NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

PROJECT NAME: San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project
(State Clearinghouse No. 2008101154)

PROJECT ADDRESS: 2701 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California

COMMENT DUE DATE: September 23, 2009

PUBLIC NOTICE: Notice is hereby given that the San Marino Unified School District (District) has completed a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project. The Draft EIR has been completed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and describes the proposed project and alternatives, and evaluates their potential environmental effects.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is in the center of San Marino High School at 2701 Huntington Drive, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County. It is approximately two miles south of Interstate 210, and approximately three miles east of State Route 110. The campus is on the north side of Huntington Drive, between Winston Avenue on the west and Gainsborough Drive on the east.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is the demolition of the Michael White Adobe, a locally designated historic landmark that is also eligible for listing in the National or California Registers. The Adobe footprint would be replaced with a concrete-asphalt open area that would be accessible to all school occupants. This area would expand the recreational area and provide new space for students to congregate. Alternatives considered in the Draft EIR include the No Project Alternative, Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative, and Stabilization In Situ Alternative.

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS: The loss of the Adobe, which is an historical resource as defined by CEQA, would result in a significant impact to the area of cultural resources, both on a project-level and cumulative-level.

PUBLIC REVIEW: The Draft EIR is available for a 45-day review period, from August 10, 2009, to September 23, 2009. In accordance with Section 15087 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR is available for general public review at the District website, at http://www.san-marino.k12.ca.us and at the following locations:

San Marino Unified School District 1665 West Drive San Marino, CA 91108
San Marino City Hall 2200 Huntington Drive San Marino, CA 91108
Crowell Public Library San Marino, CA 91108

PUBLIC MEETING AND COMMENTS: A public meeting on the proposed project and Draft EIR will be held during the District's regularly scheduled Board Meeting at 7:30 PM on August 18, 2009. The meeting will be open to the public, and interested parties may provide verbal comments on the Draft EIR at that time. Written comments will also be accepted, provided they are postmarked on or before 4:30 PM, September 23, 2009. Please address written comments to Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services at the San Marino Unified School District, 1665 West Drive, San Marino, CA 91108. Comments can also be sent by fax to (626) 299-7010 or e-mail to jboucher626@smusd.us.

PUBLIC HEARING: The San Marino Unified School District will tentatively consider certification of the Final EIR at its Regular Board Meeting at 7:30 PM on October 27, 2009, or soon thereafter. Please call the District at (626) 299-7000 to confirm the date and time.
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1. Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide the public and local and state governmental agency decision makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making. This document focuses on those impacts determined to be potentially significant as discussed in the Initial Study completed for this project (see Appendix A).

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The San Marino Unified School District (District), as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment.

Data for this DEIR was obtained from onsite field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (historical resources and noise).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The six main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are listed below:

1) To disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.

2) To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.

3) To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.

4) To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.

5) To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.

6) To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure
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analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project’s significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 EIR Format

This DEIR has been formatted as described below.

Section 1. Executive Summary: Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this EIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

Section 2. Introduction: Describes the purpose of this EIR, background on the project, the Notice of Preparation, Final EIR certification, and mitigation monitoring.

Section 3. Project Description: A detailed description of the project, the objectives of the proposed project, the project area and location, approvals anticipated to be included as part of the project, and the intended uses of this EIR.

Section 4. Environmental Setting: A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective, and information about other ongoing projects which the EIR considers cumulatively with the proposed project. The environmental setting provides baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Section 5. Environmental Analysis: A brief discussion of each environmental category eliminated from further analysis by the Initial Study, and an in-depth analysis of the environmental categories identified for further review by the Initial Study. This section provides, for each environmental category analyzed, a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance of the adverse impacts of the project after mitigation is incorporated and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

Section 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

Section 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative, Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative, and Stabilization In Situ Alternative.
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Section 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant: Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined not to be significant by the Initial Study and were therefore not discussed in detail in this DEIR.

Section 9. Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project: Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

Section 10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project: Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

Section 11. Organizations and Persons Consulted: Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.

Section 12. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR: Lists the people who prepared this EIR for the proposed project.

Section 13. Bibliography: A bibliography of the technical reports and other documentation used in the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.

Appendices. The appendices for this document contain the following supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
- Appendix B: Responses to the Notice of Preparation
- Appendix C: Loss Control Field Inspection
- Appendix D: Historical Resources Technical Report
- Appendix E: Agency Information Requests
- Appendix F: Noise Appendix
- Appendix G: Cost Estimates of Alternatives Considered

1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This DEIR

This DEIR has been prepared as a focused Project EIR as defined by State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15161, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3). This type of EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project and focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from that project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is in the center of San Marino High School at 2701 Huntington Drive, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County. It is approximately two miles south of Interstate 210 (I-210) and approximately three miles east of State Route 110 (SR-110). The campus is on the north side of Huntington Drive, between Winston Avenue on the west and Gainsborough Drive on the east.

1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project would demolish the Michael White Adobe (Adobe), an existing building on the San Marino High School campus. The Adobe would be replaced with a concrete-asphalt open area that would be accessible to all school occupants. This area would provide new space for students to congregate.
1. Executive Summary

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). The following three project alternatives were identified and analyzed for relative impacts as compared to the proposed project:

- No Project Alternative
- Relocation to Lacy Park
- Stabilization In Situ

The following presents a summary of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. These alternatives were developed to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts the project could have on historical resources. Please refer to Chapter 7 of this DEIR for a complete discussion of each of the alternatives and their associated impacts.

1.5.1 No Project Alternative

Under this alternative, no changes to the project site would occur. The Adobe would maintain in its current condition with limited public access and would continue to be gated to deter unauthorized entry. Minimal maintenance of the Adobe would continue to be performed by the District.

1.5.2 Relocation to Lacy Park

On May 13, 2009, the City Council unanimously approved a resolution to allow the Adobe to be relocated to Lacy Park, near the historic Armin Thurnher House, and take ownership, as long as the City would not incur any costs to relocate, landscape, or refurbish the Adobe. If economically feasible, under this alternative, the Adobe would be relocated to Lacy Park at 1485 Virginia Road in San Marino, which is approximately 1.4 miles from San Marino High School. As the City of San Marino is the only entity that has demonstrated willingness to accept the building, Lacy Park was determined to be the only feasible recipient site for the Adobe. Once relocated, the Adobe would be stabilized on a new foundation and be watertight. The Adobe would operate in a manner similar to the Thurnher House and would be accessible on a regular basis to the public.

1.5.3 Stabilization In Situ

Under the Stabilization In Situ Alternative, the Adobe would not be demolished, but would be stabilized in its current location for school use. This alternative would be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for allowing school use of existing nonconforming buildings. This alternative would allow students and staff of San Marino High School to occupy the Adobe.

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to:

1. Whether this DEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
1. Executive Summary

2. Whether the benefits of the project override those environmental impacts which cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.

3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.

4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.

5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the project besides the Mitigation Measures identified in the DEIR.

6. Whether implementation of the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative, which would substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives, is technically and financially feasible.

7. Whether implementation of the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative is economically feasible.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Areas of controversy include the following:

1. Potential loss of a historic building. Comments regarding the historic building and the proposed project have been received by the District in response to the Notice of Preparation released by the District for the proposed project.

2. Although the project’s preservation consultants believe it is technically feasible to relocate the Adobe, a successful move of an adobe building has not been documented. If adequate funding is identified to implement the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative, it is questionable whether the Adobe can be relocated in a successful manner.

3. Due to the dire economic conditions of the state and District, it is not certain that the District can identify adequate funding sources to implement the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative.

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant and for all significant impacts mitigation measures are identified. The level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures is also presented.
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## 5.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1-1: The proposed project would impact the Michael White Adobe, an identified historic resource.</td>
<td>Potentially significant.</td>
<td>1-1 The San Marino Unified School District shall engage a professional architectural photographer and an architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (Architectural Historian) to implement Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation of the current status of the Adobe and its setting consisting of both photographs and a written narrative. The Architectural Historian shall direct the photographer to take images that duplicate views shown in the 1936 HABS documentation as well additional views. No less than 15 photographs shall be used to document the current status of the Adobe and its setting. The photographs shall be large format, 4-inch by 5-inch, black and white negatives (two sets), contact prints (one set) and 8-inch by 10-inch prints (two sets). All shall be archivally processed and prints shall be made on fiber-based paper. Two original negatives shall be made at the time the photographs are taken. One set of negatives shall travel with set of contact prints to the National Park Service for entry into the HABS collection in the Library of Congress; the second set of negatives shall be transmitted to the San Marino Public Library along with one set of 8-inch by 10-inch prints. A second set of 8-inch by 10-inch prints shall be transmitted to the San Marino Historical Society. The written narrative shall reformat the information contained in this assessment and be transmitted to all the repositories named. Photocopies of the previous HABS documentation including drawings and photographs prepared in 1936 shall be transmitted to both the San Marino Public Library and San Marino Historical Society along with the contemporary work. The draft documentation shall be assembled by the Architectural Historian and submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval prior to submittal to the repositories. The District Superintendent or designee shall accept the final documentation prior to work on the Adobe site. If the plaque on a pedestal is removed from its existing location, the District Superintendent or designee shall approve final relocation plans for the plaque to ensure the Adobe site is interpreted.</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Impact 5.1-2: Development of the project could impact archaeological resources. | Potentially significant. | 1-2  
The period furnishings, ephemera and other personal property contained within the Adobe appear to be the property of the San Marino Historical Society and shall be returned to the owner or set aside prior to commencement of any construction, including demolition and site preparation, activity on the property. |  
Less than significant. |
| Impact 5.1-3: Development of the proposed project could impact paleontological resources. | Potentially significant. | 1-4  
Should paleontological soils be uncovered during grading, a paleontological monitor shall also be retained by the District, upon the archaeological monitor’s request, to oversee ground-disturbing activities, including but not limited to all grading, excavation, and site preparation. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant resources. Should fossil-bearing formations be uncovered, the monitor shall |  
Less than significant. |
### Table 1-1

**Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professionally collect any specimens without impeding development. Any paleontological artifacts recovered shall be preserved, as determined necessary by the project paleontologist, and offered to an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations. This mitigation measure shall also apply to trenching for utilities, geological testing, and any other ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 NOISE

Impact 5.2-1: Construction activities associated with the project would temporarily elevate the daytime noise environment in the vicinity of noise-sensitive uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant.</td>
<td>Prior to construction, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the San Marino Unified School District administrators for San Marino High School to discuss construction activities that generate high noise levels. Coordination between the administrators and the construction contractor shall continue on an as-needed basis throughout the construction phase of the project to avoid potential disruption of classroom activities as feasible.</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The San Marino Unified School District shall specify that the contractor shall properly maintain and tune all construction equipment in accordance with the manufacture’s recommendations to minimize noise emissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The San Marino Unified School District shall specify that the contractor shall fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The San Marino Unified School District shall specify that the construction contractor shall place stationary construction equipment and material delivery (loading/unloading) areas as far from adjacent residential and classroom uses as is feasible, but no closer than 50 feet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.2-2: Operation of the project would not generate a substantial increase in noise levels.</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impacts</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 prior to taking action on those projects. This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) has been prepared to satisfy CEQA, as set forth in the Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq. 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.

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21067, 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.” The San Marino Unified School District (District) has the principal responsibility for approval of the San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project. For this reason, the District 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 San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project to allow the District to make an informed decision regarding approval of the project. Specific discretionary actions to be reviewed by the District are described later in Section 4.3.3 (Project Approvals).

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

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

The overall purpose of this DEIR is to inform the lead agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public of the environmental effects of the development and operation of the proposed San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project. This DEIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the project, including effects that may be significant and adverse; evaluates a number of alternatives to the project; and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The District determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study in October 2008 (see Appendix A). Comments received during the public review period, which extended from October 31, 2008, to December 1, 2008, are in Appendix B.
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The NOP process is used to help determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the DEIR. Based on this process and the Initial Study for the project, certain environmental categories were identified as having the potential to result in significant impacts. Issues considered Potentially Significant are addressed in this DEIR. Issues identified as Less Than Significant or No Impact are not addressed beyond the discussion in the Initial Study. Refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A and Section 5.0 for discussion of how these initial determinations were made.

2.3 SCOPE OF THIS DEIR

Based upon the Initial Study, District staff determined that a DEIR should be prepared for the proposed project. The scope of the DEIR was determined based upon the District’s Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the District, comments received in response to the District’s offer to sell the Michael White Adobe (Adobe), and changed economic conditions since the release of the Initial Study and NOP for public review. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts to levels of less than significant.

2.3.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant

Fourteen environmental impact categories are identified here as not significantly affected by, or affecting the proposed San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project and as such are not discussed in detail in this DEIR. This determination was made by the District in its preparation of the Initial Study and further elaborated in Section 5.0 of this DEIR.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

2.3.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts

Two environmental factors have been identified as potentially significant impacts if the proposed project is implemented. These factors are listed below and further discussed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of this DEIR, respectively:

- Cultural Resources
- Noise
2.3.3 **Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**

This DEIR identifies one significant and unavoidable adverse impact, as defined by CEQA, that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Unavoidable adverse impacts may be considered significant on a project-specific basis, cumulatively significant, and/or potentially significant. If the District, as the Lead Agency, determines that unavoidable significant adverse impacts will result from the project, such as the loss of a historical resource in the case of the proposed project, the District must prepare a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” before it can approve the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that the decision-making body has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable significant environmental effects and has determined that the benefits of the project outweigh the adverse effects and, therefore, the adverse effects are considered acceptable. The analysis in this DEIR concluded that implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources, as discussed in Section 5.1 and Chapter 6 of the DEIR.

2.4 **FINAL EIR CERTIFICATION**

This DEIR is being circulated for public review for a period of 45 days. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the DEIR to the District address shown on the title page of this document. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the District will review all written comments received and prepare written responses for each comment. A Final EIR (FEIR) will then be prepared incorporating all of the comments received, responses to the comments, and any changes to the DEIR that result from the comments received. This FEIR will then be presented to the District for potential certification as the environmental document for the project. All persons who commented on the DEIR will be notified of the availability of the FEIR and the date of the public hearing before the District.

The DEIR is available to the general public for review at the following locations:

- San Marino Unified School District  
  1665 West Drive  
  San Marino, CA 91108

- San Marino City Hall  
  2200 Huntington Drive  
  San Marino, CA 91108

- Crowell Public Library  
  1890 Huntington Drive  
  San Marino, CA 91108

2.5 **MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires that agencies adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to Public Resources Code 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 and Reporting Program for the San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project will be completed as part of the Final EIR prior to consideration of the project by the District Board of Education.
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3. **Project Description**

3.1 **PROJECT LOCATION**

The project site is in the center of San Marino High School at 2701 Huntington Drive, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County. It is approximately two miles south of Interstate 210 (I-210), and approximately three miles east of State Route 110 (SR-110). The campus is on the north side of Huntington Drive, between Winston Avenue on the west and Gainsborough Drive on the east. Figure 3-1, *Regional Location*, and Figure 3-2, *Local Vicinity*, illustrate the project site in its regional and local contexts.

3.2 **STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

The following objectives have been established for the San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project and will aid decision makers in their review of the proposed project and its associated environmental impacts:

- Maximize the net useable space on the San Marino High School campus.
- Maintain the San Marino High School campus and other District-owned property in a manner that reflects the prudent and efficient use of public resources.
- Ensure the efficient and responsible use of District funds.
- Avoid disruption to the educational and recreational activities at San Marino High School and other San Marino Unified School District properties.
- Reduce costs associated with the maintenance of the Michael White Adobe.
- Reduce liability associated with the Michael White Adobe, a non–Field Act compliant structure.
- Increase public access to the Michael White Adobe.
- Consider the feasibility of preserving the Michael White Adobe, either in situ or at Lacy Park.
- Develop mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce or eliminate potentially significant effects.

3.3 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

“Project,” as defined by the CEQA Guidelines, means “the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and that is … an activity directly undertaken by a public agency” (CEQA Guidelines 15378[a][1]).

The proposed project is the demolition of the Michael White Adobe (Adobe), which is on the San Marino High School campus. Demolition of the Adobe would expand the useable recreational space on the campus. Site preparation would include but not be limited to removal of items, including the fencing around the
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Adobe, site paving, landscaping, wood-framed roof, porches, interior partitions, chimney, interior brick floors, windows, and utilities. Demolition of the Adobe would be accomplished by first protecting the adjacent sports facilities from debris and damage. The existing plaque on a pedestal from 1956 would either be retained in place or relocated. If relocated, the plaque may be removed from its pedestal and permanently mounted either on a wall or in paving near to the project site. Approximately four feet of soil below existing grade would be disturbed to demolish the Adobe and its footings in order to provide for paving with asphalt or concrete with adequate drainage flow. Demolition of the Adobe would take one to two weeks and would occur shortly after project approval. Demolition could take place while school is in session.

Once removed, the Adobe would be replaced with a concrete-asphalt open area that would be accessible to all school occupants. This area would provide new space for students to congregate (see Figure 3-3). The concrete footings that currently support the Adobe would be removed. The Adobe and immediately surrounding area, including the area that is currently fenced around the Adobe, would be “capped” with concrete; a flat concrete slab would be installed in the ground currently supporting the Adobe. Capping the site would prevent stormwater from collecting and creating hazards. The wrought-iron fence along the north and east sides of the project site would be removed. Fencing south and west of the site that separate the site from the pool deck would remain for safety; the pool deck is approximately five feet lower than the project site.

3.4 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This Draft EIR is a focused Project DEIR, which examines the environmental impacts of the proposed San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project. It is the intent of this DEIR to enable the San Marino Unified School District, other responsible agencies, and interested parties to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project, thereby enabling the District Board of Education to make informed decisions with respect to the requested actions. The anticipated approval required for this project is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marino Unified School District Board of Education</td>
<td>• Certification of EIR as it relates to its legal adequacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval of the proposed project or project alternatives as described in the EIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Layout

Existing Layout of Project Site

Proposed Layout of Project Site

Source: Carmichael-Kemp Architects 2009
San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project DEIR
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4. Environmental Setting

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section is to provide, pursuant to provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines, a “description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, from both a local and a regional perspective.” The environmental setting will provide a set of baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency will determine the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. The description of the environmental setting shall be no longer than is necessary to provide a meaningful context for the understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project, its alternatives, and mitigation measures.

4.2 REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is in the City of San Marino, which is bordered by the cities of Pasadena to the north and west, South Pasadena to the west, Alhambra and San Gabriel to the south, and unincorporated Los Angeles County to the east. The City of San Marino covers approximately 3.75 square miles. The terrain is characterized by low hills and canyon areas, mainly in the northwest, as well as areas with relatively flat land. The foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains are approximately four miles north.

The City of San Marino is fully built out, primarily with residential uses. Other land uses in San Marino include commercial, recreational open space, and community and public/institutional uses. There are no industrial uses or wilderness areas in the City. All residential properties in the City are low density, single-family residences. There are no multiple-family units in the City. The City contains several neighborhoods defined in the San Marino General Plan. The project site is between two such neighborhoods. The Winston Avenue Neighborhood, immediately west of San Marino High School, has predominantly two-story homes of approximately 12,000 square feet, often in Mediterranean and Spanish styles. This neighborhood is defined by the age of the homes and by their “romance revival” architecture. The San Marino High School neighborhood is immediately east of the project site. It is distinguished from other neighborhoods, including the Winston Avenue Neighborhood, primarily by its later period of development. There is a predominance of single-story ranch homes, fewer sidewalks and parkways, and lower profile street trees.

The project site is owned by the San Marino Unified School District. The District encompasses approximately 5 square miles and serves the City of San Marino and nearby unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County. The District operates four schools: Carver and Valentine elementary schools, Huntington Middle School, and San Marino High School. District enrollment during the 2008–2009 school year was 3,211 K–12 students.

San Marino High School is in a residential area and surrounded by single-family homes on all sides. According to the City of San Marino General Plan Land Use map, the land use designation for the high school is “Community Use,” and the City's Zoning Map designates the school as R-1 District V, which is a residential designation. The Rubio Wash Flood Channel, an open drainage structure, separates the school from the residences to the west. A small landscaped area is at the northwest corner of Huntington Drive and Gainsborough Drive, and commercial uses line Huntington Drive immediately west of the project site and approximately one-quarter mile east of the project site.
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4.3 LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

As illustrated in Figure 4-1, Aerial Photograph, the project site is in the center of the San Marino High School campus, in the midst of the school’s recreational facilities. The site is immediately surrounded by the high school’s athletic facilities, with an L-shaped swimming pool to the south and west, a baseball diamond to the east, and additional recreational facilities to the north. Photos of the Michael White Adobe (Adobe) and its proximity to the surrounding athletic uses are in Figure 4-2, Michael White Adobe.

San Marino High School

San Marino High School serves grades 9–12 and had an enrollment of 1,096 students during the 2008–2009 school year. The school operates on a traditional calendar during the months of August through June. School hours are generally from 8 AM to 3 PM. Summer school has been provided at the campus each year from June until the last week of July. The campus is used before and after school hours for academic, sports, and other programs sponsored by the school, district, city, and community. The campus is also available for public use during nonschool hours in accordance with the Civic Center Act and District policies. During school hours, however, public access on the campus is prohibited unless approval is granted by the high school principal’s office. Ambient noise in the area include on-site operations of the high school, including students using the recreational facilities on the campus and vehicles in the parking lot, as well as traffic along Huntington Drive.

Michael White Adobe

A wrought-iron fence surrounds the vacant project site to prevent unauthorized entry. The project site consists of the Adobe, which is a recognized historic structure and built as early as 1845. The approximately 1,200-square-foot property is an L-shaped adobe house sided with smooth stucco. A one story wing is arranged in a north–south orientation (north wing), and a one-and-a-half story wing is arranged in an east–west orientation (south wing). The one-and-a-half story Adobe has a wood shake roof, wood frames around the doors and windows, and one chimney centered in the south wing. The Adobe is surrounded on all sides by a steel fence. Yucca and other succulents line the east porch, while a cyprus tree shades the north elevation. The porches are paved with brick.

The interior of the Adobe is separated into three rooms. The connection between the north wing and the two rooms in the south wing is particularly wide. Typical of adobe construction, window and door openings reveal thick exterior wall dimensions. Floors are brick while walls are generally finished with smooth plaster. A wood panel is removed from the doorway connection between the north and south wings to reveal the adobe construction. Chair rails are present in the south wing.

As the District is not in the business of maintaining nonschool function buildings and does not have the budget to do so, minimal maintenance has been afforded to the Adobe over the last 50 years. It should be noted that while the roof appears to provide watertight assembly, there is evidence of rising damp or moisture penetration along the interior of the east elevation wall of the south wing. There is also evidence of a termite infestation throughout the interior of the building that could lead to severe damage. A field inspection report was completed for the Adobe to identify violations of regulatory requirements. The report provides more information on the existing conditions and hazards of the Adobe and has been included as Appendix C of this EIR.
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Aerial Photograph

Source: Google Maps 2008
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Michael White Adobe

View looking north across swimming pool, toward Michael White Adobe.

View looking west across varsity baseball field. The Michael White Adobe is visible in the center of the photograph.
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Additionally, because the Adobe was built in the mid 1800s, it does not meet requirements of the Field Act (Education Code Section 17280 et seq.)\(^1\), which requires school buildings to meet a higher standard of building safety than that required for commercial, residential, and industrial construction, with particular regard for earthquake safety. For these reasons, the Adobe is legally unsafe for student and staff occupancy and has been fenced off. Although some alterations to the building have been made, the Adobe has not been retrofitted, remodeled, or upgraded to comply with the California Building Standards Code or with the Field Act.

The conditions of the Adobe are further exacerbated because the campus is closed to the public during school operating hours. Access to the Adobe is prohibited during these times unless arrangements are made with the District or San Marino High School administration. Public access to the Adobe during nonschool hours can be made with the San Marino Historical Society. However, because of the limited access and because no formal agreement currently exists with other organizations to maintain it for increased public use, the Adobe continues to be poorly maintained and not adequately preserved.

**Michael White Adobe and Design Immunity**

Government Code section 830.6 provides that public entities and their employees are generally immune from liability for injuries caused by defective plans or designs as long as the plans were approved in advance by the appropriate authorities (i.e., the Division of the State Architect [DSA]). In this situation, the District is not afforded such protection since it is already aware that the Adobe was not designed based on plans and specifications approved by the appropriate authorities.

Government Code section 830.6 specifically addresses the limits of the design immunity in instances where structures are subsequently found to be unsafe:

> Notwithstanding notice that constructed or improved public property may no longer be in conformity with a plan or design or a standard which reasonably could be approved by the legislative body or employee, the immunity provided by this section shall continue for a reasonable period of time sufficient to permit the public entity to obtain funds for and carry out remedial work necessary to allow such public property to be in conformity with a plan or design approved by the legislative body of the public entity or other body or employee, or with a plan or design in conformity with a standard previously approved by such legislative body or other body or employee. In the event that the public entity is unable to remedy such public property because of practical impossibility or lack of sufficient funds, the immunity provided by this section shall remain so long as such public entity shall reasonably attempt to provide adequate warnings of the existence of the condition not conforming to the approved plan or design or to the approved standard. However, where a person fails to heed such warning or occupies public property despite such warning, such failure or occupation shall not in itself constitute an assumption of the risk of the danger indicated by the warning.

In addition, Government Code section 840.2 provides that an employee of a public entity may be personally liable for injuries caused by a dangerous condition of public property if:

> The employee had the authority and it was his responsibility to take adequate measures to protect against the dangerous condition at the expense of the public entity and the funds and the other means for doing so were immediately available to him, and he had actual or

---

\(^1\) The Field Act is applicable to school buildings and hospitals and calls for a higher level of structural strengthening and higher level of review than the Uniform Building Code.
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constructive notice of the dangerous condition... a sufficient time prior to the injury to have taken measures to protect against the dangerous condition.

Because the District is aware that the Adobe does not meet the safety requirements of the DSA, has never been approved by an appropriate authority, and is not in compliance with the California Building Standards Code or Field Act, the District and governing Board Members may be held liable for injuries or damages caused by structural failure or collapse of the Adobe, pursuant to Government Code Section 830.6 or Government Code Section 835.

