as feasible.
- To the extent feasible, use acoustic enclosures, shields, or shrouds for stationary equipment such as compressors and pumps.
- Shut off generators when generators are not needed and limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible.
- Coordinate deliveries to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to unload and idling for long periods of time.
- Grade surface irregularities on construction sites to prevent potholes from causing vehicular noise.
- Minimize the use of impact devices such as jackhammers, pavement breakers, and hoe rams. Where possible, use concrete crushers or pavement saws rather than hoe rams for tasks such as concrete or asphalt demolition and removal.
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Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development is currently anticipated and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. The nearest airports to the Project Site are Cable Airport in the City of Upland, a private airstrip located approximately 2.7 miles northeast of the site; Brackett Field in the City of La Verne, a general aviation airport located approximately 3.2 miles northwest of the site; and Ontario International Airport in the City of Ontario, approximately 8 miles southeast of the site.

Measured noise contours associated with Cable Airport operations shown in Figure 6-7 (Cable Airport Noise Contours) of the City’s General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element indicate critical noise contours do not impact any neighborhoods in Claremont, including the Project Site. Additionally, measured noise contours associated with Brackett Field and Ontario International Airport operations shown in the Brackett Field Airport Influence Area exhibit of the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan and Policy Map 2-3 (Noise Impact Zones) of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan of the Ontario International Airport, respectively, indicate that critical noise contours of these airport do not impact any neighborhoods in Claremont, including the Project Site.

Following is a discussion of the potential airport-related noise impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would not expose hotel workers or guests to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts due to aircraft noise would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.12(e), above.

Additionally, there are no heliports adjacent to or within the vicinity of the Project Site; the closest heliport to the Project Site is San Antonio Regional Hospital Heliport in the City of Upland (Airnav.com 2015), approximately five miles northeast of the site. Over congested areas, helicopters are required to maintain an altitude of at least 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within 2,000 feet of the aircraft, except as needed for takeoff and landing (Code of Federal Regulations Title 14 Section 91.119). Additionally, helicopter takeoffs and landings are at a sufficient distance from the Project Site. Furthermore, the Project Site is not within the flight path of the heliport and helicopter takeoffs and landings at this private airstrip are infrequent.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would not expose hotel workers or guests to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise at the San Antonio Regional Hospital Heliport. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential population growth impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

No residential development is proposed under the Specific Plan; therefore, the Specific Plan would not directly induce population growth in the area. Under the Specific Plan, a new 121-room Hampton Inn & Suites hotel would replace the existing 64-room Knights Inn motel. The increase in hospitality use onsite (provision of 53 additional guest rooms) would not induce population growth in the area as the use would not result in the provision of permanent housing; as with the exiting motel, the proposed hotel would provide short-term stay for hotel guests.

Additionally, the increases in hospitality use proposed onsite under the Specific Plan (increased hotel size and guest rooms) would not indirectly induce population growth in the area or surrounding region, as the employment growth induced by the proposed hotel would not be substantial. Additionally, it is anticipated that the employment growth induced by the proposed hotel would be accommodated by residents of Claremont and the surrounding region. The construction phase of the proposed hotel would also generate some temporary employment. The unemployment rate in Los Angeles County in August 2015 was estimated at 7.5 percent (EDD 2015); therefore, the proposed hotel’s operational- and construction-related employment is expected to be absorbed from the regional labor force and would not attract new workers into Claremont.
or the surrounding region. Therefore, the proposed hotel’s operational- and construction-related employment generation is not expected to adversely affect population growth in the area.

Furthermore, because the Project Site is an urban infill site, development of the proposed hotel would not induce population growth through the extension of roads or infrastructure.

Therefore, no significant impacts to population and housing would occur as a result of the proposed hotel development and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning area and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** No housing exists on the Project Site. As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the Project Site is developed with commercial uses (hotel, restaurant, and gas station) and their related site improvements (e.g., parking areas, drive aisles, landscaping).

**Planning Area 1**

Based on the preceding, development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would not result (either directly or indirectly) in the displacement of housing or people. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, because no development would occur and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.13(b), above.

### 3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. Fire protection and emergency medical services are provided to the City of Claremont (including the Project Site) by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD). The City is served by three fire stations: Station 101 at 606 W. Bonita Avenue, Station 102 at 2040 Sumner Avenue, and Station 62 at 3710 N. Mills Avenue. The closest fire station to the Project Site is Station 101, approximately 1.2 miles north of the Project Site. LACFD also provides fire protection services to the City of Pomona south of Claremont and has mutual aid agreements with all of the other fire departments in Los Angeles County, including the La Verne Fire Department. In the event of an emergency at the Project Site that required more resources than Station 102 could provide, LACFD would direct resources to the site from other LACFD stations nearby and, if needed, would request assistance from other nearby fire departments.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services as a result of development and redevelopment activities accommodated under the Specific Plan.

### Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical service. However, the increase would not be much greater than the calls
that could be generated by the existing motel. Additionally, considering the existing firefighting resources available in and near the City of Claremont, as discussed above, project impacts on fire protection and emergency services are not expected to occur. The City also involves LACFD in the development review process in order to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into development projects. All proposed hotel site and building improvements would be subject to review and approval by LACFD prior to building permit and certificate of occupancy issuance.

Additionally, the hotel building will be fully sprinklered. Fire hydrants would also be installed at key locations internal to the site, as required by the Los Angeles County Fire Department to meet the hose-pull requirements and provide adequate fire access for the proposed hotel.

Furthermore, during the City’s development review process, the project applicant would be required to comply with the requirements in effect at the time building permits are issued, including the provision of adequate fire flow, number, and location of hydrants, building clearances, and street and driveway/aisle turning radii for access, as well as payment of the Fire Facilities Impact Fee outlined in Section 16.203.010 (Imposition and Payment of a Fire Facilities Impact Fee) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. As stated in Section 16.203.010, in order to meet the fire protection service needs of new development and to maintain adequate fire service levels within the City, the Fire Facilities Impact Fee pays new development’s fair share of the costs of constructing and equipping new fire protection facilities. Currently, the Fire Facilities Impact Fee is $0.20 per square foot of building area.

Finally, development of the proposed hotel is required to comply with the most current adopted fire code, building code, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City of Claremont and LACFD. For example, the City has adopted by reference the 2014 Los Angeles County Fire Code for the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (Title 32, Los Angeles County Code) in Chapter 15.20 (Fire Prevention) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, for the purpose of prescribing regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and property from hazardous materials or explosion (as well as fire). Compliance with these codes and standards is ensured through the City’s and LACFD’s development review and building plan check process.

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not have a significant impact on fire protection and emergency services and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Implementation of these improvements would not result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical service. Therefore, no impacts on fire protection and emergency services would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Claremont Police Department (CPD) provides police protection to the City of Claremont (including the Project Site). CPD operates out of its facility at 570 West Bonita Avenue in Claremont, approximately 1.2 miles north of the Project Site. Per the most recent police services information and numbers provided by CPD, CPD is staffed by 39 full-time sworn officers, 1 part-time detective (sworn) position, and 37 non-sworn staff.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to police protection and services as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would result in an increase in calls for police services service. However, the increase would not be much greater than the calls that could be generated by the existing motel. Additionally, development of the proposed hotel is not expected to cause a need for new or expanded police facilities or additional officers.

Police operations are also financed through the City's General Fund, whose revenue sources include property taxes, sales taxes, and citations. Development of the proposed hotel would result in a direct increase in revenue to the City’s General Fund in the form of property and sales taxes, which would partially offset any police services impacts generated by the proposed hotel.

Additionally, the City involves CPD in the development review process in order to ensure that the necessary police protection features are incorporated into development projects. All site and building improvements of the proposed hotel would be subject to review and approval by CPD.

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not have a significant impact on police services and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area serving the restaurant. Implementation of these improvements would not result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical service. Therefore, no impacts on police services would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

c) Schools?

No Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to schools as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The increase in the student generation and the need for new or the expansion of existing school facilities is tied to population growth. No residential development is proposed under the Specific Plan, and development of the proposed hotel is not expected to generate an increase in the student population in the area. Therefore, no impacts to schools would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Parks?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.15(a), below

e) Other public facilities

No Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to other public facilities, such as libraries, as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The need for new or the expansion of existing library services and facilities is tied to population growth. No residential development is proposed under the Specific Plan, and development of the proposed hotel is not expected to generate a need for new or additional library services or facilities. Therefore, no impacts to libraries would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:

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?

No Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to parks and recreational facilities as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

The increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities and the need for new or the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities is tied to population growth. No residential development is proposed under the Specific Plan; therefore, no population growth or increase in the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities would occur. Additionally, guests of the proposed hotel would have access to recreational uses onsite, including an outdoor pool area and covered spa, and a fitness center. Therefore, no impact on parks and recreational facilities would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.15(a), above.

3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Environmental Analysis

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix G to this Initial Study:


**Analysis:**

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** PlaceWorks prepared a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the Proposed Project in accordance with the City’s requirements (see Appendix G). The purpose of the TIA was to evaluate the potential traffic and circulation impacts associated with the Proposed Project on the surrounding roadway system, and recommend improvements to mitigate impacts (if any) considered significant in comparison to established regulatory thresholds determined by the City of Claremont and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Existing traffic conditions were used as the “baseline” for the analysis in the TIA and to evaluate the potential impacts of the Proposed Project.

Following is a discussion on the findings and conclusions of the TIA.

**Traffic Analysis**

**Intersection Analysis**

**Definition of Level of Service**

Roadway capacity is generally limited by the ability to move vehicles through intersections. A level of service (LOS) is a standard performance measurement to describe the operating characteristics of a street system in terms of the level of congestion or delay experienced by motorists. Service levels range from A through F, which relate to traffic conditions from best (LOS A: uncongested, free-flowing conditions) to worst (LOS F: total breakdown with stop-and-go operation).

