CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT
REGARDING THE
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE
CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL FIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2020029071

Exhibit A

I. BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a number of written findings be made by the lead agency in connection with certification of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approval of the project pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code. This document provides the findings required by CEQA and the specific reasons for considering the project acceptable even though the project has significant impacts that are infeasible to mitigate.

The lead agency is responsible for the adequacy and objectivity of the EIR. The Glendale Unified School District (GUSD or District), as lead agency, has subjected the Draft EIR (DEIR) and Final EIR (FEIR) to the agency's own review and analysis.

A. PROJECT LOCATION

Crescenta Valley High School (Crescenta Valley HS) is located at 2900 Community Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Map Numbers 5801-016-903 and 5801-016-904) in the southwest part of the unincorporated community of La Crescenta, Los Angeles County, California. The Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement project (proposed project) would be developed on the southernmost part of the campus within the existing field area. Specifically, the project would result in new construction that would impact approximately 4.37 acres of the existing field and track, the existing temporary bleachers, the handball courts, the tennis courts, and an existing storage facility at the southern edge of the campus. The proposed project would not impact other areas of the campus. The 4.37 acres will be referred to as the "project site" and/or "track and field."

The Crescenta Valley HS campus is trapezoidal and bordered by Community Avenue to the north, Interstate 210 (I-210) to the south, Glenwood Avenue to the east, and Ramsdell Avenue to west. The project site is bounded by existing Crescenta Valley HS tennis and basketball courts to the north, with single-family residential uses located further north across Prospect Avenue, I-210 to the south, single-family uses to the west across Ramsdell Avenue, and single-family uses to the east. La Crescenta Elementary School is located approximately 250 feet to the northeast of the project site. The community of La Crescenta is an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County that is surrounded by the cities of Glendale to the south and west, La Cañada Flintridge and unincorporated Montrose to the east, and the Angeles National Forest to the north. Regional access to the Crescenta Valley HS campus is I-210, approximately 0.1 mile to the south.

B. PROJECT SUMMARY

Objectives for the Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement project are as follows:

1. Provide lighting to allow night use of the track and field to accommodate school-related events and activities.

2. Provide bleachers with adequate capacity to accommodate various spectator events currently held on and off campus.

3. Utilize existing space to enhance opportunities for after-school athletic and extracurricular activities.

4. Enhance sense of community by allowing home football games to occur on campus.

5. Upgrade the athletic fields to boost school pride.

The proposed project would redevelop the area north of the existing track and field and south of the tennis courts to install permanent bleachers and new field lighting for the existing track and field. Additional improvements would include a restroom and storage/maintenance buildings, a team room, and a concession stand. The proposed project includes the development of new bleachers with 3,442 seats. All 3,442 seats would be along the northeastern portion of the existing field. The bleachers would be aluminum and galvanized steel construction with concrete foundations. The project would include the installation and operation of four 100-foot-tall light poles along the perimeter of the running track, two of which would have a public address (PA) system. The project would also include a 540-square-foot concession stand along the northern perimeter of the project site and a 2,254-square-foot home team room along the southeastern perimeter of the project site. The proposed project would make use of existing street and on-site parking, as well as utilizing available parking at the La Crescenta Elementary School campus. No change in site parking would occur. As a result of community comments received during the public comment period, the project was revised in the Final EIR to eliminate pedestrian access at the eastern end of the campus along Altura Avenue. An 8-foot fence would be installed at the northeast end of the track and field and the existing turnstile would be locked and not used. Campus access at this location would be limited to an emergency gate for fire/paramedic uses and District vehicle access only. Table 1-1, *Proposed Athletic Field Improvements*, provides details for each component of the proposed project.

Table 1-1 Proposed Athletic Field Improvements

Component	Description
Main Bleachers	3,442 seating capacity 43 feet high 58 feet wide 248 feet long 200-square-foot press box 14,500 total square footage
Concession Stand	540 total square footage 3 sinks 4 service windows
Storage Room	1,300 total square footage
Restrooms	1,860 total square footage
Home Team Room	2,254 total square footage
Scoreboard	10 feet high 32 feet wide
Field Lighting (4)	100 feet tall

Table 1-1 Proposed Athletic Field Improvements

Component	Description
	12 fixtures per pole 26-inch x 21-inch 1,430W LED lighting fixtures 2 poles would include a public address (PA) system

The proposed project would accommodate various sporting practices and events that currently take place on the existing Crescenta Valley HS campus or at other District campuses (namely Glendale High School for varsity football games). Currently, the project site serves Crescenta Valley HS's physical education purposes and school sports programs. In addition to Crescenta Valley HS uses, outside sporting groups have been individually permitted by GUSD to use the practice field on weekends, generally between the hours of 8:30 am and 6:00 pm on Saturdays and 8:00 am and 6:00 pm on Sundays. The various sporting practices and events to be held at the project site would include football, soccer, lacrosse, and track practices and events. The sports field would be used primarily by the Crescenta Valley HS students. No other District campuses would use the sports field on a regular basis. Events that were expected to exceed the seating capacity would be scheduled at other facilities. The highest spectator attendance is projected for the fall football games. Currently, home football games are played at Glendale High School, approximately seven miles to the south, which has a 6,500-seat capacity stadium. Based on attendance at Crescenta Valley High School football games for the past three years, the average attendance at varsity football games has been 1,600 spectators.

Construction activities are anticipated to begin in summer 2022. The construction would be completed in one stage, last 18 to 24 months, and include the following activities—grading and excavation of the northern bleacher area, trenching for site utilities, construction of the bleachers and ancillary structures, and light pole installation. Grading activities would disturb an area of approximately 44,000 square feet and would result in the export of approximately 800 cubic yards of soil.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In conformance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Glendale Unified School District conducted an extensive environmental review of the proposed project. The environmental review process has included:

- Completion of an Initial Study (IS)/Notice of Preparation (NOP) on February 20, 2020. The public review period extended from February 20 to March 20, 2020. Copies of the IS were made available for public review at the Glendale Unified School District Office and Crescenta Valley HS.

- Completion of the scoping process where the public was invited by the District to participate in a scoping meeting held March 5, 2020 at the Crescenta Valley HS Auditorium, 2900 Community Avenue, La Crescenta-Montrose, CA 91214. The notice of a public scoping meeting was included in the NOP.

- Preparation of a DEIR and supporting technical appendices, which was made available for a 45-day public review period beginning January 21, 2021 and ending March 8, 2021. The scope of the DEIR was determined based on the District's Initial Study, comments received in response to

the NOP, and comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the District. Section 2.3, *Scope of this DEIR*, of the DEIR describes the issues identified for analysis in the DEIR. The Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR was sent to interested persons and organizations, sent to the State Clearinghouse in Sacramento for distribution to public agencies. Copies of the DEIR were made available for public review on January 21, 2021 at the District's website and for individual order upon request.

- A public informational meeting was held on February 17, 2021 to present an overview of the CEQA process, the project description, and the conclusions in the DEIR. The meeting was conducted virtually due to COVID-19 gathering restrictions. Attendees were given the option to present verbal and written comments during the meeting.

- Preparation of a Final EIR (FEIR), including the Responses to Comments to the DEIR, the Findings of Fact, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations. The FEIR/Response to Comments contains comments on the DEIR and responses to those comments.

- Public hearings on the proposed project were held before the Glendale Unified School District Board of Education on September 28, 2021.

D. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings the proposed project includes, but is not limited to, the following documents and other evidence:

- The NOP, NOA, and all other public notices issued by the District in conjunction with the proposed Project.

- The DEIR and FEIR for the proposed project.

- All written and verbal comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the DEIR.

- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the DEIR.

- All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the proposed Project.

- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the DEIR and FEIR.

- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the DEIR and FEIR.

- The Resolutions adopted by the District's Board of Education in connection with the proposed project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein, including comments received after the close of the comment period and responses thereto.

- Matters of common knowledge to the District, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings.

E. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the District's actions related to the project are at the Glendale Unified School District Office, 349 West Magnolia Avenue, Glendale, CA 91204. The Glendale Unified School District is the custodian of the administrative record for the project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request at the offices of the Glendale Unified School District. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and Guidelines Section 15091(e).

II. FINDINGS AND FACTS AND OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Glendale Unified School District, as lead agency, is required under CEQA to make written findings concerning each alternative and each significant environmental impact identified in the DEIR and FEIR.

Specifically, regarding findings, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

> (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
>
> 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.
>
> 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
>
> 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.
>
> (b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
>
> (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in

subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

The "changes or alterations" referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370, including:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

A. FORMAT

This section summarizes the significant environmental impacts of the project, describes how these impacts are to be mitigated, and discusses various alternatives to the proposed project, which were developed in an effort to reduce the remaining significant environmental impacts. All impacts are considered potentially significant prior to mitigation unless otherwise stated in the findings.

This remainder of this section is divided into the following subsections:

Section B, Summary of Environmental Impacts, presents the summary of impacts of the proposed project.

Section C, Findings on Impacts Determined to Be Less Than Significant, presents the impacts of the proposed project that were determined in the DEIR to be less than significant without the addition of mitigation measures and presents the rationales for these determinations.

Section D, Findings on Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significant, presents significant impacts of the proposed project that were identified in the FEIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and the rationales for the findings.

Section E, Findings on Significant Unavoidable Impacts, presents significant impacts of the proposed project that were identified in the FEIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, the findings for significant impacts, and the rationales for the findings.

Section F, Findings on Project Alternatives, presents alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them in relation to the findings set forth in Section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which allows a public agency to approve a project that would result in one or more significant environmental effects if the project alternatives are found to be infeasible because of specific economic, social, or other considerations.

B. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following is a summary of the environmental topics considered to have no impact, a less than significant impact, a less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation measures, and a significant and unavoidable impact.

It should be noted that topics identified as significant and unavoidable contain individual impacts that would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

Less than Significant Impact or No Impact

- Aesthetics (Visual character degradation; effect on a scenic vista and state scenic highways)
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning

- Mineral Resources
- Noise (Noise exposure from private air strip; excessive noise levels from public airports and private air strips; short-term groundborne vibration and groundborne noise)
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation (Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including roadway facilities, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b); hazards due to a design feature; inadequate emergency access;)
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service System

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

- Noise (Construction-generated noise)

Significant and Unavoidable Impact

- Aesthetics (Operational light trespass)
- Noise (Operation-related noise levels in excess of established standards)
- Transportation (Parking)

C. FINDINGS ON IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Initial Study

An Initial Study was prepared by the District to identify the potential significant effects of the proposed project. The Initial Study was completed and distributed with the NOP for the proposed project, dated February 20, 2020. The Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have no impact or less than significant impacts to the following topics: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Recreation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service System. All other topical areas of evaluation included in the Environmental Checklist were determined to require further assessment in an EIR.

DEIR

It was determined that several potential environmental effects would not result from the proposed project or would result but would not have a significant impact on the environment. This determination was made based on the findings of the DEIR prepared for the proposed project. The following summary briefly describes those environmental topics that were found not to be significant with

implementation of existing regulations, as detailed in each respective topical section of Chapter 5 of the DEIR.

1. Aesthetics

IMPACT 5.1-1 THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON A SCENIC VISTA.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.1-8 of Section 5.1, *Aesthetics* of the DEIR.

The project site is fully developed with an existing high school campus, athletic fields, on-site parking and ancillary educational uses. The project's surrounding vicinity is urban and fully developed with residential, commercial, and educational uses. Additionally, the southern end of the project site is directly bounded by the I-210. The nearest scenic areas in the vicinity are the Verdugo Mountains Open Space Preserve, approximately 0.5 miles to the southwest, and the Angeles National Forest, approximately 1.25 miles to the northeast.

Partial views of the Angeles National Forest and the Verdugo Mountains are afforded to motorists traveling on the north-south oriented Ramsdell Avenue, which forms the eastern boundary of Crescenta Valley HS. The proposed project would not introduce visual obstructions that would affect motorists or passerby traveling on this roadway, as views from the project site and these scenic areas are limited and obstructed by the surrounding urban environment. Additional, views from the south beyond I-210 would not be obstructed by the project elements (permanent bleachers, new field lighting, and other stadium facilities).

Moreover, the project site does not contain unique visual features that would distinguish it from surrounding areas nor is it located within a designated scenic vista as identified in the Los Angeles County General Plan Conservation and Natural Resources Element. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact to scenic vistas.

Finding:

Impacts to scenic vista would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

2. Air Quality

IMPACT 5.2-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.2-22 of Section 5.2, A*ir Quality* of the DEIR.

Changes in population, housing, or employment growth projections have the potential to affect Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) demographic projections and therefore the assumptions in South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Based on the scope and nature of the project, the construction of the bleachers and ancillary structures would not result in an increase in population and employment in the unincorporated community of La Crescenta. Finally, the long-term emissions generated by the proposed project would

not produce criteria air pollutants that exceed the South Coast AQMD significance thresholds for project operations (see Impact 5.2-3). South Coast AQMD's significance thresholds identify whether a project has the potential to cumulatively contribute to the Southern California Air Resources Board (SoCAB) nonattainment designations. Because the project would not exceed the South Coast AQMD's regional significance thresholds and growth is consistent with regional growth projections, the project would not interfere with South Coast AQMD's ability to achieve the long-term air quality goals identified in the AQMP. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

Finding:

Impacts to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.2-2 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT GENERATE SHORT-TERM EMISSIONS IN EXCEEDANCE OF SOUTH COAST AQMD'S THRESHOLD CRITERIA.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.2-23 of Section 5.2, A*ir Quality* of the DEIR.

Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources, such as on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, vehicles hauling materials to and from the site, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Construction of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutants associated with construction equipment exhaust and fugitive dust from demolition and debris haul, grading and soil haul, trenching, building construction, architectural coating, pavement of asphalt and nonasphalt surfaces, and finishing and landscaping of the site. Air pollutant emissions from construction activities on-site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. An estimate of maximum daily construction emissions for the proposed project is provided in Table 5.2-9. According to South Coast AQMD 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. As shown in Table 5.2-9, the maximum daily emissions for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ from construction-related activities would be less than their respective South Coast AQMD regional significance threshold values.

Finding:

Short-term construction-related impacts to air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.2-3: LONG-TERM OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT GENERATE EMISSIONS IN EXCEEDANCE OF SOUTH COAST AQMD'S THRESHOLD CRITERIA.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.2-24 of Section 5.2, A*ir Quality* of the DEIR.

Implementation of the proposed project would improve the Crescenta Valley HS existing athletic facilities, which would allow for varsity games that are currently held at Glendale High School to be

played on-site. As a result, the proposed project would provide a closer option for stadium events for use by the school and local population. As described in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, because these are existing games and events already held at other locations in the District, project implementation would not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with transportation emissions would not increase. Operation of the ancillary structures would result in a nominal increase in energy use. Consequently, project operations would result in an overall minimal net change in emissions from existing conditions and would not exceed the South Coast AQMD regional operation-phase significance thresholds. Projects that do not exceed the South Coast AQMD regional significance thresholds would not result in an incremental increase in health impacts in the SoCAB from project-related increases in criteria air pollutants.

Finding:

Long-term operation-related impacts to air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.2-4: CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.2-24 of Section 5.2, A*ir Quality* of the DEIR.

This impact analysis describes changes in localized impacts from short-term construction activities. The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations during construction activities if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated levels.