4.4 ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines states that cumulative impacts shall be discussed where they are significant. It further states that this discussion shall reflect the level and severity of the impact and the likelihood of occurrence, but not in as great a level of detail as that necessary for the project alone. Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts to be “...two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Cumulative impacts represent the change caused by the incremental impact of a project when added to other proposed or committed projects in the vicinity.

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130 (b)(1)) state that the information utilized in an analysis of cumulative impacts should come from one of two sources:

A. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or

B. A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document designed to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions.

The cumulative impact analyses in this Draft EIR are based on method A. Cumulative impacts are analyzed by considering concurrent development projects in the project area.

The majority of the City of San Marino has been developed, largely with residences. Very few development projects occur in the City. As of January 2009, only five development projects were underway in the City of San Marino. The project site is also within two miles of the cities of Pasadena, San Gabriel, Temple City, Alhambra, and unincorporated portions of the County of Los Angeles. Requests were submitted to these governments for information regarding new development within their respective boundaries. Table 4-1 contains a list of new developments within two miles of the proposed project, as provided by the above-listed agencies. This list of projects serves as the basis for the cumulative analyses provided in the individual sections of Chapter 5, Environmental Analysis.
### Table 4-1
Development Projects within One Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Distance from Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1236 Patton Way, San Marino</td>
<td>New single-family residence</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2853 Gainsborough Drive, San Marino</td>
<td>New single-family residence</td>
<td>0.3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2390 Huntington Drive, San Marino</td>
<td>New commercial building</td>
<td>0.3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8356 Sheffield Road, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>New multifamily (5 detached condominiums)</td>
<td>0.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8300 Longden Avenue, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>New multifamily (9 condominiums)</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 South Santa Anita, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Convert single-family residences to multifamily</td>
<td>0.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2434 Oneida Street</td>
<td>New multifamily</td>
<td>0.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 South Sierra Madre Boulevard, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>New 24-unit condominium</td>
<td>0.8 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 South Sierra Madre Boulevard, Pasadena</td>
<td>New construction of 71 townhomes on three parcels</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900 East Del Mar Boulevard, Pasadena</td>
<td>Amendment to Master Development Plan to add 231,000-square-foot medical development</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2889 San Pasqual Street, Pasadena</td>
<td>Demolition of 29 dwelling units, construction of 59 new dwelling units &amp; 6,200 square feet of administrative offices</td>
<td>0.9 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Correspondence with Amanda Thorson (Planning Assistant, City of San Marino) and Adam Gulick (Associate Planner, City of Temple City); Planning Case Logs of the City of San Gabriel (http://www.sangabrielcity.com/cityservices/communitydev/plancaselog.shtml); Correspondence with Tony Alcaraz (Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County); Los Angeles County DRP Cumulative Project Report; correspondence with Tony Gardea (Associate Planner, Community Planning, City of Pasadena; and Pasadena Planning and Development Projects map (http://www.cityofpasadena.net/planning/mapping/projectmap.asp).
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The CEQA Initial Study Checklist identified two categories with potentially significant impacts, cultural resources and noise. These categories are analyzed in Section 5.1 and Section 5.2, respectively, of this Draft EIR. The remaining 14 categories were eliminated from further analysis by the Initial Study. Since that time, the project description of the proposed project has been updated. At the time of the release of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), as seen in Appendix A, the proposed project included the removal of the Michael White Adobe (Adobe)—either through demolition or relocation—and expansion of the swimming pool, either in place or in the area of the existing basketball courts. However, as described in Chapter 3 of this document, the proposed project now consists only of the demolition of the Michael White Adobe and the creation of an open area in its place. The pool and basketball courts would remain in their current locations and conditions. Accordingly, the project site is now only defined as the area around the Adobe, and no longer includes the pool or the area north of the Adobe.

The update to the project description does not result in any new actions or activities, which were not part of the proposed project as originally described in the Initial Study. Rather, the revisions reduced the scope of the proposed project and reduced the size of the project site. The following is a discussion of each of the environmental categories that was eliminated from further analysis by the Initial Study. As described below, the changes to the project description do not require that any of these areas be analyzed in detail in the EIR.

Aesthetics

The proposed project no longer includes the expansion of the pool or reconstruction of the pool and basketball courts. Instead, the proposed project would create an open area where the Adobe is currently located. This area would be aesthetically similar to the surrounding campus. The revised project would not create substantially different aesthetic effects than the originally proposed project. The conclusions of the Initial Study with regard to aesthetics are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

Agricultural Resources

The update to the project description has reduced the size of the project site and scope of the proposed project. Agricultural resources would not be affected. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

Air Quality

All air quality impacts were identified in the Initial Study as less than significant. The updated project description would not require expansion of athletic facilities and would result in a smaller construction scope. Therefore, the revised project would result in fewer emissions than originally analyzed in the Initial Study. The revisions to the proposed project would not increase traffic or use of the site and would therefore not increase operational emissions. The analysis of the Initial Study therefore overstates the potential for air quality impacts. It is a conservative analysis. No new air quality impacts were introduced by revisions to the project description, and further analysis is not required.
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**Biological Resources**

The update to the proposed project reduced the scope of the project and size of the project site. It would not result in any activities which were not analyzed in the Initial Study. The changes to the proposed project would not impact any undeveloped land or result in any new impacts to biological resources. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

**Geology and Soils**

The revisions to the proposed project reduced the scope of the project and size of the project site. The revised proposed project would not develop any land which was not analyzed in the Initial Study. The revisions would therefore not result in any new exposure to geologic hazards. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The revisions to the proposed project reduced the size of the project site. Development would not take place on any new land not considered in the initial study. The revisions to the proposed project would therefore not result in exposure of school occupants to any new hazards or hazardous materials. As the updated project description reduced the scope of the proposed project, and reduce the activities required, the hazards and use of hazardous materials required by the proposed project have been reduced as well. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The revisions to the proposed project would not create any new hydrology or water quality impacts. The revisions to the proposed project would not develop any land which was not analyzed in the Initial Study, and would therefore not result in any unanalyzed exposure to flooding, inundation, or other hydrology hazards. The reduced scope of the project description would further lessen impacts to water quality. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

**Land Use and Planning**

The revisions to the proposed project would not introduce any new planning conflicts and would not physically divide an established community. The updated project description consist only of reductions to the originally proposed actions. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

**Mineral Resources**

The updated project description reduced the size of the project site. Development would not take place on any new land not considered in the initial study. The availability of mineral resources would be unaffected by the updated project. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

**Population and Housing**

The revisions to the proposed project would not induce growth, or displace houses or people. The reduction in scope of the proposed project would not introduce any new population or housing impacts. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.
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Public Services

Impacts to public services are generally caused by population growth, or increased intensity of use at a site. The originally proposed project, as analyzed in the Initial Study, would have made improvements to athletic facilities, which would have been available to the public. In that way, the originally proposed project may have slightly increased the intensity of use of the site. However, the revised project description no longer includes improvements to athletic facilities and would not increase the intensity of use of the site. For this reason, the Initial Study overstates the impacts to public services which would occur. The public services analysis in the Initial Study is conservative. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate and further analysis is not required.

Recreation

The reduction of the scope of the proposed project would not increase use of recreation facilities or require the construction of new recreation facilities. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.

Transportation and Traffic

The updated project description would generate new vehicle trips to the project site or require changes to roadways. The traffic analysis in the Initial Study is accurate, and further analysis is not required.

Utilities and Service Systems

The originally proposed project, as analyzed in the Initial Study, would have expanded recreational facilities at the project site, including the pool. This also could have slightly increased the use of the project site, and consequently resulted in an incremental increase in water consumption and demand for wastewater treatment. The revised project description would not expand the pool or make other improvements to athletic facilities, or otherwise increase the use of the site. For this reason, the Initial Study overstates the impacts to utilities which would occur. The utilities analysis in the Initial Study is conservative. The conclusions of the Initial Study are accurate, and further analysis is not required.
5. Environmental Analysis
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5.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources include places, object, structures, and settlements that reflect group or individual religious, archaeological, architectural, or paleontological activities, or are considered important for their architectural or historical value. Such resources provide information on scientific progress, environmental adaptations, group ideology, or other human advancements. This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) evaluates the potential for implementation of the San Marino High School Michael White Adobe project to impact cultural resources in the City of San Marino. The analysis in this section is based, in part, upon the following information:


This study is included in Appendix D of this Draft EIR.

5.1.1 Regulatory Background

National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 (Protection of Historic Properties) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. Section 106 Review refers to the federal review process designed to ensure that historic properties are considered during federal project planning and implementation. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent federal agency, administers the review process, with assistance from State Historic Preservation Offices.

National Register of Historic Resources (National Register)

The National Register is the nation’s official list of historic and cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the National Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect the country’s historic and archaeological resources. Properties listed in the National Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service (NPS), which is part of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

As defined in National Register Bulletin #15, “How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,” resources are eligible for the National Register if they:

- A) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

- B) are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or

- C) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- D) have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.
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Once a resource has been determined to satisfy one of the above-referenced criteria, then it must be assessed for “integrity.” Integrity refers to the ability of a property to convey its significance, and the degree to which the property retains the identity, including physical and visual attributes, for which it is significant under the four basic criteria. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain its historical integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these aspects.

California Public Resources Code

Archaeological, paleontological, and historical sites are protected pursuant to a wide variety of state policies and regulations enumerated under the California Public Resources Code. In addition, cultural and paleontological resources are recognized as nonrenewable and therefore receive protection under the California Public Resources Code and CEQA.

- California Public Resources Code 5020–5029.5 continued the former Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee as the State Historical Resources Commission. The Commission oversees the administration of the California Register of Historical Resources, and is responsible for the designation of State Historical Landmarks and Historical Points of Interest.

- California Public Resources Code 5079–5079.65 defines the functions and duties of the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The OHP is responsible for the administration of federally and state mandated historic preservation programs in California and the California Heritage Fund.

- California Public Resources Code 5097.9–5097.991 provides protection to Native American historical and cultural resources, and sacred sites and identifies the powers and duties of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). It also requires notification of discoveries of Native American human remains, descendants and provides for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

California Register of Historical Resources (California Register)

The California Register was established to serve as an authoritative guide to the state’s significant historical and archaeological resources (PRC § 5024.1). State law provides that in order for a property to be considered eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found by the State Historical Resources Commission to be significant under any of the following four criteria; if the resource:

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

2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

3) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values.

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

In addition to meeting one of the four above criteria, California Register eligible properties must also retain sufficient integrity to convey historic significance. California Register regulations contained in Title 14, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852 (c), provide that “it is possible that historical resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but they may still be eligible for listing in the
California Register." The OHP has consistently interpreted this to mean that a property eligible for listing in the California Register must retain “substantial” integrity.

The California Register also includes properties which: have been formally determined eligible for listing in, or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register); are registered State Historical Landmark Number 770, and all consecutively numbered landmarks above Number 770; points of historical interest, which have been reviewed and recommended to the State Historical Resources Commission for listing; and city- and county-designated landmarks or districts (if criteria for designation are determined by OHP to be consistent with California Register criteria). PRC Section 5024.1 states:

(g) A resource identified as significant in an historical resource survey may be listed in the California Register if the survey meets all of the following criteria:

(1) The survey has been or will be included in the State Historical Resources Inventory.

(2) The survey and the survey documentation were prepared in accordance with [OHP]… procedures and requirements.

(3) The resource is evaluated and determined by the office to have a significance rating of category 1-5 on DPR [Department of Parks and Recreation] form 523.

(4) If the survey is five or more years old at the time of its nomination for inclusion in the California Register, the survey is updated to identify historical resources which have become eligible or ineligible due to changed circumstances or further documentation and those which have been demolished or altered in a manner that substantially diminishes the significance of the resource.

City of San Marino Local Register of Historic Resources

The local register of historic resources as established under Section 2, Article 12 of the San Marino City Code adopted in March 1989, allows for City Council to “designate a building, landmark or other property within the City as a local historical landmark in special recognition of the property’s role during the formation and existence of the City.” Nomination is by petition of an individual or organization.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 regulates the protection of archaeological resources and sites that are on federal lands and Indian lands.

5.1.2 Historical Resources

The following discussion of the history of the City of San Marino is adapted from the San Marino Historical Society.

The City of San Marino once consisted of large fruit ranches and vineyards owned by early day pioneers whose names were known to all Californians, such as Benjamin Wilson, James DeBarth Shorb, L. J. Rose, Edward J. Kewen, and General George Stoneman. Although not as well known, Michael White, whose home, the Michael White Adobe (Adobe), still stands on the high school campus, was the most enduring of the pioneers. The flag of Spain still flew over the Californias when the young English sailor arrived in 1817. He played a part in historical events through the Mexican period and well into American statehood.
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In an earlier era, this area was part of the vast California mission system, providing rich yields of food, tallow, and hides. As the San Gabriel Mission grew, a need arose for a grist mill to process the grains. Such a mill was built about 1816 and is, today, El Molino Viejo, or the Old Mill, the oldest building in San Marino and a historic landmark of Southern California.

Description of Project Site

The DPR 523 form prepared for the project site in 1977 describes it as a “one-and-a-half story adobe [that] has a wood shake roof, wood frames around the doors and windows and two chimneys.”

Exterior

The Adobe is an L-shaped adobe house sided with smooth stucco, as seen from above in Figure 4-1, Aerial Photograph. A one-story wing is arranged in a north–south orientation (north wing), and a one-and-a-half-story wing arranged in an east–west orientation (south wing). Clad in shingles, the gable roof has slightly overhanging eaves; it is fairly steep above the south wing and shallower along the north wing. Wood clapboard siding is arranged horizontally on the gable ends. The building has two corredores (roof-covered porches), each supported by two wood posts. One is along the east elevation of the north wing and the other is along the south elevation of the south wing. While two chimneys were present in 1977 when the DPR 523 form was prepared, there is currently only one chimney, centered in the south wing. Fenestration generally consists of wood frame and sash double-hung windows with metal grates on the exterior. Wood doors are located along the east elevation of the north and south wings, and an additional door is centered along the south elevation. Photographs can be seen in Figure 5.1-1, Exterior of Michael White Adobe.

The building is surrounded on all sides by a wrought-iron fence. Yucca and other succulents line the east porch, while a Cyprus tree shades the north elevation. The porches are paved with brick. A swimming pool encircles the project site on the west and south sides, approximately 10 feet from the building. Contained by a retaining wall, the pool is approximately 5 feet below the level of the Adobe. Bleachers for baseball spectators are located east of the building. North of the building is a paved access road.

Interior

The interior of the Adobe is separated into three rooms, with one room in the north wing that retains evidence of a chimney along the east wall, and two rooms in the south wing that are separated by fireplace. The connection between the north wing and the two rooms in the south wing is particularly wide. Typical of adobe construction, window and door openings reveal thick exterior wall dimensions. Floors are brick while walls are generally finished with smooth plaster. A wood panel is removed from the doorway connection between the north and south wings to reveal the adobe construction. Chair rails are present in the south wing. It should be noted that while the roof appears to provide a watertight assembly, there is evidence of rising damp or moisture penetration along the interior of the east elevation wall of the south wing. Photographs of the interior can be seen in Figure 5.1-2, Interior of Michael White Adobe.

Alterations

Although the Michael White Adobe has been altered many times since it was constructed in 1845, it retains substantial integrity from 1977 when it was found eligible for listing in the National Register for its association with an important person. Because there are no extant building or alteration permits, the description of alterations has been pieced together through review of historic photographs, aerial photographs, historical drawings, and extant historical fabric. The historical photographs, drawings, and maps referenced below are included in the Historical Resources Technical Report, Appendix D of this Draft EIR.
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Exterior of Michael White Adobe

View looking southwest.

View looking west.
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Interior of Michael White Adobe

[Image of the interior of Michael White Adobe]

[Image of another angle of the interior of Michael White Adobe]
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The 1977 DPR form states:

The numerous alterations include exterior wiring for electricity, addition of wire cages covering the windows and doors, and addition of several windows. White stucco now covers the original adobe foundation. K.L. Carver restored the residence in 1953 but the interior and exterior have since been vandalized.

Photographs from 1936, taken as part of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS), show the Adobe with a two-story addition. Historical photos also show a lean-to along the north elevation of the south wing, accessed from the east by double doors, and the porch along the east elevation is enclosed (used for parking). It is estimated the wood frame addition was constructed between 1865 and 1880 by Michael White to house his growing family of 13 children. The project site was located at the time in a rural landscape with no other buildings evident. The Adobe is surrounded by mature trees and a dirt road runs along the east elevation. An aerial photograph from 1928 shows the Adobe set far back from Huntington Drive surrounded by citrus groves. A 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map also shows two ancillary buildings, not readily visible in the aerial photograph. A 1938 aerial photograph shows the groves replaced by fields while residential neighborhoods began to develop to west of Gainsborough Drive and south of Huntington Drive.

The two-story, wood-frame addition was removed around 1947 when Tony Garcia, who worked for the San Marino School District’s maintenance department and resided at the property from 1942–1947, moved the two-story wood-frame addition to 704 El Monte Avenue, where he reconstructed it as a two-story duplex. Photos from circa 1947 show the Adobe with the wood-frame two-story addition removed, while the lean-to is still evident. Although there is some evidence of deterioration of whitewashed mud over the adobe walls on the west elevation, the house appears to be in relatively good condition in these photographs. A site plan from 1947 shows proposed removal of ancillary buildings. An aerial photograph from 1949 shows a school complex facing Huntington Drive while the Adobe is evident behind. The Adobe appears to be surrounded by trees and open space in this photo, with dense residential development on all sides.

In contrast, photographs from 1952 show large areas of deterioration with significant portions of the roof missing in the south wing. It is possible the Adobe suffered damage due to the July 1952 Tehachapi earthquake. The lean-to has been removed in these photographs, as well as the enclosure around the porch along the east elevation. In addition, door leaves and window sashes have been removed.

A “restoration” of the Adobe began in 1952 and was completed in 1956. An aerial photograph from 1953 shows grading in progress on all of the land surrounding the Adobe and school. A 1952 site plan shows the Adobe, identified as “existing historical monument,” with proposed boys and girls gyms to the west and south. A 1953 site plan shows proposed pools.

Undated photos after the 1952–1956 restoration shows the Adobe with reconstructed porches, new windows and doors including window grates, new roof, new brick paving on the exterior and interior, cement plaster cladding, and plantings along the north wing. Although a chimney is evident at the north wing in these photographs, it is no longer extant. It should be noted that as part of the restoration work, it appears that both the interior and exterior of the Adobe were clad in cementious plaster. A plaque on a pedestal was added southeast of the Adobe in 1956. By 1959, the area immediately surrounding the Adobe was fenced on the west and south with chain-link above retaining walls enclosing the pool. At an undetermined date, a fence with steel pickets on the north and east adjacent to walkways leading to athletic fields was added to fully enclose the Adobe. There do not appear to have been any alterations since the Adobe was surveyed as appearing eligible for listing in the National Register in 1977 or since it was designated a local historical landmark in 1989.
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Historic Context

The 1977 DPR form states,

Michael Clarington White, called Miguel Blanco in California, was born in England and came to California in 1829. He was an accomplished sailor who served in that capacity as well as a mail courier for the Mexican government of California in the mid 1830’s. In 1831, White married Maria del Rosario, daughter of Dona Eulalia de Guillen, a politically powerful woman in Southern California. White was granted land from the Mexican government in 1843 and built his adobe several years later. An orchard and vineyard were also located on the property. Later owners included L. H. Titus and James Ford. San Marino High School has been built around the original structure.

Michael White

As a participant and witness to the early history of Los Angeles, the Adobe continues to appear eligible for listing in the National Register under criterion B for this association. When he was 76, Michael White gave an oral history to Thomas Savage for the Bancroft Library in 1877. Thomas Savage wrote in his introduction that he found Michael White to be:

Genial and obliging, willing to impart what he knew. It is evident that he is a man who gave but little of his attention to politics, and would take no part in civil strife….Mr. White is in very feeble health; his hand is extremely shaky, his memory seems to be quite fresh, and I am led to believe…that he is a truthful man, a man who means always to speak the truth.

In the oral history, Michael White tells the colorful narrative of his life chronologically. Born in Kent, England, in 1801, he was apprenticed to a whaling ship in 1814, arriving in Baja California in 1817. His sailing adventures continued along the Alta and Baja California coast, as well as to the Sandwich Islands (Hawaiian Islands), interspersed with overseeing construction of boats in Santa Barbara and San Pedro around 1928.

It was likely during construction of the schooner Guadalupe in San Pedro for the Mission San Gabriel in 1830 that he met his wife Maria del Rosario Guillen. They were married in 1831 at Mission San Gabriel and he promptly left for Mazatlan, Mexico. She was the daughter of the famous centenarian Doña Eulalia Perez de Guillen—who lived until 1878 to be over 100 years old and was known as “Mother Superior” of San Gabriel Mission and “keeper of the keys”—and White’s marriage appears quite strategic. By this point, Michael White had become a Mexican citizen, correspondingly changing his name to Miguel Blanco to reflect his new citizenship. Returning from Mazatlan, White and his family settled at Rancho Los Nietos. The first of his 13 children was born soon thereafter.

In 1836, while White was still living at Rancho Los Nietos, Judge Jose Sepulveda tried to convince him to fight in a skirmish in San Diego. Declining, White replied, “Yes, I am a citizen of Mexico, but not a citizen of revolutions.” This attitude against aggression was one he took throughout the turbulent years leading up to the Treaty of Guadalupe in 1848 and American control of California, although he reluctantly participated in a company led by William Workman in late February 1845 in the Battle of Cahuenga that overthrew Micheltorena, as well as the Battle of Chino, a raid led by Benjamin Wilson in September 1846. Loyal to his English ancestors and Mexican citizenship, White felt “that the Americans have treated him badly; he accuses Americans of having swindled him out of lands and robbed him of other property….All this misfortune he lays at the door of Americans, their authorities, and laws.”
In 1839, White traveled to New Mexico with 50 horses and mules, ending up in Taos, where he sold his livestock. Two years later, he returned to California with the renowned Rowland and Workman Party, which also included Benjamin Wilson, who became a close friend and neighbor of White.

Rowland and Workman were together granted 48,000 acres of Rancho La Puente, and in 1843, White had his first foray as a landholder when he was granted Rancho Muscupiabe in the Cajon Pass in San Bernardino by Mexican Governor Micheltorena. Because it was at the confluence of several overland routes, White lasted only one year on the land and quickly abandoned it as indefensible.

In 1845, he was granted 500 varas (or approximately 75 acres) from the new Mexican Governor Pio Pico and called his ranch San Isidro (or San Ysidro) where he constructed the Adobe and later the two-story wood-frame addition. It is possible he received his ranch in connection with his service to Mission San Gabriel or for his role in construction of the schooner Guadalupe or, as others suggest, as Doña Eulalia’s son-in-law. White planted a vineyard and orchards containing a variety of fruit trees on his ranch and permanently settled down from his adventures. White’s rancho was a sliver between the vast rancho of San Pasqual, which was nearly 14,000 acre and later purchased by Wilson, and the Santa Anita ranch, which was 13,319 acres owned by Hugo Reid, and later made famous as the “Arcadia” of E. J. “Lucky” Baldwin.

White parceled off portions of his rancho to his children as they had their own families. Notably, one daughter married Francisco Alvarado, brother of Mexican Governor Jose Alvarado while another daughter married Joseph Heslop (Jose Eslape). In 1878, White lost his ranch to L. H. Titus in a sheriff’s sale. To save the ranch, his mother-in-law, Dona Eulalia, considered joining the Barnum circus as the oldest woman in the world, but she died the same year. He purchased a $2000 cottage in Los Angeles that burned down the same year. Until his death in 1885, White lived with his children.

Other Owners of Project Site

Luther Harvey Titus (1822–1900), who owned adjoining property, came to California in 1869. He grew oranges on his 65 acres, selling his land in 1887 for $15,000. The property was allegedly sold to the San Francisco silver baron James C. Flood (1826–1889), and was later owned by Governor Henry Harrison Markham (1840–1923) and Louis Leonard Bradbury (b. 1823) who gained ongoing fame through his development of the Bradbury Building in downtown Los Angeles. The property was deeded to Isaac Newton Van Nuys (1836–1912) by 1899. Given extensive land holdings of these prominent men and well-known residences, there is no evidence that any of them or their families lived at the property.

San Marino High School

The first school in San Marino opened in 1918 with 58 students at a site on Huntington Drive between Virginia and West drives. School enrollment grew over 600 percent between 1917 and 1928, causing the school board to purchase a site for another elementary school at the intersection of Huntington Drive and Granada Avenue, as well as a site that would become San Marino High School. In 1928, 18 acres of White’s former ranch property was purchased by the San Marino School District, which leased it as a flower and vegetable farm to a Japanese family. When the Japanese family was interred during World War II, the Adobe was occupied by Tony Garcia, who worked in the maintenance department of the San Marino School District.

Although the 18 acres were purchased as a future high school, the site was initially used for Carver Elementary School, named for K. L. Carver and constructed in 1947 with school buildings bordering on Huntington Drive. Kauffman L. Carver (1888–1971) served on the school board for 19 years, 13 of those as president.
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Until 1921, when South Pasadena and San Marino formed a new school district, San Marino students attended high school in adjacent cities. In 1952, after heated debate and a city-wide election, it was decided to separate from South Pasadena and form a separate San Marino High School. Carver Elementary School was converted and expanded to accommodate the high school in 1952, with a new elementary school on San Gabriel Boulevard—San Marino High School—appears to have opened at the project site by 1955. By 1959, the Adobe was surrounded on the west and south by the high school swimming pool and on the north and east by athletic fields. The San Marino Unified School District was formed in 1957.

A longtime San Marino resident, K.C. Carver spearheaded preservation of the Adobe. “It was planned at that time, 1952, that the house would become an integral part of the community used partly as an historical site and partly as a meeting place for campus organizations.” After the 1952–1956 restoration, the Adobe was used briefly as a historical museum exhibiting Indian collections of Aileen White and Laurie Coleman, as well as miscellaneous artifacts donated by Collis H. Holladay. By 1972, the Adobe was known as the “Pep Adobe” and used by the Pep Squad for storage. The bronze marker was placed by the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West after the restoration.