**Intersection Level of Service**

The methodology used to assess the operation of a signalized intersection was based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010, which is the latest method to evaluate intersection LOS. The intersection LOS analysis is based on the traffic volumes observed during the peak hour conditions. The peak hours selected for analysis are the highest volumes that occur in four consecutive 15-minute periods from 7 to 9 AM and from 4 to 6 PM on weekdays. Per the HCM methodology, overall average intersection delay at signalized intersections was calculated, and the worst-case approach delay was calculated at unsignalized intersections. The level of service corresponds to the delay calculated. Table 12 describes the level of service concept and the operating conditions expected under each level of service for signalized intersections.
### Table 12  Level of Service Descriptions for Signalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Control Delay (seconds/vehicle)</th>
<th>Level of Service For V/C 1.0</th>
<th>Level of Service for V/C&gt;1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 to 10.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.01 to 20.00</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.01 to 35.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.01 to 55.00</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55.01 to 80.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>80.01 and up</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.  
Notes: V/C = volume per capacity ratio

For unsignalized all-way stop intersections, the LOS criteria is based on the weighted average control delay, and for two-way or side-street stop-controlled intersections, LOS is based on the worst approach. Table 13 presents the LOS criteria according to the corresponding control delay.

### Table 13  Level of Service Descriptions for Unsignalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Control Delay (seconds/vehicle)</th>
<th>Level of Service For V/C 1.0</th>
<th>Level of Service for V/C&gt;1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 to 10.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.01 to 15.00</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.01 to 25.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.01 to 35.00</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>35.01 to 50.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>50.01 and up</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.  
Notes: V/C = volume per capacity ratio

**Acceptable LOS and Thresholds of Significance**

The City’s General Plan Community Mobility Element has established LOS “E” as the minimum level of service for intersections along major arterial roads such as Indian Hills Boulevard, and LOS D along secondary arterial roads such as San Jose Avenue. In addition, an intersection is considered to be operating at a deficient level of service if the volume per capacity ratio (v/c) is equal or greater than 1.00. When traffic from a proposed development causes an intersection to operate at an unacceptable level of service, mitigation measures are required to meet City’s standards. The City of Claremont has not adopted thresholds of significance to evaluate traffic impacts from land use development projects.

In addition, the I-10 interchange intersections at Indian Hill Boulevard are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (2002) states that Caltrans endeavors to maintain an LOS at the transition between “C” and “D” target at intersections of state highway facilities. This equates to an average control delay per vehicle of less than 35 seconds. However, in the Interstate 10 Transportation Concept Report (Caltrans 2013), Caltrans acknowledges that due to financial, environmental,
right-of-way and political constraints, it is very difficult to continue to add more lanes to the freeway system. With these limitations, as stated in page 3 of the Interstate 10 Transportation Concept Report, Caltrans District 7 office has established LOS F as the minimum acceptable level of service on the freeway system. For the purpose of identifying deficiencies and traffic impacts in the TIA, the acceptable level of service at freeway interchange intersections was LOS E, consistent with the City of Claremont’s standards at intersections along Indian Hills Boulevard and the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP).

The City has not adopted thresholds of significance to evaluate traffic impacts from land use development projects. For the TIA, the thresholds of significance were derived from the Los Angeles County CMP Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines. A significant traffic impact would occur if:

- The proposed project increases traffic demand on a facility by 2 percent (increase in v/c greater than or equal to 0.02), causing the facility to operate at unacceptable level of service.
- The proposed project increases traffic demand on a facility by 2 percent (increase in v/c greater than or equal to 0.02) that already operates at unacceptable level of service.

**Study Area Intersections and Traffic Analysis Scenarios**

The TIA analyzed existing and future weekday daily, AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions at five study area intersections and the Project Site’s existing access driveways (see Figure 2 [Study Area Roadway Network and Intersections] of the TIA). The study area was defined based on the calculated project trip generation and distribution in consultation with City of Claremont Engineering Division staff. Intersection included:

- Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue
- Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps
- Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps
- Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive
- Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue
- Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue
- Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue
- Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3

The study area intersections were analyzed under the following traffic scenarios:

- Existing Without Project Traffic Condition
- Existing Plus Project Traffic Condition
- Opening Year (2017) Without Project Traffic Condition
- Opening Year (2017) Plus Project Traffic Condition
- Long Range (2035) Without Project Traffic Condition
- Long Range (2035) Plus Project Traffic Condition
3. Environmental Analysis

Additionally, a total of 40 planned and/or approved cumulative projects in the cities of Claremont, Montclair, Upland and Pomona were considered in the cumulative traffic analysis of the TIA. Figure 9 (Cumulative Developments Location Map) of the TIA depicts the location of the cumulative projects (see Appendix G).

Project Trip Generation

The trip generation for the existing motel and the proposed hotel were calculated based on the trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 9th Edition. Table 14 shows the trip generation rates for the AM and PM peak hours and daily for motel and hotel uses. Table 15 presents the Proposed Project’s trip generation; the table shows the net traffic increase resulting from operation of the proposed hotel versus the existing motel. As shown in Table 15, the proposed hotel is expected to generate approximately 629 vehicle trips on a typical weekday, with 36 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 43 trips occurring during the PM peak hour.

Table 14  Trip Generation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.

1 Based on rates included in the ITE’s Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition.

Table 15  Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trip Generation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.

Existing Without Project Traffic Condition

Weekday AM and PM peak hour turn movement volumes were collected at the study-area intersections and project access driveways on November 5, 2015. The Existing Without Project traffic condition intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 16. As shown in this table, all study area intersections currently operate at an acceptable level of service during the AM and PM peak hours under the Existing Without Project traffic condition.
3. Environmental Analysis

Table 16  Existing Without Project Intersection Delay and LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.2  C</td>
<td>26.2  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>25.8  C</td>
<td>29.2  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>25.8  C</td>
<td>23.4  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>18.1  B</td>
<td>20.0  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>11.5  B</td>
<td>13.6  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>11.2  B</td>
<td>13.3  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>10.8  B</td>
<td>12.2  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>14.9  B</td>
<td>15.6  C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.

Notes: All intersections except Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps and East Bound Ramps are under jurisdiction of the City of Claremont; these two intersections are under Caltrans' jurisdiction.

**Existing Plus Project Traffic Condition**

To assess the Existing Plus Project traffic condition, existing traffic was combined with project traffic. The intersection operations for the Existing Plus Project traffic condition are shown in Table 17. As shown in this table, all study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service during the peak hours under the Existing Plus Project traffic condition; the Proposed Project would result in only small increases in delay at the study intersections. However, addition of the Proposed Project's traffic would not result in a significant impact at any of the study area intersections under the Existing Plus Project traffic condition.

Table 17  Existing Plus Project Intersection Delay and LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.4  C</td>
<td>26.1  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>23.7  C</td>
<td>29.3  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>23.8  C</td>
<td>23.7  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>18.2  B</td>
<td>19.5  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>11.5  B</td>
<td>13.6  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>10.9  B</td>
<td>11.9  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>15.1  C</td>
<td>16.0  C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.

Notes: All intersections except Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps and East Bound Ramps are under jurisdiction of the City of Claremont; these two intersections are under Caltrans' jurisdiction.
3. Environmental Analysis

Opening Year (2017) Without Project Traffic Condition

To assess future background traffic conditions at the time of project opening year (2017), existing traffic was combined with the anticipated ambient growth and the traffic from cumulative projects anticipated being operational in 2017. The Opening Year (2017) Without Project traffic condition intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 18. As shown in this table, all study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service during the AM and PM peak hours under the Opening Year (2017) Without Project traffic condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Average Delay (sec/veh)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour LOS</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Average Delay (sec/veh)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.
Notes: All intersections except Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps and East Bound Ramps are under jurisdiction of the City of Claremont; these two intersections are under Caltrans' jurisdiction.

Opening Year (2017) Plus Project Traffic Condition

To assess future traffic conditions with the Proposed Project at the time of project opening year (2017), project traffic was added to the background 2017 traffic condition. The intersection operations for the Opening Year (2017) Plus Project traffic condition are shown in Table 19. As shown in this table, all study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service during the peak hours under the Opening Year (2017) Plus Project traffic condition; the Proposed Project would result in only small increases in delay at the study intersections. However, addition of the Proposed Project’s traffic would not result in a significant impact at any of the study area intersections under the Opening Year (2017) Plus Project traffic condition.
3. Environmental Analysis

### Table 19  Opening Year (2017) Plus Project Intersection Delay and LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.9 C</td>
<td>26.9 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>27.9 C</td>
<td>33.8 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>29.7 C</td>
<td>27.8 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.6 C</td>
<td>23.1 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>13.1 B</td>
<td>13.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>11.0 B</td>
<td>12.0 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>15.2 C</td>
<td>16.2 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.

Notes: All intersections except Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps and East Bound Ramps are under jurisdiction of the City of Claremont; these two intersections are under Caltrans’ jurisdiction.

### Long Range (2035) Without Project Traffic Condition

To assess future background traffic conditions at the time of project opening year (2017), existing traffic was combined with the anticipated ambient growth and the traffic from cumulative projects anticipated being operational in 2035. The Long Range (2035) Without Project traffic condition intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 20. As shown in this table, all study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service during the AM and PM peak hours under the Long Range (2025) Without Project traffic condition.

### Table 20  Long Range (2035) Without Project Intersection Delay and LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>28.3 C</td>
<td>30.6 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>53.9 D</td>
<td>61.2 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>42.6 D</td>
<td>39.3 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>23.7 C</td>
<td>27.0 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>11.8 B</td>
<td>15.9 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>11.9 B</td>
<td>15.3 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>11.6 B</td>
<td>13.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>17.4 C</td>
<td>18.4 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.