Construction-Phase LSTs

Screening-level localized significance thresholds (LSTs) (pounds per day) are the amount of project-related mass emissions at which localized concentrations (ppm or $\mu g/m^3$) could exceed the ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for criteria air pollutants for which the SoCAB is designated nonattainment. The screening-level LSTs are based on the project site size and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor and are based on the California AAQS, which are the most stringent AAQS, established to protect sensitive receptors most susceptible to respiratory distress. Table 5.2-11 of the DEIR shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during on-site construction activities compared with the South Coast AQMD's screening-level LSTs, for sensitive receptors within 82 feet (25 meters). As shown in the table, the construction of the proposed project would not generate construction-related on-site emissions that would exceed the screening-level LSTs. Thus, project-related construction activities would not have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Construction Health Risk

The Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment (OEHHA) issued updated guidance for the preparation of health risk assessments in March 2015 (OEHHA 2015). It has also developed a cancer risk factor and noncancer chronic reference exposure level for diesel particulate matter (DPM) based on continuous exposure over a 30-year time frame. No short-term acute exposure levels have been

developed for DPM. South Coast AQMD currently does not require the evaluation of long-term excess cancer risk or chronic health impacts for a short-term project. Emissions from construction equipment primarily consist of DPM. The project is anticipated to be developed in approximately 21 months, which would limit the exposure of on- and off-site receptors. Based on guidance from South Coast AQMD, construction risk is extrapolated based on the LST analysis. As described above, construction activities would not exceed the screening-level construction LSTs. For the reasons stated above, it is anticipated that construction emissions would not pose a threat to on- and off-site receptors, and project-related construction health impacts would be less than significant.

Finding:

Impacts from construction-related exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.2-5: OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.2-26 of Section 5.2, A*ir Quality* of the DEIR.

This impact analysis describes changes in localized impacts from long-term operation of the project. The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations during operational activities if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated levels.

Operation LSTs

Operation of the proposed project would not generate substantial quantities of emissions from on-site, stationary sources. Land uses that have the potential to generate substantial stationary sources of emissions require a permit from South Coast AQMD, such as chemical processing or warehousing operations where substantial truck idling could occur on-site. The proposed project does not fall within these categories of uses. Therefore, net localized air quality impacts from project-related operations would be less than significant.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of carbon monoxide (CO) called hotspots. 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. The proposed project would generate a net increase of 644 PM peak hour trips, which is substantially below the incremental increase in peak hour vehicle trips needed to generate a significant CO impact. Implementation of the project would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the project site.

Finding:

Impacts from long-term operation-related exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3. Energy

IMPACT 5.3-1: CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD NOT RESULT IN WASTEFUL, INEFFICIENT, OR UNNECESSARY CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY OR HAVE EXCESSIVE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.3-4 of Section 5.3, *Energy* of the DEIR.

Construction of the proposed project would require the use of construction equipment for grading, hauling, and building activities. The construction activities are typical for projects of this nature and would not require any construction techniques that would require substantial amounts of energy. The surrounding area is already served by electrical infrastructure provided by Southern California Edison (SCE). The proposed project would connect to these existing lines. Adequate infrastructure capacity in the vicinity of the site would be available to accommodate the electricity and natural gas demand for construction activities and would not require additional or expanded infrastructure.

The construction contractors are also expected to minimize idling of construction equipment during construction as required by state law (see Section 5.2, *Air Quality*), and reduce construction and demolition waste by recycling. These required practices would limit wasteful and unnecessary electrical energy and gas consumption. Furthermore, there are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in other parts of the state. Therefore, the proposed short-term construction activities would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary fuel consumption.

Transportation

Short-term Construction Impacts

Transportation energy use depends on the type and number of trips, VMT, fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary. The majority of construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas powered or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment. Impacts related to transportation energy use during construction would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure.

Findings:

Impacts to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.3-2: OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN WASTEFUL, INEFFICIENT, OR UNNECESSARY CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY RESOURCES, OR CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT A

STATE OR LOCAL PLAN FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY OR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.3-5 of Section 5.6, *Energy* of the DEIR.

Electricity

Project operation would use approximately 22,838 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/yr) for field lighting operation. While the proposed project would increase energy demand at the site compared to existing conditions, it would be required to comply with the applicable Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen. In addition, because the proposed project would be subject to the more stringent 2019 Title 24 standards and would exceed energy efficiency code requirements through project design, the project's electricity demand could potentially be lower than the calculations presented above. Project development would not require SCE to obtain new or expanded electricity supplies, and impacts would be less than significant.

Renewable Energy

Project development would not interfere with achievement of the 60 percent Renewable Portfolio Standard set by SB 100 for 2030 or the 100 percent zero carbon energy goal for 2045. These goals apply to SCE and other electricity retailers. As electricity retailers reach these goals, emissions from end user electricity use will decrease from current emission estimates.

Vehicle Miles Traveled and Fuel Consumption

Transportation energy use depends on the type and number of trips, VMT, fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Transportation energy used during operation of the site would come from employee and visitor vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would be temporary and would fluctuate throughout the lifespan of the proposed project. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix F), the proposed project would generate 644 trips on a Friday evening during special events or games. However, since varsity football games are currently held at Glendale High School, the proposed project would allow varsity games to be played on-site, providing a closer venue for use by the school and local population. As described in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, project implementation would not result in an increase in VMT. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a reduction in transportation related fuel consumption.

Findings:

Impacts to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during operation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

4. Geology and Soils

IMPACT 5.4-1: PROJECT OCCUPANTS AND VISITORS WOULD BE SUBJECT TO POTENTIAL STRONG SEISMIC GROUND SHAKING.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.4-7 of Section 5.4, *Geology and Soils* of the DEIR.

The proposed project is in a seismically active area of Southern California, and therefore would potentially be subject to moderate to strong ground shaking from local and regional earthquakes. Strong seismic ground shaking could occur at the project site, resulting in damage to structures (e.g., bleachers, restrooms, concessions, team rooms) if they are not properly designed to withstand such conditions. Construction of the bleachers, restrooms, and team room would be subject to building design and construction standards identified in the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC contains provisions for earthquake safety based on factors including occupancy type, the types of soil and rock on-site, and the strength of ground motion with a specified probability at the site. Additionally, during construction, on-site inspectors would ensure that the project meets and adheres to all requirements of the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for school facilities. The proposed project would be designed to meet the exacting seismic requirements of the Field Act, reviewed and approved by DSA, and construction will be monitored by a DSA-approved inspector. Adherence to such building design and construction standards would ensure that potential impacts relative to strong seismic ground shaking remain less than significant.

Finding:

Impacts to seismic ground shaking would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.4-2: UNSTABLE GEOLOGIC UNIT OR SOILS CONDITIONS, INCLUDING SOIL EROSION, COULD RESULT FROM DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.4-7 of Section 5.4, *Geology and Soils* of the DEIR.

The potential exists for soil erosion during project construction to expose the underlying ground surface. The construction contractor would be required to implement standard dust control measures and construction site stormwater runoff control measures. Conformance with such standards would reduce the potential for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil from the site during the grading and construction phase. Due to the flat topography of the proposed project site, the potential for lateral spreading is considered very low. Additionally, the project site is not in an area prone to liquefaction. The project site is not at risk for on-site or off-site landslide or rockfall events due to its relatively level surface. Project compliance with the requirements of the CBC and the DSA standards would ensure that all proposed improvements would be constructed in conformance with appropriate seismic design and construction methods to reduce potential risk to the public, thereby reducing impacts associated with unstable soils.

Finding:

Impacts to unstable geologic unit or soils conditions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

IMPACT 5.5-1: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD GENERATE A NET INCREASE IN GHG EMISSIONS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THAT WOULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.5-20 of Section 5.3, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* of the DEIR.

Implementation of the proposed project would improve the Crescenta Valley HS existing athletic facilities, which would allow for varsity games that are currently held at Glendale High School to be played on-site. As a result, the proposed project would provide a closer option for stadium events for use by the school and local population. As described in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, project implementation would not result in an increase in VMT. Therefore, GHG emissions associated with transportation emissions are not anticipated to increase. Operation of the ancillary structures would result in a nominal increase in energy use. GHG emissions associated with field lighting for the stadium would generate 12 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MTCO_2e$) per year. As shown in Table 5.5-5, the proposed project would not exceed South Coast AQMD's bright-line significance threshold.