Ranchos in Southern California

Table 5.1-1, Ranchos in Southern California, lists the only 35 extant adobes in Los Angeles County, as described in Historic Adobes of Los Angeles County by John Kielbasa (1997) with an additional four adobes identified by further research from Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation. A corresponding map can be seen in Figure 5.1-3, Ranchos in Southern California.

Five other adobe houses are located in the vicinity of the Michael White Adobe. The San Gabriel Adobes were associated with the San Gabriel Mission, described by Kielbasa in Historic Adobes of Los Angeles County as the “social, economic and religious center of Southern California.” The recently restored Hart Adobe is located in Sierra Madre and was constructed by John Jacob Hart. The substantially altered Hermitage Adobe was constructed for James Craig. The Flores Adobe was so named for General Jose Maria Flores, who led the Mexican Army of California during Mexican War and retreated to this site. The Flores Adobe was constructed by Juan Perez, a cousin of Dona Eulalia, on Rancho San Pasqual, which she is credited for opening to settlement. Finally, the Hugo Reid Adobe in Arcadia was located on the adjoining Santa Anita rancho.
## Table 5.1-1

### Ranchos in Southern California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Optional)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Pico Adobe (Ranchito Romulo)</td>
<td>10940 Sepulveda Boulevard</td>
<td>Mission Hills</td>
<td>Closed, earthquake damage</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Lopez Adobe</td>
<td>1100 Pico Street</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Rancho Los Encinos (De la Osa Adobe)</td>
<td>16756 Moorpark Street</td>
<td>Encino</td>
<td>Restored and open to the public</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Miguel Leonis Adobe</td>
<td>23537 Calabasas Road</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>Historical Museum</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Reyes Adobe</td>
<td>Reyes Adobe Road at Rainbow Crest Drive</td>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>Closed, city plans to restore and turn site into historical museum</td>
<td>1797-1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Sepulveda Adobe</td>
<td>Mulholland Highway at Las Virgenes Canyon Road</td>
<td>Malibu Creek State Park</td>
<td>Restored and open to the public</td>
<td>1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Catalina Verdugo Adobe</td>
<td>2211 Bonita Avenue</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Park ranger HQ for Glendale Rec and Parks, plan to turn into museum</td>
<td>1860-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> La Casa Adobe de San Rafael</td>
<td>1330 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Owned by city, open to public 2 days/week</td>
<td>1872-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Rancho La Liebre Adobe</td>
<td>Tejon Ranch Company, State Route 138 10 mi. e. of Gorman</td>
<td>Private land, not open to public</td>
<td>late 1850s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> La Casa de Miguel Ortiz</td>
<td>13980 Elizabeth Lake Road</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lake</td>
<td>Private residence, not open to public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Avila Adobe</td>
<td>10 E. Olvera Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Available for tours</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Rancho Los Feliz Adobe</td>
<td>Griffith Park, 4730 Crystal Springs Drive</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>HQ for park rangers, Griffith Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Rancho La Brea Adobe (Gilmore Adobe)</td>
<td>6333 W. 3rd Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Private office</td>
<td>1828-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Rocha Adobe</td>
<td>2400 Shenandoah Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> Rancho La Cienega O’Paso de La Tijera</td>
<td>3725 Don Felipe Drive</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Private offices</td>
<td>late 1770s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> The Centinela Adobe</td>
<td>7634 Midfield Avenue</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Houses local artifacts, open to public</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> Rancho San Pedro (Domínguez Ranch Adobe)</td>
<td>18127 Alameda Street</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>Museum, open to public</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong> Rancho Los Cerritos Adobe</td>
<td>4600 Virginia Road</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Museum and library, open to public</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong> Rancho Los Alamitos Adobe</td>
<td>6400 Bixby Hill Road</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Adobe and gardens open to public as a museum</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1-1</th>
<th>Ranchos in Southern California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Juan Matias Sanchez Adobe</td>
<td>946 Adobe Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Flores Adobe</td>
<td>1804 Foothill Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Michael White Adobe</td>
<td>2701 Huntington Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 San Gabriel Adobes</td>
<td>315 Orange Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hugo Reid Adobe</td>
<td>Los Angeles State and County Arboretum, 601 Baldwin Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pio Pico Mansion</td>
<td>6003 Whittier Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 William Workman Adobe</td>
<td>15415 East Don Julian Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 William R. Rowland Ranch House</td>
<td>Lemon Creek Park, 130 Avenida Alipaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 La Casa Primera</td>
<td>1569 N. Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 La Casa Alvarado</td>
<td>1459 Old Settlers Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Adobe de Palomares (La Casa Madera)</td>
<td>491 E. Arrow Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 La Casa de Carrion</td>
<td>919 Puddingstone Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Gage Home (Casa de Rancho San Antonio)</td>
<td>7000 East Gage Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Shadow Ranch</td>
<td>22633 Vanowen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Hermitage Adobe</td>
<td>2121 Monte Vista Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hart Abode</td>
<td>Memorial Park, 222 W. Sierra Madre Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Mitchell Schoolhouse Adobe</td>
<td>24151 San Fernando Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Ortega-Vigare Adobe</td>
<td>616 S Ramona Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 El Molino Viejo</td>
<td>1120 Old Mill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Hawks Adobe</td>
<td>37 E. Montecito</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ranchos in Southern California

Source: Chattel Architecture, Planning & Preservation, Inc. 2009

San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project DEIR  •  Figure 5.1-3
5. Environmental Analysis

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This page intentionally left blank.
Adobe Construction

The predominant mode of construction before the population boom of the 1880s was adobe. The benefits of adobe construction include climatic considerations. As a slow conductor of heat, adobe structures maintained a stable interior temperature despite wide climate fluctuations. Adobe structures were relatively small and consisted of only a few rooms, usually rectangular in plan, but less commonly L-, U-, or H-shaped. Ideally, adobe structures were constructed on high ground near a fresh water source. Stones cleared from the site were often used in the foundation. Made from readily available materials, adobe bricks were composed from mixture of water, earth, and clay found near the home site combined with straw or horse hair and sand to hold the mixture together. The mud-like substance was then poured into rectangular wood frames, typically 18 inches by 24 four inches, and formed into bricks that were spread out and allowed to partially dry. At that point, the frames were removed, leaving the adobe brick to dry completely in the sun.

When the bricks were dry they were stacked on the foundation to create thick walls and held together with a mud mixed with sand. Traditionally, Southern California adobes were single-story buildings. By the mid-1800s, larger, more elaborate adobes and two-story adobes started to appear. Primitive adobes houses had thatched roofs made from tree branches or tules (swamp rushes). Later roofs were made from wood beams and planks. Brea was used to caulk the space between the planks. Generally roofs were flat but in the 1860s, adobes began adopting gabled roofs covered with wood shake. Although interior floors were initially packed earth, they were later lined with clay tile. Plaster was applied to walls. While this form of construction is generally quite durable, heavy rains can easily melt the walls without sufficient protection.

Summary of Historic Significance of the Adobe

The Michael White Adobe was assessed in 1977 and found eligible for listing in the National Register under criterion B for its association with Michael White. The Historical Resources Technical Report confirms that finding of significance and eligibility. As evidenced by his oral history in 1877, Michael White was witness and participant to events pivotal to the development of Los Angeles County and Southern California. Constructing and residing at the property for 33 years, from 1845 until 1878, the project site is the only extant property directly associated with Michael White. As the property is National Register eligible under criterion B, it is also California Register eligible under criterion 2 for the period 1845–1878, when White lost the property in the sheriff’s sale.

The project site is eligible for listing in the California Register under criterion 1 for its rare and unique property type as one of 39 remaining adobe houses in Los Angeles County. With only 39 examples, some of which are significantly altered, extant adobe structures are an increasingly rare and important building type. The Adobe is also California Register–eligible for its method of construction under criterion 3. The period of significance for eligibility under criteria 1 and 3 is 1845, the construction date. Despite alterations, the project site continues to express its adobe construction through its form, thick walls, and deep openings.

While National Register eligibility under criterion A and C was considered, given losses of design, materials, workmanship and setting, the property was found to only meet California Register integrity standards, which allow for some loss of integrity.

The project site was designated a local historical landmark as one of the oldest buildings in San Marino. The only other building from this period is the Old Mill. This significance corresponds with National and California register criterion A/1, “associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.” This presumptive significance aligns with application of California Register criterion 1 noted above.
Due to the age of the Adobe and the length of residency by Michael White and his family, there is the potential that the property could be eligible under criterion 4 for its ability to yield information important in history, specifically the adobe foundations as evidence of archaic construction technique or household artifacts as evidence of 19th and early 20th century domestic use. Additional research by a Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA)-certified historic archaeologist would be required to document this significance. However, given the high probability the site would yield significant information potential, it is found California Register–eligible under criterion 4 for historic archaeology with a period of significance of 1845–circa 1920s, when sewer systems became prevalent.

Character-Defining Features of the Adobe

Based on alterations to the subject property described in detail above, it appears that character-defining features are limited to the adobe walls. All other features appear to have been replaced or restored during the 1952–1956 restoration, including plaster finishes. Although some time has passed (53 years) since the restoration, none of the alterations appear to have taken on significance, as they do not date from the period of significance when Michael White and his family resided at the subject property (1845–1878).

Integrity of the Adobe

In addition to meeting one of the four criteria of the National or California Registers, a property must also retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance. A property either retains its integrity, the physical and visual characteristics necessary to convey its significance, or it does not. The seven aspects of integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain its historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these aspects.

- **Location.** The subject property retains its integrity of location, as it has not been moved. In addition, the subject property retains its integrity of design.

- **Design.** As seen in historical photographs, the existing form, plan, space, structure, and style of the subject property reflects its earlier period.

- **Setting.** Its integrity of setting (defined in part as relationships between buildings and other features, or open space), has been significantly compromised by surrounding athletic facilities, specifically construction of a swimming pool on two sides. Construction of the school and facilities obliterated any sense of an earlier rural setting of vineyards or orchards.

- **Materials.** The subject property generally retains its integrity of materials. Its most important material, adobe brick, is still evident in interpretive panels as well as in the deep openings for windows and doors.

- **Workmanship.** As the adobe construction is still evident, the subject property also generally retains integrity of workmanship, or evidence of artisans’ labor and skill in constructing or altering a building.

- **Feeling of Association.** Despite the loss of setting, the subject property’s feeling—or presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property’s original character—is still present. For its integrity of association to be retained, the property must be sufficiently intact to convey its earlier relationships to an observer. Comparing it with historical photographs, subject property appears to retain sufficient integrity of association.
Although there have been substantial physical alterations to the subject property since it was constructed, it appears to retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance and appears to retain its general form and structure from its period of significance.

### 5.1.3 Archaeological Resources

As part of their investigation, Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation requested a search of the archaeological records of the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton. These records catalogue archaeological finds throughout the region. The SCCIC found no record of archaeological resources on the project site or within a quarter-mile radius of the project site. However, the SCCIC found that, while no records of archaeological resources were found, the project site could contain archaeological resources due to the presence of the Michael White Adobe. Due to confidentiality agreements, the full results of the SCCIC records search cannot be reproduced in this document.

Additionally, archaeological resources related to the construction of the building may exist at the project site. Chattel concluded that the site is eligible under criterion 4 of the California Register, for historical archaeology, such as the foundations of the building and household artifacts as evidence of 19th and early 20th century domestic use.

NAHC was contacted, and a search of the Sacred Lands Files was requested. The NAHC indicated that no known Native American resources were identified. However, the NAHC recommended that local tribes be contacted, and provided a list of Native American representatives. Each of the representatives was contacted. One response was received, from Johntommy Rosas on behalf of the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation. This response stated that archaeological resources and human remains could be found on the project site. The correspondence with the NAHC and Johntommy Rosas is included in Appendix E, Agency Information Requests.

### 5.1.4 Paleontological Resources

The Natural History Museum (NHM) of Los Angeles County maintains a database of vertebrate fossil finds throughout southern California. The NHM was contacted, and a search of their database was requested. Dr. McLeod, Vertebrate Paleontology, at the NHM indicated that, according to their research, the very northern portion of the project area includes surficial deposits composed of older Quaternary Alluvium, while the majority of the project area has surficial deposits composed of younger Quaternary Alluvium, primarily derived as fan deposits from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north or possibly as fluvial deposits from drainages in the area. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils, at least in the uppermost layers, but they are likely underlain, possibly at relatively shallow depths, by deposits of older Quaternary Alluvium.

The NHM has indicated that fossils have been recovered from these deposits of older Quaternary Alluvium relatively near the project site, in Eagle Rock.

### 5.1.5 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

- **C-1** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
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C-2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

C-3 Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

C-4 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

The Initial Study, included as Appendix A, substantiates that impacts associated with the following threshold would be less than significant:

- Threshold C-4

This impact will not be addressed in the following analysis.

5.1.6 Environmental Impacts

The following impact analysis addresses thresholds of significance for which the Initial Study disclosed potentially significant impacts. The applicable thresholds are identified in brackets after the impact statement.

IMPACT 5.1-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD IMPACT THE MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE, AN IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCE. [THRESHOLD C-1]

Impact Analysis: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 provides direction on determining significance of impacts to archaeological and historical resources. Generally, a resource shall be considered “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852), including the following:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

According to CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact to historical resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(b). A substantial adverse change is defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(4)(b)(1), as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired, according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(4)(b)(2), when a project:

(A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

(B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public
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Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

CEQA Guidelines also specify a means of evaluating the relative significance of project impacts on historical resources. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(3) state:

Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Secretary’s Standards, Weeks and Grimmer, 1995), shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.

Compliance with the Secretary’s Standards indicates that a project may have a less than significant impact on a historical resource. The converse of this does not hold; that is, failure to comply with the Secretary’s Standards is not, by definition, a significant impact under CEQA. CEQA recognizes that alterations that are not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards may still not result in significant impacts to the historical resource. Therefore, the significance of project impacts on a historical resource can be evaluated by determining:

- Whether a project is in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards (less than significant impact);
- Whether a project is in substantial conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and does not result in material impairment (less than significant impact);
- Or whether a project is not in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and results in material impairment (significant impact).

For purposes of this analysis, the following are thresholds for determining if the project will result in a historically significant impact:

1. It results in alteration of an historical resource that is not in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and results in material impairment of the resource.
2. It results in a change of the character of the historical resource’s setting, through the introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that are not in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards, and results in material impairment of the resource’s setting.

The proposed project would demolish the Adobe building. Demolition of the Adobe would materially impair the qualities that make the historical resource significant and render it ineligible for listing in the National and California Registers. Demolition activities would also disturb the soil surface surrounding and beneath the building and likely harm potentially significant subsurface cultural resources, including archaic construction techniques that may be found in the foundation, footing, or other materials bearing on native soil that support the adobe walls. In addition, evidence of domestic use may be disturbed. Thus, demolition would be a significant impact to both historical and archaeological resources under CEQA.
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IMPACT 5.1-2: DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT COULD IMPACT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES. [THRESHOLD C-2]

Impact Analysis: The proposed project would require ground-disturbing activities at the project site. While the SCCIC and the NAHC indicated that there are no records of archaeological resources on the project site or in the immediate area, the SCCIC indicated that it is possible that archaeological artifacts associated with the Adobe are buried at the site. As described above, a Native American representative contacted for the proposed project stated that Native American artifacts may be located at the site. Furthermore, archaeological resources related to the construction of the building and evidence of domestic use may exist at the project site. The foundations of the building may reveal archaeological artifacts related to archaic construction techniques and household artifacts may reveal evidence of 19th and early 20th century domestic use. The proposed project may impact undiscovered archaeological resources.

IMPACT 5.1-3: DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT COULD IMPACT PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES. [THRESHOLD C-3]

Impact Analysis: The proposed project would require ground-disturbing activities at the project site. As stated above, the NHM has indicated that fossils may be found in deposits of older Quaternary Alluvium underlying the project site. The letter from Dr. McLeod at the NHM states that:

Surface grading or very shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed in the proposed project area probably will not uncover significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deeper excavations that extend into older Quaternary deposits, however, may well encounter significant fossil vertebrate specimens.

As the proposed project would require ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that older Quaternary deposits could be disturbed. Undiscovered paleontological resources may be impacted by required ground disturbing activities.

5.1.7 Cumulative Impacts

A project would have a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources if it contributes to the cumulative loss of significant historical or archaeological resources. As described in the Environmental Setting and listed in Table 5.1-1, Ranchos in Southern California, the Michael White adobe is 1 of 6 adobe houses in the project vicinity, and 1 of 39 ranchos in southern California. These Adobes are increasingly threatened with demolition, and the loss of the Adobe would contribute to the cumulative loss of these remaining historical resources. The demolition of the Adobe would be cumulatively considerable and its loss would constitute an adverse and significant cumulative impact.

5.1.8 Existing Regulations

- National Historic Preservation Act
- National Register of Historic Resources
- California Public Resources Code
- California Register of Historical Resources
- City of San Marino Local Register of Historic Resources
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5.1.9 Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be potentially significant:

- Impact 5.1-1 The proposed project would impact the Michael White Adobe.
- Impact 5.1-2 The proposed project would require ground-disturbing activities, which could impact undiscovered archaeological resources.
- Impact 5.1-3 The proposed project would require ground-disturbing activities, which could impact undiscovered paleontological resources.
- Cumulative Impacts The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative loss of historical adobe buildings in the area.

5.1.10 Mitigation Measures

Impact 5.1-1

1-1 The San Marino Unified School District shall engage a professional architectural photographer and an architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (Architectural Historian) to implement Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation of the current status of the Michael White Adobe and its setting consisting of both photographs and a written narrative. The Architectural Historian shall direct the photographer to take images that duplicate views shown in the 1936 HABS documentation as well additional views. No less than 15 photographs shall be used to document the current status of the Adobe and its setting. The photographs shall be large format, 4-inch by 5-inch, black-and-white negatives (two sets), contact prints (one set), and 8-inch by 10-inch prints (two sets). All shall be archivally processed and prints shall be made on fiber-based paper. Two original negatives shall be made at the time the photographs are taken. One set of negatives shall travel with set of contact prints to the National Park Service for entry into the HABS collection in the Library of Congress; the second set of negatives shall be transmitted to the San Marino Public Library along with one set of 8-inch by 10-inch prints. A second set of 8-inch by 10-inch prints shall be transmitted to the San Marino Historical Society. The written narrative shall reformat the information contained in this assessment and be transmitted to all the repositories named. Photocopies of the previous HABS documentation, including drawings and photographs prepared in 1936, shall be transmitted to both the San Marino Public Library and San Marino Historical Society along with the contemporary work. The draft documentation shall be assembled by the Architectural Historian and submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval prior to submittal to the repositories. The District Superintendent or designee shall accept the final documentation prior to work on the Adobe site. If the plaque on a pedestal is removed from its existing location, the District Superintendent or designee shall approve final relocation plans for the plaque to ensure the Adobe site is interpreted.

1-2 The period furnishings, ephemera, and other personal property contained within the Adobe appear to be the property of the San Marino Historical Society and shall be returned to the owner or set aside prior to commencement of any construction activity, including demolition and site preparation, on the property.
Impact 5.1-2

1-3 The San Marino Unified School District shall engage a Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) certified archaeologist (Archaeologist) to prepare a predictive archaeological model and treatment plan, including a monitoring program. The treatment plan shall include a plan for recovery of significant information, including documentation of any foundations, footings, or other subsurface evidence of adobe construction and 19th and early 20th century domestic use. The Archaeologist shall implement the treatment plan by monitoring construction activities on the Adobe site at all times that ground-disturbing work is under way. Artifacts recovered from the Adobe site shall be made available to local repositories, including the San Marino Historical Society, Old Mill Foundation, and Huntington Library. However, the recovered artifacts may be disposed of if no local repository is willing or able to accept them. The draft predictive archaeological model and treatment plan shall be assembled by the Archaeologist and submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval and the District Superintendent or designee shall accept the final predictive archaeological model and treatment plan prior to work on the Adobe site. The final report documenting information and artifact recovery shall be submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval and, when approved, shall be transmitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton for entry into the records of the California Historical Resources Information System.

Impact 5.1-3

1-4 If paleontological soils are uncovered during grading, a paleontological monitor shall also be retained by the District, upon the archaeological monitor’s request, to oversee ground-disturbing activities, including but not limited to all grading, excavation, and site preparation. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant resources. Should fossil-bearing formations be uncovered, the monitor shall professionally collect any specimens without impeding development. Any paleontological artifacts recovered shall be preserved, as determined necessary by the project paleontologist, and offered to an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations. This mitigation measure shall also apply to trenching for utilities, geological testing, and any other ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project.

5.1.11 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Impact 5.1-1

Demolition of the Michael White Adobe cannot be accomplished in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards, and demolition by its nature is material impairment of the historical resource. Furthermore, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(2), documentation will not reduce significant direct impacts of the demolition of the Adobe to a less than significant level. Therefore, demolition of the Adobe will constitute a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource, and potential impacts to the historical resource would remain adverse and significant.

Impacts 5.2-2 and 5.1-3

Recovery of scientifically consequential information would reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources associated with earth-moving activities to a less than
significant level. Therefore, with application of Mitigation Measures 1-4 and 1-5, impacts to undiscovered archaeological and paleontological resources would be reduced to levels below significance.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The loss the Adobe would contribute to the cumulative loss of the remaining historical resources in the area. The demolition of the Adobe would remain cumulatively considerable after mitigation, and cumulative impacts would remain adverse and significant.
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5.2 NOISE

This section of the Draft EIR discusses the fundamentals of sound; examines federal, state, and local noise guidelines, policies, and standards; reviews noise levels at existing receptor locations; evaluates potential noise impacts associated with the project. This evaluation uses procedures and methodologies as specified by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Noise modeling data sheets for this analysis are included as Appendix F.

5.2.1 Environmental Setting

Noise Terminology

The following are definitions of terminology used in this section:

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

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

- **A-Weighted Decibel (dBA).** An overall frequency-weighted sound level in decibels that approximates the frequency that humans can hear.

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

- **Day-Night Level (L_{dn}).** The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, with 10 dB added to the sound levels occurring during the period from 10 PM to 7 AM.

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

$L_{dn}$ and CNEL values rarely differ by more than 1 dB. As a matter of practice, $L_{eq}$ and CNEL values are considered to be equivalent and are treated as such in this assessment.

Noise Descriptors

Noise is most often defined as unwanted sound. Although sound can be easily measured, the perception of noise and the physical response to sound complicate the analysis of its impact on people. People judge the relative magnitude of sound sensation in subjective terms such as “noisiness” or “loudness.”

Characteristics of Sound

When an object vibrates, it radiates part of its energy as acoustical pressure in the form of a sound wave. Sound can be described in terms of amplitude (loudness), frequency (pitch), or duration (time). The human hearing system is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. Therefore, to approximate this human, frequency-dependent response, the A-weighted filter system is used to adjust measured sound levels. The normal range of human hearing extends from approximately 0 dBA to 140 dBA.
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Unlike linear units such as inches or pounds, decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale, representing points on a sharply rising curve. Because of the physical characteristics of noise transmission and noise perception, the relative loudness of sound does not closely match the actual amounts of sound energy. Table 5.2-1, *Change in Sound Pressure Level*, presents the subjective effect of changes in sound pressure levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Apparent Loudness</th>
<th>Change in Sound Pressure Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>± 3 dB</td>
<td>Threshold of human perceptibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 5 dB</td>
<td>Clearly noticeable change in noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 10 dB</td>
<td>Half or twice as loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 20 dB</td>
<td>Much quieter or louder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bies and Hansen 2003

Sound is generated from a source and dissipates exponentially with distance from that source. This phenomenon is known as “spreading loss.”

When sound is measured for distinct time intervals, the statistical distribution of the overall sound level during that period can be obtained. The sound level equivalent \( L_{eq} \) is the most common parameter associated with such measurements. \( L_{eq} \) is the average sound level over a given period of time. For example, the \( L_{eq} \) noise level is the level that is exceeded 50 percent of the time; half the time the noise exceeds this level and half the time it is less than this level. This level is also exceeded 30 minutes in an hour. Similarly, the \( L_{90} \), \( L_{08} \), and \( L_{95} \) values are the noise levels that are exceeded 2, 8, and 25 percent of the time or 1, 5, and 15 minutes per hour. Other values typically noted during a noise survey are the \( L_{min} \) and \( L_{max} \). These are the minimum and maximum noise levels obtained over the measurement period.

Because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion at night, state law requires that, for planning purposes, an artificial dB increment be added to quiet-time noise levels in 24-hour noise descriptors called the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or Day-Night Noise Level (\( L_{dn} \)).

**Psychological and Physiological Effects of Noise**

Physical damage to human hearing begins at prolonged exposure to noise levels higher than 85 dBA. Exposure to high noise levels affects the entire biological system, with prolonged noise exposure in excess of 75 dBA increasing body tensions, thereby affecting blood pressure and functions of the heart and nervous system. Extended periods of noise exposure above 90 dBA can result in permanent cell damage. When the noise level reaches 120 dBA, a tickling sensation occurs in the human ear even with short-term exposure. This level of noise is called the threshold of feeling. As the sound reaches 140 dBA, the tickling sensation is replaced by the feeling of pain in the ear, called the threshold of pain. A sound level of 160 to 165 dBA will result in dizziness or loss of equilibrium. The ambient or background noise problem is widespread and generally more concentrated in urban areas than in outlying, less developed areas. Table 5.2-2 shows *Typical Noise Levels from Noise Sources*.
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Table 5.2-2
Typical Noise Levels from Noise Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Outdoor Activities</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Common Indoor Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jet Flyover at 1,000 feet</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rock Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Lawn Mower at three feet</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Truck at 50 feet, at 50 mph</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Food Blender at three feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Urban Area, Daytime</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner at ten feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Traffic at 300 feet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Large Business Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Urban Daytime</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dishwasher Next Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Urban Nighttime</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Theater, Large Conference Room (background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Suburban Nighttime</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Rural Nighttime</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bedroom at Night, Concert Hall (background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast/Recording Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Noise- and Vibration-Sensitive Receptors

Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise and vibration, including residential, school, churches, and open space/recreation areas where quiet environments are necessary for enjoyment, public health, and safety. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include residential uses surrounding the site as follows:

- **Single-Family Residents adjacent to San Marino High School.** Residential areas are sensitive to noise, especially during the evening and early morning hours when people are sleeping. Single-family residences abut San Marino High School to the west. These residences are approximately 305 feet away from the Michael White Adobe (Adobe) at the San Marino High School campus.