Notes: All intersections except Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps and East Bound Ramps are under jurisdiction of the City of Claremont; these two intersections are under Caltrans’ jurisdiction.
3. Environmental Analysis

**Long Range (2035) Plus Project Traffic Condition**

To assess future traffic conditions with the Proposed Project at the time of project opening year (2017), project traffic was added to the background 2035 traffic condition. The intersection operations for the Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition are shown in Table 21. As shown in this table, all study area intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service during the peak hours under the Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition; the Proposed Project would result in only small increases in delay at the study intersections. However, addition of the Proposed Project’s traffic would not result in a significant impact at any of the study area intersections under Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>28.5 C</td>
<td>31.1 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>55.9 E</td>
<td>64.3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>42.7 D</td>
<td>39.9 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Auto Center Drive</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>23.5 C</td>
<td>29.3 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at American Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>11.9 B</td>
<td>16.0 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 1 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>11.6 B</td>
<td>13.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Driveway 2 at San Jose Avenue</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill Boulevard at Site Driveway 3</td>
<td>Cross Street Stop</td>
<td>17.5 C</td>
<td>19.0 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PlaceWorks 2016.
Notes: All intersections except Indian Hill Boulevard at I-10 Westbound Ramps and East Bound Ramps are under jurisdiction of the City of Claremont; these two intersections are under Caltrans’ jurisdiction.

**Transit Analysis**

The number of person trips that would be generated by the proposed hotel was calculated according to the LA County CMP guidelines. The CMP guidelines recommend estimating the number of person trips by multiplying the project’s peak hour traffic estimate by 1.4 times vehicle trips. This would equate to 102 person trips (73 x 1.4) under the Proposed Project during the highest peak hour, which is the PM peak hour. The number of transit trips generated would be 3.5 percent of the total person trips. Therefore, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 4 transit trips (102 x 0.035) during the PM peak hour. Foothill Transit provides transit service in the study area with bus routes 480 and 855 along Indian Hill Boulevard. As the number of transit trips generated by the Proposed Project would be minimal, it is anticipated that the existing transit service in the project area would be able to accommodate the project-generated transit trips. The existing public transit system would not be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Access Driveway Analysis

Vehicular access into the Project Site is currently provided via two full-access (all turning movements permitted) driveways off of San Jose Avenue and two restricted-access driveways (right-in/right-out only permitted) off of Indian Hill Boulevard (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). The northern access driveway on Indian Hill provides a wider and direct two-way access to the motel area as opposed to the southern driveway, which is narrow, one-way and leads to the car wash area of the gas station and its parking area.

Under the Proposed Project, vehicular access to the Project Site would be modified to eliminate the existing eastern access driveway off of San Jose Avenue (see Figures 3 and 7, Conceptual Site Plan); the other three driveways would remain and continue to serve the Project Site. The following discusses the future access operations at the San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard driveways with addition of the Proposed Project under the Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition, which would be the worst-case scenario because traffic volumes on adjacent streets would be higher.

Access to Indian Hill Boulevard

The northern right-in/right-out access driveway off of Indian Hill Boulevard (see Figure 3) would continue to be available as a right-in/right-out driveway upon development of the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1; no changes to this access driveway would be implemented under the Proposed Project. During the AM peak hour, it is projected that 27 vehicles would enter the Project Site and 28 vehicles would leave the site via this access driveway. The delay at the access driveway is anticipated to be minimal and it would operate at LOS A under the Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition. The access driveway would adequately accommodate all volumes generated under the Proposed Project with its current design, which includes one entry and one exit lane. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Access to San Jose Avenue

Access into and out of the Project Site from San Jose Avenue would be provided via the existing western full-access driveway off of San Jose Avenue (see Figures 3 and 7). Elimination of the eastern access driveway near the intersection of San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard would improve vehicular circulation, because it would eliminate conflicting movements in the influence area of the intersection of Indian Hill Boulevard at San Jose Avenue. Compared to the existing eastern access driveway on San Jose Avenue, the western access driveway provides better access to the Project Site from San Jose Avenue because it is farther from the intersection San Jose Avenue/Indian Hill Boulevard intersection, and left-turn storage on San Jose Avenue for the westbound left turn lane into the Project Site can accommodate three cars.

Vehicular queuing for the western full-access driveway was analyzed in the TIA to assess the potential for vehicles to enter the Project Site by making the left turn into the site via the San Jose Avenue access driveway. As stated in the TIA, due to relatively low volumes on San Jose Avenue, vehicles would find adequate gaps to perform left and right turns into and out of the Project Site with only one driveway off of San Jose Avenue. During the AM peak hour, it is projected that 48 vehicles would make a left turn into the Project Site from San Jose Avenue via the access driveway. In this case, the number of westbound vehicles on San Jose Avenue opposing the westbound left turn would be 421. During the PM peak hour, 41 vehicles would access the
Project Site by making a left turn into the site via the San Jose Avenue access driveway. In this case, the number of westbound vehicles on San Jose Avenue opposing the westbound left turn would be 532. As stated in the TIA, there would be sufficient gaps to prevent a substantial vehicular backup in the queue. Therefore, the westbound left turn into the Project Site off of San Jose Avenue is expected to operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours under the Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition. Therefore, the storage on the westbound left turn lane on San Jose Avenue would be adequate to handle the anticipated traffic under the Proposed Project.

Additionally, there would be approximately 19 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 21 vehicles in the PM peak hour exiting the Project Site onto San Jose Avenue via the western access driveway. This would result in approximately one vehicle every three minutes, and the majority would be right turns. As stated in the TIA, there would be little queueing onsite and the access driveway would operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours under the Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic condition. The access driveway would be adequate for vehicles exiting with one shared right and left turn, and no excessive internal queuing or delays for vehicles exiting the Project Site would occur.

Therefore, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Internal Circulation Analysis**

The current internal vehicular circulation plan consists of a number of asphalt-paved drive aisles that serve the parking areas on the south and north portions of the Project Site. The existing vehicular circulation plan has a point where the east-west and north-south access driveways intersect just north of the gas station (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*). The proposed vehicular circulation plan would include an improved system of north/south and east/west asphalt-paved drive aisles. The proposed circulation plan includes two points of vehicular entry into the hotel parking area from within the project site—the current entry point near the area where the drive aisles for the restaurant, gas station, and hotel meet on the eastern end of the Project Site and a new entry point near the proposed outdoor pool area (see Figure 7, *Conceptual Site Plan*). The new circulation plan under the Proposed Project would improve internal circulation by providing an additional access to the hotel parking area, by providing a loop that would reduce the need for back-up maneuvers to turn around, and by improving access for emergency vehicles (e.g., fire trucks, police vehicles). The proposed circulation plan also improves vehicular circulation for the hotel patrons, as the additional entry point into the hotel area would reduce occurrences of conflicting movements at the existing location near the gas station where all three internal drive aisles intersect; the additional access to the hotel area would reduce the amount of vehicles at that internal intersection location.

Additionally, as previously discussed, the Proposed Project would generate 64 trips during the AM peak hour and 73 trips during the PM peak hour. Given the relatively low volumes that would be generated, the internal proposed circulation plan would adequately accommodate the amount of traffic utilizing the internal drive aisles.

Therefore, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Conclusion

As demonstrated above, no significant traffic or circulation impacts would occur as a result of development of the Proposed Project and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Alternative Modes of Transportation Analysis

Alternative modes of transportation are further discussed below in Section 3.16(f).

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?

No Impact. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was created statewide as a result of Proposition 111 and has been implemented locally by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). The CMP in effect in Los Angeles County was issued by Metro in 2010. The CMP requires that the traffic impact of individual development projects of potential regional significance be analyzed. A specific system of arterial roadways plus all freeways comprise the CMP system. A total of 164 intersections are identified for monitoring on the system in Los Angeles County. The LOS standard in the CMP system in Los Angeles County is LOS E.

According to the CMP Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines developed by MTA, a CMP traffic impact analysis is required given the following conditions:

- CMP arterial monitoring intersections, including monitored freeway on- or off-ramp intersections, where the proposed project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours.

- CMP freeway monitoring locations where the proposed project would add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on the CMP system as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

CMP Intersection Analysis

Planning Area 1

As stated in the TIA prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix G), the nearest CMP facility (on-/off-ramp intersections) to the Project Site is Arrow Highway at Indian Hill Boulevard, approximately 0.5 mile north of the site. Based on the project trip generation and distribution provided in the TIA, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would add less than 20 peak hour trips to this CMP intersection during the peak hours; the number of trips would be less than the 50 vehicle-trip threshold called for in the CMP TIA Guidelines.
In addition, I-10 is a CMP monitoring location; I-10 abuts the southern boundary of the Project Site (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). As shown in Table 15, Project Trip Generation, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would generate 43 trips during the PM peak hour; the number of trips would be less than the 150 vehicle-trip threshold. Due to the nominal increase in traffic of up to 11 peak hour trips on each freeway segment, the effect of the project on freeway operations would be negligible. Additionally, because the Proposed Project would not contribute to more than 50 peak trips to the freeway mainline segments of I-10, merge/diverge and mainline analyses are not required.

Therefore, when considering Los Angeles County CMP criteria, no further review of potential CMP traffic impacts to intersections or freeway monitoring locations is required. Additionally, the Proposed Project is not considered a project of regional significance. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

CMP Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis

Planning Area 1

As stated above, the nearest CMP facilities (freeway mainline segments) to the Project Site include I-10, west of Indian Hill Boulevard. As concluded in the TIA, it is projected that the proposed project would not add 150 or more trips to this CMP facilities during the AM or PM peak hour; therefore, no CMP traffic impact analysis is required. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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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?

No Impact. The nearest airports to the Project Site are Cable Airport in the City of Upland, a private airstrip located approximately 2.4 miles northeast of the site; Brackett Field in the City of La Verne, a general aviation airport located approximately 3.1 miles northwest of the site; and Ontario International Airport in the City of Ontario, approximately 5.8 miles southeast of the site.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 6-5 (Cable Airport Safety Zones) of the City's General Plan Public Safety and Noise Element, and per the Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (WVPA ALUC1981), the Project Site is not within the Cable Airport land use plan. The Project Site is also not within the airport land use plan for Brackett Field (LAC ALUC 2004) or for Ontario International Airport (ONT-IAC 2011). Additionally, none of the runways for the aforementioned airports are aligned with or in proximity of the Project Site and the airports do not direct heavy air traffic over the site.