Finding:

Impacts to the increase of GHG Emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.5-2: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, POLICY, OR REGULATION ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF REDUCING THE EMISSIONS OF GHG EMISSIONS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.5-21 of Section 5.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* of the DEIR.

Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions include CARB's Scoping Plan and SCAG's RTP/SCS.

CARB Scoping Plan

CARB's Scoping Plan is California's GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state's GHG emissions reduction target established by AB 32, which is to return to 1990 emission levels by year 2020. On December 24, 2017, CARB adopted the Final 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update to address the new 2030 interim target to achieve a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, established by SB 32. While measures in the Scoping Plan apply to state agencies and not the proposed project, the project's GHG emissions would be reduced by statewide compliance with measures that have been adopted since AB 32 and SB 32 were adopted. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct implementation of the CARB Scoping Plan.

SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but provides incentives for consistency to governments and developers. Because stadium operations would be moved to the project site upon completion of construction, the proposed project would provide students and the local population with a closer option for stadium events, thereby reducing VMT in the District. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the RTP/SCS, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings:

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, impacts to GHG plan adoption would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

IMPACT 5.6-1 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COULD AFFECT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN EMERGENCY RESPONDER OR EVACUATION PLAN.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.6-8 of Section 5.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* of the DEIR.

The proposed project would not interfere with the implementation of the Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP) or any of the daily operations of the County's Emergency Operation Center, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD), or the Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department. All construction activities would be required to be performed per the County's and LACFD's standards and regulations. As appropriate, a traffic control plan would be prepared and implemented to ensure that the project does not interfere with the circulation of emergency service vehicles and that emergency access to and from the site and any neighboring properties is maintained at all times.

The proposed project would also be required to go through the County'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 Title 32 (Fire Code) of the County's Code of Ordinance—to ensure that they do not interfere with the provision of local emergency services (e.g., provision of adequate access roads to accommodate emergency response vehicles, adequate numbers/locations of fire hydrants). Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the Los Angeles County's emergency response or evacuation plans.

Findings:

Impacts to the implementation of an emergency responder or evacuation plan would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.6-2 THE PROJECT SITE IS IN A DESIGNATED FIRE HAZARD ZONE AND COULD EXPOSE STRUCTURES AND/OR RESIDENCES TO FIRE DANGER.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.6-9 of Section 5.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* of the DEIR.

The proposed project is not in a state or local responsibility area (SRA or LRA) or land classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ), as identified in the Los Angeles County Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map. The nearest SRA FHSZ is approximately 1.25 miles north, and the nearest LRA FHSZ is approximately 0.43 mile south. Land between the edge of the nearest FHSZ and the project site is dense urban development and Interstate 210.

According to the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), a Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) is defined as any area where structures and other human development meet or intermingle with wildland vegetation. There are two types of classification of WUI areas: interface and intermix. Interface WUIs are areas with housing in the vicinity of contiguous wildland vegetation, and intermix WUIs are areas where housing and vegetation intermingle. As identified in the Wildland-Urban Interface Change 1990-2010 map, the proposed project is in an intermix WUI area.

The proposed project would be confined to the existing developed high school campus. The project site is surrounded by single-family residences and I-210. There is no wildland susceptible to wildfire on or near the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not introduce people or structures to substantial hazards from wildland fires.

Findings:

Impacts to hazards from wildland fires would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

7. Hydrology and Water Quality

IMPACT 5.7-1 THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD VIOLATE ANY WATER QUALITY STANDARDS OR WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.7-7 of Section 5.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of the DEIR.

Construction Phase

Clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to impact water quality through soil erosion and increasing the amount of silt and debris carried in runoff. Additionally, the use of construction materials, such as fuels, solvents, and paints may present a risk to surface water quality. Finally, the refueling and parking of construction vehicles and other equipment on-site during construction may result in oil, grease, or related pollutant leaks and spills that may discharge into the storm drain system.

To minimize these potential impacts, development of the project would require compliance with the Construction General Permit (CGP) Water Quality Order 2009-0009-DWQ (as amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-006-DWQ), which requires the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). A SWPPP requires the incorporation of best management practices (BMPs) to control sediment, erosion, and hazardous materials contamination of runoff during construction and prevent contaminants from reaching receiving water bodies. The construction contractor is always required to maintain a copy of the SWPPP at the site and implement all construction BMPs identified in the SWPPP during construction activities. Prior to the start of

construction, the project applicant is required to provide proof of filing of the PRDs with the SWRCB, which include preparation of SWPPP. Categories of potential BMPs that would be implemented for the proposed project are described in Table 5.9-1, *Construction BMPs*. The District would comply with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Construction impacts to stormwater quality would be less than significant.

Operation Phase

The proposed project would take place within the boundaries of an already developed Crescenta Valley HS campus, which is currently connected to the County's storm drain system. Prior to the start of construction, a water quality management plan (WQMP) would be prepared to describe site conditions, pollutants of concern, low impact design (LID) and treatment control BMPs, calculations for the design capture volume based on final site design, source control BMPs, and an operations and maintenance plan that outlines the inspection and maintenance responsibilities for the treatment control BMPs. This would reduce peak flows and infiltrate some of the stormwater into the ground. In addition, site design BMPs would be implemented. After completion of the project, ground surfaces at the project site would be either hardscape or maintained landscaping, and no large areas of exposed soil would be left to erode off the campus. The campus would not discharge increased stormwater runoff or pollutants.

Findings:

Impacts to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.7-2 THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY DECREASE GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES OR INTERFERE SUBSTANTIALLY WITH GROUNDWATER RECHARGE SUCH THAT THE PROJECT MAY IMPEDE SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT OF THE BASIN.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.7-10 of Section 5.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of the DEIR.

The project site is above the San Fernando Valley groundwater basin and Verdugo basin. The proposed project does not include new wells that would extract groundwater from the aquifer. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not lower the groundwater table or deplete groundwater supplies. Furthermore, the existing school campus does not provide intentional groundwater recharge. The proposed project would install permanent bleachers and new field lighting around the existing track and field, which would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on-site. However, compared to existing conditions, this increase is not anticipated to substantially affect groundwater recharge in the area. Additionally, no water features (e.g., streams or creeks) that serve the purpose of groundwater recharge for the area are in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge.

Findings:

Impacts to groundwater would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.7-3 SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH THE ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN A SUBSTANTIAL EROSION OR SILTATION ON- OR OFF-SITE.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.7-10 of Section 5.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of the DEIR.

There are no streams or rivers on the project site. The school is fully developed and currently connects to the Los Angeles County storm drain system, and the proposed improvements would not significantly increase impermeable surfaces on campus.

Construction Phase

During construction, erosion and siltation from the disturbed areas may occur. Construction-related activities that expose soils to rainfall/runoff and wind are primarily responsible for erosion. Construction activities would expose soil through excavation, grading, and trenching. Unless adequate erosion controls are installed and maintained during construction, sediment may enter storm drains. Project construction would be subject to the Statewide Construction General Permit and implementation of BMPs specified in the SWPPP. Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related grading and construction activities. The construction-phase BMPs would also ensure effective control of sediment discharge and associated pollutants associated (e.g., nutrients, heavy metals, and certain pesticides). Therefore, project-related construction activities would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Operation Phase

Upon project completion, drainage from the campus would continue to be captured on-site or conveyed to the Los Angeles River via the same storm drains as under existing conditions. The entire campus would discharge the same amount of stormwater. No areas of exposed soil would be left to erode following project completion. All areas would either be paved or landscaped. The proposed project also includes the implementation of post-development BMPs as a part of the WQMP, which would prevent erosion and siltation on- or off-site. Furthermore, the District would be required to submit grading plans to the County per the provisions outlined in the County's Code of Ordinance. During County review of submitted grading plans, staff would ensure that the minimum requirements to regulate grading and earthwork are incorporated into the proposed project in order to control the quality of drainage and runoff (including erosion and siltation) from the project site. Thus, project development would not cause substantial erosion.