- **Classrooms at San Marino High School.** Classrooms at the San Marino High School campus are sensitive to noise. Noise generated by nonclassroom sources can interfere with the intelligibility of communication in the classroom setting and disrupt the classroom environment. The classroom buildings at the San Marino High School are approximately 170 feet southeast of the Adobe.
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Existing Noise Environment

The project site is on the San Marino High School campus, which had a student enrollment of 1,096 students during the 2008–2009 academic year. The existing ambient noise environment in the vicinity of the project site includes stationary noise from use of the onsite athletic hardcourts and playfields and noise from the parking lot, as well as mobile-source noise from traffic on Huntington Drive south of the school.

Regulatory Framework

State of California

State of California Building Code

The state of California’s noise insulation standards are codified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Building Standards Administrative Code, Part 2, California Building Code. These noise standards are applied for new construction in California for the purpose of interior noise compatibility from exterior noise sources. The regulations specify that acoustical studies must be prepared when noise-sensitive structures, such as residential buildings, schools, or hospitals, are located near major transportation noise sources, and where such noise sources create an exterior noise level of 60 dBA CNEL or higher. Acoustical studies that accompany building plans must demonstrate that the structure has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. For new residential buildings, schools, and hospitals, the acceptable interior noise limit for new construction is 45 dBA CNEL.

Land Use Compatibility Criteria

Table 5.2-3 presents a land use compatibility chart for community noise adopted by the State of California as part of General Plan Guidelines. This table provides urban planners with a tool to gauge the compatibility of new land uses relative to existing and future noise levels. This table identifies normally acceptable, conditionally acceptable, and clearly unacceptable noise levels for various land uses. A conditionally acceptable designation implies new construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements for each land use is made and needed noise insulation features are incorporated in the design. By comparison, a normally acceptable designation indicates that standard construction can occur with no special noise reduction requirements.
## Table 5.2-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>CNEL (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-Low Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential- Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging, Motels, Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheatres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Businesses, Commercial and Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conditionally Acceptable: New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and the needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.

### Normally Unacceptable: New construction or development generally should not be undertaken. New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.
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City of San Marino

City of San Marino Ambient Base Noise Level

The City of San Marino regulates noise through the Chapter XIV, Article 4, Section 14.04.05 of the City’s Municipal Code. Pursuant to the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated at a property are restricted from exceeding certain noise levels for extended periods of time. The City applies the noise standards (summarized in Table 5.2-4) to nontransportation noise sources. These standards do not gauge the compatibility of developments in the noise environment, but provide restrictions on the amount and duration of noise generated at a property, as measured at the property line of the noise receptor. The City’s Noise Ordinance is designed to protect people from objectionable nontransportation noise sources such as music, machinery, pumps, and air conditioners. Pursuant to the City’s Municipal Code, the City restricts any person from generating noise at any adjacent residential property line at a level that exceeds a noise level of 65 dB from any parcel in an R-1 zone and 75 dB from any parcel in a C-1 Zone, Park and Recreational Zone, or Historical and Cultural Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Zone</th>
<th>Time Interval</th>
<th>Ambient Base Noise Levels (dBA)</th>
<th>Maximum Permissible Noise Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1 Residential</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 Residential Corridor²</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1 Commercial, Park and Recreational Zone, Historical or Cultural Zone</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of San Marino, City of San Marino Municipal Code. Chapter XIV, Article 4, Noise Control, Section 14.04.04.

Notes: Any noise at a level which exceeds the ambient base level as set forth in this Section by more than 10 dB, when measured at any adjacent privately owned residential property line, shall constitute proof of a violation of this section.

¹ Where the ambient noise levels is less than the base noise levels, the ambient noise levels shall be used as the baseline noise environment.

² Residential corridor shall mean any residential property located within 150 feet of a commercial zone or from any portion of Huntington Drive not abutting a commercial Area.

City of San Marino Construction Hours

According to Section 14.04.07 of the City’s Municipal Code, it is unlawful to operate construction equipment that would require a building, plumbing, electrical or grading permit in a residential zone or 500 feet within a residential zone in a manner that the noise produced would exceed 65 dBA in a residential zone or 75 dBA in a commercial, park and recreation, or historical and cultural zone, unless a permit has been obtained from the Planning and Building Director. In addition, the City regulates hours of construction. Construction activities are restricted to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Friday and 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM on Saturday.

City of San Marino School Noise Exemption

Activities conducted at schools, including sports, carnivals, assemblies, and other related activities (see City of San Marino Municipal Code Chapter XIV, Article 4, Section 14.04.13), are exempt from the noise standards of the City’s Noise Ordinance.
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Vibration Standards

The FTA provides criteria for acceptable levels of groundborne vibration for various types of special buildings that are sensitive to vibration for both vibration annoyance and structural damage. The human reaction to various levels of vibration is highly subjective and variable. As noted in the FTA manual, “although PPV is appropriate for evaluating the potential of building damage, it is not suitable for evaluating human response” (FTA 2006). This is because it takes time for the human body to respond to vibration signals. Table 5.2-5 lists the FTA criteria for acceptable levels of groundborne vibration based on the relative perception of a vibration event for various types of vibration-sensitive land uses.

### Table 5.2-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Max $L_v$ (VdB)$^1$</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Distinctly felt vibration. Appropriate to workshops and nonsensitive areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Felt vibration. Appropriate to offices and nonsensitive areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Daytime</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Barely felt vibration. Adequate for computer equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Nighttime</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vibration not felt, but groundborne noise may be audible inside quiet rooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FTA 2006.

$^1$ As measured in 1/3-octave bands of frequency over the frequency ranges of 8 to 80 Hz.

The level at which groundborne vibration is strong enough to cause structural damage has not been determined conclusively. The most conservative estimates are reflected in the FTA standards, shown in Table 5.2-6. Wood-frame buildings, such as typical residential structures, are more easily excited by ground vibration than heavier buildings. According to the Caltrans’ *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibration* (2002), extreme care must be taken when sustained pile driving occurs within 25 feet of any building; however, the threshold at which there is a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.2 inch per second.

### Table 5.2-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Category</th>
<th>PPV (in/sec)</th>
<th>VdB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Reinforced concrete, steel, or timber (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Nonengineered timber and masonry buildings</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FTA 2006.

Notes: RMS velocity calculated from vibration level (VdB) using the reference of one microinch/second.
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5.2.2 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would result in:

N-1 Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

N-2 Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

N-3 A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

N-4 A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

N-5 For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

N-6 For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working the project area to excessive noise levels.

The Initial Study, included as Appendix A, substantiates that impacts associated with the following thresholds would be less than significant:

• Threshold N-2
• Threshold N-5
• Threshold N-6

These impacts will not be addressed in the following analysis.

5.2.3 Environmental Impacts

The following impact analysis addresses thresholds of significance for which the Initial Study disclosed potentially significant impacts. The applicable thresholds are identified in brackets after the impact statement.

**IMPACT 5.2-1:** CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT WOULD TEMPORARILY ELEVATE THE DAYTIME NOISE ENVIRONMENT IN THE VICINITY OF NOISE-SENSITIVE USES. [THRESHOLD N-4]

*Impact Analysis:* Short-term noise would be generated from construction activities. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction: (1) mobile noise from transport of workers and material deliveries and (2) stationary construction noise from use of on-site construction equipment. The following analysis describes construction noise impacts associated with demolition of the Adobe structure.

**Short-Term Construction Noise from On-Road Mobile Sources**

First, the transport of workers and movement of materials to and from the site could incrementally increase noise levels along local access roads; and/or, short-term noise impacts could occur during demolition, site
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preparation, grading, and/or physical construction. The transport of workers and equipment to the
construction site would incrementally increase noise levels along site access roadways. Even though there
would be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential with passing trucks, the expected number of
workers and trucks is small relative to the background traffic. The truck trips would be spread throughout the
workday and would primarily occur during nonpeak traffic periods. Therefore, these impacts are less than
significant at noise receptors along the construction routes during demolition of the Adobe, and no mitigation
measures are necessary.

Short-Term Construction Noise from Off-Road Construction Equipment

Under the proposed project, demolition activities would commence following approval of the project and
salvage of historic architectural features. Demolition activities could be conducted during winter break.
However, for the purpose of this analysis, demolition activities are assumed to overlap with operational
activities at the school site. Demolition of the structure would take approximately two weeks. Once demolition
has been completed, the site would be capped with a concrete foundation. Off-road construction equipment
used for site preparation would include a bobcat and backhoe.

For onsite construction equipment noise, construction is performed in distinct steps, each with its own mix of
equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics. 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. Construction noise levels were calculated using the FHWA’s
Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) based on the equipment list provided by the District. Noise
levels in Table 5.2-7 represent the average noise levels from demolition activities associated with the Adobe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Construction Noise Levels at Noise-Sensitive Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents West of the San Marino High School Campus</td>
<td>57 dBA L_{eq}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Classroom Buildings</td>
<td>67 dBA L_{eq}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FHWA RCNM, Version 1.1. Based on the construction equipment mix provided by the District.

Construction activities would elevate ambient noise levels during the daytime at the noise-sensitive uses
adjacent to the project site and at onsite classrooms. Construction activities would be limited to the hours
permitted by the City of San Marino (7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Friday and 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM on
Saturday) under Section 14.04.07 of the City’s Municipal Code and would not occur in the evening or late
night hours. Demolition activities would occur for a very short time (2 weeks). However, equipment-intensive
construction activities would be limited because the majority of construction would not involve use of large
construction equipment. Consequently, because construction activities would occur for a relatively short
duration, during the least noise-sensitive portions of the day, and use of loud equipment would be minimal,
impacts at offsite sensitive-receptors would be less than significant for either scenario.

However, construction activities would coincide with the noise-sensitive portion of the school day. Demolition
could generate noise levels up to 67 dBA L_{eq} at the onsite classroom building. Excessive noise can disrupt
the learning environment. A teacher can be understood without any interruption at approximately 20 feet if
the inside sound level is 55 dBA Lmax (FICON 1992). Because even short-term construction activities have
the potential to disrupt the classroom learning environment, impacts are potentially significant.
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IMPACT 5.2-2    OPERATION OF THE PROJECT WOULD NOT GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN NOISE LEVELS. [THRESHOLDS N-1 AND N-3]

Impact Analysis: Once the Adobe is demolished, the project site would be capped. No additional structures or improvements would be made. The project site would be an open quad and part of the existing recreational uses of the campus. The project site would not generate additional noise. Consequently, no impact would occur from the operational phase of the project.

5.2.4  Cumulative Impacts

Construction Noise

Construction noise impacts are confined to a local area of impact. Consequently, cumulative impacts would only occur if other projects are being constructed in the vicinity of the project at the same time. The whole area surrounding the project site is developed with suburban uses. Consequently, project-related construction noise would not substantially increase the ambient noise environment. Cumulative impacts are therefore also considered less than significant.

Operation

The project would not substantially increase the ambient noise environment. Consequently, stationary noise associated the project would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in less than significant cumulative noise impacts.

5.2.5  Existing Regulations and Standard Conditions

- Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Building Standards Administrative Code, Part 2, California Building Code: Requires habitable rooms and classrooms to achieve noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL.
- City of San Marino Municipal Code, Chapter XIV, Article 4, Noise Control.

5.2.6  Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions of approval, the following impacts would be less than significant: 5.2-2 and cumulative impacts.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be potentially significant:

- Impact 5.2-1   Construction activities associated with the project would temporarily elevate the daytime noise environment in the vicinity of noise-sensitive uses.

5.2.7  Mitigation Measures

Impact 5.2-1

2-1    Prior to construction, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the San Marino Unified School District administrators for San Marino High School to discuss construction activities that generate high noise levels. Coordination between the administrators and the construction contractor shall continue on an as-needed basis throughout the construction phase of the project to avoid potential disruption of classroom activities as feasible.
2-2 The San Marino Unified School District shall specify that the contractor shall properly maintain and tune all construction equipment in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations to minimize noise emissions.

2-3 The San Marino Unified School District shall specify that the contractor shall fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer.

2-4 The San Marino Unified School District shall specify that the construction contractor shall place stationary construction equipment and material delivery (loading/unloading) areas as far from adjacent residential and classroom uses as is feasible, but no closer than 50 feet.

5.2.8 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measures 2-1 through 2-4 would reduce noise generated by construction activities to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure 2-1 would require the construction contractor to coordinate with the District to avoid classroom disruption. Because construction activities would occur for a relatively short duration, use of loud construction equipment would be minimal, and mitigation measures would ensure that the construction contractor would coordinate activities with the District to minimize classroom disruption, potential impacts associated would be less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts relating to noise remain.
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6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Chapter 1, Executive Summary, contains Table 1-1, which summarizes the environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and level of impact significance before and after mitigation. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires a discussion of any significant impacts that cannot be reduced to levels of insignificance. Although mitigation measures have been identified, where feasible, for all of the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project, the project would result in one impact that is significant and unavoidable even after implementation of feasible mitigation measures. This impact is discussed in Chapter 5, Cultural Resources. The proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a building that meets the definition of a historical resource under CEQA.

The Michael White Adobe (Adobe) is eligible for listing on the national and state registers, and is a recognized local historic landmark. The Adobe is considered a historical resource under CEQA. Demolition of the Adobe would constitute a significant impact to a historical resource, as described in Section 5.1. Mitigation Measure 1-1 would require that the building be documented and Mitigation Measure 1-2 would require that period furnishings, ephemera, and other personal property in the Adobe be returned to the San Marino Historical Society.

However, even after the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would remain significant and adverse. Demolition by its nature is material impairment of the historical resource, and no feasible mitigation measures are available to mitigate the demolition of the historical resource to a less than significant level. As a result, demolition of the Adobe would be considered a significant unavoidable adverse impact.
6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts
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7. **Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

7.1 **INTRODUCTION**

7.1.1 **Purpose and Scope**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines on alternatives (Section 15126.6[a] through [f]) are summarized below to explain the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in the EIR.

- “The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly” (15126.6[b]).

- “The specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated along with its impact” (15126.6[e][1]).

- “The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, and at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (15126.6[e][2]).

- “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” (15126.6[f]).

- “Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)” (15126.6[f][1]).

- For alternative locations, “only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR” (15126.6[f][2][A]).

- “An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative” (15126.6[f][3]).
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For each alternative, this analysis:

- Describes the alternative,
- Analyzes the impact of the alternative as compared to the proposed project,
- Identifies the impacts of the project that would be avoided or lessened by the alternative,
- Assesses whether the alternative would meet most of the basic project objectives, and
- Evaluates the comparative merits of the alternative and the project.

Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), additional significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

7.1.2 Project Objectives

As described in Section 3.2, the following objectives have been established for the proposed project and will aid decision makers in their review of the project, the project alternatives, and associated environmental impacts:

- Maximize the net useable space on the San Marino High School campus.
- Maintain the San Marino High School campus and other District-owned property in a manner that reflects the prudent and efficient use of public resources.
- Ensure the efficient and responsible use of school district funds.
- Avoid disruption to the educational and recreational activities at San Marino High School and other San Marino Unified School District properties.
- Reduce costs associated with the maintenance of the Michael White Adobe.
- Reduce liability associated with the Michael White Adobe, a non–Field Act compliant structure.
- Increase public access to the Michael White Adobe.
- Consider the feasibility of preserving the Michael White Adobe, either in situ or at Lacy Park.
- Develop mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce or eliminate potentially significant effects.

7.1.3 Alternatives for Historical Resources

For a project with potential impacts on historical resources, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 states that a lead agency must “identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource.” “Feasible” is defined as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors” (Public Resources Code Section 21061.1). Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives (as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)) are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.
The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones that meet the project objectives, are ostensibly feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen a significant environmental effect. Of the alternatives considered, the EIR need only examine in detail those that the Lead Agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of reasonable alternatives must be selected and discussed in a manner that fosters meaningful public participation and informed decision making (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]).

Alternatives that are designed to comply in part or in full with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards would avoid or substantially lessen historic resource impacts. “Where maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of the historical resource will be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, the project’s impact on historical resources shall generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4[b][1]).

7.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are clearly infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[f][3]). This section identifies alternatives considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible, and provides a brief explanation of the reason for their exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[c]).

7.2.1 Alternative Locations

CEQA requires that alternative locations for a project be considered. As the proposed project entails the removal of existing buildings, the project is site specific, and an analysis of alternative locations is not applicable. Alternative locations will therefore not be considered further.

7.2.2 Relocation and Stabilization to Rotary Park at Huntington Drive and Gainsborough Drive

This alternative would relocate and stabilize the Michael White Adobe (Adobe) in a manner similar to the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative described below. However, under this alternative, the Adobe would be relocated to the southeast corner of the San Marino High School campus, near the intersection of Huntington Drive and Gainsborough Drive. This location contains an area known as Rotary Park, which contains a landscaped garden and a gazebo as well as a small parking lot. Under this alternative, the Adobe would remain under the care of the District. As Rotary Park is small, this alternative would result in the loss of the garden and parking area, and unlike the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative, which would transfer ownership of the building, this alternative would require the District continue to maintain the Adobe.

Because this alternative would maintain the Adobe on District-owned property, a fence would be built around it to prevent unauthorized entry by students or staff. Therefore, this location would not provide greater accessibility of the historical building to the public. Public access to the Adobe during regular school hours...
would remain prohibited unless arrangements are made with the District or San Marino High School administration. Access during nonschool hours would continue to be made with the San Marino Historical Society. This alternative would also result in the loss of already limited school parking. Although this alternative would be technically feasible and could reduce historic impacts associated with the demolition scenario to acceptable standards, this alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would:

- Allow many of the same problems currently faced by the District to continue
- Result in the loss of already limited school parking.

Furthermore, this Alternative would not meet the following project objectives:

- Maximize the net useable space on the San Marino High School campus.
- Maintain the San Marino High School campus and other District-owned property in a manner that reflects the prudent and efficient use of public resources.
- Ensure the efficient and responsible use of school district funds.
- Reduce costs associated with the maintenance of the Michael White Adobe.
- Reduce liability associated with the Michael White Adobe, a non–Field Act compliant structure.
- Increase public access to the Michael White Adobe.

### 7.2.3 Rehabilitation In Situ

Under this alternative, the Adobe would be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for rehabilitation in situ or in place. This alternative would not result in a significant impact to the historical resource. However, compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards precludes compliance with the requirements of the Division of the State Architect (DSA). As the building would not comply with the DSA safety requirements, it could not be used by students or staff of the District.

This alternative does not meet the District’s needs. While it would be rehabilitated without significant impact to a cultural resource, the Adobe would not be used by students or staff. The District would continue to perform minimal maintenance on the building and would not be able to occupy the property for school operational uses. Under this alternative, the building would continue to pose many of the same problems it currently poses to the District. Furthermore, this alternative would not meet the following project objectives:

- Maximize the net useable space on the San Marino High School campus.
- Maintain the San Marino High School campus and other District-owned property in a manner that reflects the prudent and efficient use of public resources.
- Ensure the efficient and responsible use of school district funds.
- Avoid disruption to the educational and recreational activities at San Marino High School and other San Marino Unified School District properties.
- Reduce costs associated with the maintenance of the Michael White Adobe.
7. Alternative to the Proposed Project

- Reduce liability associated with the Michael White Adobe, a non–Field Act compliant structure.
- Increase public access to the Michael White Adobe.

For these reasons, this alternative was not selected for further analysis.

7.2.4 Reconstruction and Stabilization Alternative

An alternative method of relocating the Adobe was also considered. This alternative would use the reconstruction method of relocation to transfer the Adobe to another site (including the Rotary Park site, see Section 7.2.2 of this chapter, and the Lacy Park site, see Section 7.3.2 of this chapter). This alternative method entails carefully removing plaster on each side of the adobe walls and taking the adobe walls apart brick by brick, while documenting the location of each brick for reconstruction. Damaged brick would be replaced with stabilized and unstabilized adobe units. Under this alternative, the adobe walls at the receiver site would have embedded reinforced concrete columns at corners that would continue down into the subgrade, analogous to a flag pole. Stone footings would be placed between the columns’ subgrade, and adobe brick would be placed between the columns above grade. While this alternative may be a cost-effective way of relocating the Adobe, it appears this methodology would fall in the range of reconstruction rather than rehabilitation. This would result in a less than significant impact to historic resources. However, as this alternative method involves a great potential loss of fragile archeaic material, including material infilling joints in the adobe brick walls, this approach would be less preferable. This alternative method is more invasive than relocating the Adobe in the manner described in the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative (Section 7.3.2). For this reason, the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative, rather than this Reconstruction and Stabilization Alternative, was selected for further analysis.

7.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

The alternatives selected for further analysis strive to achieve the basic project goal, which is to maximize the net useable space on the high school campus while minimizing historical and cultural resources impacts. The District has decided to further evaluate the following three alternatives:

- No Project Alternative
- Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative
- Stabilization In Situ Alternative

Where feasible, the California Historical Building Code (CHBC; Part 8 of Title 24, California Building Code) was applied as an essential component for each alternative. The CHBC provides alternative building regulations for the “preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, related construction, change of use or continued use” of qualified historical buildings or properties. These regulations are intended to provide: alternative building code enforcement solutions for the preservation of qualified historical buildings or properties; access for persons with disabilities; a cost-effective approach to preservation; and reasonable safety for the occupants or users. However, the CHBC shall not be construed to allow development of a lower level of safety of structural design and construction than is reasonably equivalent to the regular code provisions in occupancies that are critical to the safety and welfare of the public at large, including, but not limited to, public and private schools, hospital, municipal police and fire stations, and essential services facilities. Therefore, the CHBC would be applicable to the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative. However, it would not be applicable to the Stabilization In Situ Alternative, where the Adobe would remain on the high school campus and would need to be altered in conformance with requirements of the DSA.
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7.3.1 No Project Alternative

Under this alternative, no changes to the project site would occur. The Adobe would remain in its current condition with limited public access and would continue to be gated to deter unauthorized entry. Minimal maintenance of the Adobe would continue to be performed by the District.

Cultural Resources

Although maintenance is considered preservation under the Secretary’s Standards, there is no maintenance, stabilization, or mothballing implementation plan that currently exists. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would allow the building to deteriorate further. Evidence of rising damp and thus moisture infiltration in the east wall of the south wing and evidence of termite infestation throughout the interior of the building has already been observed, and can eventually lead to severe damage if not properly maintained. The No Project Alternative would result in a potentially significant impact on the historical resource. Impacts to cultural resources under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would not require demolition and would therefore not generate any noise associated with those activities. As construction-related noise is the primary sources of noise associated with the proposed project, this alternative would be superior to the proposed project in the area of noise.

Conclusion

The No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project in the area of noise and environmentally similar in the area of cultural resources. There would be no immediate cost to implement the No Project Alternative. This alternative would not meet the following five project objectives:

- Maximize the net useable space on the San Marino High School campus.
- Maintain the San Marino High School campus and other District-owned property in a manner that reflects the prudent and efficient use of public resources.
- Ensure the efficient and responsible use of school district funds.
- Reduce costs associated with the maintenance of the Michael White Adobe.
- Reduce liability associated with the Michael White Adobe, a non-Field Act compliant structure.
- Increase public access to the Michael White Adobe.

7.3.2 Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative

If economically feasible, the Adobe would be relocated to Lacy Park at 1485 Virginia Road in San Marino, which is approximately 1.4 miles from San Marino High School. Lacy Park was identified as the only available recipient site for the Adobe. During the public review period for the Notice of Preparation, the District published a notice to offer to sell the Adobe in the San Marino Tribune, Pasadena Star News, and on www.historicproperties.com. The District also directly mailed the notice to 16 agencies and organizations. Of the agencies contacted, only the City of San Marino responded favorably. On May 13, 2009, the City Council unanimously approved a resolution to allow the Adobe to be relocated to Lacy Park, near the historic Armin
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Thurnher House, and take ownership, as long as the City would not incur any costs to relocate, landscape, or refurbish the Adobe. As the City of San Marino is the only entity that has demonstrated willingness to accept the building, Lacy Park was determined to be the only feasible recipient site for the Adobe.

The preliminary move route is illustrated in Figure 7-1, *Relocation Route*. Although the City has approved a map showing a specific location, described as Alternate 3, it is understood that the City is amenable to a location at the entrance to Lacy Park. Alternate 3 is not preferred, however, because it would place the Adobe on a site currently occupied by a lawn and several old-growth trees, including at least three substantial oak trees. Relocation and placement of the Adobe may require removal of some of these trees, as the Adobe would be placed within the trees’ canopy and would be inappropriate. In addition, the specific location described in Alternate 3 appears to change the compass orientation of the relocated Adobe. As a result, a potential relocation zone that is near the Thurnher House in Lacy Park has been identified. Both the Alternate 3 location approved by the City of San Marino and the potential relocation zone being considered can be seen in Figure 7-2, *Potential Relocation Zone*.

To implement this alternative, the District would engage a qualified architectural and engineering team (preservation consultants) to plan and move the Adobe from the donor site at San Marino High School to the receiver site within the potential relocation zone at Lacy Park. The preliminary maps, sketches, and reports prepared for the relocation would serve to guide all future associated work through design development, construction documents, and construction administration. The architect on the team would be required to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in historical architecture and the structural engineer would be required to have a minimum of 10 years experience in historical preservation projects of a similar nature, including work on adobe structures. The mover and contractor responsible for implementing the work would be required to meet similar minimum qualifications standards. The preservation consultants would recommend the final receiver site, employing the criteria in the 1979 publication *Moving Historic Buildings* by John Obed Curtis, particularly with respect to appropriate solar orientation and relationship to other site features, and the Secretary’s Standards would be employed to minimize harm and maximize preservation of physical character. Construction documents prepared by the preservation consultants, including the final relocation route, would be reviewed and approved by the District Superintendent or designee, as well as the City of San Marino, and receive all required clearances from governmental agencies with jurisdiction over the relocation route prior to commencing any work on the donor site. The CHBC would be utilized to the maximum extent possible.