Furthermore, development in this planning area includes a proposed hotel, which would not result in an increase in air traffic levels of any of the aforementioned airports. Therefore, project development would not cause any changes in traffic pattern that would lead to safety risks at either airport. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts due to a design feature or incompatible uses as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 7, Conceptual Site Plan, vehicular access to the proposed hotel would be provided via a full-access driveway off of San Jose Avenue and via the northern restricted-access driveway off of Indian Hill Boulevard, which are both existing driveways. Some hardscape and landscape improvements would be made to the full-access driveway off of San Jose Avenue. The existing full-access driveway adjacent to the
restaurant in Planning Area 2 (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph) would be removed, as detailed below under the Planning Area 2 discussion.

The proposed vehicular circulation plan for the hotel would include an improved system of north/south and east/west asphalt-paved drive aisles (see Figure 7). The new circulation plan would also eliminate the dead-end drive aisle situation that currently exists near the southwestern end of the existing motel (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph) by providing a looped circulation system that would eliminate the need for vehicular back-up maneuvers to turn around. Additionally, the proposed circulation plan improves vehicular circulation for the hotel patrons, as the additional access point into the hotel parking area would reduce the occurrence of conflicting vehicular movements and amount of vehicles at the intersecting point where the drive aisles for the restaurant, gas station and hotel meet. The proposed hotel would also provide a network of narrow low-speed internal drive aisles that would be safe and walkable for pedestrians, while maintaining an efficient circulation system for vehicles.

Furthermore, the City of Claremont and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) have adopted roadway design standards that preclude the construction of any unsafe design features. The design and construction of the proposed access and circulation improvements (e.g., drive aisles, sidewalks), would be required to adhere to the City of Claremont’s Standard Engineering Plans and LACFD’s design standards, which are imposed on project developments by the City’s Engineering Division and LACFD during the building permit and development review process. Compliance with these established design standards would ensure that hazards due to project design features would not occur, and that improvements to the full-access driveways off of San Jose Avenue and placement of the internal drive aisles and intersections would not create a conflict for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists traveling within the Project Site or along San Jose Avenue, or for those exiting the Project Site.

Finally, the Proposed Project would not include incompatible uses such as farm equipment on area roadways. Therefore, no impacts resulting from hazards due to any onsite design features or incompatible uses would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

At this time, some of the vehicular access and circulation improvements associated with the existing restaurant in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, as shown in Figure 107, the existing full-access driveway adjacent to the restaurant (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph) would be removed in order to provide improved vehicular access into and out of the Project Site from San Jose Avenue; the area of the existing driveway to be removed would be improved with landscaping and hardscape improvements. Other improvements would occur along the western portion of the parking area that serves the existing restaurant in order to accommodate new parking and circulation improvements needed to serve the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1.
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As noted above, the City and LACFD have adopted roadway design standards that preclude the construction of any unsafe design features. Compliance with these established design standards would ensure that hazards due to project design features would not occur. Therefore, no impacts resulting from hazards due to any onsite design features or incompatible uses would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the vehicular access and circulation improvements associated with the existing gas station in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, if in the future any vehicular access and circulation improvements occur within this planning area, they would be required to be implemented by the individual land owner and in accordance within the framework established by the Specific Plan, and would be required to adhere to the City’s Standard Engineering Plans and LACFD’s design standards. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on emergency access as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

As outlined above, development of the proposed hotel in this planning area would introduce new circulation improvements onsite, as well as closure of an existing full-access driveway off of San Jose Avenue. As shown in Figure 7, the proposed vehicular circulation plan for the hotel would include an improved system of north/south and east/west asphalt-paved drive aisles. The new circulation plan would also eliminate the dead-end drive aisle situation that currently exists near the southwestern end of the existing motel (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph) by providing a looped circulation system that would eliminate the need for back-up maneuvers by emergency vehicles (e.g., fire trucks, police vehicles) to turn around. The looped circulation system would improve overall access for emergency vehicles.

To address fire and emergency access needs, the proposed access and circulation improvements would be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable LACFD design standards for emergency access (e.g., minimum lane width and turning radius). For example, drive aisles would be designed to meet the minimum width requirements of LACFD to allow for adequate passing of emergency vehicles.

Development of the proposed hotel would also require incorporation of all applicable design and safety requirements as set forth in the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City and LACFD, such as those outlined in Chapter 15.20 (Fire Prevention) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, which incorporates by reference the 2014 Fire Code for the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles Count (Title 32, Los Angeles County Code). Compliance with these codes and standards is ensured through the City’s and LACFD’s development review and building permit process.
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Additionally, during the building permit and development review process, the City would coordinate with LACFD and the Claremont Police Department to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into the proposed hotel and that adequate circulation and access (e.g., adequate drive aisle turning radii for fire trucks) is provided within the circulation components of the proposed hotel. All proposed site and building improvements would be subject to review and approval by the City, LACFD, and Claremont Police Department prior to building permit and certificate of occupancy issuance.

Furthermore, implementation of the proposed hotel would not require major road closures or otherwise impact the functionality of San Jose Avenue or Indian Hill Boulevard as a public safety access routes. However, some minor improvements would be required within the San Jose Avenue right-of-way, which would require temporary closure of small portions of these roads. For example, some construction would occur within the public right-of-way of this road in order to make the necessary potable water and wastewater infrastructure connections, and in order to provide closure of an existing full-access driveway off of San Jose Avenue. Any minor road closures would be temporary and would only be necessary throughout the duration of construction activities associated with the street improvements. All proposed road closures would also be subject to review and approval by the City. Upon completion of the improvements, all street conditions would be restored to normal.

Therefore, no significant impacts related to emergency access would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

As noted above and shown in Figure 7, the existing full-access driveway adjacent to the restaurant (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph) would be removed in order to provide improved vehicular access into and out of the Project Site from San Jose Avenue; the area of the existing driveway to be removed would be improved with landscaping and hardscape improvements. Other improvements would occur along the western and eastern portions of the parking area serving the existing restaurant in order to accommodate new parking and circulation improvements. Based on the preceding, no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the access and circulation improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Additionally, any future vehicular access and circulation improvements implemented as a part of future development proposals within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and provided in a manner that fits into and connects to the vehicular access and circulation improvements of Planning Area 1 and the overall Project Site. Any future vehicular access and circulation improvements would also be required to be implemented in accordance with LACFD’s design standards.
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Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, any future vehicular access and circulation improvements implemented as a part of future development proposals within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and provided in a manner that fits into and connects to the vehicular access and circulation improvements of Planning Area 1 and the overall Project Site. Any future vehicular access and circulation improvements would also be required to be implemented in accordance with LACFD’s design standards. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to alternative modes of transportation as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Pedestrian Facilities and Circulation

As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4a and 4b, Site Photographs, the current pedestrian circulation system serving the Project Site consists of a public sidewalk that runs along the Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue Project Site frontages, an internal concrete walkway that wraps around the restaurant, and a linear concrete walkway that is limited mainly to the back end of the motel. The current walkway serving the existing motel does not connect to the other commercial uses onsite or to the public sidewalks along Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue. Pedestrians desiring to access the motel from the public sidewalks have to traverse the parking area drive aisles.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Figure 7, the pedestrian circulation plan for the proposed hotel would include an improved system of walkways. Specifically, the pedestrian circulation plan includes a walkway system that would be accessible from and connect to all points of the hotel, as well as the proposed outdoor pool area. The proposed walkway system would also provide an improved internal connection to the restaurant in Planning Area 2 and the public sidewalks along Indian Hill Boulevard and San Jose Avenue, as well as destinations beyond.

Additionally, the proposed pedestrian circulation improvements would be required to adhere to the site design guidelines outlined in the Specific Plan. For example, the Specific Plan outlines the following site design guidelines:

- Safe and convenient pedestrian connections shall be provided between buildings, onsite amenities, and parking areas and to offsite public sidewalks.

- Well-marked, publicly accessible paths of travel shall be provided in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.
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- Pedestrian walkways shall be free of obstacles within the pathway, including vehicular overhangs, risers, utilities and other structures.

Therefore, no impacts to pedestrian circulation or facilities would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

At this time, the pedestrian access and circulation improvements associated with the existing restaurant in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, any future pedestrian access and circulation improvements implemented as a part of future development proposals within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and provided in a manner that fits into and connects to the pedestrian access and circulation improvements of Planning Area 1 and the overall Project Site. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the pedestrian access and circulation improvements associated with the existing restaurant in this planning area would remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. However, any future pedestrian access and circulation improvements implemented as a part of future development proposals within this planning area would be required to be implemented within the framework established by the Specific Plan and provided in a manner that fits into and connects to the pedestrian access and circulation improvements of Planning Area 1 and the overall Project Site. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Bicycle Facilities and Circulation**

Under current conditions and as shown in Exhibit 2-4 (Bike Plan) of the City's General Plan Community Mobility Element, there is an existing bikeway (a Class II bike lane) on both sides of and along the entire stretch of San Jose Avenue that lies within the City’s boundaries. Additionally, as shown in Exhibit 2-4, proposed Class II and III bike lanes are called for on Indian Hill Boulevard from Auto Center Drive on the south to Base Line Road on the north. Per the Community Mobility Element, Class II facilities are a marked bike lane on the pavement adjacent to traffic and Class III facilities consist of posted riding areas. There are currently no bicycle facilities (e.g., bicycle racks) within any of the planning areas.

