

2. Introduction

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects. This draft environmental impact report (DEIR) has been prepared to satisfy CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The environmental impact report (EIR) is the public document designed to provide decision makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid environmental damage and to identify alternatives to the project. The EIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth inducing impacts; effects not found to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

The lead agency means “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment” (CEQA § 21067). The City of Claremont has the principal responsibility for approval of the La Puerta School Site Specific Plan. For this reason, the City of Claremont is the CEQA lead agency for this project.

The intent of the DEIR is to provide sufficient information on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed La Puerta School Site Specific Plan to allow the City to make an informed decision regarding approval of the project. Specific discretionary actions to be reviewed by the City are described in Sections 3.1.1.4, *Discretionary Actions and Approvals*, and 3.2, *Intended Uses of the EIR* of Chapter 3, *Project Description*.

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with requirements of the:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, §§ 21000 et seq.)
- State Guidelines for the Implementation of the CEQA of 1970 (CEQA Guidelines), as amended (California Code of Regulations, §§ 15000 et seq.)

The overall purpose of this DEIR is to inform the lead agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public about the environmental effects of the construction and operation phases of development that would be accommodated by the La Puerta School Site Specific Plan. This DEIR addresses effects that may be significant and adverse; evaluates alternatives to the project; and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

2. Introduction

2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The City of Claremont determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on February 4, 2022 (see Appendix A). Comments received during the NOP’s public review period, from February 4, 2022, to March 7, 2022, are summarized below and included in Appendix A.

The NOP process helps determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the DEIR. Based on this process, certain environmental categories were identified as having the potential to result in significant impacts. Issues considered Potentially Significant are addressed in Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, of this DEIR; issues determined to have Less Than Significant or No Impact and how the determination was made is provided in Chapter 8, *Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*. Because the City decided to prepare an EIR during initial review of the proposed project, as permitted by CEQA Guideline Section 15063, no Initial Study was required to determine that the proposed project required an EIR, and no Initial Study was prepared.

Five agencies, six organizations and thirty-seven residents responded to the NOP. This DEIR has taken those responses into consideration. Table 2-1 summarizes the issues identified by commenting agencies or persons and references the section(s) of this DEIR where the issues are addressed.