Findings:

Impacts to erosion or siltation on- or off-site would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.7-4 SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH THE

ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE RATE OR AMOUNT OF SURFACE RUNOFF IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN FLOODING ON- OR OFFSITE.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.7-11 of Section 5.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of the DEIR.

Refer to Impact 5.7-3. The drainage pattern and the flow and rate of stormwater runoff from the campus after project completion would be the same as existing conditions. Thus, project development would not result in flooding on- or off-campus.

Findings:

Impacts to flooding on- or off-site would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

8. Noise

IMPACT 5.8-3 THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CREATE SHORT-TERM OR LONG-TERM GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION AND GROUNDBORNE NOISE.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.8-17 of Section 5.8, *Noise* of the DEIR.

Operational Vibration

The operation of the proposed project would not include any substantial long-term vibration sources. Thus, no significant vibration effects from operations sources would occur.

Vibration Annoyance

The County of Los Angeles has an established vibration threshold equivalent to 80 vibration decibel (VdB). Table 5.8-11, *Vibration Annoyance Levels from Project Construction Equipment*, shows VdB levels for typical construction equipment and the estimated vibration levels at nearby sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors vary based on the proposed construction area, as discussed above for construction noise. The nearest off-campus receptors are approximately 150 and 200 feet from construction activity. As shown in Table 5.8-11 of the DEIR, vibration levels would not exceed 80 VdB at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Architectural Damage

For reference, a peak particle velocity of 0.20 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) is used as the limit for nonengineered timber and masonry buildings (which would apply to the off-site surrounding structures) (FTA 2018). At distances greater than 25 feet, construction-generated vibration levels would be less than 0.2 in/sec PPV. Table 5.8-12 shows typical construction equipment vibration levels and estimated vibration levels at the nearest residential structures. The nearest sensitive receptor is 35 feet east of the edge of the proposed construction site. At this distance, vibration levels would be up to 0.127 in/sec PPV, which would not exceed 0.2 in/sec PPV.

Findings:

Impacts related to vibration annoyance would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

9. Public Services

IMPACT 5.9-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD INTRODUCE NEW STRUCTURES INTO THE LACFD'S SERVICE BOUNDARIES, INCREASING THE REQUIREMENT FOR FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.9-4 of Section 5.9, *Public Services* of the DEIR.

The proposed improvements would result in additional usage of the project site during organized events and/or practices. Due to the nature of the facilities proposed, there is potential that implementation of the proposed project would substantially increase the need for fire protection services, alter response times, or adversely affect LACFD's ability to provide service to the site using existing equipment and personnel.

The LACFD is the primary fire department providing service to the project site and would remain so under project implementation. LACFD Station 63 is approximately 0.5 mile south from the project site. Currently, there are no existing deficiencies in fire protection service provided in the area around and including the project site. The proposed project is not anticipated to have significant impacts on fire services. Section 5.10, *Transportation*, states that the District will implement an event traffic control plan to direct traffic flow and ensure public safety during major sporting events. With the implementation of the management plan, the proposed project would not result in adverse road conditions that would interfere with LACFD operations during an event of emergency or disaster. The proposed project would not have a significant impact on LACFD's ability to maintain adequate fire protection service in the area. Based on the review of the proposed project by the LACFD, there would be adequate facilities, equipment, and service personnel to respond in the event of an emergency at this location.

Findings:

Impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.9-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD INTRODUCE NEW STRUCTURES INTO THE LASD'S SERVICE BOUNDARIES, THEREBY INCREASING THE REQUIREMENT FOR POLICE PROTECTION FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.9-6 of Section 5.9, *Public Services* of the DEIR.

The proposed improvements would result in additional usage of the project site during organized events or practices, which are currently held at Glendale High School 7 miles south of the project site.

Due to the nature of the facilities proposed, there is potential that such conditions would potentially increase the need for sheriff protection services, alter response times, or adversely affect the department's ability to provide service to the site using existing equipment and personnel.

LASD has an average response time of 3.5 minutes, and the Crescenta Valley Sheriff Station currently has 63 sworn personnel and 28 civilian employees. The proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on police services. Currently, there are no existing deficiencies in the level of police service provided to the area including and surrounding the project site. Additionally, as stated in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, the District will implement an event traffic control plan to direct traffic flow and ensure public safety during major sporting events. With the implementation of the management plan, the proposed project would not result in adverse road conditions that would interfere with LASD operations during an event of emergency or disaster. The proposed project would not have a significant impact on the ability to maintain adequate level of police protection service to the area.

Additionally, the proposed project would allow for home varsity football games to be held at Crescenta Valley HS and during major sporting events, the number of traffic and pedestrians would increase at the project site. However, as stated in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, the District would implement an event traffic control plan with school safety traffic control personnel stationed at the intersections to help improve traffic flow and ensure public safety during peak travel times to and from major sporting events held at Crescenta Valley HS. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the LASD's ability to provide adequate service and would not require new or expanded police facilities that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

Findings:

Impacts related to police protection services would be less than significant no mitigation measures are necessary.

10. Transportation

IMPACT 5.10-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH A PROGRAM, PLAN, ORDINANCE OR POLICY ADDRESSING THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, INCLUDING TRANSIT, ROADWAY, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.10-7 of Section 5.10, *Transportation* of the DEIR.

All roads in the vicinity of the school have paved sidewalks on both sides of the street. In addition, crosswalks are painted on all major intersections in the study area, such as intersections along Community Avenue and Ramsdell Avenue. The closest bikeway to the project site is a Class II bikeway along Foothill Boulevard. The existing sidewalk and crosswalks would provide for adequate pedestrian travel—accessing the project site on foot or parking on public streets and walking to the school. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities would not be impacted due to the proposed project.

During construction, the project may have the potential to cause temporary closure of the sidewalks adjacent to the athletic field, or increase safety hazards due to construction vehicles entering and exiting

the project site (e.g., for delivery of building materials). Signage and/or workers conducting traffic would be present to direct pedestrians.

The proposed project site is primarily surrounded by residential uses, and the attendees of the field would continue to use the designated pedestrian routes that they currently use. While implementation of the proposed project would increase vehicular and pedestrian travel to the site during athletic events, the proposed project improvements would not include any new features that would introduce new hazards to pedestrian safety because no changes to existing roadways or pedestrian/bicycle accommodations would occur.

The proposed project would be confined to the project site and would not affect roadway facilities. No new roads or infrastructures (such as stop signs, traffic lights, traffic calming measures, etc.) would be installed under the proposed project.

Findings:

Impacts related to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.10-2: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT OR BE INCONSISTENT WITH CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15064.3, SUBDIVISION (B).

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.10-7 of Section 5.10, *Transportation* of the DEIR.

The proposed project would allow for already occurring larger sporting events such as varsity football games that are currently held at Glendale High School, approximately 7 miles from Crescenta Valley HS, to be relocated to Crescenta Valley HS, serving its own student population. The change in VMT as a result of this shift in vehicle trips cannot be precisely predicted. These trips are intermittent and infrequent in nature (depending on sports season, and no events during much of the calendar year). Any project-generated operational change in VMT would generally be associated with the redistribution of trips to and from these existing larger sporting events. With the implementation of the proposed project, trips generated by the football games would originate and conclude at Crescenta Valley HS instead of Glendale High School. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a shift in travel patterns among local streets rather than an overall increase in trips compared to existing traffic levels.