**Planning Area 1**

Patrons and employees traveling to the proposed hotel in bicycles would be able to access the hotel via the Project Site’s internal walkways and drive aisles, which connect to the public sidewalks along San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard and the Class II bike lane along San Jose Avenue. As shown in Figure 7, a bicycle rack would be placed near the main building entry of the proposed hotel. The provision of bicycle parking onsite would help provide and encourage an alternative mode of transportation for hotel patrons and employees. Once off of the Project Site, cyclists would have access to the existing bicycle facilities (e.g.,
sidewalks, bike lanes) along San Jose Avenue, Indian Hill Boulevard and others throughout the City. Section 21100(h) of the California Vehicle Code allows bicycles to ride on sidewalks; therefore, patrons and employees of the hotel would be able to ride along the public sidewalks abutting the Project Site and those beyond. Therefore, no impacts to bicycle facilities and circulation would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

There are no bicycle facilities within this planning area and none are proposed under the Specific Plan. Additionally, the existing restaurant in this planning area would remain in its current condition; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed in the parking area that serves the restaurant. Based on the preceding, no impacts to bicycle facilities and circulation would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

There are no bicycle facilities within this planning area and none are proposed under the Specific Plan. Additionally, at this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts to bicycle facilities and circulation would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Public Transit

As an alternative to automobile travel for project residents, Foothill Transit provides public transit bus service in the City of Claremont. Two Foothill Transit bus routes operate in the project area:

- **Route 480** runs mainly east–west from Montclair to West Covina, operating on Indian Hill Boulevard in the study area, seven days per week.

- **Route 855** runs mainly north–south from Pomona to Claremont, operating on Mountain Avenue, Base Line Road, and Indian Hill Boulevard in the study area, seven days per week.

The nearest bus stop to the Project Site is for Routes 480 and 885, which is adjacent to the existing restaurant in Planning Area 2, on Indian Hill Boulevard near the Indian Hill Boulevard/San Jose Avenue intersection. This bus stop and others in proximity of the Project Site currently serve and would continue to serve the Project Site. Safe access to the bus stop from within the Project Site would be provided via the existing and proposed pedestrian paths internal to the site and the existing public sidewalk along San Jose Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard.

Additionally, there is existing commuter rail service (Metrolink) serving the Claremont Metrolink Station approximately 0.9 mile north/northeast of the Project Site, in downtown Claremont. The Metrolink San Bernardino Line operates seven days per week east–west from downtown San Bernardino to Los Angeles Union Station. Metrolink also provides service to the Downtown Pomona Metrolink Station, approximately
3. Environmental Analysis

3.5 miles southwest of the Project Site. The Metrolink Riverside Line operates seven days per week east–west from downtown Riverside to Los Angeles Union Station.

Furthermore, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority plans to complete an extension of the Gold Line light rail line eastward from its current terminus in Pasadena to Montclair. The current segment (Foothill to Azusa) broke ground on June 26, 2010, and will be completed in 2015 (MGLFECA 2012a). The subsequent segment (Azusa to Claremont) for the Gold Line recently cleared environmental review (certified by the Construction Authority Board of Directors in March 2013) and construction will commence sometime after the first phase (Foothill to Azusa) is completed (MGLFECA 2012b). In Claremont, the Gold Line would run alongside the Metrolink track and include a stop at the Claremont Metrolink Station.

Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, no impacts to public transit would occur as a result of development of the proposed hotel in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts to public transit would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts to public transit would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Result in a determination by the waste water 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical study, included as Appendix E to this Initial Study:


**Analysis:**

a) **Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** While the City of Claremont operates the local wastewater collection system that serves the Project Site, wastewater generated in the City flows through this system via regional trunk lines to the Pomona Water Reclamation Plant (PWRP) at 295 Humane Way in the City of Pomona. The PWRP is owned and operated by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Sanitation Districts). The Sanitation Districts is required by federal and state law to meet applicable standards of treatment plant discharge requirements. Specifically, the Sanitation District's wastewater treatment system is subject to a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (No. CA0053619) issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) in 2009 under Order No. R4-2009-0076 (LARWQCB 2009); the NPDES permit regulates the amount and type of pollutants that the system can discharge into receiving waters. The Sanitation Districts wastewater treatment system is operating and would continue to operate subject to state waste discharge requirements and federal NPDES permit requirements, as set forth in the aforementioned permit and order numbers.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on wastewater treatment requirements of LARWQCB as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
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Planning Area 1

Based on the preceding, the additional wastewater that would be generated by the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan (see Table 22, Estimated Project Wastewater Generation) and treated by the Sanitation Districts would not impede the Sanitation Districts ability to continue to meet its wastewater treatment requirements. Therefore, impacts on LARWQCB’s and the Sanitation Districts wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

Based on the preceding, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the hardscape and landscape improvements proposed in this planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to water and wastewater treatment facilities as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Water Demand and Treatment Facilities

Water is supplied to the City of Claremont (including the Project Site) by the Golden State Water Company (GSWC). GSWC’s water supplies for its Claremont System are a combination of purchased water from the Three Valleys Municipal Water District (TVMWD) and groundwater pumped from the Six Basins and Chino Basin (TVMWD 2011). The Project Site sits above the Upper Claremont Heights groundwater basin. TVMWD buys water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), which MWD imports from northern California via the State Water Project. Imported water from northern California is treated at TVMWD’s Miramar Water Treatment Plant in the City of Claremont, with a capacity of 25 million gallons per day (mgd) (MWD 2012). MWD has an additional water treatment plant in the region, the Weymouth Treatment Plant in the City of La Verne, with a capacity of 520 mgd (MWD 2011). Water treatment facilities filter and/or disinfect water before it is delivered to customers. Once treated, the water is supplied to GSWC, who supplies it to land uses within the City.

27 The Claremont System serves the City of Claremont, part of the cities of Montclair, Pomona, and Upland, and a portion of unincorporated county land (TVMWD 2011).
28 The Six Basins is a group of small groundwater basins located in the northeasterly portion of the TVMWD service area. The grouping includes the Canyon, Upper Claremont Heights, Lower Claremont Heights, Pomona, Live Oak, and Ganesha Basins (TVMWD 2011).
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Planning Area 1

As shown in Table 24, *Estimated Project Water Demand*, below, the average water demand of the proposed hotel that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan would be approximately 9,009 gallons per day (gpd) compared to 4,928 gpd for the existing motel onsite. Therefore, the proposed hotel would generate a net water demand increase over existing conditions of approximately 4,081 gpd. The increase in water demand would result in an increased demand for water treatment and conveyance.

The additional water demand of 4,389 gpd under the proposed hotel would be a negligible increase in terms of impacting TVMWD’s Miramar Water Treatment Plant and MWD’s Weymouth Treatment Plant; as noted above, the Miramar Water Treatment Plant has a treatment capacity of 26 mgd and the Weymouth Treatment Plant has a treatment capacity 520 mgd. Based on the capacity of these water treatment facilities, there is adequate water treatment capacity in the region for the proposed hotel’s forecast water demand.

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in a substantial increase in water demand. The new landscaping improvements (which are minor in nature) would result in a minimal increase in water demand. Therefore, because the increase in water demand would be minimal and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Wastewater Demand and Treatment Facilities

While the City of Claremont operates the local wastewater collection system that serves the Project Site, wastewater generated in the City flows through this system via regional trunk lines to the PWRP at 295 Humane Way in the City of Pomona. The PWRP is owned and operated by the Sanitation Districts and has capacity of 15 mgd and currently treats roughly 13 mgd (LACSD 2015a).
Planning Area 1

As shown in Table 22, the existing motel generates approximately 4,416 gpd of wastewater, while the proposed hotel would generate approximately 8,073 gpd; this would equate to a net increase of approximately 3,657 gpd of wastewater compared to exiting conditions. The increase in wastewater generation would result in an increase in demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Wastewater Generation Factor (in gpd)¹</th>
<th>Average Wastewater Generation (in gpd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Motel</td>
<td>64 rooms</td>
<td>69 gallons/room/day</td>
<td>4,416 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hotel</td>
<td>121 rooms</td>
<td>69 gallons/room/day</td>
<td>8,073 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>+57</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+3,657 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SC AQMD 2013.
Notes: gpd = gallons per day
¹ Motel/hotel wastewater generation factor per Appendix D of the CalEEMod User’s Guide (SC AQMD 2013). Wastewater generation is 25,367 gallons/room/year, or approximately 69 gallons/room/day.

The additional wastewater generation of approximately 3,933 gpd under the proposed hotel would be a negligible increase in terms of impacting the Sanitation Districts PWRP; as noted above, the PWRP has a treatment capacity of 15 mgd. Based on the capacity, there is adequate wastewater treatment capacity in the region for the proposed hotel’s forecast wastewater generation.

Additionally, the project applicant/owner of the proposed hotel would be required to pay all required sewer service fees as outlined in Chapter 13.08 (Service Fees) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code in order to defray the costs of sewer services and facilities required to accommodate the additional wastewater generated by development projects. As stated in Section 13.08.010 (Fees Established–Schedule) of this chapter, pursuant to the authorization contained in Section 5470 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, the sewer service fees outlined in this chapter are established, prescribed, and imposed to be paid to the City for services and facilities furnished by the City in connection with its sanitary sewerage system. These fees are established as a fixed cost per year and may be billed annually, semiannually, quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly as determined by the City of Claremont’s Finance Director.

Furthermore, as a condition of approval and prior to issuance of grading permits for the propose hotel and in order to determine which sewer main the hotel development will be connecting to, the project applicant would be required to conduct sewer flow metering at specific locations as directed by the Claremont City Engineer. The sewer flow metering would be required to be conducted in accordance with the City’s Engineering Division standards and methodology. Additionally, all proposed wastewater infrastructure improvements (on- and off-site) would be required to be designed and installed in accordance with the City’s Engineering Division standards. The condition of approval will be provided as a condition in the resolution.
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Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment or conveyance facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area serving the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in an increase in wastewater generation. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to stormwater drainage facilities as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

See response to Section 3.9(j), above. As concluded in this section, drainage runoff from this planning area would be more than adequately handled by the proposed hotel's drainage system and would not add additional runoff to Claremont's drainage system over existing conditions.