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
Agency			
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	3/2/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommends surveying the project site and its surroundings and determine potential distribution of species ▪ DEIR include measure to preclude take of fully protected species ▪ Recommends DEIR include an infectious tree disease management plan or preventative measures ▪ Recommends providing a complete assessment and impact analysis of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area ▪ Recommends DEIR provide feasible alternatives and mitigation strategy to reduce impact towards wildlife 	<i>Section 5.3, Biological Resources</i>
California State University Polytechnic, Pomona	3/7/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ States EIR should address the potential loss of viewshed from residential buildings ▪ EIR should address the potential impacts on the recreational open space the project site provides ▪ Lead agency should study and address the potential impacts the proposed project will have on wildlife and their habitat ▪ EIR should address the potential impacts the proposed project may have on storm water runoff using mandated metrics ▪ EIR should evaluate the impacts of project on Tonga Nation cultural heritage and resource 	<i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.3, Biological Resources</i> <i>Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i> <i>Section 5.15, Tribal Cultural Resources</i> <i>Chapter 8, Impacts Found Not to be Significant</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
LA County Fire Department	3/14/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Development Unit states development of this project must comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants Forestry Division states potential impacts to erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, archeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance should be addressed 	<p><i>Section 5.3, Biological Resources</i> <i>Section 5.4, Cultural Resources</i> <i>Section 5.13, Public Services</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i> <i>Chapter 8, Impacts Found Not to be Significant</i></p>
LA County Sanitation Districts	2/22/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments that a payment of connection fee may be required before this project is permitted to discharge sewage system Advises the developers that the district provides services based on what is legally permitted to by the Southern California Association of Governments' regional growth forecast 	<p><i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i></p>
Native American Heritage Commission	2/8/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are affiliates with the geographic area of the project site 	<p><i>Section 5.15, Tribal Cultural Resources</i></p>
Organization			
Claremont Change	3/6/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests a change in the project proposal to adopt affordable housing initiative for low-income members in the community 	<p><i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i></p>
Democratic Club of Claremont	3/4/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests modifying and adding more residential buildings for elderly and low-income people Suggests adding in water system to recycle water from the residential area and solar panels to cut fossil fuels 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service System</i></p>
Housing Claremont	3/6/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports moving forward with the current plan yet comments that it falls short of the density and affordability thresholds 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i></p>
Inclusive Claremont	3/4/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIR should focus on providing smaller homes suitable for the elderly EIR should focus on providing housing for college students, college faculty, and low-income students from surrounding area Notes that Policy 8-3.12 of the Housing Element to encourage affordable housing from proposed projects Suggests the project should build smaller, multi-story units that would yield at least 100-150 affordable units 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.142 Population and Housing</i></p>
Sustainable Claremont	3/7/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends the plan to explore denser and diverse mix of housing styles to serve diverse family sizes Recommends the project should include smaller and affordable units to address housing demands 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i></p>
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians	2/15/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asked about the expected date of completion for the cultural report 	<p><i>Section 5.15, Tribal Cultural Resources</i></p>
Residents			
Alicia Brady	2/24/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests that the EIR show denser, affordable housing is environmentally feasible and for it to be included as a viable alternative to the proposed project. 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i></p>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
Armando Macias	2/22/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resident comments the project will increase traffic and carbon emission from more vehicles ▪ Concerns about increase in water usage from future residents living in the proposed project ▪ Suggests using the site for historic Serrano Indians, agriculture, and wildlife education 	<p><i>Section 5.3, Biological Resources</i> <i>Section 5.5, Cultural Resources</i> <i>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i></p>
Becky Margiotta	2/16/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EIR should analyze housing density ▪ Concerns regarding the project proposal will not meet housing demand nor provide affordable housing ▪ Resident is considered the project will increase traffic and carbon emission from more vehicles 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i></p>
Bill Buehler	2/3/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding the project size not being accurate to what is described in the project proposal 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>
Bob Gerecke	2/14/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests adding another entry and exist street in the project proposal to avoid hazards in an emergency 	<p><i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i></p>
Brian Weisner	2/15/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving the previous school property or providing park space ▪ Concerns about wildlife and habitat ▪ Concerns that the project does not account for adequate transportation infrastructure ▪ Concerns regarding carbon emission from the increase in motor vehicles 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.3 Biological Resources</i> <i>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i></p>
Burton Family	2/16/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests leaving the site vacant to limit traffic and carbon emissions ▪ Concerns regarding the aesthetic and cultural value of the current site will be lost 	<p><i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.4, Cultural Resources</i> <i>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i></p>
Carl Butler	3/7/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving site as a green space for members of the community 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>
Claudia Strauss	3/7/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests changing the current plan to include more denser and affordable housing 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i></p>
Dianna Graves	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests changing the current plan to instead preserve the land parcel and use as a green space 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>
Don & Cathy Elberg	2/18/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding the increase in motor vehicles the project site will bring during and after construction 	<p><i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i></p>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
Donald & Judith Moyer	2/13/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments that the project is inconsistent with the design and character of surrounding homes ▪ States the plan lacks traffic pattern planning and will create a traffic and safety hazards to the residents ▪ Concerned the future of open space and parks in Claremont will be compromised ▪ Concerned that only one access to the development will cause safety problems and will not allow proper access to emergency responders 	<p><i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i> <i>Section 5.13, Public Services</i></p> <p><i>Chapter 8, Impacts Found Not to be Significant</i></p>
Donald & Judith Moyer	3/6/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving the site as a green space ▪ Concerns regarding the new residential project will not maintain the core values and land use of Claremont 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>
Gordon Hunter	2/3/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes the housing project due to concerns regarding water availability and building in a drought prone area 	<p><i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i></p>
Jake Lackey	2/16/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving the site as a green space ▪ Recommends EIR include a detailed plan for how the project will impact water management and availability 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i></p>