The proposed project is a local-serving use, providing an improved sports facility primarily for teams and spectators from the local school district. The proposed project would not create any new regional trips, even for playoff and championship games, and those are contained within one season of the year. Travel by the visiting team and spectators would simply be to a new facility, rather than the current facility, and no new regional trips would be created, and average trip lengths would not increase. VMT would not increase as local spectators would be closer to the event, and for the visiting team spectators the regional trips generated would not be new trips and many of those trips would be shorter in length than they were before the project. Overall trips would be shorter in length and VMT would be lower, as the District and local area would now have an additional destination for larger sporting events that are already occurring.

For typical daily operations of the school, the proposed project would have no measurable effect on VMT. The project would not generate any outside vehicle trips when events are not scheduled, and would only be supporting the school use as an ancillary facility. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in VMT from existing conditions by allowing local spectators to be closer to the events.

Findings:

Impacts related to conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

IMPACT 5.10-3: PROJECT CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN DESIGNED TO ADEQUATELY ADDRESS POTENTIALLY HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS (SHARP CURVES, ETC.), POTENTIAL CONFLICTING USES, AND EMERGENCY ACCESS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.10-8 of Section 5.10, *Transportation* of the DEIR.

No off-site improvements are proposed as part of the proposed project. No new access drives or roadway improvements are proposed to provide access to the project site; therefore, no improvements that may result in hazardous conditions would occur. Main access to the proposed fields would remain at the pedestrian gate (which also serves as emergency vehicle access) along Ramsdell Avenue at the southwestern portion of the Crescenta Valley HS campus. Parking for the field is in parking lots along Ramsdell Avenue and along streets in the surrounding neighborhoods. Additionally, the proposed project would not change the land use of the site, which currently supports sporting fields. The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Construction of the project would temporarily generate additional traffic on the existing area roadway network. These vehicle trips would include construction workers traveling to the site as well as delivery trips associated with construction equipment and materials. Delivery of construction materials to the site would likely require a number of oversized vehicles that may travel at slower speeds than existing traffic.

Because of the limited nature of the proposed improvements, a significant number of construction trips to/from the site is not anticipated. Once materials are delivered to the site, all construction activities would occur on-site within the existing boundaries of the school campus and would not disrupt off-site traffic flows. Lane closures are not anticipated, and no off-site roadway improvements are required or proposed that would have the potential to interrupt area circulation or redirect traffic. As such, project construction is not anticipated to substantially disrupt area traffic or cause a significant increase in daily traffic on area roadways or at local intersections, thereby adversely affecting existing conditions. Per standard construction procedures, the construction contractor would prepare and implement a traffic control plan to ensure that public safety and emergency access are maintained during the construction phase. Implementation of the traffic control plan would ensure that existing conditions are not adversely affected or substantially degraded by project construction.

No on-site improvements for purposes of vehicular access are proposed. The existing access lane is located on the southwestern edge of the project site. Therefore, emergency access to the field and

associated improvements would be similar to what occurs under existing conditions and would be adequate to serve the site.

Findings:

Impacts related to increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

11. Wildfire

IMPACT 5.11-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIR AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN OR EMERGENCY EVACUATION PLAN.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.11-8 of Section 5.11, *Wildfire* of the DEIR. See also Section 5.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, Impact 5.6-1.

Implementation of the proposed project would not have a significant impact on implementation of the Los Angeles Emergency Operations Plan. Additionally, as stated in Section 5.10, *Transportation*, the District will implement an event traffic control plan to direct traffic flow and ensure public safety during major sporting events. With the implementation of the management plan, the proposed project would not result in road conditions that would interfere with emergency responders. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Findings:

Impacts related to impairing an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

D. FINDINGS ON IMPACTS MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The following summary describes impacts of the proposed project that, without mitigation, would result in significant adverse impacts. Upon implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the DEIR, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

1. Noise

IMPACT 5.8-1: CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD RESULT IN TEMPORARY NOISE INCREASES IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.8-7 of Section 5.8, *Noise* of the DEIR.

Construction Vehicles

The transport of workers and materials to and from the construction site could potentially increase noise levels along local access roadways, including but not limited to I-210, La Crescenta Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue, and Ramsdell Avenue. Individual construction vehicle pass-bys and haul trucks

may create momentary noise levels of up to 85 dBA (L_{max}) at 50 feet from the vehicle, but these occurrences would generally be temporary and short lived.

The building construction phase is anticipated to generate 26 daily trips (workers and vendors combined) based on information provided by the District and the air quality modeling for the project. The addition of 26 worker and vendor trips and 26 daily haul trips would result in a negligible noise increase when compared to the thousands of existing daily trips on these roadways. Therefore, noise impacts from construction-related truck traffic would be less than significant.

Construction Equipment

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. Each activity phase of construction involves the use of different construction equipment, and therefore each activity phase has its own distinct noise characteristics. Noise levels from construction activities are dominated by the loudest piece of construction equipment. The dominant noise source is typically the engine, although work piece noise (such as dropping of materials) can also be noticeable.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not require blasting or pile driving. Construction building activities would be located in various areas spread throughout the project site. Overall, construction is anticipated to last approximately 1 year and 3 months.

Off-Campus Receptors to the South

Residences to the south would be across I-210. The City of Glendale General Plan Noise Element provides existing noise contours along I-210 that extend to the unincorporated area of La Crescenta and the project area. The residences to the south are within the 70 dBA CNEL noise contour. Project construction noise levels are therefore anticipated to be overshadowed by traffic noise, and construction noise impacts to the sensitive receptors to the south would be less than significant.

Off-Campus Receptors to the West

A 540-square-foot concession stand is proposed on the southwest corner of the track and field. The concession stand would be prefabricated, and minor grading would take place before installation. It is anticipated it would take less than 10 days to complete and therefore the threshold of 75 dBA would apply (LA County Code Section 12.08.440 (B)). The nearest sensitive receptors to the prefabricated structure are approximately 150 feet to the west; at these receptors, construction noise levels would be 75 dBA or less. Because of the anticipated short-term duration for this activity and because construction noise levels at these receptors would be 75 dBA or less, construction noise impacts at sensitive receptors to the west would be less than significant.

On-Campus Receptors

The nearest on-site building is approximately 250 feet from the nearest proposed construction area (bleachers). At that distance, exterior noise levels could reach up to 67 dBA L_{eq}. Typical exterior-to-interior noise attenuation is 25 dBA with windows closed, resulting in interior noise levels of approximately 42 dBA L_{eq}. The CALGreen requirements for nonresidential interior spaces is 50 dBA L_{eq}. Therefore, because average construction noise levels are not expected to exceed 50 dBA L_{eq}, this would result in a less-than-significant impact to students on campus.

Off-Campus Receptors to the North and East

As shown in Table 5.8-9, *Project-Related Construction Noise Levels*, each activity phase would exceed the County's stationary construction equipment noise limit of 60 dBA at the nearby sensitive receptors to the north and east. This would result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure N-1 would be implemented.

Mitigation Measures

N-1 As required by the Los Angeles County Code, construction activities shall take place only between the hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekdays and Saturdays, and not on Sundays or a national holiday. In addition, the following practices shall be observed and implemented:

- Erect a temporary noise barrier/curtain along the eastern and northern construction site boundaries (see Figure 5.8-3, *Proposed Temporary Noise Barrier)*. The temporary sound barrier shall have a minimum height of 12 feet and be free of gaps and holes. The barrier can be (1) a ¾-inch-thick plywood wall OR (2) a hanging blanket/curtain with a surface density or at least 2 pounds per square foot.
- Limit noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, to safety warning purposes only.
- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines should be strictly prohibited.
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, as far as feasible from sensitive receptors. If they must be located near receptors, adequate muffling (with enclosures where feasible and appropriate) shall be used reduce noise levels at the adjacent sensitive receptors. Any enclosure openings or venting shall face away from sensitive receptors.
- Use "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Construction staging areas shall be established at locations that will create the greatest distance between the construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who will be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include in it the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

Finding:

Based on the preceding, noise impacts during construction would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1. The District hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

E. FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The following summary describes the unavoidable adverse impact of the proposed project where either mitigation measures were found to be infeasible, or mitigation would not lessen impacts to less than significant. The following impact would remain significant and unavoidable:

1. Aesthetics

IMPACT 5.1-2: OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD GENERATE A NEW SOURCE OF SUBSTANTIAL LIGHT OR GLARE WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT NIGHTTIME VIEWS IN THE AREA.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.1-9 of Section 5.1, *Aesthetics* of the DEIR.