Additionally, as outlined in Chapter 17.162 (Storm Drainage Fees) of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code, in addition to the onsite drainage facilities that are required to be constructed under Chapter 17.016 (Required Subdivision Improvements), drainage fees are required to be paid in conjunction with subdivision or development in order to defray the costs of offsite drainage facilities required to accommodate the additional water runoff created by development projects. The project applicant/owner of the proposed hotel would be required to pay these fees prior to the issuance of grading permits.

Furthermore, any proposed site drainage improvements within this planning area would be required to be designed and installed in accordance with the City's Engineering Division standards.

Therefore, development of the proposed hotel would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. Therefore, because no new development is proposed and based on the preceding, the no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant Impact. As noted above in Section 3.17(b), water is supplied to the City of Claremont (including the Project Site) by GSWC via a combination of purchased water from TVMWD and groundwater pumped from the Six Basins and Chino Basin (TVMWD 2011). Estimated water supplies in GSWC's Claremont System through 2035 are shown in Table 23; estimates are from GSWC's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Claremont. As shown in this table, total estimated water supplies in the Claremont System are forecast to increase from 10,620 acre-feet (AF) in 2010 to 14,872 AF in 2035.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased water from TVMWD</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>7,070</td>
<td>7,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater, Six Basins</td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td>7,119</td>
<td>7,119</td>
<td>7,119</td>
<td>7,119</td>
<td>7,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater, Chino Basin</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,662</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,992</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,872</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GSWC 2011.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to water supplies as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

Planning Area 1

As shown in Table 24, the average water demand of the proposed hotel that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan would be approximately 9,009 gpd compared to 4,928 gpd for the existing motel onsite. Therefore, the proposed hotel would generate a net water demand increase over existing conditions of
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approximately 4,081 gpd (1,489,565 gallons per year), or approximately .01252867 acre-foot per day (4.5 acre-feet of water per year).29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 24 Estimated Project Water Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Land Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Motel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCQMD 2013.  
Notes: gpd = gallons per day  
1 Motel/hotel water demand factor per Appendix D of the CalEEMod User’s Guide (SCAQMD 2013). Water demand includes 25,367 gallons/room/year for indoor use and 2,819 gallons/room/year for outdoor use, for a total of 28,186 gallons/room/year, or approximately 77 gallons/room/day.

As demonstrated in Table 23, *Current and Planned Water Supplies for the Claremont System in Acre Feet/Year*, there would be sufficient existing and future water supplies in the Claremont System to meet the proposed hotels estimated water demand, and project development would not require new or expanded water supplies. Therefore, GSWC’s water supplies are expected to be adequate to meet all City demands, including those of the proposed hotel, and the proposed hotel would not require GSWC to obtain new or expanded water supplies. The proposed hotel’s water supply increase is also not considered substantial since the project would be consistent with the City’s General Plan; the City’s General Plan forms GSWC’s basis for evaluating the service area’s future water demands as a part of its 2010 UWMP.

Additionally, following Governor Brown’s recently declared State of Emergency, the Governor issued the fourth in a series of Executive Orders on actions necessary to address California’s severe drought conditions, which directed the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) to implement mandatory water reductions in urban areas to reduce potable urban water usage by 25 percent statewide. On May 5, 2015, the State Water Board adopted an emergency conservation regulation in accordance with the Governor’s directive. The provisions of the emergency regulation went into effect on May 18, 2015.

Per the emergency regulation, Claremont is required to reduce water use by 32 percent from water usage in June 2013. In response to these recent actions and in order to help the City meet its water reduction percentage and help reduce daily water use, the following mandatory restrictions have gone into effect for Claremont (City of Claremont 2015):

- Watering or irrigating of lawn, landscaping, or other vegetated area with potable water is limited to two days a week.
- All leaks, breaks, or other malfunctions must be repaired within 48 hours.

29 One gallon equals .00000307 acre-foot.
3. Environmental Analysis

- Using water to wash vehicles is prohibited except by use of bucket, hand-held hose equipped with a shut-off nozzle, high pressure/low volume wash system, or at a commercial car wash that utilizes re-circulated water.

- No outdoor watering or irrigation between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

- Watering more than 15 minutes per day per watering station is prohibited (does not apply to hand watering or drip systems).

- Watering in a manner that causes runoff or excessive water to flow onto adjoining hardscape or surfaces is prohibited.

- No washing down hard or paved surfaces.

- Re-circulating water is required for water fountains and decorative water features.

Additionally, in order to achieve the mandatory water-use reductions established by SWRCB, GSWC recently filed Advice Letters with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to activate Staged Mandatory Water Conservation and Rationing (Schedule 14.1). Schedule 14.1 filings outline restrictions, water allocations, enforcement measures and surcharges designed to achieve reductions due to water supply shortages or to achieve identified water usage goals established by an authorized government agency or official (GSWC 2015a).

The mandatory water restrictions set by the City and SWRCB not only help Claremont achieve its required water reduction target of 32 percent, but also help GSWC meet the provisions of its Schedule 14.1 filings. In fact, through implementation of these mandatory water restrictions, for the period of June 1 to October 25, 2015 (compared to 2013 usage), Claremont’s total water reduction was at 43 percent (GSWC 2015b). Therefore, the City is currently exceeding its water reduction target of 32 percent. The project applicant/owner of the proposed hotel would be required to comply with all applicable mandatory water restrictions and thereby, help the City in continuing to meet (and exceed) its water reduction target.

Furthermore, the proposed hotel’s landscape plan would be required to be installed and maintained in compliance with the water-efficient landscape requirements outlined in the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Chapter 16.131 [Water Efficient Landscape Requirements] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code), which applies to all new landscape installations or rehabilitation projects. For example, as outlined in Section 16.131.030 (Implementation Procedures) of this chapter, prior to installation, a Landscape Documentation Package is required to be submitted to the City for review and approval of all landscape projects subject to the provisions of Chapter 16.131. The project applicant/owner of the proposed hotel would also be required to adhere to the water conservation measures outlined in Chapter 8.30 (Water Conservation) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code. For example, as outlined in Section 8.30.040 (Permanent Water Conservation Requirements) of this chapter, the project applicant/owner would be required to adhere to the following water conservation measures, which are effective at all times:
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- Limits on water hours.
- No excessive water flow or runoff.
- No washing down hard or paved surfaces.
- Obligation to fix leaks, breaks or malfunctions.
- Drinking water served upon request only.
- Commercial lodging establishments must provide guests option to decline daily linen services.

As also noted in Section 1.4.8, Sustainability, the proposed hotel would be designed to include a number of sustainability features (which would in turn help reduce water usage), including the use of site design and landscape palettes (e.g., native drought tolerant planting) to conserve water and reduce runoff; grouping plant vegetation according to sun exposure and watering requirements to make efficient use of onsite water usage; and use of high-efficiency showerheads, faucets, and toilets. Other sustainability features would be considered by the City as the proposed hotel is refined during the design and construction phase.

Finally, development of the proposed hotel would be required to comply with the provisions of the most current California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; incorporated by reference in Chapter 15.22 [Green Building Standards Code] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code), which contains requirements for indoor water use reduction and site irrigation conservation. The required CALGreen measures would substantially reduce the proposed hotel’s water demand compared to the existing motel, which was built before these more stringent standards were adopted.

Therefore, impacts on water supplies as a result of development of the proposed hotel would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area serving the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in a substantial increase in water demand. The new landscaping improvements (which are minor in nature) would result in a minimal increase in water demand. Therefore, because the increase in water demand would be minimal and based on the preceding, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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e) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on wastewater treatment facilities as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

Project impacts on wastewater treatment and capacity are discussed above in Section 3.17(b). As concluded in Section 3.17(b), there is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity in the region for the proposed hotel's estimated wastewater generation. Therefore, impacts on wastewater treatment and capacity would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 2**

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area serving the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in an increase in wastewater generation. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Planning Area 3**

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Claremont’s Community Services Department provides trash collection and recycling services to all residents and businesses in Claremont. The City handles two types of solid waste: daily curb-side solid waste from residential and commercial customers, and large quantity solid waste generated from construction sites and other sources (Claremont 2006a). City trucks collect curb-side solid waste from residential and commercial areas and take it to the City Yard at 1616 Monte Vista Avenue, where it is transferred to other trucks and eventually taken to local landfills.

Nearly 99.9 percent of solid waste generated in the City of Claremont that is disposed in landfills was disposed of at three landfills up until the latter part of 2013, which are shown in Table 25. The remainder of the solid waste generated in Claremont was recycled, reused, or composted. However, one of the three landfills receiving solid waste from Claremont, The Puente Hills Landfill, was recently closed (ceased operation on October 31, 2013; LACSD 2015b) and no longer receives solid waste; therefore, solid waste generated in the City is only disposed of at the other two landfills shown in Table 25.
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### Table 25  Landfills Receiving Solid Waste from Claremont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Maximum Permitted Daily Disposal (tons)</th>
<th>Average Daily Disposal in 2013 (tons)</th>
<th>Estimated Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill</td>
<td>Rialto, San Bernardino County</td>
<td>67,520,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfill</td>
<td>Brea, Orange County</td>
<td>36,589,707</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puente Hills Landfill³</td>
<td>City of Industry, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>104,109,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,962</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source 1                  | CalRecycle 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, and 2015d; LACSD 2015b. |
| Source 2                  | One cubic yard of compacted trash and soil equals approximately 0.75 ton of compacted trash and soil (CalRecycle 2015d). |
| Source 3                  | Average daily disposal is calculated based on 300 operating days per year. Each of the three facilities is open six days per week, Monday through Saturday, except certain holidays; CalRecycle 2015c. The year 2013 was used because this is the latest year when total solid waste tonnage was reported for all four quarters of the year. |
| Source 4                  | Ceased operation on October 31, 2013, and no longer receives solid waste (LACSD 2015b). |

Additionally, the Sanitation Districts are constructing a waste-by-rail facility near the former Puente Hills Landfill in the City of Industry that will ship solid waste to the Mesquite Landfill in Imperial County (LACSD 2010b). The Mesquite Landfill has enough capacity for 8,000 tons per day of solid waste disposal for 100 years.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on landfill capacity as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.