Relocation of the Adobe would be accomplished by first protecting the adjacent sports facilities from debris and damage during the move. Site preparation would include but would not be limited to the removal of items, including the fencing around the Adobe, site paving, landscaping, wood-framed roof, porches, interior partitions, chimney, interior brick floors, and utilities. Approximately four feet of soil below the existing grade would be disturbed. The Adobe would be moved in two sections, and preparation to shore, lift, and transport the Adobe would occur in two phases. Site access requires the north wing be moved first, followed by the south wing. The base of the north wing Adobe walls above the existing foundations would have to be strengthened to provide a structural system that can be lifted. After the base of the Adobe wall is consolidated to prevent caving, a reinforced concrete bond beam would be introduced in small alternating sections to create a continuous new foundation. A continuous wood ledger would be attached to the inside and outside face of the bond beam and temporary wood framing would be constructed to confine the Adobe walls. Periodic sections of the existing foundations would be documented and removed, and hydraulic jacks would be placed in the cavities. After the jacks are in place and mechanically linked to lift together, the Adobe would be slowly lifted in small increments. As the limit of one lift is approached, wood cribbing would be installed in the vertical gap to maintain the new higher position. The lift sequence would be repeated until the building is high enough above the grade to install a steel beam grid. Once the grid is in place, the transportation axles and wheels would be positioned under the steel grid. Additional interior bracing between
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the confined Adobe walls to keep the building from racking during the move would be put in place prior to leaving the project site. The same procedure would be required for moving the southern wing.

Grading, compaction, and other preparation of the receiver site at Lacy Park, including stubbed-out utilities, would need to be further documented. This alternative does not include full rehabilitation of the Adobe, but stabilization only. Stabilization in the relocation involves placement of the Adobe structure on the new foundation with sufficient site work to ensure water flow away from the Adobe, construction of new roof structures and sheathing, and patching of exterior surfaces as necessary to provide a watertight assembly. It is anticipated that a new chimney, flooring, and other work will be required to fully rehabilitate the relocated Adobe for use. Once relocated, the Adobe would be stabilized on a new foundation and be watertight. The Adobe would operate in a manner similar to the Thurnher House and be accessible to the public on a regular basis.

The relocation process would begin in the fall of 2009 after certification of the EIR and project approval. Selection of qualified firms, preparation of the plans, and the implementation of the necessary improvements to stabilize and prepare the Adobe for the move, as well as preparation of the receiving site, would take a few months. The entire preparation is expected to take approximately six months, and relocation activities would likely occur during the summer of 2010.

Cultural Resources

While CEQA only requires a qualitative comparison of impacts associated with project alternatives to the proposed project and does not require a technical analysis of impacts of project alternatives, the Historical Resources Technical Report prepared for the proposed project analyzed the impacts of this alternative in depth. While potential impacts would result from the work necessary to move the structure, Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation concluded that relocation and stabilization could be accomplished in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards. As established in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(3), this alternative would therefore not result in a significant impact to the historic Adobe building.

Relocation of the Adobe to Lacy Park would provide it with a more appropriate setting than the San Marino High School campus. Rehabilitation guidelines of the Secretary’s Standards define setting as, “The area or environment in which a historic property is found,” and recommend “Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and landscape features of the setting.” The current setting among the high school’s recreational facilities is severely compromised and inappropriate. An Adobe built in the mid 1800s would not have been constructed in a school campus surrounded by athletic facilities, but would be in a more rural setting. Therefore, relocation and stabilization at Lacy Park would provide a more historically appropriate setting for the Adobe than its current placement.

As this alternative would require ground-disturbing activities similar to those associated with the proposed project, Mitigation Measures 1-3 and 1-4 identified in this DEIR would also apply to this alternative. These alternatives require that the District engage an archaeologist and, if paleontological soils are uncovered, a paleontologist as well, to monitor ground-disturbing activities. Under this alternative, cultural monitoring would be required at both the project site and the future location of the Adobe, where ground-disturbing activities would also be required.

Because the proposed project would demolish the Adobe, and because this alternative would not result in a significant impact to the building and would place it in a more appropriate setting, this alternative is superior to the proposed project with regard to cultural resources.
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Relocation Route

Map of relocation route for Michael White Adobe from San Marino High School to Lacy Park.

Source: Google Maps 2009
San Marino High School Michael White Adobe Project DEIR

The Planning Center • Figure 7-1
Map of Lacy Park showing possible receiving site for Michael White Adobe. The City has approved the “Alternate 3” location indicated on the map. However, the Alternate 3 location is not preferred, and potential sites throughout the indicated potential relocation zone are being considered.
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Noise

While CEQA only requires a qualitative comparison of impacts associated with project alternatives to the proposed project and does not require a technical analysis of impacts of project alternatives, the Noise Appendix (Appendix F) prepared for the proposed project analyzed the impacts of this alternative in depth. The following is based on the analysis and calculations in this appendix.

Under this alternative, short-term noise would mainly be associated with the preparation of the Adobe for relocation and relocation activities. If relocation of the Adobe is conducted, relocation activities would commence following approval of the project and approval of the receiver site at Lacy Park. Construction activities would entail site preparation work to prepare the building for relocation including: removing the roof, demolition of the interior walls, and constructing a concrete beam at the base of the perimeter walls. Onsite preparation would take approximately four months. In addition to onsite preparation, site preparation would need to be conducted at Lacy Park. Relocation would be on the eastern side of Lacy Park, near the Thurhner House. Site preparation at Lacy Park would take approximately one month to construct the foundation and concrete slab for the structure. After both sites are prepared, the building would be transported from the high school to Lacy Park and stabilized. Overall, construction activities would take approximately six months. Off-road construction equipment used for site preparation would include forklifts, a bobcat, and pneumatic tools.

Because construction is performed in distinct steps, each with its own mix of equipment, each construction phase has its own noise characteristics. 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. Construction noise levels were calculated using the FHWA’s RCNM based on the equipment list provided by the District. Noise levels in Table 7-1 represent the average noise levels from construction activities associated with relocation of the Adobe to Lacy Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>dBA $L_{eq}$</th>
<th>dBA $L_{max}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents West of the San Marino High School Campus</td>
<td>62 $L_{eq}$</td>
<td>65 $L_{max}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents South and East of Lacy Park¹</td>
<td>71 $L_{eq}$</td>
<td>73 $L_{max}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurhner Lawn Picnic Area</td>
<td>77 $L_{eq}$</td>
<td>75 $L_{max}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Classroom Buildings</td>
<td>73 $L_{eq}$</td>
<td>79 $L_{max}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FHWA RCNM, Version 1.1. Based on the construction equipment mix provided by the District.
¹ Based on the potential relocation site closest to the off-site sensitive receptors.

Groundborne vibration is almost never annoying to people who are outdoors and is therefore evaluated in terms of indoor receivers (FTA 2006). Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. Vibration is typically sensed at nearby structures when objects within the structure generate noise from the vibration, such as rattling windows or picture frames. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor building construction. The results from vibration can range from no
perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Ground vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that can damage structures, but can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to the construction site.

The highest levels of vibration would be experienced when a heavy piece of construction equipment is operating or passes in proximity to the nearby vibration-sensitive structures. However, vibration levels taper off the farther construction equipment operates from the nearest sensitive structure. Levels of vibration produced by construction equipment are evaluated against the FTA’s significance threshold for vibration annoyance of 78 VdB for residential structures during the daytime, as shown in Table 7-2. As shown in this table, vibration from construction activities at Lacy Park would not be perceptible at the single-family residential areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Maximum Vibration Levels at 115 feet (VdB)</th>
<th>Significance Threshold (VdB)</th>
<th>Exceeds Significance Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment¹</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on methodology from the United States Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (2006).

¹ Vibration levels from the listed off-road construction equipment are equivalent to vibration levels generated by a small bulldozer.

Vibration-Induced Structural Damage

Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches levels that can damage structures. However, the FTA has also established thresholds for vibration levels that would damage building structures. Wood-frame buildings, such as typical residential structures, are more easily excited by ground vibration than heavier buildings (steel-framed, concrete, etc.). The threshold at which there is a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.2 inch per second, and 0.12 for historical buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage. Project-related construction vibration was evaluated for its potential to cause structural damage in comparison to the FTA’s structural damage criteria for the closest structure to the relocation site at Lacy Park. As shown in Table 7-3, construction activities associated with the project would result in PPV levels that are below the FTA’s criterion for vibration-induced structural damage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Maximum RMS Velocity at 5 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>Significance Threshold (in/sec)</th>
<th>Exceeds Significance Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment¹</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹ Vibration levels from the listed off-road construction equipment are equivalent to vibration levels generated by a small bulldozer.
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Noise impacts would generally be similar to those associated with the proposed project. The mitigation measures applied to the proposed project would also be applied to this alternative. However, because this alternative would require a longer schedule and would have increased duration of construction/relocation-related noise, this alternative is inferior to the proposed project with regard to noise.

Conclusion

The Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project in the area of cultural resources, and environmentally inferior to the proposed project in the area of noise. It would cost approximately $1,158,328 (see Appendix G) to implement and would also fail to meet the following project objective:

- Avoid disruption to the educational and recreational activities at San Marino High School and other San Marino Unified School District properties.

7.3.3 Stabilization In Situ Alternative

Under the Stabilization In Situ Alternative, the Adobe would not be demolished, but would be stabilized in its current location for school use. This alternative would be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the DSA for allowing school use of existing nonconforming buildings. Application of these DSA requirements would require a new foundation and walls, and would make the Adobe Field Act compliant. Therefore, under this alternative, students and staff of District would be able to occupy the Adobe.

Implementation of this alternative would require removal of a sufficient area of the existing footing or foundation to install a new reinforced concrete footing to support plywood and wood stud walls, which would permanently encase or encapsulate the existing adobe structure. The new foundation for the plywood and wood stud walls would be placed to avoid the existing condition of the foundation supporting the adobe wall. The existing ceiling and roof structures would be supplemented with plywood diaphragms and provide additional support at the top of the adobe wall with installation of permanent anchors set in epoxy resin. The adobe walls would be protected with batt insulation prior to placement of the permanent plywood and wood stud walls, and all-thread rods with washers (similar to threaded bolts, but without heads) would be through-bolted in the adobe walls.

Cultural Resources

While stabilization of the Adobe in situ would allow the adobe structure to remain, adobe would no longer be visible on either the exterior or interior of the building. Permanent encapsulation of the adobe walls might be considered in conformance with the reversibility concept described in rehabilitation standard 10 of the Secretary Standards: “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.” However, the most important feature of the historical resource would no longer be visible and thus would violate rehabilitation standard 2, which is “The historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.” Additionally, encapsulating the adobe walls might accelerate deterioration by retaining moisture behind the enclosed walls. This could cause possible future deterioration to go unchecked. Because compliance with DSA requirements would obscure the most important feature of the historic resource and would violate rehabilitation standard 2, the safety requirements of the DSA are incompatible with the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for historic buildings. Bringing the building into conformance with DSA standards would result in a significant impact to
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the historic resource. This alternative would therefore be similar to the proposed project with regard to cultural resources.

Noise

This alternative would require some ground-disturbing activities. These ground-disturbing activities could be performed quickly. Construction efforts to bring the Adobe to DSA standards could take up to six months and result in noise nuisance during school operation hours. However, the noise impacts would not be significant. Therefore, this alternative would be similar to the proposed project with regard to noise.

Conclusion

The Stabilization In Situ Alternative would be environmentally similar to the proposed project in the area of cultural resources, and environmentally similar to the proposed project in the area of noise. This alternative would require approximately $1,040,007 to implement (see Appendix G for breakdown of fees). This alternative would not meet the following four project objectives:

- Avoid disruption to the educational and recreational activities at San Marino High School and other San Marino Unified School District properties.
- Increase public access to the Michael White Adobe.
- Consider the feasibility of preserving the Michael White Adobe, either in situ or at Lacy Park.
- Develop mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce or eliminate potentially significant effects.

7.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

As provided in Section 6 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in one significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources. This significant impact is due to the fact that the Adobe is a historical resource, as defined by CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, and demolition of an historical resource is a significant adverse impact because it would materially impair the resource. Table 7-4, Summary of Environmental Effects of Proposed Project and Alternatives, summarizes the environmental effects of all three alternatives compared to the proposed project and provides the cost to implement the proposed project and each of the alternatives.
Table 7-4
Summary of Environmental Effects of Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts Relative to Proposed Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project (Demolition of Adobe)</td>
<td>$176,493</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation to Lacy Park</td>
<td>$1,158,328</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization In Situ</td>
<td>$1,040,007</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, an EIR must identify an “environmentally superior alternative,” which would be the alternative that has the least impact on the environment or would be capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of the project. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]). Taking into consideration only the alternatives, the environmentally superior alternative would be the Relocation to Lacy Park Alternative. Although it is necessary to identify the environmentally superior alternative, the decision makers are free to select the proposed project or any of the alternatives evaluated in this EIR.
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8. **Impacts Found Not to Be Significant**

California Public Resources Code Section 21003 (f) states: “...it is the policy of the state that...[a]ll persons and public agencies involved in the environmental review process be responsible for carrying out the process in the most efficient, expeditious manner in order to conserve the available financial, governmental, physical, and social resources with the objective that those resources may be better applied toward the mitigation of actual significant effects on the environment.” This policy is reflected in the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Guidelines) Section 15126.2(a), which states that “[a]n EIR [Environmental Impact Report] shall identify and focus on the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project” and Section 15143, which states that “[t]he EIR shall focus on the significant effects on the environment.” The Guidelines allow use of an Initial Study to document project effects that are less than significant (Guidelines Section 15063(a)). Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR.

### 8.1 **ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

After release of the Initial Study for the proposed project, the scope of the project description was reduced. The updated project description resulted in no new significant or potentially significant impacts, and the Initial Study, as released with the Notice of Preparation in October 2008 remains accurate and applicable. Please refer to Appendix A and Section 5.0 of this EIR for explanation of the basis of the impacts determined to be less than significant. Impact categories and questions below are summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, as contained in the Initial Study and Section 5.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8-1</th>
<th>Impacts Found Not to Be Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Initial Study Determination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. AESTHETICS.</strong> Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</strong> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

#### Table 8-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, | No Impact                   |
| on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in      |                             |
| local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department     |                             |
| of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?                                 |                             |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural | No Impact                   |
| community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the      |                             |
| California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?             |                             |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by    | No Impact                   |
| Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, |                             |
| coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other |                             |
| means?                                                                              |                             |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory      | Less Than Significant Impact |
| fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife    |                             |
| corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?                        |                             |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources,    | Less Than Significant Impact |
| such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?                                     |                             |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural       | No Impact                   |
| Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat     |                             |
| conservation plan?                                                                  |                             |

#### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?  | Less Than Significant Impact |

#### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including     |                             |
| the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:                                        |                             |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-     | Less Than Significant Impact |
| Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or     |                             |
| based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and  |                             |
| Geology Special Publication 42.                                                      |                             |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?                                                   | Less Than Significant Impact |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?                         | Less Than Significant Impact |
| iv) Landslides?                                                                     | No Impact                   |
### Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

#### Table 8-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Initial Study Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIV. RECREATION.** Would the project:

| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | No Impact                   |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | No Impact                   |

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

| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | No Impact                   |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | No Impact                   |

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

| a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| e) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | Less Than Significant Impact |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | No Impact                   |
9. **Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project**

According Section 15126.2(c) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, “[u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.”

In the case of the proposed project, implementation would require the demolition of the Michael White Adobe (Adobe), a building that meets CEQA’s definition of a historical resource. Demolition of the building would result in the permanent loss of the historical resource. The site of the Adobe would be converted into an open area, which would be used by the high school.

Project implementation would result in the irreversible consumption of limited, slowly renewable, and nonrenewable resources, committing such resources, although limited, to uses that future generations would be unable to reverse. It would require the commitment of some resources including: 1) building materials, 2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and 3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site. The proposed project would require aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt, such as sand and stone, water; petrochemical construction materials such as plastic; petroleum-based construction materials; and other similar slowly renewable or nonrenewable resources. Additionally, fossil fuels for vehicles and equipment would also be consumed. The consumption of such resources would represent a long-term commitment of those resources; however, it would not be considered substantial.
10. **Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project**

Pursuant to Sections 15126(d) and 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, this section is provided to examine ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Also required is an assessment of other projects that would foster other activities which could affect the environment, individually or cumulatively. To address this issue, potential growth-inducing effects will be examined through analysis of the following questions:

- Would this project remove obstacles to growth, e.g., through the construction or extension of major infrastructure facilities that do not presently exist in the project area, or through changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development?

- Would this project result in the need to expand one or more public services to maintain desired levels of service?

- Would this project encourage or facilitate economic effects that could result in other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

- Would approval of this project involve some precedent-setting action that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

Please note that growth-inducing effects are not to be construed as necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. This issue is presented to provide additional information on ways in which this project could contribute to significant changes in the environment.

**Would this project remove obstacles to growth, e.g., through the construction or extension of major infrastructure facilities that do not presently exist in the project area, or through changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development?**

The proposed project would not intensify land use and would not involve the construction or extension of infrastructure facilities. The proposed project consists of the removal of a historic building, which would be replaced by an open area. No changes would be made to existing regulations pertaining to land development. As a result, the proposed project would not be growth inducing and would not remove any obstacles to growth.

**Would this project result in the need to expand one or more public services to maintain desired levels of service?**

As discussed in the Initial Study (Appendix A) and Chapter 5 of this EIR, the proposed project would not have a substantial effect on demand for any public services, including police and fire protection, parks, schools, and libraries. The proposed project consists of the demolition of a historic building. It would not increase the school’s enrollment or capacity, or the population of the area. The proposed project would not be growth inducing with respect to the expansion of public services.
10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project

Would this project encourage or facilitate economic effects that could result in other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

The proposed project would demolish the Michael White Adobe. This would result in a slight increase in jobs associated with the construction efforts required. However, the economic effects would be minor and temporary. As a result, the proposed project would not be growth inducing with respect to economic activities.

Would approval of this project involve some precedent-setting action that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

The proposed project would not promote growth as it consists of removal of a building on an existing high school campus. Pressures to develop other land in the surrounding area would derive from regional economic conditions and market demands for housing, commercial, and industrial land uses that are not directly or indirectly influenced by the proposed project. Approval of the proposed project would not, therefore, involve a precedent-setting action that could be applied to other properties and thereby encourage or facilitate growth that would not otherwise occur.
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Appendix A
Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
The proposed project involves the expansion of the San Marino High School swimming pool. Three scenarios are currently being considered by the District: Scenario A would entail the expansion of the pool in its current location, and Scenario B and Scenario C would involve relocating the pool to the area of the basketball courts, and relocating the basketball courts to the areas of the pool and Michael White Adobe. The proposed project would require the removal of the Michael White Adobe, a locally historic landmark. If technically and economically feasible, the building would be relocated. If it is determined that the relocation of the Adobe is infeasible, it would be demolished.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The Initial Study completed for the proposed project concluded that cultural resources and noise will be further analyzed in the EIR. A copy of the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project is available for public review at the following repositories:

- San Marino Unified School District (SMUSD) will be the Lead Agency for the subject project and will be preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) for the project identified herein. This Notice of Preparation (NOP) is being sent in compliance with Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15082, 15103, and 15375 of the California Code of Regulations.

Comments and concerns regarding the environmental issues associated with the subject project are requested from organizations and individuals. For agencies reviewing this notice, we request your review as to the scope and content of the environmental information relevant to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by SMUSD when considering any permit or other approval that your review as to the scope and content of the environmental information relevant to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by SMUSD when considering any permit or other approval that your agency must issue for the project.

The Initial Study:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project concluded that cultural resources and noise will be further analyzed in the EIR. A copy of the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project is available for public review at the following repositories:

- San Marino Unified School District
- San Marino High School
- San Marino City Hall
- Crowell Public Library
- 2200 Huntington Drive
- 1890 Huntington Drive
- San Marino, CA 91108
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING DATE AND LOCATION: The SMUSD will be holding a public scoping meeting to solicit public comments regarding issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The scoping meeting will provide information regarding the project and the anticipated scope of analyses to be contained in the Draft EIR. The SMUSD encourages all interested individuals and organizations to attend this meeting.

Date: November 13, 2008
Time: 7:30 PM
Location: San Marino Unified School District
Board Room
1665 West Drive
San Marino, California 91108

SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS: The enclosed materials reflect the scope of the proposed project, which may be of interest to you and/or the organization you represent. All comments will be considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR. Written comments must be submitted to the below contact by 4:30 PM on December 1, 2008. Written comments will also be accepted at the public scoping meeting described above.

Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, CA 91108
Tel: 626.299.7000, Extension 390
Fax: 626.299.7010

INITIAL STUDY FOR:
SAN MARINO HIGH SCHOOL POOL EXPANSION

prepared for:
SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
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San Marino, CA 91108
Tel: 626.299.7000 Ext. 390 • Fax: 626.299.7010
Website: www.san-marino.k12.ca.us
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Los Angeles, CA 90045
Tel: 310.670.9221 • Fax: 310.670.9512
Website: www.planningcenter.com
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Barbara Wu
Director, School Facilities Planning
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1. Introduction

The San Marino Unified School District is proposing to expand the existing San Marino High School swimming pool. The District is considering three scenarios, all of which would require removal of the Michael White Adobe, a locally designated historic landmark.

All projects in the State of California are required to undergo an environmental review to determine the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Public Resources Code [PRC], §§ 21000 et al. 2004). CEQA was enacted in 1970 by the California Legislature to disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities and the ways to avoid or reduce the environmental effects by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures. CEQA applies to all California government agencies at all levels, including local agencies, regional agencies, and state agencies, boards, commissions, and special districts. The District is the Lead Agency for an environmental impact report (EIR) to be prepared for the proposed project described in this Initial Study. As such, the District is required to conduct an environmental review to analyze the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed project.

1.1 Project Location

The project site is in the center of San Marino High School at 2701 Huntington Drive, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County. It is approximately two miles south of Interstate 210 (I-210), and approximately three miles east of State Route 110 (SR-110). The campus is on the north side of Huntington Drive, between Winston Avenue on the west and Gainsborough Drive on the east. Figure 1, Regional Location, and Figure 2, Local Vicinity, illustrate the project site in its regional and local contexts.

1.2 Environmental Setting

1.2.1 Existing Land Use

As illustrated in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the project site is in the center of the high school, in the midst of the school’s recreational facilities. The project site is noncontinuous. It consists of two halves separated by a small parking area and a driveway that provides vehicular access to the high school football stadium and Michael White Adobe. A cell tower and the Raymond Fault are also in this area.

The northern half of the site contains three full basketball courts and one half-court. The southern half contains an L-shaped swimming pool and the Michael White Adobe. The pool is 75 feet by 45 feet and includes a shallow area of 35 feet by 37 feet. This configuration allows for six competitive swimming lanes and meets California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) competition requirements for six-lane swimming, a water polo area of play using wall-mounted goals, and one-meter diving. The pool, however, does not meet CIF’s preferred specifications.

The Michael White Adobe is a recognized historic structure. It is known to have existed as early as 1845. The structure is vacant, and the interior walls show evidence of damage and deterioration. Photographs can be seen in Figure 4, Michael White Adobe. The structural integrity of the building has not been determined; however, several signs of structural problems have been observed in the building, including termites and signs of decay. Additionally, the building does not meet requirements of the California Field Act, which requires school buildings to meet high standards of building safety, with particular regard for earthquake safety. For these reasons, the building is considered unsafe for occupation. A fence surrounds the property and prevents unauthorized entry.

1.2.2 Surrounding Land Use

The project site is immediately bordered by the varsity baseball field and football stadium to the east, tennis courts to the north, student parking and the school’s large gymnasium to the west, and the small gymnasium to the south. Figure 5, Surrounding Development, provides recent photographs of the recreational uses surrounding the building. San Marino High School serves grades 9–12 and had an enrollment of 1,137 during the 2007–2008 school year. The school operates on a traditional calendar during the months of August through June. Summer school is provided at the campus each year and ends the last week of July.

San Marino High School is in a residential neighborhood and surrounded by single-family homes on all four sides. The Rubidoux Wash Flood Channel, an open drainage structure, separates the school from the residences to the west. A small landscaped area is at the northwest corner of Huntington Drive and Gainsborough Drive, and commercial uses line Huntington Drive immediately west of the project site and approximately one quarter-mile east of the project site.

1.3 Project Description

1.3.1 Proposed Land Use

The proposed project involves the expansion of the San Marino High School swimming pool. Three scenarios are currently being considered by the District. Scenario A would entail the expansion of the pool in its current location, and Scenarios B and C would involve relocating the pool to the areas of the basketball courts, and relocating the basketball courts to the areas of the pool and Michael White Adobe. Development of any of the three scenarios, as described below, would require the removal of the Adobe and would need to be implemented in two separate phases.

Phase 1

The first phase of the proposed project is the removal of the Michael White Adobe, a designated City of San Marino landmark. If technically and economically feasible, the building would be relocated to a public location and preserved in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (National Park Service 1995) and Moving Historic Buildings by John Obed Curtis (National Park Service 1979). The receiving site for the building has not been identified at this time, but potential sites include Lacy Park; the Old Mill; and the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, all of which are within one mile of the project site. Preparations for the relocation of the Michael White Adobe, including the stabilization of the building and the preparation of the receiving site would begin in the summer of 2009 after certification of the EIR and project approval. Selection of qualified firms, preparation of the plans, and the implementation of the necessary improvements to stabilize the Adobe and prepare the receiving site would take a few months. The relocation itself would likely occur during winter break of 2009, if all the work is completed in time, or spring break of 2010. The building would likely be separated into two parts, which would be relocated and reassembled. Temporary bleachers would be installed at the current location of the Michael White Adobe for spectator viewing of pool events.
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View looking north across swimming pool, toward Michael White Adobe.