Light Trespass Impact

Although the County's Code of Ordinance does not identify a maximum amount of illumination that can be generated by institutional uses, it defines an unacceptable level of light trespass of 0.5 foot-candle or greater when the light trespass falls onto an adjoining public right-of-way or an adjoining residentially-zoned lot, open space-zoned lot, or agriculturally-zoned lot. Therefore, the District has adopted the 0.5 foot-candle at the property line as the threshold for impact for the proposed project.

Figures 5.1.-2a to 5.1-2d illustrate the amount of light trespass at the Crescenta Valley HS property line with implementation of the proposed project. As shown in DEIR Figure 5.1-2a, *Proposed Field Illumination Summary-Off-Site (Mayfield)*, and Figure 5.1-2b, *Proposed Field Illumination Summary-Off-Site (Ramsdell)*, light spillover during lighted game events along Mayfield Avenue and Ramsdell Avenue would not reach levels above 0.5 foot-candles and no adverse impacts would occur. However, as shown in DEIR Figure 5.1-2c, *Proposed Field Illumination Summary-Offsite (I-210)*, and Figure 5.1-2d, *Proposed Field Illumination Summary-Offsite (Residential),* light levels from the proposed field lighting during lighted game events would approach 0.98 and 0.77 foot-candle on the I-210 and neighboring property consisting of residential uses, respectively. Light levels would exceed the 0.5 foot-candle threshold and the project would result in new lighting that would intrude on neighboring residential uses and could affect nighttime views during lighted game events (not on a nightly basis). This would be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure AE-1 would be implemented.

Generation of Glare

Field lighting would include high intensity lamps, which, if not installed properly, could cause glare impacts for people in the residential areas. The design elements for glare control include mounting height, visors and shielding, and reflective housing around the lamp. The proposed lighting incorporates all of these elements, and each element can be arranged individually to control and minimize any potential glare impacts. The luminaires are equipped with large hoods and shields and

are specially designed to direct the light onto the track and field with minimum glare. Precise position of the fixtures, accurate focusing of the light beams, and the shielding of the arc of the beams would eliminate glare impacts at surrounding residential uses and roadways. As part of the proposed project, the lighting engineer that installs the lights would ensure that the lights are properly adjusted and maintained so that glare would not impact the surrounding community. Therefore, glare impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion

Consistent with the County's Code of Ordinance, the proposed lighting system directs light "away from adjacent properties and public rights of way." As discussed above, the proposed lighting system—when in use—would generate additional sources of light that would be visible from surrounding streets and land uses (including residential neighborhoods). However, the project site is in an urbanized environment with a variety of existing sources of nighttime illumination; most views toward the project site feature an existing glow produced by building lights, street lights, traffic, and other elements of the urban context. Furthermore, there are no windows or outdoor spaces (e.g., yards) that would be expected to experience direct light overspill from the proposed light poles. Although the poles would be 100-feet-tall, they would face downward and would not be used past 10:00 p.m. However, implementation of the proposed project would result in light levels along the norther property line to exceed the County's 0.5 foot-candle threshold, and impacts of the proposed project would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures

AE-1 The Glendale Unified School District shall minimize the effects of new sources of nighttime lighting by incorporating the following measures into project design and operation:

- All lighting shall be shielded and directed downward onto the athletic fields to minimize potential light escape and/or spillover onto adjacent properties.
- The new athletic field lights shall be shall shut off automatically at 10:00 p.m. A voicemail phone number and contact information will be posted on the school website and made available to neighbors that can be used in the event lights remain on past 10:00 pm, or to report any (non-emergency) incidents related to use of the field for large events. The District will manage and respond to all calls received.

Findings:

The District finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings. (Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3); Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the District has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social,

technological or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

2. Noise

IMPACT 5.8-3: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WOULD RESULT IN PERIODIC OPERATION-RELATED NOISE THAT WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.8-9 of Section 5.8, *Noise* of the DEIR.

Traffic Noise

Audible increases in noise generally refer to a change of 3 dBA, which is the threshold of perceptibility in exterior environments. Changes of between 1 and 3 dBA are considered potentially audible, and changes of less than 1 dBA are typically inaudible. Only audible changes (i.e., 3 dBA or more) at sensitive receptor locations are considered potentially significant, and an increase of 3 dBA CNEL is used as a threshold for a substantial traffic noise increase. A doubling of traffic flows (e.g., 10,000 vehicles per day to 20,000 per day) would be needed to create a 3 dBA CNEL increase in traffic-generated noise levels. No new daytime student or staff trips would occur. The PM peak hour volumes were used to determine noise increases during proposed evening games and practices (Appendix D). Table 5.8-10 shows that projected traffic-related noise along study roadway segments would increase up to 2.9 dBA. Traffic noise increases would not exceed 3 dBA along study roadway segments.

Stationary Noise

Operational stationary noise sources from the proposed PA system and crowd noise were modeled using the SoundPLAN computer program. Noise modeling was conducted for residential locations closest to the project site, as shown on DEIR Figure 5.8-2, *Future Track and Field Noise Contours*. Development and operation of the track and field would generate noise associated with crowds and amplified music and speech from the proposed PA system. In addition to daytime use, the future bleacher and PA noise was modeled assuming project operational noise could occur in the evening hours between 7:00 pm and 10:00 pm. The operational noise analysis assumed full capacity of the bleachers.

As shown in DEIR Table 5.8-7, during short-term noise monitoring in the project vicinity, noise levels ranged from approximately 56 to 62 dBA Leq. Results of SoundPLAN modeling indicate that future operational noise levels from a full-capacity event are predicted to range as high as 92 dBA Leq at the first row of residential property lines to the east of the project and up to 82 dBA Leq at the first row of residential property lines to the west. This would result in periodic ambient noise increases of approximately 36 dBA to the east and 20 dBA to the west, though multiple factors may affect overall noise levels from event to event at each residential receptor—crowd size, type of game, type of amplified or live marching band, shielding such as intervening buildings, etc. Special events with less than full capacity would increase ambient noise levels to a lesser degree. A 10 dBA increase is perceived as a doubling of the sound (see Section 5.8.1.1). Though Section 12.08.570 of the County Code exempts noise from activities conducted on public and private playgrounds or school grounds, operational noise

from special events and games could at times exceed the existing ambient noise levels by more than 10 dBA and would therefore be potentially significant. Mitigation measure N-2 would be implemented.

Mitigation Measures

N-2 Prior to holding the first spectator event, the District shall develop a Noise Control Plan. Signs shall be erected at entry points to show prohibited activities during an event (e.g., use of air horns, unapproved audio amplification systems, bleacher foot-stomping, loud activity in parking lots upon exiting the field), and events shall be monitored by District staff. In addition, the following measures shall be implemented:

- The District shall retain a qualified acoustical consultant during final design of the PA system. The consultant shall prepare a report detailing recommended measures to minimize special event and game noise to the degree feasible. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, construction of a sound wall along the property line to the east and/or relocation of the speakers/poles closer to the bleachers, thereby maximizing the distance between the speakers and nearby residences.
- During subsequent design phases of the bleachers and PA system, the District's sound system contractor shall create a track and field sound system design plan. The project's sound system design goal should optimize conveying information to the event attendees while minimizing off-site spill-over effects.
- Prior to the first sports field event, the public address system contractor shall perform a system check to verify appropriate sound levels in the seating areas and minimized spill-over sound in the adjacent community areas.

Findings:

The District finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings. (Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3); Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the District has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

3. Transportation

IMPACT 5.10-4: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN INADEQUATE PARKING CAPACITY.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed starting on page 5.10-9 of Section 5.10, *Transportation* of the DEIR.