**Planning Area 1**

**Operational-Related Solid Waste Generation**

Using sample solid waste generation rates from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle 2015e), Table 26 estimates the amount of solid waste per day that would be generated by the proposed hotel. As shown in the table the proposed 121-room hotel is forecast to generate approximately 484 pounds of solid waste per day (or 176,660 pounds per year). However, the existing 64-room motel currently generates approximately 256 pounds of solid waste per day (or 93,440 pounds per year). Therefore, the proposed hotel would result in an increase of approximately 228 pounds of solid waste per day (or 83,220 pounds per year) over existing conditions.
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### Table 26  Estimated Project Solid Waste Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Generation Rate (ppd)</th>
<th>Average Solid Waste Generation (ppd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Motel</td>
<td>64 rooms</td>
<td>4 lbs/room/day</td>
<td>256 ppd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hotel</td>
<td>121 rooms</td>
<td>4 lbs/room/day</td>
<td>484 ppd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change</strong></td>
<td>+57 rooms</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+228 ppd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalRecycle 2015e.

Notes: ppd = pounds per day; lbs = pounds

The additional solid waste generation of 228 ppd under the proposed hotel would be a negligible increase in terms of impacting the Sanitation District’s landfill capacities. As demonstrated in Table 25, *Landfills Receiving Solid Waste from Claremont*, there is more than adequate daily and total landfill capacity in the region to serve the proposed hotel’s increase in operational-related solid waste disposal needs, and project development would not require additional landfill capacity. Additionally, once the waste-by-rail facility is completed in Industry, the solid waste capacity of the Mesquite Landfill (8,000 tons per day of solid waste disposal) will be available to the region.

Furthermore, as noted in Section 1.5.8, *Sustainability*, the proposed hotel would be designed to include a number of sustainability features (which would in turn help reduce solid waste generation during the construction and operational-related phases), including minimizing waste created during construction and recycling of most construction debris; use of recycled aggregate (crushed concrete) for fill, backfill and other uses; and use of materials with a recycled content. Other sustainability features would be considered by the City as the proposed hotel is refined during the design and construction phase.

Therefore, no significant operational-related impacts on landfill capacity would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Construction-Related Solid Waste Generation**

Development of the proposed hotel would involve the demolition of existing buildings, parking areas and drive aisles and other site improvements, and removal of a number of ornamental trees associated with the existing motel (site structures and features to be demolished or removed are shown in Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4a and 4b, *Site Photographs*). The proposed hotel’s construction and demolition activities would result in a temporary generation of solid waste.

As demonstrated in Table 25, there is adequate landfill capacity in the region to serve the proposed hotel’s construction-related solid waste needs, and project construction activities would not require additional landfill capacity. Solid waste generated during the proposed hotel’s construction phase would also be temporary, and would cease upon completion of the construction phase. Additionally, as noted above, the proposed hotel would be designed to include a number of sustainability features, which would in turn help reduce solid waste generation during the construction phase.
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Furthermore, development of the proposed hotel would be required to comply with the provisions of the most current California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; incorporated by reference in Chapter 15.22 [Green Building Standards Code] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code), which outlines requirements for construction waste reduction, material selection, and natural resource conservation.

Therefore, no significant construction-related impacts on landfill capacity would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in an increase in solid waste generation. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. See response to section 3.17(f), above.

Additionally, the following federal and state laws and regulations govern solid waste disposal. The EPA administers the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 and the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which govern solid waste disposal. In the State of California, Assembly Bill 939 (Integrated Solid Waste Management Act of 1989; Public Resources Code 40050 et seq.) required every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000 by such means as recycling, source reduction, and composting. In addition, AB 939 requires each county to prepare a countywide siting element specifying areas for transformation or disposal sites to provide capacity for solid waste generated in the county that cannot be reduced or recycled for a 15-year period. AB 1327, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, requires local agencies to adopt ordinances mandating the use of recyclable materials in development projects. There are 41 solid waste diversion programs in the City of Claremont, including composting, recycling, household hazardous waste, and business waste reduction programs.

Compliance with AB 939 is measured in part by actual disposal rates compared to target disposal rates; actual rates at or below target rates are consistent with AB 939. Actual disposal rates for the City of Claremont in 2014, the latest year for which data is available, were 4.2 pounds per day (ppd) per resident and 10.5 ppd per employee; target disposal rates were 5.3 ppd per resident and 13.8 ppd per employee (CalRecycle 2015f). Therefore, disposal rates in the City in 2014 were consistent with AB 939.

Following is a discussion of the potential impacts as a result of development and redevelopment activities that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan.
3. Environmental Analysis

Planning Area 1

Development of the proposed hotel under the Specific Plan would be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations governing solid waste, including those listed above, and in doing so, not affect the City’s ability to continue to meet the required AB 939 waste diversion requirements. Additionally, the enclosed refuse area for the hotel would include separate bins for solid waste and recyclable materials. Therefore, impacts related to solid waste statutes and regulations would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 2

No new buildings or structures are proposed within this planning area; only hardscape and landscape improvements are proposed within the parking area that currently serves the restaurant. The proposed improvements would not result in an increase in solid waste generation. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Planning Area 3

At this time, the existing gas station and associated site improvements within this planning area will remain in place and not undergo any changes under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Environmental Analysis

Analysis:

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The Project Site is currently developed and disturbed and is located in an urbanized area of the City. As shown in Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4a and 4b, *Site Photographs*, the site consists of a number of buildings and structures, surface parking lots and drive aisles, and other hardscape and landscape improvements associated with the existing motel and commercial uses onsite. Onsite vegetation includes a number of decorative trees and shrubs along the site boundaries and internal to the Project Site. As shown in Figure 3, surrounding land uses consist of single-family residences to the north, across San Jose Avenue; professional services and a pre-school (Kinder Kountry) adjacent to the west, with residential uses beyond; commercial and auto sales uses to the south, across I-10; and commercial uses to the east, across Indian Hill Boulevard. The Project Site does not contain any sensitive natural resources that could be disturbed as a result of project development. As demonstrated in Section 3.4, *Biological Resources*, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in the reduction of the habitat of fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Impacts to nesting habitat for migratory birds would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (see Section 3.4[d], above). Additionally, as demonstrated in Section 3.5, *Cultural Resources*, no historic resources were identified onsite, and therefore the project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples 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.)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As noted above in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*, per the Claremont General Plan land use plan, the Project Site is designated as Commercial with a Specific Plan Overlay. With adoption of the Specific Plan, the Commercial land use designation would remain; no general plan amendment is required. Additionally, according to the City’s zoning map, the Project Site is zoned Specific Plan Area 12 (SP12). Per Chapter 16.081 (Specific Plan District) of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code, the areas designated as Specific Plan District are subject to the preparation and adoption of a specific plan. The Specific Plan would be adopted by the Claremont City Council as ordinance and functions as the regulatory document that serves as the zoning for the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not weight short-term goals above long-term environmental goals of the City. The issues relevant to development that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan are also very localized and confined to the immediate project area.
Furthermore, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City where supporting utility infrastructure (e.g., water, wastewater, and drainage) and services (e.g., solid waste collection) currently exists. Furthermore, the Project Site is generally too small in scope to appreciably contribute to existing cumulative impacts, and is located in such an area where little new development is occurring that may combine cumulatively.

Cumulative traffic impacts were also considered in the TIA prepared for the project (see Appendix G), whose findings and conclusions are provided in Section 3.16, *Transportation/Traffic*. More specifically, the TIA included traffic that would be generated by the related cumulative projects in the project study area under the Opening Year (2017) Plus Project and Long Range (2035) Plus Project traffic conditions. As concluded in Section 3.16, no impacts would occur under either of these future traffic conditions, which considered cumulative traffic impacts.

Finally, impacts related to other topical areas such as air quality, GHG, hydrology and water quality, and recreation would not be cumulatively considerable with implementation of the Specific Plan in conjunction with other cumulative projects.

In consideration of the preceding factors, the Specific Plan’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be rendered less than significant; therefore, project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed in the respective topical sections of this Initial Study, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in potentially significant impacts in the areas of air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials and noise, which may cause adverse effects on human beings. However, feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would have no substantial adverse effects on human beings.
3. Environmental Analysis
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4. **Summary Table of Mitigation Measures**

The following provides the mitigation measures, the responsible party and time frame for implementation, and the monitoring agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1</td>
<td>During rough grading, the construction contractor(s) shall use construction equipment that meets the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-Certified Tier 3 off-road emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment of 50 horsepower or more. Prior to rough grading, the project engineer shall ensure that all construction management and grading plans clearly show the requirement for EPA Tier 3 or higher emissions standards for construction equipment over 50 horsepower. During rough grading, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the project site for verification by the City’s Community Development staff or their designee. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers of construction equipment onsite. A copy of each engine’s certified tier specification shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment to the City’s Community Development staff. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations. Construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board’s Rule 2449.</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during rough grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-2</td>
<td>During rough grading, the construction contractor(s) shall use construction equipment fitted with Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment of 50 horsepower or more. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by CARB regulations. Prior to rough grading, the project engineer shall ensure that all construction management and grading plans clearly show the requirement for Level 3 DPF for construction equipment over 50 horsepower.</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during rough grading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary Table of Mitigation Measures