Joel Carnes	3/8/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding rezoning and sale of public land 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>
John Moylan	2/14/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving the site as a green space 	<p>Chapter 3, Project Description</p>
Joyce Sauter	2/15/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding proposed project will obstruct scenic views ▪ Concerns regarding inadequate emergency plan for the proposed housing project ▪ Concerns that the project will increase the amount of motor vehicles ▪ Suggests providing up-to-date power and water infrastructure to meet demands of future and current residents 	<p><i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems</i></p>
Katie Sandbridge	2/17/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding proper walking and biking routes and infrastructure for school children and pedestrians ▪ Concerns regarding the lack of community spaces ▪ Suggests examining the impact on wildlife with the construction of project ▪ Suggests examining how future storms would impact the development ▪ Urges that the agency should consult local tribes in EIR process 	<p><i>Section 5.3, Biological Resources</i> <i>Section 5.11, Land Use and Planning</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i> <i>Section 5.15, Tribal Cultural Resources</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i></p>
Kathryn Flynn	3/1/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests revising the site as a green space or as a cultural educational use of the land ▪ Concerns regarding increasing water demands in a highly drought prone area 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i></p>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
Lash Keith Vance	3/1/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests keeping La Puerta site as public space for future generations ▪ States the project's development will not be compatible to existing surrounded area ▪ Concerned that there is only one single access road which will cause traffic and emergency issues ▪ The project will significantly impact existing utilities infrastructure and storm drainage systems ▪ Recommends the project site include appropriate buffers and avoid pacing natural vegetation ▪ Concerned about the potential impacts of future school growth and parking space ▪ Recommends consultation with Native American population throughout the construction phase of the project 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i> <i>Section 5.13, Public Services</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i> <i>Section 5.15, Tribal Cultural Resources</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i></p>
Lynn Westfahl	3/8/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ States that the project will put a strain on water supply ▪ Dose not believe current plan is prepared to handle the amount of traffic the new development will present ▪ States the development does not have adequate infrastructure in an event of an emergency ▪ Concerns regarding the noise and air pollution that will arise ▪ Believes the project will obstruct the aesthetic views of surrounding area 	<p><i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.2, Air Quality</i> <i>Section 5.11, Noise</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i></p>
Mason Prophet	3/3/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project does not satisfy the surrounding housing styles or values ▪ Concerns regarding runoff from the proposed site polluting downhill residents ▪ Suggests leaving the site untouched for possible future school sites 	<p><i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>
Maura Carter	3/1/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests prevising the site as a green space or for educational and cultural purposes ▪ Suggests conducting an EIR on all land that is proposed for rezoning ▪ Suggests focusing on sustainable management for resources such as water, energy, air quality, wildlife, biological, geological, and utilities ▪ Comments that the need for affordable housing is important however the project site is an unacceptable location 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.2, Air Quality</i> <i>Section 5.5, Energy</i> <i>Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i></p>
Mel Stark	2/22/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the proposal to developing new homes and occupying vacant land 	N/A
Mike Eschleman	2/28/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preserve the open space for future generation ▪ Concerns regarding rezoning and sale of public land ▪ Concerns that the project will increase the amount of motor vehicles and create unsafe environments for pedestrians ▪ EIR should include additional air and noise pollution, biological and geological impacts from the project 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.2, Air Quality</i> <i>Section 5.3, Biological Resources</i> <i>Section 5.6, Geology and Soils</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i> <i>Section 5.14, Transportation</i></p>
Monica Steckling	2/20/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the proposed development because of increase in aesthetic value and provide housing for residents. 	<p><i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics</i> <i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing</i></p>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
Paul Wheeler	3/2/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preserve the open space for current and future generations to enjoy ▪ Concerns regarding rezoning and sale of public land 	<i>Chapter 3, Project Description Section 5.11, Land Use and Planning</i>
Phyllis Eschleman	2/28/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving current site as an open green space 	<i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i>
Ping Chang	2/15/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests preserving the current site for educational and public purposes ▪ Concerns regarding the increase in traffic from additional residential homes 	<i>Chapter 3, Project Description Section 5.14, Transportation</i>
Richard & Diane Heppner	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding the increase in traffic from additional residential homes ▪ Concerns that the project will put additional strain on water supply and demand ▪ States that the building of residential homes will worsen air quality ▪ States the project will eliminate the potential to create green open space 	<i>Section 5.2, Air Quality Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning Section 5.1,4, Transportation Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i>
Rick Williams	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ States wildlife and vegetation will be impacted by development ▪ Energy infrastructure and water systems may be interrupted due to the additional homes ▪ Suggests tribal community input and consulting AB 52 ▪ Suggests preserving the current site for educational and public purposes 	<i>Chapter 3, Project Description Section 5.3, Biological Resources Section 5.15, Tribal Cultural Resources Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i>
Rob Bell	3/7/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggests analyzing the potential impact of current and future utility usage with the ▪ Recommends EIR address the anticipated increased traffic flows from this project ▪ States EIR should address how storm water will be captured due to the new development ▪ Recommends EIR evaluate the potential impacts the new development will have on existing viewsheds 	<i>Section 5.1, Aesthetics Section 5.13, Public Services Section 5.14, Transportation Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i>
Steve & Rena Juliar	2/16/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding the increase in traffic from additional residential homes ▪ States the project will further strain utility services such as water and electric 	<i>Section 5.14, Transportation Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i>
Steve Goldwater	2/15/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demands EIR explain the purpose of the project in this specific site compared to surrounding regions ▪ Asks why there is no mention of a water recycling system or water capture in the plans ▪ Concerns regarding the increase in traffic from additional residential homes ▪ Concerns regarding the building of these homes will obstruct scenic views ▪ Asks if the sewer line capacity during peak hours have been investigated ▪ States that the plan take precautions to limit noise pollution 	<i>Chapter 3, Project Description Section 5.1, Aesthetics Section 5.11, Noise Section 5.13, Public Services Section 5.14, Transportation Section 5.16, Utilities and Services</i>
Susan Neely	3/6/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asks that the EIR include looking at the proximity of property lot to the trail and the lack of privacy. ▪ Asks a change in project plans to include smaller apartment complexes to meet affordable housing requirements 	<i>Section 5.12, Population and Housing Section 5.14, Transportation</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Date	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed in Chapter/Section:
Thomas Ilgen	2/16/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preserve the open space for current and future generations to enjoy ▪ Concerns regarding rezoning and sale of public land ▪ Supports retaining the land as a public space for recreational and educational purposes ▪ Concerns regarding large new density residential housing will enlarge ecological footprint 	<p><i>Chapter 3, Project Description</i> <i>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> <i>Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning</i></p>