In order to assess parking demand at the proposed parking area, occupancy counts were conducted on a Friday evening during the same peak period as the traffic counts. The parking occupancy was monitored during this period in order to assess how much parking would likely be available for event attendees in on-street and off-street campus parking spaces.

There are a total of 1,097 on-street parking spaces and 236 off-street parking spaces, for a total of 1,333 parking spaces. A summary of the results of the parking occupancy is shown in Table 5.10-1, *Parking Availability in the Study Area*. As shown, there are 901 parking spaces (236 off-street and 665 on-street) available within the vicinity of the project site. Using the same assumptions as for project trip generation, the total estimated parking demand is 1,053 spaces. With the 236 spaces that can be provided in school or overflow parking facilities, the estimated demand spillover onto adjacent on-street parking areas within the neighborhood is 817 vehicles without additional arrangements. As a result, the overall area parking occupancy would be 100 percent. With the remaining needed vehicles spilling into the unoccupied off-street parking spaces, there is still a deficiency of 205 parking spaces. Therefore, the parking demand from the project cannot be fully absorbed by the available parking supply at the school lots and on public streets and impacts would be significant. Mitigation measure T-1 would be implemented.

Mitigation Measures

T-1 Prior to any ground disturbing activities, the District shall prepare an event traffic control plan. The plan shall be implemented during major sporting events held at Crescenta Valley HS (e.g., where near-full or full capacity is anticipated, such as at varsity or championship football games). The plan shall require that, immediately prior to each major sporting event, documentation of all available off-street parking supplies and temporary signage be placed at appropriate, pre-determined locations along local streets in the vicinity of available event parking areas. The plan shall also determine additional parking spaces at nearby vacant or underutilized parking lots and require that District school safety traffic control personnel be available to direct event traffic to and from available designated parking areas. Additionally, the plan shall consider the provision of a shuttle service in the event that off-site parking lots are available and used for individual events (this would vary on an event-by-event basis). The traffic officers shall be stationed at the intersections to help improve traffic flow and ensure public safety during peak travel times to and from major sporting events held at CVHS. All temporary directional signage shall be removed by traffic control personnel following each major stadium event.

Findings:

The District finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings. (Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3); Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the District has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social,

technological or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

F. FINDINGS ON PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

1. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS

The following is a discussion of an alternative considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in the DEIR.

- **Alternative Bleacher Design:** This alternative would place the home bleachers along the north side of the track and field and two portable bleachers along the east and west side of the track and field. The home bleachers would have a seating capacity of 3,396 while the portable bleachers would provide for 420 seats, for a total of 4,236 seats. This design would increase noise impacts to nearby residential uses by decreasing the distance between the uses and was deemed infeasible. Moreover, the alternative would also require more parking spaces and increase traffic impacts due to the increase in seating capacity. This design may also result in an increase in conflicts among rival team spectators. Therefore, this alternative was considered, but rejected as infeasible.

2. ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

The following alternatives were determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives with the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project but avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.

- No Project Alternative
- Bleacher and Field Improvements with No Lighting Alternative

No Project Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines requires the analysis of a No Project Alternative. This analysis must discuss the existing site conditions as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed permanent bleachers with 3,442 seats, four 100-foot light poles, 540-square-foot concession stand, 2,254-square-foot home team room, restroom, PA system, and storage/maintenance building would not be constructed. The existing track and field would continue to be used only during the daytime—by Crescenta Valley HS physical education and school sports programs, and by permitted outside sporting groups on weekends.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would avoid environmental impacts in the areas of construction air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services (fire and police), transportation, and wildfire, and avoid the nighttime lighting, operational noise, and traffic and parking impacts.

Finding: While the No Project Alternative would lessen the environmental effects of the proposed project, it does not meet any of the project objectives. As such, the District rejects this alternative.

Bleacher and Field Improvements with No Lighting Alternative

This alternative would provide a track and field with bleachers with no nighttime lighting. All other aspects of the proposed project would remain the same, including the development of new bleachers with 3,442 seats, concession stand, home team room, scoreboard, PA system, and restroom and storage/maintenance building(s). Operation of the Crescenta Valley HS field would continue as in existing conditions, and under the existing joint use agreement, outside sporting groups would continue to be individually permitted by the District to use the practice field on weekends, generally between the hours of 8:30 am and 6:00 pm on Saturdays and 8:00 am and 6:00 pm on Sundays. This alternative would eliminate the aesthetic (lighting) impacts from the 100-foot-tall lights as well as reduce air quality, energy, greenhouse gas, noise, public service (fire and police), and traffic impacts due to decreased field usage. Event-related noise and traffic (parking) impacts would also be reduced. The track and field would be used by outside groups after school hours and on weekends, similar to existing conditions; however, no nighttime usage would occur under this alternative.

Finding: The No Lighting alternative would have reduced environmental impacts in the areas of aesthetics, construction air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation and traffic. This alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project. However, the No Lighting alternative does not meet the project objectives of utilizing the existing space to enhance opportunities for after-school athletic and extracurricular activities and providing lighting to allow night use of the sports field. For these reasons, the District rejects this alternative.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the District has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the following unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the proposed project and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to these impacts: (1) Aesthetics, (2) Noise, and (3) Transportation. The District also has examined alternatives to the proposed project, none of which both meet the project objectives and is environmentally preferable to the proposed project.

Regarding a Statement of Overriding Considerations, Guidelines Section 15093 provides:

> (a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
>
> (b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record.

The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

A. BACKGROUND

CEQA requires decision makers to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 [b]). The agency's statement is referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The following sections provide a description of each of the proposed project's significant and unavoidable adverse impacts and the justification for adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

B. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The following adverse impacts of the proposed Project are considered significant, unavoidable, and adverse based on the DEIR, FEIR, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and the findings discussed in Section II, *Findings and Facts Regarding Impacts*, of this document.

1. Aesthetics

- During temporary events, light levels would exceed the 0.5 foot-candle threshold and the proposed project would result in new lighting that would intrude on neighboring residential uses and could affect nighttime views.

2. Noise

- Operation-generated noise levels during special events and games would exceed the existing ambient noise levels by more than 10 dBA, and the proposed project would result in temporary noise levels near sensitive receptors.

3. Transportation

- There is a deficiency in parking spaces during special events and games, and the larger events resulting from implementation of the proposed project would result in inadequate parking capacity.

C. CONSIDERATION IN SUPPORT OF THE STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed project, the District has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified above may be considered "acceptable" due to the following specific considerations, which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

1. Environmental Benefits

- The proposed Project represents an improvement to an existing high school track and field and is designed to serve the existing and future residents that live within the Crescenta Valley HS neighborhood. Varsity games are currently held at Glendale High School, approximately seven miles to the south of the project site. The proposed Project will reduce travel time and vehicle miles for its own student population and game attendees, thereby contributing to improved air quality effects and reduced greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicle use and use of fossil fuels.

2. Social Benefits

- The proposed project will enhance the sense of community and upgrade the athletic fields to boost school pride by allowing home football games to occur on campus.

- The proposed project will enhance and expand opportunities for after-school athletic and extracurricular activities for Crescenta Valley HS students by providing lighted field and other amenities.

- The proposed project will provide bleachers with adequate capacity to accommodate various spectator events currently held on and off campus.

D. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the District concludes that the Crescenta Valley High School Field Improvement Project will result in the extended use of the field by allowing the use of the track and field during nighttime hours. Implementation of the proposed project will also enhance opportunities for after-school athletic and extracurricular activities. The District has balanced the project's benefits against the project's significant unavoidable impacts. The District finds that the project's benefits outweigh the project's significant unavoidable impacts, and those impacts, therefore, are considered acceptable in light of the project's benefits. The District finds that each of the benefits described above is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the project notwithstanding the proposed project's significant unavoidable impacts.