Table 26  Summary of Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AQ-3  | Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the construction contractor(s) shall prepare a dust control plan (Plan) and implement the following measures during rough grading activities in addition to the existing requirements for fugitive dust control under South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 to further reduce PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. The Plan shall be submitted to and verified by the City’s Community Development staff. The City’s Community Development staff shall verify compliance that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.  
- During rough grading, the construction contractor shall sweep streets with Rule 1186-compliant, PM10-efficient vacuum units on a daily basis if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.  
- During rough grading, the construction contractor shall water exposed ground surfaces and disturbed areas a minimum of every three hours on the construction site and a minimum of three times per day.  
- During rough grading, the construction contractor shall limit onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to no more than 15 miles per hour.  | Project Applicant, Construction Contractor | Prior to issuance of any construction permits | City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff |
| AQ-4  | The construction contractor(s) shall limit the daily amount of asphalt and pool demolition debris haul to a maximum of 7 truckloads per day (14 truck trips per day) if approximately 16-cubic yard haul trucks are used, assuming a one-way haul distance of 6 miles (approximately 112 cubic yards of demolition debris haul per day). If the one-way haul distance is greater than 6 miles, total overall daily haul truck miles traveled shall not exceed 84 miles. These requirements shall be noted on all construction management plans.  | Project Applicant, Construction Contractor | During demolition and hauling activities | City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff |
| Biological Resources |  |  |  |
| BIO-1  | Prior to the commencement of any proposed actions (e.g., site clearing, demolition, grading) during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to September 1, as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife), the monitoring biologist contracted by the project applicant shall conduct a pre-construction survey(s) to identify any active nests in and near the project area no more than three days prior to initiation of the action. If the biologist does not find any active nests that would be potentially impacted, the proposed action may proceed. However, if the biologist finds an active nest within or adjacent to the action area and determines that the nest may be impacted, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest using temporary plastic fencing or other suitable materials, such as barricade tape and traffic cones. The buffer zone shall range from a 300- to 500-foot radius at the discretion of the biologist and in coordination with the construction contractor. Only specified activities (if | Project Applicant, Biologist, and Construction Contractor | Prior to the commencement of any proposed actions (e.g., site clearing, demolition, grading) during the breeding/nesting season | City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff |
### Table 26  Summary of Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>any) approved by the qualified biologist in coordination with the construction contractor shall take place within the buffer zone until the nest is vacated. Activities that may be prohibited within the buffer zone by the biologist may include but not be limited to grading and tree clearing. Once the nest is no longer active and upon final determination by the biologist, the proposed action may proceed within the buffer zone. Any active nests observed during the survey shall be mapped on a recent aerial photograph, including documentation of GPS coordinates.</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Archeological and/or Paleontological Consultant, Native American Monitor, and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td>City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural Resources

**CUL-1.** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, and for any subsequent permit involving excavation to an increased depth, the project applicant shall retain a Los Angeles County-certified archaeologist and paleontologist who shall be on call during all grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities. Additionally, a certified aboriginal tribe of the Los Angeles basin Native American Monitor shall be onsite during any and all ground disturbances (including but not limited to pavement removal, post holing, auguring, boring, grading, excavation and trenching). The purpose of the onsite certified Native American Monitor is to protect any cultural resources which may be affected during construction or development. Evidence of the contracted professionals retained by the project applicant shall be provided to the City of Claremont Community Development Department. In the event archeological, Native American or paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, a professional archeological, Native American or paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant cultural resources until they can be formally evaluated. Suspension of ground disturbances in the vicinity of the discoveries shall not be lifted until the archaeological, Native American or paleontological monitor has evaluated discoveries to assess whether they are classified as significant cultural resources, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. If archaeological, Native American or paleontological resources are recovered, they shall be offered to a repository with a retrievable collection system and an educational and research interest in the materials, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History or the University of California at Riverside, or any other local museum or repository willing to and capable of accepting and housing the resource. If no museum or repository willing to accept the resource is found, the resource shall be considered the property of the City of Claremont, and may be stored, disposed of, transferred, exchanged, or otherwise handled by the City at its discretion. The archaeologist, Native American, or paleontologist shall prepare a final report describing all identified and curated resources (if any are found) and
4. Summary Table of Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 26</th>
<th>Summary of Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit the report to the City’s Community Development Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Claremont Building Division that all design recommendations in the project’s Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation dated September 22, 2015, (incorporated herein by this reference) pertaining to strong ground shaking and site soils have been incorporated into the project design and grading plan. During grading and construction phases, the City’s Building Division staff shall verify that grading and construction activities comply with these recommendations.</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Engineer, and Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of demolition permits for any buildings or structures onsite, the project applicant shall have implemented the following measures:</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have retained a California Certified Asbestos Consultant (CAC) to perform abatement project planning, monitoring (including air monitoring), oversight, and reporting of all asbestos-containing materials (ACM) encountered. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all ACM shall be conducted in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Rule 1403 and California Code of Regulation Title 8, Section 1529 (Asbestos).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have retained a licensed or certified lead inspector/assessor to conduct the abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered. The contracted lead inspector/assessor shall be certified by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). All lead abatement shall be performed by a CDPH-certified lead supervisor or a CDPH-certified worker under the direct supervision of a lead supervisor certified by CDPH. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered shall be conducted in accordance with the US Occupational Safety and Health Administration Rule 29, CFR Part 1926, and California Code of Regulation, Title 8, Section 1532.1 (Lead).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of the contracted professionals retained by the project applicant shall be provided to the City of Claremont Community Development Department. Additionally, contractors performing ACM and lead waste removal (if any is performed) shall provide evidence of abatement activities to the City’s Community Development Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. Summary Table of Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1, the project applicant's civil engineer (in coordination with the City of Claremont's Engineering Division staff) shall have determined the ownership of the public storm drain that runs along the southern boundary of the project site. If it is determined that either Caltrans or the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County is the owner of the public storm drain, the project applicant shall acquire all necessary approvals and encroachment permits necessary to connect to the storm drain; the project applicant shall provide evidence to the City's Engineering Division staff of all approvals and permits obtained. However, if onsite discharge values are restricted into the public storm drain system by the entity that owns the storm drain, additional onsite storage volume shall be required to hold all runoff generated onsite. In this case, the project applicant shall provide the City's Engineering Division staff with a final Low Impact Development Report (LIDR) demonstrating that all onsite runoff will be stored and infiltrated onsite and that no offsite runoff would occur. The final LIDR shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Claremont and Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Standards Manual requirements.</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Civil Engineer, and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits for the proposed hotel in Planning Area 1</td>
<td>City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Noise** | | | |
| NOI-1 Prior to the issuance of demolition and grading permits, the project applicant shall conduct a construction noise analysis once the final construction equipment list that will be used for demolition and grading activities is determined. The construction noise analysis shall be submitted to the Claremont's Community Development staff for review and approval. If the analysis determines that demolition and grading activities would exceed the City's construction noise standards, as outlined in Subsection 16.154.020.F.4 of the City of Claremont's Municipal Code, then specific measures to attenuate the noise impact and meet the City's noise standards shall be outlined in the construction-noise analysis, reviewed and approved by the City, and implemented by the project applicant. Due to the sensitive nature of the pre-school adjacent to the southwestern site boundary (which includes an outdoor play area), as well as the residential uses to the north across San Jose Avenue, potential noise-reduction measures to be implemented may include a temporary noise barrier along the western and/or northern boundary of the construction site. The actual height and material of the noise barrier(s), as well as any other type of noise-reduction measure(s) to be implemented, shall be determined by the specific construction noise analyses and designed so as to achieve the aforementioned noise standards. Additionally, the final | Project Applicant, Acoustical Consultant, and Construction Contractor | Prior to the issuance of demolition and grading permits | City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff |
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Table 26  Summary of Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>measures shall be placed on the cover sheet of all demolition and grading plans and shall be discussed at the pre-demolition and pre-grading meetings. The noise-reduction measures to be implemented herein are in addition to the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure NOI-2.</td>
<td>Project Applicant, Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of demolition and grading permits</td>
<td>City of Claremont, Community Development and Building Division staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI-2 Prior to the issuance of demolition and grading permits, the following noise-reduction measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of the construction phase. The measures shall be placed on the cover sheet of all demolition and grading plans and shall be discussed at the pre-demolition and - grade meetings. The noise-reduction measures to be implemented herein are in addition to the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure NOI-1. • Construction activities shall comply with all requirements of the City’s Noise Ordinance (Subsection 16.154.020.F.4 [Noise and Vibration Standards, Exemptions] of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code), as well as the following: • Restrict construction activities to daily operation between 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM Monday through Friday and 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays. There shall be no work on Sundays and federal holidays. • Noise levels, as measured on residential properties, do not exceed 65 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour, 70 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 10 minutes in any hour, and 79 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 10 minutes in any hour, or 80 dBA at any time. • A construction site notice shall be posted near the construction site access point or in an area that is clearly visible to the public. The notice shall include the following: job site address; permit number, name, and phone number of the contractor and owner; dates and duration of construction activities; construction hours allowed; and the City and construction contractor phone numbers where noise complaints can be reported and logged. If a credible complaint is received regarding construction noise levels at nearby sensitive uses (e.g., residential properties, pre-school), the complaint shall be investigated by the City. If this initial investigation indicates a potential violation of the City’s noise standards, the City shall retain a noise monitoring professional – at the project applicant’s sole expense – to monitor construction noise levels periodically for two days (as soon as reasonable following the day the complaint is received) to ensure that the construction activities are being conducted in accordance with the noise standards outlined in Subsection 16.154.020.F.4 of the City of Claremont’s Municipal Code.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Summary Table of Mitigation Measures

#### Table 26  Summary of Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ensure that all construction equipment is monitored and properly maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations to minimize noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Fit all construction equipment with properly-operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds, no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer, to minimize noise emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ If construction equipment is equipped with back-up alarm shut offs, switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters, as feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Stationary equipment (such as generators and air compressors) and equipment maintenance and staging areas shall be located as far from existing noise-sensitive land uses, as feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To the extent feasible, use acoustic enclosures, shields, or shrouds for stationary equipment such as compressors and pumps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Shut off generators when generators are not needed and limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Coordinate deliveries to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to unload and idling for long periods of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Grade surface irregularities on construction sites to prevent potholes from causing vehicular noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Minimize the use of impact devices such as jackhammers, pavement breakers, and hoe rams. Where possible, use concrete crushers or pavement saws rather than hoe rams for tasks such as concrete or asphalt demolition and removal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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