View looking west across varsity baseball field. The Michael White Adobe is visible in the center of the photograph.
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If relocation is deemed technically or economically infeasible, the Michael White Adobe would be demolished. Demolition of the Adobe would take one to two weeks and would occur during the summer of 2009, when school is not in session. After the building is removed, the area of the Adobe’s footprint would be prepared to allow for the installation of temporary bleachers for spectator viewing of pool events. Demolition of the buildings and installation of the bleachers would be completed prior to the start of the 2009–2010 school year.

**Phase II**

Phase II would begin once the District is able to raise the funds to implement one of three proposed development scenarios. The District expects that sufficient funding would be available by the summer of 2010. Prior to the implementation of one of the three scenarios described below, the bleachers installed as part of Phase I would be removed.

**Scenario A – Expanded Pool Plan**

Under this scenario, the pool would be expanded in its current location. The expanded pool would be 75 feet long by 82 feet wide with shallow water along the north side. The new pool surface area would be 6,150 square feet. This would allow for eight swimming lanes and a water polo area of play that is 56 feet wide. The pool deck north of the pool would also be expanded and would be 30 feet wide along the entire northern edge of the pool. The pool would be lighted for evening use. The design of the expanded pool proposed under Scenario A is illustrated in Figure 6, Expanded Pool Plan. Construction of Scenario A would occur between November 2010 and July 2011.

**Scenario B – New Pool Plan 1**

Under this scenario, a new pool would be created where the basketball courts are currently. The existing pool would be removed and replaced with two full basketball courts (see Figure 7, Relocated Basketball Courts). Both the pool and basketball courts would be lighted for evening use. The new pool would be 75 feet by 82 feet, the same size as the expanded pool proposed in Scenario A. However, Scenario B would allow for a much larger deck and storage areas. Two new buildings would be constructed in the northern part of the project site: a 650-square foot boys’ restroom and locker room and a 1,500-square foot building that would house the pool equipment room, chemical storage rooms, a deck equipment storage room, and coaches’ offices. A generator may be installed in this building. The existing girls’ restroom, immediately north of the existing basketball courts, would continue to operate. The design of the new pool proposed under Scenario B is illustrated in Figure 8, New Pool Plan 1. Under Scenario B, construction of the new pool would occur between November 2010 and December 2011. Demolition of the existing pool and the creation of the basketball courts would occur after the new pool is built and would take approximately four months, between January 2012 and April 2012.

**Scenario C – New Pool Plan 2**

Similar to Scenario B, Scenario C would replace the existing pool with two full basketball courts and would create a new pool where the basketball courts are currently, and both the pool and basketball courts would be lighted for evening use. Scenario C would also construct two new buildings with the same design as the buildings proposed in Scenario B, but slightly farther north. Scenario C proposes a larger pool than Scenario B. The pool would have dimensions of 75 feet by 110 feet. This would allow for ten competitive swimming lanes and would meet the preferred CIF competition requirements for swimming, water polo with floating goals, and one-meter diving. This scenario would have less deck space than Scenario B. The design of the new pool proposed under Scenario C is illustrated in Figure 9, New Pool Plan 2.
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2. Environmental Checklist

2.1 BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: San Marino High School Pool Expansion

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
   San Marino Unified School District
   1665 West Drive
   San Marino, CA 91108

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
   Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
   626.299.7000, Ext. 390

4. Project Location: The project site is in the center of San Marino High School at 2701 Huntington
   Drive, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County.

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:
   San Marino Unified School District
   1665 West Drive
   San Marino, CA 91108

6. General Plan Designation: The City of San Marino General Plan Land Use Map designates the
   project site as “Community Use.”

7. Zoning: The City of San Marino Zoning Map designates the site as R-1 District V, which is a
   residential designation.

8. Description of Project: The proposed project involves the expansion of the San Marino High School
   swimming pool. Three scenarios are currently being considered by the District: Scenario A would entail
   the expansion of the pool in its current location, and Scenario B and Scenario C would involve relocating
   the pool to the area of the basketball courts, and relocating the basketball courts to the areas of the pool
   and Michael White Adobe.

   The proposed project would require the removal of the Michael White Adobe, a locally designated
   historic landmark. If technically and economically feasible, the building would be relocated. If it is
   determined that the relocation of the Adobe is infeasible, it would be demolished.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project site is within the campus of San Marino High School.
   It is immediately bordered by the varsity baseball field and football stadium to the east, tennis courts to
   the north, student parking and the large gymnasium to the west, and the small gymnasium to the south.
   San Marino High School is in a residential neighborhood and surrounded by single-family residences on
   all four sides.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:
    Division of the State Architect
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2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Public Services
- Hazardous & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems

2.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Julie Roucheg  
Signature  
October 22, 2008  
Date  
San Marino Unified School District  
Printed Name

2.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they would reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
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8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

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

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

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

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

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

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

VI. GEOLGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
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### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on an easement lot, as defined in Table 18-1-III of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where owners are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences or are intersected with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or indirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | X |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | X |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | X |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | X |

#### XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

#### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rates, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

| a) Fire protection? | X |
| b) Police protection? | X |
| c) Schools? | X |
| d) Parks? | X |
| e) Other public facilities? | X |
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#### XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:

| a) Would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state? | X |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource? | X |

#### XV. TRANSPORTATION/Traffic. Would the project:

| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | X |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | X |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | X |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | X |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | X |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | X |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle routes)? | X |

#### XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

| a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | X |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | X |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | X |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | X |
| e) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? | X |
2. Environmental Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | X                              |                                                   |                |           |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | X                              |                                                   |                |           |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | X                              |                                                   |                |           |
3. Environmental Analysis

Section 2.3 provided a checklist of environmental impacts. This section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

3.1 AESTHETICS

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

No Impact. There are no scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project site. The project site and surrounding area are relatively flat and have been developed with San Marino High School, single-family residences, and other urban uses. The proposed project would improve athletic facilities at the school. Any new structures would be relatively small and unobtrusive. The proposed project would not impact any scenic vistas. No further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is State Route 2 (SR-2), approximately eight miles northwest of the project site. Portions of I-210, approximately four miles west of the project site, are considered eligible state scenic highways, but are not officially designated. The project site is not visible from SR-2, I-210, or any other scenic highways. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact any scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in the removal of a historic building from San Marino High School and the creation of athletic facilities in its place. The building is an adobe that existed as early as 1845 and is likely eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources for its contribution to California history and cultural heritage, association with important persons in our past, and/or may likely yield information important to history. The building is not visible from the street or any other public views, and it appears dilapidated, out of place, and incompatible with the surrounding school uses.

Project implementation would remove the Adobe and either expand the existing swimming pool or create new basketball courts in its place, both of which would be more compatible with the existing character and quality of the site and surroundings than the building. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would improve and expand athletic facilities at San Marino High School. The improved facilities would include lighting for evening use of the facilities. Any new lighting installed by the proposed project would be similar to existing lighting for athletic fields on the campus. As the project site is in the center of the school, the lights would not be adjacent to residences or other sensitive light receptors, and would not have a noticeable effect on day or nighttime views.

3.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (CAL-ASAM) prepared by the California Dep. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

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

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area is fully developed. There is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the project site, and the proposed project would not convert any farmland to nonagricultural uses. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The City of San Marino General Plan Land Use Map designates the project site as "Community Use," and the City’s Zoning Map designates the site as R-1 District V, which is a residential designation. The proposed project would not affect any land zoned for agricultural use. Furthermore, the proposed project would not alter the use of any land. It would expand and improve existing athletic facilities. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or with a Williamson Act contract. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would expand and improve existing athletic facilities at the school. The project would not affect farmland either directly or indirectly. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use, and no impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. No further analysis is required.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

The Air Quality section addresses the impacts of the proposed project on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthy pollutant concentrations. The primary air pollutants of concern for which ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been established are ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM₂.₅), sulfur oxides (SOₓ), oxides of nitrogen (NOₓ), and lead (Pb). Areas are classified under the federal Clean Air Act as either attainment or nonattainment areas for each criteria pollutant based on whether the AAQS have been achieved. The South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), is designated by both the state and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as a nonattainment area for O₃, PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅. This section analyzes the type and quantity of air pollutant emissions that would be generated by the construction and operation of the
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proposed project. In addition, this section analyzes the project’s contribution to global climate change impacts in California through an analysis of project-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The primary GHG of concern is carbon dioxide (CO₂) because it constitutes the majority (99 percent) of project-related GHG emissions. A background discussion on the air quality regulatory setting, meteorological conditions, existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the project site, and air quality modeling can be found in Appendix A to this Initial Study.

Methodology

Projected construction- and operation-related air pollutant emissions are calculated using the Urban Emissions (URBEMIS2007) inventory model distributed by the SCAQMD. The URBEMIS2007 computer model compiles an emissions inventory of construction, stationary, and vehicle emissions sources. The calculated emissions of the project are compared to thresholds of significance for individual projects using the SCAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook.

Thresholds of Significance

CEQA allows for the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district to be used to assess impacts of a project on air quality. The SCAQMD has established thresholds of significance for regional air quality emissions for construction activities and project operation. In addition to the daily thresholds listed above, projects are also subject to the AAQS. These are addressed though an analysis of localized CO impacts and localized significance thresholds (LSTs).

Regional Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD has adopted regional construction and operational emissions thresholds to determine project-specific and cumulative impacts on air quality within the SoCAB, as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: SCAQMD Significance Thresholds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollutant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organic Gases (VOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NOₓ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Oxides (SOₓ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Inhaling Particulates (PM₁₀)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Inhaling Particulates (PM₂.₅)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 1983

CO Hotspot Analysis

The localized CO impacts are based on the California CO standards:

- 1-hour = 20 parts per million
- 8-hour = 9 parts per million

3. Environmental Analysis

The SCAQMD requires the assessment of CO hot spots at congested intersections for which project traffic would travel. Exceedance of the one- and eight-hour ambient air quality standards would constitute a significant air quality impact.

Localized Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD developed LSTs for emissions of NOₓ, CO, PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅ generated at the project site (off-site mobile-source emissions are not included the LST analysis). LSTs are the maximum emissions at a project site that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent federal or state AAQS. LSTs are based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant within the project air pollutant monitoring station area, or source receptor area (SRA) and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. LST analysis for construction is applicable for all projects of five acres and less. Table 2 lists the LSTs for Scenario A of the proposed project, which is for a 0.50-acre project site in SRA 8 with sensitive receptors within 25 meters from on-site activities. Table 3 lists the LSTs for Scenarios B and C, which involve a 1.05-acre project site within SRA 8 with sensitive receptors within 25 meters from on-site activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds for a 0.50-Acre Project Site in SRA 8 at 25 Meters – Scenario A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollutant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NOₓ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Inhaling Particulates (PM₁₀)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Inhaling Particulates (PM₂.₅)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 2006, Appendix A. Based on LSTs for a project site in SRA 8 that is 0.50 acres at a distance of 25 meters (82 feet) between the source and receptor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds for a 1.05-Acre Project Site in SRA 8 at 25 Meters – Scenarios B &amp; C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollutant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NOₓ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Inhaling Particulates (PM₁₀)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Inhaling Particulates (PM₂.₅)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 2006, Appendix A. Based on LSTs for a project site in SRA 8 that is 1.05 acres at a distance of 25 meters (82 feet) between the source and receptor.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

Less Significant Impact. A consistency determination plays an important role in local agency project review by linking local planning and individual projects to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). It fulfills
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the CEQA goal of informing decision makers of the environmental efforts of the project under consideration at a stage early enough to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed. It also provides the local agency with ongoing information as to whether they are contributing to clean air goals contained in the AQMP. There are two key indicators of consistency:

- Indicator 1: Whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the ambient air quality standards or interim emission reductions in the AQMP.
- Indicator 2: Whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP. The AQMP strategy is, in part, based on projections from local general plans.

Emissions generated by construction and operation of the proposed project would be under the SCAQMD emission thresholds. Therefore the project would not be considered by the SCAQMD to be a substantial source of air pollutant emissions and would be consistent with the AQMP under the first indicator. San Marino High School is an existing school and the proposed project would not introduce new uses that would exceed the regional air emissions inventory assumptions of the AQMP. In addition, the proposed project would not introduce new vehicle trips and therefore mobile-source emissions should be similar to the existing uses. Furthermore, the project is not considered by the Southern California Association of Governments to be a regionally significant project that would warrant a consistency review for criteria emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP and would be consistent under the second indicator. Consequently, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP and impacts are less than significant in this regard. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The first phase of the project would involve the removal of the Michael White Adobe building next to the existing San Marino High School swimming pool. After removal of the Adobe, one of three building scenarios would occur. Under Scenario A, the existing swimming pool (4,670 square feet) would be expanded to the increased dimensions of 75 feet by 82 feet (6,150 square feet). Under Scenario B, the swimming pool would be relocated to the site of the existing basketball courts and the basketball courts would be relocated to the site of the existing swimming pool. Under Scenario B, the dimensions of the new pool would be the same as under Scenario A. Additionally, two structures (boys’ restroom and an equipment/office building) would be constructed under Scenario B. Scenario C would be similar to Scenario B; however, the dimensions of the pool would be increased to 75 feet by 110 feet (8,250 square feet) resulting in a smaller deck area. Air pollutant emissions associated with the project could occur over the short term for site preparation and building construction activities. In addition, a minimal increase in emissions would result from the long-term operation of the completed project from facility-related energy consumption and on-site stationary source emissions.

Short-Term Air Quality Impacts

Construction activities would result in the generation of air pollutants. These emissions would primarily be 1) exhaust emissions from powered construction equipment, 2) dust generated by demolition, earthmoving, excavation, and other construction activities, 3) motor vehicle emissions, and 4) emissions of volatile organic compounds from the application of asphalt, paints, and coatings.

3. Environmental Analysis

Phase I of construction is estimated to initiate at the end of June of 2009 and completed at the end of August 2009 (two months). Phase II of construction is estimated to start November of 2010 and be completed end of April 2012 (18 months) for the worst-case scenario (Scenario C). Construction emissions were estimated using the SCAQMD’s URBEMIS2007 inventory model and are included in Tables 4 and 5.

Phase I

The worst-case scenario of Phase I, as it relates to air quality impacts, assumes the demolition of the Michael White Adobe building. Demolition is estimated to begin in summer of 2009 and last one month. It is also assumed that one tractor, one excavator, and one dump truck would be needed to demolish the existing structure. If the historic structure is found to have lead paint and/or asbestos, the District’s contractor would be required to comply with the SCAQMD permit conditions set forth for demolition under Rule 1403 (see Section 3.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). Demolition emissions were estimated using URBEMIS2007 and are included in Table 4. As shown in this table, all emissions from construction-related activities are less than their respective SCAQMD threshold values. Therefore, impacts from emissions related to construction activities would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required. This issue will not be analyzed in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pollutants (lb/day)</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeds Threshold

Table 4 Maximum Daily Construction Emissions

Source: URBEMIS2007 version 2.4

Phase II

Scenario C would be the worst-case construction scenario because it would consist of the removal of the existing basketball courts and swimming pool, filling of the existing swimming pool after its removal, and construction of the new expanded swimming pool (75 feet by 110 feet), new basketball courts, boys’ restroom, and the office/equipment room. As shown in Table 5, construction-related emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for criteria pollutants. Because Scenario C would be the worst-case scenario, it can be assumed that construction-related emissions from Scenarios A and B would also be under the SCAQMD regional thresholds. Consequently, construction-related impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required, and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.
3. Environmental Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Alteration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Construction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD, Version 0.2.4
1 Based on Scenario C, which is the worst-case scenario.
2 Demolition of basketball courts.
3 Demolition of the swimming pool.

Long-Term Operation-Related Impacts

Long-term air emission impacts are associated with changes in stationary and mobile sources related to the proposed project. As the project would replace the existing facilities with similar facilities, no new vehicle trips would be generated by the project. While the project would expand and/or replace the existing pool and construct a new restroom and equipment/offices, emissions generated by these new stationary sources would be minimal and would not exceed the SCAQMD regional emissions thresholds. Consequently, as minor additional vehicle trips would be generated by the project from potential increased use of the pool by the community and any increase in emissions from new stationary sources would be minimal, the impact from the project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required and this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The SCAQMD, Office of Planning and Research, and California Air Resources Board (CARB) have not formally adopted regional emissions thresholds for GHG emissions. However, the SCAQMD is currently in the process of drafting thresholds for CO2 emissions for construction and operation of a project. According to the SCAQMD Working Group’s second revised proposal significance threshold approach, the draft threshold for construction is 6,500 metric tons total for the entire construction period and the draft threshold for operation is 6,500 metric tons per year of operation. As shown in Table 6, construction of the project would not exceed the draft SCAQMD threshold. Furthermore, as no additional vehicle trips would be generated by the project and any increase in emissions from new stationary sources would be minimal, GHG emissions from the new on-site sources is also less than significant. Because the project would not exceed the draft SCAQMD threshold, CO2 emissions are likely not to be considered substantial enough to result in a significant cumulative impact relative to GHG emissions and climate change impacts. Therefore the project’s cumulative contribution to GHG emissions is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CO2 Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD, Version 0.2.4
1 Includes construction-related CO2 emissions from Phases I and II.
2 The SCAQMD has proposed, but not yet adopted, a significance threshold of 6,500 metric tons of CO2 for construction and 6,500 tons/year for operation.

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

c) Less Than Significant Impact. The SoCAB is designated by the USEPA and CARB as in nonattainment for O3, PM10, and PM2.5. In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values does not add significantly to a cumulative impact. The URBEEMS modeling demonstrates that construction activities would not result in emissions in excess of the SCAQMD threshold values and therefore the project does not add significantly to any cumulative impact. Furthermore, as any additional vehicle trips generated by the project would be negligible and any increase in emissions from new stationary sources would be minimal, operation of the project would also not add significant to any cumulative impact. Consequently, no mitigation measures are necessary. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

c) Less Than Significant Impact. The project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated pollutant concentration levels. Unlike the mass (weight) of construction and operational emissions shown in Tables 3 and 4 (pounds per day), localized concentrations refer to the amount of pollutant in a volume of air (ppm or μg/m3) and can be correlated to potential health effects.

CO Hotspot Analysis

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hot spots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm. However, the proposed project would not introduce new uses that would generate new mobile sources. Consequently, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations, and no significant impact would result from this project, and no mitigation measures are necessary. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.
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Construction LSTs

Emissions generated from construction activities are anticipated to cause temporary increases in pollutant concentrations. In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, only on-site stationary sources and mobile equipment occurring on the project site are included in the analysis.

Phase I

The worst-case scenario of this phase assumes that demolition of the Adobe would coincide with summer school activities. Table 7 shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during Phase I activities compared with the screening level LSTs for a 0.50-acre site for the nearest sensitive receptors, which are the students on-site. As shown in this table, maximum daily combined emissions for NO\textsubscript{x}, CO, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} from the project would not exceed the LSTs, and therefore would not result in exposure of on-site sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant. Consequently, construction emissions generated by the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Daily Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD LST</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SRA/ESAQMD 2007, Version 9.2.4, and SCAQMD 2003, Appendix A. Based on LSTs for a project site in SRA II with a 0.50-acre site and a distance of 25 meters (82 feet) between the source and receptor.

Phase II

Table 8 shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during Scenario C construction activities compared with the screening level LSTs for a 1.00-acre site. Analysis is conducted for on-site receptors, as construction activities may coincide with on-site school activities. As shown in this table, maximum daily combined emissions for NO\textsubscript{x}, CO, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} from the project would not exceed the LSTs, and therefore would not result in exposure of on-site sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pollutants (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>1 4 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>2 8 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>10 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>2 7 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Construction</td>
<td>13 8 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD LST</td>
<td>129 461 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold</td>
<td>No  No  No  No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SRA/ESAQMD 2007, Version 9.2.4, and SCAQMD 2003, Appendix A. Based on LSTs for a project site in SRA II with a 1.00-acre site and a distance of 25 meters (82 feet) between the source and receptor.

Operational LSTs

Because the proposed project would not generate many, if any, new vehicle trips and any increase in stationary source emissions from a larger pool and structures would be minimal, the project would not significant elevate pollutant concentrations during operation of the project. No mitigation measures are required. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction would involve the use of heavy equipment creating exhaust pollutants from on-site earth movement and from equipment bringing asphalt and other building materials to the site. With regard to nuisance odors, any air quality impacts would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment itself. By the time such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites away from the project site, they are typically diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. An occasional “whiff” of diesel exhaust from passing equipment and trucks accessing the site from public roadways may result. Such brief exhaust odors are an adverse, but not significant, air quality impact. No objectionable odors are anticipated to result from the operational phase of the proposed project. Furthermore, odor complaints are subject to SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which requires that odors not result in a nuisance or annoyance to the public. Therefore, impacts from objectionable odors are less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

3.4 Biological Resources

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

No Impact. There are no candidate, sensitive, or special status species as designated by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service on or in the vicinity of the project site. The project site and surrounding area is fully developed. There is no native habitat on or in the vicinity of the project site. The project would have no adverse impact on sensitive or special status species directly or by
3. Environmental Analysis

modifying habitat. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. No further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The project site is currently developed with a building and athletic facilities. There is no riparian habitat on the project site. No sensitive natural communities exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts to sensitive natural communities would occur as result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The project site is developed with a building and athletic facilities, and the surrounding areas are developed with school and residential uses. There are no federally protected wetlands such as streams, marshes, or vernal pools on or near the project site. The Rubio Wash Flood Channel runs immediately west of the project site. The flood channel is a man-made structure that contains no habitat and is not a biologically sensitive wetland. No impacts to wetlands would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no migration corridors, native habitat, wildlife, or wildlife nursery sites in the vicinity of the project site. The project would be required to comply with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This would include conducting a nesting bird survey of trees near the project site to confirm the absence of nesting birds that could be affected by demolition activities. Compliance with the Treaty Act would reduce project impacts to fish or wildlife species, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery to less than significant. No further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not affect any protected biological resources. However, the proposed project may require the removal of some trees. The City of San Marino has regulations governing the removal of trees. Specifically, trees of at least 24 inches in diameter and at least 15 feet high cannot be removed from public property without a City-approved permit. However, the project site is part of San Marino High School, which is owned by the District. The site is therefore not within City property or right-of-way, and no permits from the City of San Marino would be required for the removal of trees. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area are fully developed. The proposed project would replace a vacant building with athletic facilities and would not develop any previously undeveloped land. There is no native habitat on or in the vicinity of the project site, and the project site has not been designated for preservation or open space. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. No further analysis is required.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Section 1064.5 defines historic resources as resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historical resources, or the lead agency. Generally a resource is considered to be “historically significant,” if it meets one of the following criteria:

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

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

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

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

Review of the Historic Property Data File for Los Angeles County (dated June 11, 2007) indicates that the subject property was previously surveyed as a “3B,” which means it “appears eligible for NR [National Register of Historic Places] as an individual property through survey evaluation.” Properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places are automatically included on the California Register of Historical Resources. As the subject property is eligible for the NR, it is therefore also eligible for the California Register. The property is also a locally designated historic landmark. Because the subject property is locally designated, it is a historical resource and has presumptive significance under CEQA. According to CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact to historical resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Impacts to the Michael White Adobe are potentially significant. This issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.1, the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archeological resource, i.e., an artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality (such as being the oldest or best available examples
of its type) or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

The proposed project would remove the Michael White Adobe. According to San Marinos: From Ranch to City, a history written by Midge Sherwood, the Michael White Adobe is the oldest residence in the City of San Marino. Implementation of the proposed project would disturb soils near the foundation of the historic building and may uncover archaeological resources important to the City’s history. The proposed project would also expand the existing pool or create a new pool in the northern portion of the project site, which would require ground-disturbing activities. These ground-disturbing activities may uncover previously undiscovered resources. The project could have a potentially significant impact to archaeological resources if uncovered resources are not properly curated. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would remove an existing building and would expand or relocate a swimming pool. These actions would require ground-disturbing activities, which may disturb previously undiscovered paleontological resources below the surface of the project site. Impacts to paleontological resources could be potentially significant if uncovered resources are not properly curated. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no known human remains on the project site. However, the proposed project would involve ground-disturbing activities, which could disturb undiscovered human remains. If human bone is discovered during geologic testing or during construction, work shall immediately cease and the procedures described in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code shall be followed. Section 7050.5 requires notification of the coroner. If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, the applicant shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission by phone within 48 hours. Following notification of the Native American Heritage Commission, the procedures described in Section 5097.94 and Section 5097.96 of the California Public Resources Code shall be followed. Conformance with standard conditions concerning the discovery of human remains would ensure that impacts related to human remains would be less than significant. This issue will not be examined further in the EIR.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Several geotechnical investigations of San Marino High School have been completed for previous projects. The following analysis is based in part on the following studies:

- Geotechnical Investigation: Athletic Track and Field Renovation; San Marino High School, Geobase, April 2005.

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less Than Significant Impact. Fault rupture occurs when an active fault displaces in two separate directions during an earthquake. Fault rupture hazards can be estimated based on a site’s proximity to an active or potentially active fault and the designation of the site as being within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act of 1972. The entire project site is within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The location of faults can be determined through geologic cuts known as trenching. Based on previous trenching completed south of the existing basketball courts at San Marino High School, it has been confirmed that an active fault known as the Raymond Fault traverses the campus. As shown in Figure 10, Location of Raymond Fault, the fault runs in between the existing basketball courts in the northern portion of the project site and the Michael White Adobe and existing pool in the southern part of the project site. It is a high-angle reverse fault, thrusting basement rocks north of the fault over sediments to the south.

In accordance with Education Code Section 17212.5, the proposed project would be prohibited from placing buildings or structures on the Raymond Fault or any other potential fault traces that can reasonably be expected to rupture within the life of a building or structure. Under Scenario A, the proposed expanded pool would be approximately 100 feet south of the Raymond Fault. Under Scenarios B and C, the proposed pool would be over 50 feet north of the two new buildings would be approximately 200 feet north of the Raymond Fault. Additionally, in keeping with Education Code Sections 17212 and 17212.5 and the California Geologic Survey – Note 48, if Scenario B or C were selected, additional geological and soil engineering studies would be completed by either a certified engineering geologist or registered geotechnical engineer. The studies would require additional trenching in order to confirm that development of the new structures would not be placed on or within 50 feet of a fault.