The City held a scoping meeting for the DEIR from 6:00 PM to about 7:15 PM on February 16, 2022 via teleconference. The purpose of the scoping meeting was to provide an open house forum for the public and other agencies to learn about the project and the CEQA process and to provide input on the environmental issues that should be addressed in the DEIR. Attendees were instructed to provide comments on the proposed project and DEIR in writing; comment letters received from attendees are included in Table 2-1.

2.3 SCOPE OF THIS DEIR

The scope of the DEIR was determined based on review of the current conditions of the project site and surrounding area, the scope of the proposed project, the NOP and comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the City. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to levels of insignificance.

The information provided in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, establishes the basis for analyzing future, project-related environmental impacts.

2.3.1 Impacts Considered Not to Be Significant

During preparation of the NOP, the City determined that three environmental impact categories (listed below) were not significantly affected by the La Puerta School Site Specific Plan. These categories are not included in Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, of the DEIR. Refer to Chapter 8, *Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*, for how this determination was made.

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Recreation

2. Introduction

2.3.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts

The City of Claremont determined that 17 environmental factors have potentially significant impacts if the proposed project is implemented.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

2.3.3 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, contains Table 1-1, which summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and levels of significance before and after mitigation for each environmental topic analyzed in this DEIR. As substantiated and concluded in the individual topical sections of Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts would result from implementation of the proposed La Puerta School Site Specific Plan. All impacts considered potentially significant were reduced to a level of less than significant with adherence to existing regulations and/or implementation of mitigation measures.

2.4 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The following documents are incorporated by reference into this DEIR, consistent with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, and they are available for review at the City of Claremont, Planning Division, 207 Harvard Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711.

- City of Claremont General Plan, 2009
- City of Claremont Sustainable City Plan, 2021
- La Puerta School Site Specific Plan, 2023

2. Introduction

2.5 DEIR REVIEW AND FINAL EIR CERTIFICATION

This DEIR is being circulated for public review for 45 days pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15105 and Public Resources Code § 21091. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the DEIR to the City address shown below. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City of Claremont will review all written comments received and prepare a written response for each comment on a proposed project feature or environmental issue. The DEIR is being distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, interested parties, and all parties who requested a copy of the DEIR in accordance with CEQA.

A notice announcing the notice of availability (NOA) of the DEIR was published in The Claremont Courier. The DEIR is available to the general public for review at the following locations:

- City of Claremont, Planning Division, 207 Harvard Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711
- <https://www.ci.claremont.ca.us/living/development-projects/la-puerta-development>

The DEIR is also available for public review on the Office of Planning and Research's CEQAnet web portal at <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov>. To search for the DEIR, in the search box simply type in La Puerta School Site Specific Plan or State Clearinghouse No. 2022020137.

Upon completion of the 45-day review period, a Final EIR (FEIR) will then be prepared with this DEIR, which will incorporate the comments received during the review period, responses to the comments, and any changes to the DEIR that result from comments. The FEIR will be presented to the City of Claremont for potential certification as the environmental document for the project. All persons who comment on the DEIR will be notified of the availability of the FEIR and the date of the public hearing before the Claremont Planning Commission and City Council.

2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires that agencies adopt a monitoring or reporting program for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 or adopted a Negative Declaration pursuant to 21080(c). Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the La Puerta School Site Specific Plan will be completed prior to consideration of the project by the City of Claremont City Council.