Design and development of the proposed project would comply with all applicable building and safety codes, including the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, California Building Code (CBC). Adherence to the CBC would be enforced by the Division of the State Architect (DSA), which is responsible for ensuring structural safety, fire and life safety, and accessibility of California’s K-12 schools and community colleges, and would reduce a potentially significant impact associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault to a level below significance. Additionally, the proposed project would not increase enrollment at San Marino High School and therefore would not expose more people to additional risks. Therefore, with the compliance to established building and safety codes enforced by DSA, impacts would not be significant, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.
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ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** All areas in southern California, including the project site, may be subject to earthquakes. The Raymond fault traverses the high school, and there are several other active faults nearby, including the Sierra Madre fault zone, approximately three miles north of the project site, and the Verdugo fault zone, approximately seven miles north of the project site. The proposed project would create improvements to a site in a seismically active area, including a swimming pool and potentially two new buildings under Scenarios B and C.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the seismic safety requirements of the CBC, and compliance with CBC requirements would be confirmed by the DSA. Furthermore, the proposed project consists of improvements to an existing and operating high school, and would not increase enrollment or result in programmatic changes to the operation of the school. The new structures proposed under Scenarios B and C would be similar to existing structures at the school. Compliance with established rules and regulations would reduce impacts related to seismic ground shaking to less than significant.

Furthermore, the current structural integrity of the Adobe is unknown. As the building was built in the 1800s, it is possible that it may not be able to withstand a strong earthquake. The removal of the building would remove a potential hazard to the campus and would make the school safer in the event of an earthquake. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking, and no further analysis is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction happens when loose, saturated sand and gravel deposits lose their load-supporting capability when subjected to intense shaking. Liquefaction potential varies based upon on-site soil composition and groundwater depth. The project site is in or adjacent to a liquefaction zone as designated by the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones El Monte Quadrangle Official Map or the Mt. Wilson Quadrangle Official Map. In 2005, Geobase, a geotechnical consulting firm, performed a geotechnical investigation for a previous project at the track field adjacent to the project site. Geobase determined that the soils underlying the school are dense and that groundwater is at a depth of more than 50 feet below the surface. Based on these factors, Geobase concluded that the potential for liquefaction at the project site is low. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with the CBC, which would ensure that the proposed project is not subject to a significant risk of seismic ground failure. Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to impacts related to ground failure. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

iv) Landslides?

**No Impact.** The project site is flat and is not in a landslide zone as designated by the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones El Monte Quadrangle Official Map or the Mt. Wilson Quadrangle Official Map. Furthermore, the proposed project consists of improvements to an existing and operating high school. Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to impacts related to landslides. No impacts associated with landslides would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

---

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Erosion is the movement of rock fragments and soil from one place to another. Precipitation, running water, waves, and wind are all agents of erosion. Significant erosion typically occurs on steep slopes where stormwater and high winds can carry topsoil down hillside.

The project site is flat and currently developed. Very small amounts of on-site soils would be prone to erosion during the removal or demolition of the Michael White Adobe and construction of the athletic facilities. However, after completion of the proposed project, there would be no bare soil on the project site, so the site would have little susceptibility to erosion. Therefore, project-related erosion impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project consists of improvements to an existing school. As stated above, the site is not in a landslide zone, and according to the 2005 Geobase report, San Marino High School is underlain by dense sandy materials that are not susceptible to significant settlement. The report also determined that, due to the topography of the project site, the potential for lateral spreading or landsliding is very low. Mandatory compliance with the CBC would ensure that risks related to unstable soils would be reduced to a level below significance, and no further analysis is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The 2005 Geobase report determined that the potential for expansive soils at the school is “low” to “very low.” Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with the CBC. Compliance with the CBC would ensure that the proposed project would not be subject to risks related to expansive soils. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not increase enrollment at San Marino High School and would not require the need for onsite wastewater disposal systems. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be installed, and no impacts would occur. No further analysis is required.

3.7 **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The creation of athletic facilities and the demolition of the building, should it be demolished, could involve the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, solvents, and other substances. However, the duration of these activities would be short and would not require the handling of significant amounts of these substances. Large quantities of materials considered hazardous would not be used during demolition efforts. The storage, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials are regulated by the EPA, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the San Marino Fire Department. Compliance
with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner, and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. After implementation of these standards and regulations, risks involving hazardous materials arising from project demolition would be a less than significant impact. No further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, the use of hazardous substances by the project would be required to comply with regulations issued and enforced by the EPA, OSHA, and the San Marino Fire Department. The relocation and renovation, or demolition, of the Michael White Adobe would be required to comply with Rule 1403 of the SCAQMD. Rule 1403 regulates demolition, renovation, and asbestos removal projects. It is intended to limit emissions of hazardous materials including asbestos-containing materials (ACM) due to demolition and renovation activities. At this time, it is unknown if the Michael White Adobe contains ACM or other hazardous building materials, such as lead paint. If ACM or lead paint is present in the building, compliance with all applicable state and federal regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 1403, would reduce associated impacts to less than significant. Compliance with existing laws and regulations would reduce risks arising from accidental spills and upsets of hazardous materials to a less than significant impact. No further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is on the campus of San Marino High School. While the project would handle hazardous materials during construction activities, the storage, use, and transport of those materials would comply with existing regulations enforced by several agencies, as stated above. As stated in Section 3.3, Air Quality, the project would also result in some emissions during construction and demolition activities, should the Adobe be demolished. However, demolition would occur during the summer months, when the school is not occupied by students or teachers.

The proposed project would result in a larger swimming pool on campus, and Scenarios B and C of the proposed project would also create two new buildings. As discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, the air emissions associated with the implementation and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant. The proposed project may slightly increase the use of materials necessary for the cleaning and maintenance of the proposed enlarged pool. Additionally, a generator may be installed, which could produce hazardous emissions. However, use of chemicals for pool maintenance and cleaning, and emissions from the generator, would be negligible. Therefore, impacts associated with the use and generation of hazardous materials are not expected to pose a significant hazard to San Marino High School or other schools in the vicinity of the site. Impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. A database search was conducted for the project site by EDR. The executive summary of the ED R report can be found in Appendix B of this document. The complete report is available at the District office for review upon request. The database search is used to identify properties that may be listed on agency records of sites containing hazardous materials or sites with a record of hazardous conditions. The project site is not listed on any databases, and the closest facilities identified in the report are more than one-
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quarter mile north of the site. Due to the distance between the project site and the closest facilities, it is not anticipated that any potential hazards associated with these facilities would affect the project site. No significant impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. There are no airports within two miles of the project site. The nearest public airport is El Monte Airport, approximately four miles east of the project site, in the City of El Monte. Project implementation would not result in an airport-related safety hazard. No impacts would result from the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. There are no private airstrips or heliports within the vicinity of the project site. The nearest facility is the California Title Building Heliport, approximately three miles west of the project site, in the City of South Pasadena. Under Scenario A, no new standing structures would be created. Under Scenarios B and C, two buildings would be constructed in the northern portion of the project site. The structures would serve as a men’s restroom and an equipment room. Both would be single-story and would not be taller than other structures on campus. Some new lights would be installed for the basketball courts and swimming pool. However, these lights would not be taller than existing structures on campus. The proposed project would not result in an airstrip-related safety hazard. No impacts would result from the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would improve the athletic facilities of San Marino High School. This would require the removal of the Michael White Adobe. If feasible, the building would be relocated to a nearby site that is yet to be determined. The building would likely be separated into two parts, which would be relocated and reassembled. This would be completed in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations, and would not affect any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. Any impacts that would occur would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The project site is in an area developed with residential uses and roadways, and is not in an area containing dense vegetation (flammable brush) or considered wildland. There are no wildlands on the project site or in the vicinity of the project site. Furthermore, San Marino High School is currently in operation, and the proposed project involves no permanent changes to the operation of the school. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk from wildland fires. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.
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3.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Activities associated with demolition of the building and the improvements to athletic facilities may result in a temporary increase in runoff of water and dirt. This may result in short term impacts to water quality. The District would follow best management practices (BMPs) designed to minimize these impacts. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, those measures specified in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook for Municipal, Industrial/Commercial and Construction Activity and those measures identified by any other agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project site, including covering all demolition material and waste, development and implementation of a spill prevention/recovery plan, use of water trucks to prevent dust emissions, and vehicle and equipment management. The proposed project, once completed, would not generate waste or otherwise adversely affect the water quality of the area. No long-term impacts on water quality would occur as a result of the proposed project, and short-term impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. No groundwater would be used for the project, and no interference with groundwater recharge is expected. Ground-disturbing activities under Scenario A are limited to the removal of the Adobe and expansion of the swimming pool in its current location. Ground-disturbing activities under Scenarios B and C include the creation of a new swimming pool and the construction of two new buildings, as well as the removal of the Adobe. None of the ground-disturbing activities are of a large enough scale to significantly affect groundwater supplies. Furthermore, the entire site is currently developed and covered with impervious surfaces, and the proposed project would not substantially increase impervious surfaces. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river and is not expected to substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site. The project site is currently developed. The proposed expansion of the outdoor athletic facilities would not substantially increase impervious surfaces on the site. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation. No significant impacts would result, and no further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, the proposed project would not alter the course of any stream or river and is not expected to substantially alter the drainage of the site. The proposed project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the project site. No flooding would result from the proposed project. No significant impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the project site. Therefore, the project is not expected to cause any substantial increase in runoff and is not expected to impact the capacity of the storm drains. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial soil erosion and would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The project is very small and therefore has little capacity to affect water quality. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.
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h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map, the proposed project is in Flood Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard. Furthermore, the proposed project does not include the development of housing and would not result in the relocation of housing. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No Impact. The proposed project would expand athletic facilities at an existing campus. No programmatic changes to San Marino High School would occur. No people would be placed at increased risk by the proposed project. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam, or other artificial body of water. The project site is approximately three miles south of the Eaton Canyon Reservoir. There is a smaller body of water along the Eaton Wash, approximately one mile east of the project site. Due to the distance and intervening structures between any nearby bodies of water and the project site, the potential for a seiche at the Eaton Canyon Reservoir to inundate the project site with water is low. A tsunami is a series of ocean waves caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. The project site is approximately 25 miles inland, and therefore is not at risk from tsunamis.
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A mudflow is a type of landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. The project area is nearly flat. There are no slopes in the vicinity of the site that would be at risk of flooding due to mudflow.

The proposed project consists of improvements to athletic facilities and would not result in programmatic changes to San Marino High School. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose any people or structures to increased risk of inundation by tsunami or mudflow. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

3.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The proposed project would remove a building from the San Marino High School Campus and replace it with additional athletic facilities. The project would not affect the operation of the school. The school is surrounded by residential uses. Removal of the building would not divide the residential community in which the school is located. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The proposed project consists of improvements to athletic facilities on an existing campus. It would therefore not alter the land use of the project site. Furthermore, the project would conform to the existing general plan land use designation and zoning designation. As the proposed project would not alter the use of the project site, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area is fully developed. The proposed project would replace a vacant building with athletic facilities and would not develop any previously undeveloped land. There is no native habitat on or in the vicinity of the project site, and the project site has not been designated for preservation or open space. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. No further analysis is required.

3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

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

No Impact. The project site is currently developed with a vacant building and athletic facilities. The proposed project would remove the building and replace it with improved athletic facilities. This would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resources. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

3.11 NOISE

Noise is unwanted sound, and is known to have several adverse effects on people, including hearing loss, speech and sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Based on these known adverse effects of noise, the federal government, the State of California, San Marino Unified School District, and the City of San Marino have established criteria to protect public health and safety and to prevent disruption of certain human activities. Characterization of noise and vibration, existing regulations, and calculations for construction noise and vibration levels can be found in Appendix C to this Initial Study.

Noise Metrics

The community noise equivalent level (CNEL) is the average level of sound over a 24-hour period. It applies a time-weighted factor designed to emphasize noise events that occur during the evening and nighttime hours. The A-weighted decibel (dBA) is a special frequency-dependent rating scale which is usually used to relate noise to human sensitivity by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear due to the limited hearing range of humans.

Existing Noise Environment

The project site is the San Marino High School campus, which currently has an enrollment of 1,086 students for the 2008-2009 academic year. The existing ambient noise environment in the vicinity of the project site includes stationary noise from use of the on-site athletic handcourts and playfields and noise from the parking lot, as well as mobile-source noise from traffic on Huntington Drive south of the school.

Sensitive Noise Receptors

Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise and vibration. Sensitive uses include residential areas where quiet environments are necessary for enjoyment and public health and safety. Residential receptors border the existing San Marino High School site to the east, west, north, and south across Huntington Drive. Other noise-sensitive receptors include the students.

Methodology

The analysis of noise impacts considers project construction and operations noise as defined by the State of California interior noise standard and noise compatibility criteria, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria for vibration impacts, and the San Marino Unified School District for noise impacts. Based on the criteria listed above, the proposed project would have a significant adverse noise impact if the project results in any of the following:

Noise

- Project-related mobile-source noise would increase the CNEL at any noise-sensitive receptor by an audible amount of 3 dBA or more when the CNEL is 65 dBA or greater in the vicinity of noise-sensitive
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land uses. A minimum 3 dB change in noise levels is necessary for human hearing to discern a change in noise levels.

- New stationary-source noise generated at the project site would substantially increase the ambient noise environment.
- New noise-sensitive outdoor uses would be exposed to exterior noise levels that exceed 65 dBA CNEL (state of California land use compatibility criteria).

Groundborne Vibration

- Project-related construction activities would exceed the FTA’s vibration criteria of 78 VdB for daytime vibration-induced annoyance to residents/students in nearby structures.
- Project-related construction activities would result in vibration levels strong enough to result in structural damage.

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would remove the Michael White Adobe building in Phase I and expand the swimming pool facilities in Phase II. Expansion of the pool and/or relocation of the basketball courts and swimming pool would require construction activities and would increase the intensity of the use of the project site. The proposed project may also install a generator on the project site. These activities could potentially elevate ambient noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors and exceed noise compatibility standards. Further evaluation in the EIR is necessary to determine if the proposed project would exceed noise standards or expose people to excessive noise levels. Mitigation will be incorporated as needed.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would generate vibration during construction activities from use of heavy construction equipment. However, no pile driving, blasting, or other vibration-intensive activity would be required in the construction effort. Construction equipment would produce vibration from vehicle travel as well as construction activities.

Unlike noise, vibration levels are not additive because vibration is the result of a single event that occurs only when construction equipment is operating in close proximity to nearby vibration-sensitive structures. Vibration is typically sensed at nearby structures when objects within the structure generate noise from the vibration such as rattling windows or picture frames. It is typically not perceptible in outdoor environments, and therefore impacts are based on the distance to the nearest structure.

Vibration-Induced Structural Damage

The FTA has established vibration level thresholds that would cause damage to building structures. The FTA criteria for vibration induced structural damage is 0.2 inch per second for the peak particle velocity (PPV) for wood-framed structures. Vibration impacts on nearby sensitive structures is analyzed for Phases I and II of the proposed project.

Phase I – Off-Site Structures

Under Phase I, the nearest off-site structure to the project site would be the single-family residence to the west 305 feet from the boundary of the site. As shown in Table 9, operation of small off-road construction equipment, jackhammers, and loaded trucks would result in PPV levels that are below the FTA’s criteria for vibration-induced structural damage. Therefore, project construction activities associated with the potential demolition of the Michael White Adobe building would not result in vibration-induced structural damage to buildings near the project site and impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Maximum RMS Velocity at 305 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>Significance Threshold (in/sec)</th>
<th>Exceeds Significance Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on methodology from FTA 2006.
Notes: RMS velocity calculated from vibration level (VdB) using the reference of one microinch/second.
NA: Not Applicable
1. At a distance of 305 feet from the western project boundary to the nearest residential structure to the west of the project site.
2. Vibration levels from the listed off-road construction equipment are equivalent to vibration levels generated by a small bulldozer.

Phase II – Off-Site Structures

In Phase II, Scenario C is the worst-case construction scenario because the nearest off-site vibration-sensitive structures are 215 feet west of the project site. As shown in Table 10, operation of small off-road construction equipment, jackhammers, and loaded trucks would result in PPV levels that are below the FTA’s criteria for vibration-induced structural damage. It can be assumed that the impacts from vibration-induced structural damage from construction activities related to development of Scenarios A and B would also result in PPV levels that are below the criteria. Therefore, construction activities would not result in vibration-induced structural damage to buildings near the project site, and vibration impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Maximum RMS Velocity at 215 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>Significance Threshold (in/sec)</th>
<th>Exceeds Significance Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on methodology from FTA 2006.
Notes: RMS velocity calculated from vibration level (VdB) using the reference of one microinch/second.
NA: Not Applicable
1. At a distance of 215 feet from the western project boundary to the nearest residential structure to the west of the project site.
2. Vibration levels from the listed off-road construction equipment are equivalent to vibration levels generated by a small bulldozer.
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Vibration Annoyance

Tables 11 and 12 list the maximum and average vibration source levels for construction equipment anticipated to be used at the project site. Maximum vibration is based on construction equipment operating directly adjacent to the property line. However, because construction activities are typically distributed throughout the project site, construction vibration is based on average vibration levels (i.e., levels that would be experienced by sensitive receptors the majority of the time) that exceed the FTA’s infrequent events criterion for residential land uses. Impact of vibration annoyance on nearby sensitive structures is analyzed for Phases I and II of the proposed project.

Phase I – Off-Site Receptors

The distance from the center of the site to the nearest sensitive use is approximately 350 feet and is used to calculate the average vibration level. The FTA criteria for perceptible levels of vibration during the daytime is 78 vibration velocity decibels (VdB) for residential uses. While construction equipment could be operating as close as 305 feet from the nearest residential structure, the majority of heavy construction activities would be farther away. In addition, heavy construction equipment would only be in operation for a short period during grading activities. As shown in Table 11, average vibration levels would not exceed the FTA criteria for vibration annoyance. Because Phase I project demolition activities would not generate average vibration levels that exceed the FTA’s vibration annoyance threshold, no significant vibration impact from exposure of persons to excessive levels of vibration would occur during project construction activities. Therefore, Phase I project development impacts related to vibration annoyance would be less than significant without mitigation. This issue will not be analyzed in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Phase I Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment at Nearest Residences – Vibration Annoyance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Maximum Vibration Levels at 350 feet (VdB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on methodology from FTA 2006.

* At a distance of 305 feet from where any small off-road construction equipment, loaded trucks, or jackhammer is in operation to the nearest residential structure.
* At a distance of 305 feet from where any off-road construction equipment, loaded trucks, or jackhammer is in operation to the nearest residential structure.

Phase II – Off-Site Receptors

As in the analysis of vibration-induced structural damage, Scenario C is the worst-case scenario for vibration annoyance. Under this scenario, the nearest off-site vibration-sensitive structure is 215 feet west of the site. The distance from the center of the site to the nearest vibration-sensitive structure to the west is approximately 270 feet. As in the Phase I analysis, this distance is used to calculate the average vibration level. As shown in Table 12, average vibration levels would not exceed the FTA criteria for vibration annoyance and therefore would not expose persons to excessive levels of vibration during Phase II construction activities. Additionally, as Scenario C is the worst-case scenario, it is assumed that Scenario A and B construction activities would also not result in significant vibration impacts. Consequently, vibration annoyance impacts from the development of Phase II would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
<th>Phase II Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment at Nearest Residences – Vibration Annoyance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Maximum Vibration Levels at 215 feet (VdB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on methodology from FTA 2006.

* At a distance of 215 feet from where any small off-road construction equipment, loaded trucks, jackhammer, or any machinery that generates equivalent vibration levels is in operation to the nearest classroom structure.
* At an average distance of 270 feet from center of new pool construction site to nearest off-site vibration-sensitive structure.
* Vibration levels from the listed off-road construction equipment are equivalent to vibration levels generated by a small bulldozer.

On-Site Receptors

If construction activities associated with Phase I or Phase II occur during the school year, vibration generated by construction activities has the potential to disrupt classroom activities. The nearest classroom structure from the center of a construction area associated with either Phase I or Phase II is 245 feet. As shown in Table 13, average vibration levels would not exceed the FTA criteria for vibration annoyance and therefore would not expose students to excessive levels of vibration. Consequently, vibration annoyance impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13</th>
<th>Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment at Nearest Classroom – Vibration Annoyance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Maximum Vibration Levels at 245 feet (VdB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Off-Road Construction Equipment</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on methodology from FTA 2006.

* At a distance of 245 feet from where any small off-road construction equipment, loaded trucks, jackhammer, or any machinery that generates equivalent vibration levels is in operation to the nearest classroom structure.
* At an average distance of 270 feet from center of new pool construction site to nearest classroom.
* Vibration levels from the listed off-road construction equipment are equivalent to vibration levels generated by a small bulldozer.
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c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would expand the school’s athletic facilities, increasing the intensity of the use of the project site, and potentially increasing the noise generated at the project site. Scenarios B and C would relocate the pool, which could change the ambient noise levels of the project site and surrounding areas. Scenarios B and C would also create two new buildings, one of which may include a generator. These activities may substantially increase the ambient noise environment and may be potentially significant. For these reasons, further evaluation in the EIR is necessary to determine if the proposed project would exceed noise standards or expose people to excessive noise levels.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. During the construction phase of the proposed project, noise levels associated with construction activities could substantially increase the ambient noise environment. Further evaluation in the EIR is necessary to determine the noise impacts on sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. Mitigation will be incorporated as needed.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose students or staff to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. There are no public airports within two miles of the project site, and the site is not within an airport land use plan. Therefore, project residents and workers would not be exposed to significant levels of airport-related noise. No mitigation measures are necessary. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur from airport noise, and no mitigation measures are necessary. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. No programmatic changes would be made to the school as a result of the proposed project, and the proposed project would not affect school capacity or enrollment. The proposed project would not induce population growth. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. No housing would be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would not displace housing or necessitate the construction of housing. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would improve athletic facilities on an existing campus. The proposed project would not displace any people and would not require the construction of replacement housing. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The San Marino Fire Department provides fire protection and other emergency services to the project area. It operates from 2200 Huntington Drive, approximately one-half mile west of the project site. The proposed project would not increase enrollment or capacity at the school or the population of the project area. Due to the Civic Center Act, these facilities would be available for community use when not in use by the school or for a District-sponsored function. By improving the athletic facilities of the high school, the proposed project may increase the intensity or frequency of use of the facilities. However, it would not result in any programmatic changes at San Marino High School. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the need for fire protection services. No significant impacts to fire protection services would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The San Marino Police Department provides police protection to the project area. It operates from 2200 Huntington Drive, approximately one-half mile west of the project site. The proposed project would not increase enrollment or capacity at the school or the population of the project area. Due to the Civic Center Act, these facilities would be available for community use when not in use by the District. By improving the athletic facilities of the school, the proposed project may increase the intensity or frequency of use of the facilities. However, it would not result in any programmatic changes at San Marino High School. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the need for police protection services. No significant impacts to police protection services would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

c) Schools?

No Impact. The proposed project entails the expansion of existing athletic facilities at San Marino High School. As stated above, the proposed project would not increase school enrollment or capacity or induce population growth. The proposed project would increase the amount of useable space on the San Marino...
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High School campus and would therefore have a beneficial effect on the school. The proposed project would not require closing the school for any length of time. The proposed project would therefore have no impact on school services, and no further analysis is required.

d) Parks?

**No Impact.** As stated above, the proposed project would not result in an increase in school enrollment or capacity or induce population growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the demand for parks or result in additional use of parks. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

e) Other public facilities

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in an increase in school enrollment or capacity or induce population growth. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse impact on public facilities, such as libraries. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

3.14 RECREATION

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project would expand athletic facilities at San Marino High School. Due to the Civic Center Act, these facilities would be available for community use when not in use by the school or by a District-sponsored function. The proposed project would not increase enrollment or capacity of the school or the population of the area. Therefore, it would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no further analysis is required.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would either expand the existing swimming pool into the space currently occupied by the Michael White Adobe or relocate the pool to the space currently occupied by basketball courts. New recreational facilities, in the form of an expanded pool or a new pool and new basketball courts, would be created. The environmental impacts associated with the proposed project have been analyzed throughout this Initial Study and the EIR that will be prepared for the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of additional recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

3.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Project implementation would not result in an increase in enrollment at the school or an increase in the population within the project area, which would affect long-term traffic load and capacity of the street system. Phase I of the proposed project, however, would require use of construction vehicles, which would likely access the project site via Huntington Drive and would be staged at the parking lot along the west side of the campus and the driveway separating the project site. An increase in traffic due to construction vehicles would be negligible.

The proposed improved athletic facilities would be available for use by the public when not in use by the District, in accordance with the Civic Center Act. The proposed expansion of the pool may result in increased use of the pool and an increase in trips to and from the project site. However, if this increase occurs, it would be small, and the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections. No substantial increase in traffic would result from the project implementation, and no further analysis is required.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not increase student enrollment at the school or population in the project area. Any increase in traffic resulting from increased use of the athletic facilities on the campus would be negligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a decrease in the level of service standard for any roads or highways. No significant impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

**No Impact.** Under Scenario A, the proposed project would create no new structures. Under Scenarios B and C, the proposed project would create two small structures in the center of an existing school, near the football stadium. Structures developed as part of the proposed project would be one story and would not be taller than existing school buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on air traffic patterns and would not create any safety risks associated with changes in air traffic patterns. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not change the design of roadways in the project area, nor would it introduce incompatible uses onto roadways in the project area. If the Michael White Adobe is relocated, speed bumps would be removed from the San Marino High School parking lot to prevent shaking of the building. The speed bumps would be replaced immediately. The project would not cause any hazards due to design features of roadways or incompatible uses of roadways. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would expand the athletic facilities on the San Marino High School campus within the area of a vacant building. It would not alter access to the project site for emergency vehicles. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and no further analysis is required.
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f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project consists of the expansion of athletic facilities on the campus of San Marino High School for school use. The proposed project would not increase student enrollment or capacity at the school or the population of the area. Parking associated with the potential use of the facilities by community members during nonschool hours could be accommodated by the existing parking lots provided on the campus. The proposed project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. No further analysis is required.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. As described above, no increase in school enrollment or capacity or population in the project area would occur as a result of the project. The proposed project would not substantially increase traffic or alter the design of roadways. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur. No further analysis is required.

3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would expand the San Marino High School pool facilities. A small amount of wastewater would be generated temporarily due to construction activities. As stated in Section 3.8a, construction would follow BMPs intended to minimize the generation of wastewater. The proposed project would result in a larger pool on campus, which may result in a slight increase in wastewater generation. However, the pool would include a circulation system to clean the water, and the increase in wastewater generation would be negligible. Scenarios B and C of the proposed project would also create a new men’s restroom on the project site. However, as the proposed project would not increase in enrollment or result in any substantial programmatic changes at the school, the creation of a new restroom would not significantly increase wastewater generation. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed waste water treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not increase enrollment in the school or population in the area, which typically increases demand for water and increases wastewater generation. The proposed project would increase the size of the swimming pool at the project site. This may result in a slight increase in water consumption and wastewater generation. However, the pool would include a circulation system, and the increase in water consumption and wastewater generation would be negligible. Scenarios B and C of the proposed project would also create a new man’s restroom on the project site. However, as the proposed project would not increase in enrollment or result in any programmatic changes at the school, the creation of a new restroom would not substantially increase water consumption or wastewater generation. Therefore, no water or wastewater treatment facilities would be required due to the proposed project.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Because the proposed project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the project site, the proposed project would not increase surface runoff. Therefore, no new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required. No significant impacts would result, and no further analysis is required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, no increase in enrollment at San Marino High School or in the population of the area would occur as a result of the proposed project. As stated above, the proposed project would result in a pool slightly larger than the existing pool. This may result in a slight increase in water consumption. However, as the pool would include a circulation system to clean and recirculate water, this increase would be negligible. No new or expanded entitlements would be required due to the proposed project. Impacts to water supply would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, the proposed project would only generate a small amount of wastewater during demolition activities. After completion, the proposed project may slightly increase wastewater generation, due to the creation of a larger pool under. This increase would be insubstantial. Therefore, impacts to wastewater treatment providers would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact. If the relocation of the Michael White Adobe is determined to be infeasible, the proposed project would demolish the structure on the lot which would create a solid waste disposal need. The nearest landfill is the Scholl Canyon Landfill, in the City of Glendale, California. The Scholl Canyon Landfill currently takes in between 1,100 and 1,200 tons of solid waste per day. If it continues to accept waste at this rate, it is not expected to reach capacity until 2023. The Scholl Canyon Landfill and other landfills in the project area have sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste that would be generated by the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The following federal and state laws and regulations govern solid waste disposal. The USEPA administers the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 and the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which govern solid waste disposal. In the State of California, Assembly Bill (AB) 939 (Integrated Solid Waste Management Act of 1989, Public Resources Code 40005 et seq.) requires every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000 by such means as recycling, source reduction, and composting. In addition, AB 939 requires each county to prepare a countywide siting element specifying areas for transformation or disposal sites to provide capacity for solid waste that cannot be reduced or recycled for a 15- year period. AB 1327, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, requires local agencies to adopt ordinances mandating the use of recyclable materials in development...
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projects. The project would comply with all laws and regulations governing solid waste, such as those listed above. Therefore, no impact to federal, state, or local statutes and regulations related to solid waste would occur. No further analysis is required.

3.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project may result in the removal of trees or other vegetation from the project site. However, these trees are ornamental. Additionally, the project site is developed and in an urban environment; no sensitive or special status species or habitat are on or in the vicinity of the project site. Impacts related to biological resources on the project site would be less than significant. The proposed project would also result in the relocation or demolition of the Michael White Adobe, a recognized historic building. The project would have the potential to impact or eliminate a significant historic resource. The proposed project would require the preparation of an EIR to address impacts to historic and cultural resources.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project may contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts related to cultural resources and noise levels, which will be addressed in the EIR. Specifically, the proposed demolition of the historic building, if approved, may result in cumulative impacts to historic resources. Further analysis of this issue is required as part of the environmental review process.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, the proposed project has the potential to significantly impact a historical resource and noise levels in the project vicinity, and as discussed in Section 3.11, Noise, the proposed project has the potential to increase noise to a significant level at the project site. These impacts could be potentially significant and cause adverse effects on human beings. Both impacts to cultural resources and noise levels will be further analyzed as part of the environmental review process.
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Appendix

Appendix A.
Air Quality Calculations
Air Quality Appendix

The Air Quality section addresses the impacts of the proposed project on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthy pollutant concentrations. Air pollutants of concern include ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and oxides of nitrogen. This section analyzes the type and quantity of emissions that would be generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project.

Climate/Meteorology

Air quality is affected by both the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by meteorological conditions that influence movement and dispersal of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local topography, provide the link between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The City of San Marino is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). The SoCAB incorporates approximately 12,000 square miles within four counties – San Bernardino, Riverside, Los Angeles, and Orange – including some portions of what was previously known as the Southeast Desert Air Basin. In May 1996, the boundaries of the South Coast Air Basin were changed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to include the Beaumont-Banning area.

The distinctive climate of the SoCAB is determined by its terrain and geographic location. The SoCAB is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and high mountains around the rest of its perimeter. The general region lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific, resulting in a mild climate tempered by cool sea breezes with light average wind speeds. The usually mild climatological pattern is interrupted occasionally by periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, or Santa Ana winds.

The vertical dispersion of air pollutants in the SoCAB is hampered by the presence of persistent temperature inversions. High-pressure systems, such as the semi-permanent high-pressure zone in which the SoCAB is located, are characterized by an upper layer of dry air that warms as it descends, restricting the mobility of cooler marine-influenced air near the ground surface, resulting in the formation of high-level subsidence inversions. Such inversions restrict the vertical dispersion of air pollutants released into the marine layer, and together with strong sunlight, can produce worst-case conditions for the formation of photochemical smog.

The atmospheric pollution potential of an area is largely dependent on winds, atmospheric stability, solar radiation, and terrain. The combination of low wind speeds and low-level inversions produces the greatest concentration of air pollutants. On days without inversions, or on days of winds averaging over 15 mph, smog potential is greatly reduced.

Air Quality Regulations, Plans and Policies

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCA) was passed in 1963 by the U.S. Congress and has been amended several times. The 1970 Clean Air Act Amendments strengthened previous legislation and laid the foundation for the regulatory scheme of the 1970s and 1980s. In 1977, Congress again added several provisions, including non-attainment requirements for areas not meeting National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program. The 1990 Amendments represent the latest in a series of federal efforts to regulate the protection of air quality in the United States.

In 1988, the State Legislature passed the California Clean Air Act (CCAAB), which established California’s air quality goals, planning mechanisms, regulatory strategies and standards of progress for the first time. The CCAA provides the State with a comprehensive framework for air quality planning regulation. The CCAA requires attainment of state ambient air quality standards by the earliest practicable date. Attainment Plans are required for air basins in violation of the state ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) standards. Preparation of and adherence to attainment plans are the responsibility of the local air pollution districts or air quality management districts.

State and federal agencies have set ambient air quality standards for certain air pollutants. NAAQS have been established for the following criteria pollutants: CO, O3, SO2, NO2, lead (Pb), and respirable particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). The state standards for these criteria pollutants are more stringent than the corresponding federal standards. Table 1 summarizes the state and federal standards.
### Table 1  
Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standard</th>
<th>Federal Primary Standard</th>
<th>Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects</th>
<th>Major Pollutant Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ozone (O₃)</strong></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.09 ppm</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>High concentrations can directly affect lungs, causing irritation. Long-term exposure may cause damage to lung tissue.</td>
<td>Motor vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>0.07 ppm</td>
<td>0.075 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</strong></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.10 ppm</td>
<td>0.25 ppm</td>
<td>Distilled as a chemical asphyxiating. CO interferes with the transfer of fresh oxygen to the blood and deprives sensitive tissues of oxygen.</td>
<td>Internal combustion engines, primarily gasoline-powered motor vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>35 ppm</td>
<td>9 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</strong></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.30 ppm</td>
<td>0.05 ppm</td>
<td>Irritating to eyes and respiratory tract. Colors atmosphere reddish-brown.</td>
<td>Motor vehicles, petroleum refining operations, industrial sources, aircraft, ships, and railroads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>0.18 ppm</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</strong></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.25 ppm</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Irritates upper respiratory tract; injurious to lung tissue. Can lower the leaves of plants, destructive to marble, iron, and steel. Limits visibility and reduces sunlight.</td>
<td>Dust combustion, chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, and metal processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>0.04 ppm</td>
<td>0.14 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respirable Coarse Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</strong></td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>20 μg/m³</td>
<td>50 μg/m³</td>
<td>May irritate eyes and respiratory tract, decreases in lung capacity and increased mortality. Produces haze and limits visibility.</td>
<td>Dust and fume-producing industrial and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g. wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead (Pb)</strong></td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>1.5 μg/m³</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Disturbs gastrointestinal system, and causes anemia, kidney disease, and neuromuscular and neurologic dysfunction (in severe cases).</td>
<td>Present source: lead smelters, battery manufacturing &amp; recycling facilities. Past source: combustion of leaded gasoline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulfates (SO₄)</strong></td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>25 μg/m³</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Decrease in ventilatory functions, aggravation of asthmatic symptoms; aggravation of cardiac pulmonary disease; vegetation damage; degradation of visibility; property damage.</td>
<td>Industrial processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** California Air Resources Board. Updated April 2009.

1 ppm parts per million, μg/m³ micrograms per cubic meter

* standard has not been established for this pollutant/standard by this entity.

**AB32: Global Warming Solutions Act**

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

Assembly Bill 32 (AB32), the Global Warming Solutions Act, was passed by the California state legislature on August 31, 2006, to place the state on a course toward reducing its contribution of GHG. AB32 follows the emissions reduction targets established in Executive Order S-3-05, signed on June 1, 2005, which requires the state’s global warming emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020 and by 80 percent of 1990 levels by year 2050. Projected GHG emissions in California are estimated at 596 million metric tons of CO₂ in December 2007, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 million metric tons of CO₂ for the state. The 2020 target requires emissions reductions of 169 million metric tons, approximately 30 percent of the projected emissions. Pursuant to the requirements of AB 32, the state’s reduction in global warming emissions will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on global warming emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012.

In order to effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs CARB to develop appropriate regulations and establish a mandatory reporting system to track and monitor global warming emissions levels by January 2008. The Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool (CARRROT) was established to track GHG emissions. By January 1, 2009, CARB must prepare a plan demonstrating how the 2020 deadline can be met or earlier. However, as immediate progress in reducing GHG can and should be made, AB 32 directed CARB and the newly created California Climate Action Team (CAT) to identify a list of “discrete early action GHG reduction measures” that can be adopted and made enforceable by January 1, 2010. CAT is a consortium of representatives from state agencies that have been charged with coordinating and implementing GHG emission reduction programs that fall outside of CARB’s jurisdiction. In June 2007, CARB adopted 37 early actions for reducing GHG emissions, of which three were identified as discrete early action measures. Since adoption of the initial early actions, CARB has expanded the early action list to include a total of 44 measures. In June 2008, CARB released the Climate Change Draft Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) with additional GHG emission reduction measures. The draft Scoping Plan describes the proposed cap and trade program covering 85 percent of the state’s GHG emissions, proposals for requiring utilities to produce a third of their energy from renewable sources, and implementation of the California Clean Car Law. Several other initiatives and measures include full deployment of the Million Solar Roofs initiative, high-speed rail, water-related energy efficiency measures, and proposed regulations to reduce emissions from trucks and ships at California’s ports.

To address GHG emission and global climate change in General Plans and CEQA documents, Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007) requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA guidelines on how to address global warming emissions and mitigate project-generated GHG. OPR is required to prepare, develop, and transmit these guidelines on

---

1 Implementation of the California Clean Car law includes implementation of the Low Carbon Fuel standard, which requires a waiver from the USEPA in order for California to implement.
or before July 1, 2009 and directs OPR to adopt the CEQA guidelines by January 1, 2010. In addition, for projects where GHG emissions are considered significant, the California Attorney General has prepared a fact sheet listing various mitigation measures to reduce the project’s contribution to global climate change impacts.

**Existing Air Quality**

Existing levels of ambient air quality and historical trends and projections in the City of San Marino, in the vicinity of the proposed residential project, are best documented by measurements taken by the SCAQMD. The City of San Marino is located within Source Receptor Area (SRA) 8 – San Gabriel Valley (West San Gabriel Valley). The SCAQMD air quality monitoring station in SRA 8 located closest to the project site is the Pasadena Monitoring Station located approximately 1.75 miles west of the project site at 752 S Wilson Avenue in the City of Pasadena. The Pasadena Monitoring Station monitors O₃, NOₓ, CO, and PM₁₀. As this monitoring station does not monitor SO₂ and PM₁₀, data was supplemented from the Los Angeles – North Main Street Monitoring Station located 8.35 miles southwest of the project site at 1630 North Main Street in the City of Los Angeles for these criteria pollutants. The most current five years of data monitored at this monitoring station is included in Table 2.

The data show recurring violations of both the state and federal ozone. The data also indicate that the area consistently exceeds the state PM₁₀ standards and have exceeded the federal PM₁₀ standard twice in the past 5 years with recorded measurement data. The CO, SO₂, and NOₓ standard have not been violated in the last five years at this station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ozone</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 8-Hour Conc. (ppm)</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 1-Hour ≥ 0.09 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal 8-Hour ≥ 0.08 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carbon Monoxide</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 8-Hour Conc. (ppm)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 8-Hour ≥ 9 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal 8-Hour ≥ 9 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrogen Dioxide</strong>&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 1-Hour ≥ 0.25 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulfur Dioxide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 24-Hour Conc. (ppm)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 24-Hour ≥ 0.04 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal 24-Hour ≥ 0.14 ppm (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coarse Particles (PM₁₀)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 24-Hour Conc. (µg/m³)</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 24-Hour ≥ 50 µg/m³ (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal 24-Hour ≥ 150 µg/m³ (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine Particles (PM₂.₅)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 24-Hour Conc. (µg/m³)</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal 24-Hour &gt; 65 µg/m³ (days exceed threshold)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Sediment sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Schools are also considered sensitive receptors, as children are present for extended durations and engage in regular outdoor activities. Recreational land uses are considered moderately sensitive to air pollution. Although exposure periods are generally short, exercise places a high demand on respiratory functions, which can be impaired by air pollution. In addition, noticeable air pollution can detract from the enjoyment of recreation. Industrial and commercial areas are considered the least sensitive to air pollution. Exposure periods are relatively short and intermittent, as the majority of the workers tend to stay indoors most of the time. In addition, the working population is generally the healthiest segment of the public.

The nearest off-site sensitive receptors under Phase I are the residences 250 feet to the west of the proposed project site and the residences approximately 860 feet to the east. Under Scenario A of Phase II, the nearest off-site sensitive receptors would be similar to Phase I. Nearest off-site sensitive receptors for Scenarios B and C of Phase II would be the residences approximately 120 feet to the west and residences approximately 510 feet north from the proposed project site.

**Sensitive Receptors**

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others due to the types of population groups or activities involved. Sensitive population groups include children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases.
### AREA SOURCE EMISSIONS

#### Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Unmitigated Daily Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Skid Steer Loaders (44 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- Off-Road Equipment:
  - 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 13.05
- Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 939.25
- Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 19469.97

### Additional Notes

- Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated
- On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version  : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006
- Project Location: South Coast AQMD
- Project Name: SMHS - Scenario C
- File Name: F:\AAL-06\AQ\Adobe.urb924
- Page: 1

### Additional Emission Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fugitive Dust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo Off-Road Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo On-Road Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo Worker Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fugitive Dust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo Off-Road Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo On-Road Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo Worker Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Skid Steer Loaders (44 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- Off-Road Equipment:
  - 1 Skid Steer Loaders (44 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 13.05
- Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 939.25
- Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 19469.97

### Additional Notes

- Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated
- Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version  : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006
- Project Location: South Coast AQMD
- Project Name: SMHS - Scenario C
- File Name: F:\AAL-06\AQ\Adobe.urb924
- Page: 1

### Additional Emission Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fugitive Dust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo Off-Road Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo On-Road Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demo Worker Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Skid Steer Loaders (44 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- Off-Road Equipment:
  - 1 Skid Steer Loaders (44 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 13.05
- Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 939.25
- Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 19469.97

### Additional Notes

- Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated
- Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version  : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006
- Project Location: South Coast AQMD
- Project Name: SMHS - Scenario C
- File Name: F:\AAL-06\AQ\Adobe.urb924
- Page: 1
### Summary Report

#### Construction Emission Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2010 Tons/Day (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>2011 Tons/Day (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>2012 Tons/Day (Unmitigated)</th>
<th>Total Tons/Year (Unmitigated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo On Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Fugitive Dust units are in 10^-3 ft^3/min.
- Demo Off Road Diesel units are in 10^-6 lb/min.
- Demo On Road Diesel units are in 10^-6 lb/min.
- Demo Worker Trips units are in 10^-6 lb/min.

### Area Source and Operational Emission Estimates

#### Tons/Year (Unmitigated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo On Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Units are in 10^-6 lb/min.

---

**Construction Unmitigated Details Report**

**Summary Report:**

- Project Name: SMHS - Scenario C
- File Name: F:\AAL-06\AQ\Scenario_CC\urb924
- Project Location: South Coast AQMD
- On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006
- Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: ONROAD2007

**Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:**

- Off-Road Equipment:
  - 1 Skid Steer Loaders (44 hp) operating at 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day.
  - 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo On Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Units are in 10^-6 lb/min.
- Time slice units are in 10^-3 ft^3/min.

---

**Time Slice 11/30/2010-12/31/2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo On Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Units are in 10^-6 lb/min.
- Time slice units are in 10^-3 ft^3/min.
### Phase Assumptions


- **Building Volume Total (cubic feet):** 34,455.63
- **Building Volume Daily (cubic feet):** 1,811.19

#### Phase: Demolition 1/1/2012 - 3/1/2012 - Swimming Pool

- **Building Volume Total (cubic feet):** 26,605.45
- **Building Volume Daily (cubic feet):** 604.8

#### Phase: Paving 3/2/2012 - 4/30/2012 - Default Paving Description

- **Acres to be Paved:** 0.31


- **2 Trenchers (63 hp) operating at a 0.75 load factor for 8 hours per day**


- **Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100**
- **Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50**
- **Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2040 specifies a VOC of 250**
- **Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250**
- **Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250**

---

### Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report

#### AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>83.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth - No Summer Emissions</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Product</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS (daily, unmitigated)**: 0.44, 0.13, 4.70, 0.00, 0.02, 8.43

**Area Source Changes to Defaults**: 0.00, 0.02, 0.02, 91.63
CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

SUMMARY REPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Time Slice</th>
<th>Active Emissions (lbs/day, unmitigated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11/30/2010-12/31/2011</td>
<td>2.41 14.69 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11/30/2010-12/31/2011</td>
<td>2.38 14.54 8.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated):

- 2010:
  - Building Off Road Diesel: 2.38
  - Building Worker Trips: 0.02
- 2011:
  - Building Off Road Diesel: 14.69
  - Building Worker Trips: 0.02
- 2012:
  - Building Off Road Diesel: 14.54
  - Building Worker Trips: 0.02

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007
On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006
Project Location: South Coast AQMD

Demolition:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-11/29/2010: 1.01
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 1.24
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 1.31

Paving:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 1.79
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 1.40
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 1.14

Coating:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.93
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.80
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 0.77

Demolition Vendor Trips:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.01
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.00
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 0.00

Demolition Worker Trips:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.02
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.00
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 0.00

Paving Vendor Trips:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.01
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.00
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 0.00

Paving Worker Trips:
- 2010:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.02
- 2011:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2010: 0.00
- 2012:
  - 11/30/2010-12/31/2011: 0.00
Phase Assumptions:

Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 34435.63
Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 1811.19
On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 25.16
Off-Road Equipment:
1 Concrete/Industrial Saws (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day
2 Trenchers/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

Phase: Demolition 1/1/2012 - 3/1/2012 - Swimming Pool
Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 26605.45
Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 604.8
On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 8.4
Off-Road Equipment:
1 Concrete/Industrial Saws (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day
2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

Phase: Paving 3/2/2012 - 4/30/2012 - Default Paving Description
Acres to be Paved: 0.31
Off-Road Equipment:
4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day
1 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day
1 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day
1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

Off-Road Equipment:
4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 8 hours per day
1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
2 Trenchers (63 hp) operating at a 0.75 load factor for 8 hours per day

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/12/2011 ends 6/30/2011 specifies a VOC of 250
Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/12/2011 ends 6/30/2011 specifies a VOC of 250

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>83.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping - No Winter Emissions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated) 0.07 0.07 0.06 0.00 0.00 0.00 83.20

Area Source Changes to Defaults
### Summary Report:

**CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10 Dust</th>
<th>PM10 Exhaust</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5 Dust</th>
<th>PM2.5 Exhaust</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:

**CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10 Dust</th>
<th>PM10 Exhaust</th>
<th>PM2.5 Dust</th>
<th>PM2.5 Exhaust</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition 11/3/2010-1/2/2011</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Off-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo On-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 11/30/2010-1/29/2011</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Off-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Vendor Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition 1/1/2012-3/1/2012</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Off-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo On-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt 3/30/2012-4/29/2012</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>25.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Off-Gas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Off-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving On-Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase Assumptions

- **Phase Demolition 11/3/2010 – 1/2/2011 - Basketball Court**
  - Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 34,425,63
  - Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 1,711,13
  - On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 10,011
  - Off-Road Equipment:
    - 1 Concrete/Industrial Saw (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day
    - 2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

- **Phase Demolition 1/1/2012 – 3/1/2012 - Swimming Pool**
  - Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 26,605,45
  - Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 3,084
  - On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 84
  - Off-Road Equipment:
    - 1 Concrete/Industrial Saw (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day
    - 2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day
Phase: Paving 3/2/2012 - 4/30/2012 - Default Paving Description

Acres to be Paved: 0.31

Off-Road Equipment:
- 4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day
- 1 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day
- 1 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day
- 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day


Off-Road Equipment:
- 4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 8 hours per day
- 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day
- 2 Trenchers (63 hp) operating at a 0.75 load factor for 8 hours per day


Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

Area Source Emission Estimates Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area Source Changes to Defaults

0.00 0.00 0.00 16.72
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated) 0.08 0.02 0.86

GHG Emissions from Off-Site Energy use from On-Site Energy Production

Conversion Factors

- 0.0005 lbs in a ton
- 1.0 BTU in a kwh
- 471,000,000 tons of CO2e in 1990

GHG Calculations

GHG Emission Factors

- CH4: 0.000001 lbs of CH4/kwh
- N2O: 0.000001 lbs of N2O/kwh
- CO2e: 0.0001 lbs of CO2e/kwh

Conversion to CO2e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GHG Potential - Conversion to CO2e

Energy Use Calculations - Existing

- 0 sq ft of demolition
- 0 lbs of CO2e/Year

Energy Use Calculations - Project

- 17,984 sq ft of proposed building
- 2,150 lbs of CO2e/Year
- 49 lbs/day
- 9 tons of CO2e/Year

Energy Use Calculations - Net Increase

- 17,984 lbs of CO2e/Year
- 49 lbs/day
- 9 tons of CO2e/Year

Net Increase CO2 from URBEMIS2007 and Energy Use Calculations

- Construction: 0 lbs of CO2e/Year
- Operation - Mobile Sources: 0 lbs of CO2e/Year
- Operation - Area Sources: 0 lbs of CO2e/Year
- Operation - Energy Use: 0 lbs of CO2e/Year

Total: 0.0000000
### Construction Localized Significance Thresholds - San Marino HS Pool Renovation - Scenario A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Grading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operation Localized Significance Thresholds - San Marino HS Pool Renovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West San Gabriel Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West San Gabriel Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance Increment Below</th>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance Increment Above</th>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 4/18/2008 - Table C-1. 2003 – 2005
### Construction Localized Significance Thresholds - San Marino HS Pool Renovation - Scenario B & C

#### Table C-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table C-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table C-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table C-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operation Localized Significance Thresholds - San Marino HS Pool Renovation

#### Table C-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table C-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table C-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Source Receptor Area</th>
<th>Distance (meters)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Updated: 4/18/2008 - Table C-1. 2003 – 2005
Appendix

Appendix B.
Executive Summary of EDR Radius Map Report
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A search of available environmental records was conducted by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The report was designed to assist parties seeking to meet the search requirements of EPA’s Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312), the ASTM Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments (E 1527-05) or custom requirements developed for the evaluation of environmental risk associated with a parcel of real estate.

TARGET PROPERTY INFORMATION

ADDRESS
2701 HUNTINGTON DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

COORDINATES
Latitude (North): 34.126560 - 34° 7’ 35.6”
Longitude (West): 118.099360 - 118° 5’ 57.7”
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 11
UTM X (Meters): 398622.7
UTM Y (Meters): 3776539.8
Elevation: 605 ft. above sea level

USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP ASSOCIATED WITH TARGET PROPERTY
Target Property Map: 34118-B1 MOUNT WILSON, CA
Most Recent Revision: 1994
South Map: 34118-A1 EL MONTE, CA
Most Recent Revision: 1994

TARGET PROPERTY SEARCH RESULTS
The target property was identified in the following records. For more information on this property see page 6 of the attached EDR Radius Map report:

Site | Database(s) | EPA ID
--- | --- | ---
SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT | HAZNET | N/A
2701 HUNTINGTON DR
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST | HAZNET | N/A
2701 HUNTINGTON DR
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT | HAZNET | N/A
2701 HUNTINGTON DR
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

SAN MARINO HIGH | FINDS | 110021912714
2701 HUNTINGTON DR
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

DATABASES WITH NO MAPPED SITES
No mapped sites were found in EDR’s search of available ("reasonably ascertainable ") government records either on the target property or within the search radius around the target property for the following databases:

FEDERAL RECORDS
NPL | National Priority List
Proposed NPL | Propositional Priority List Sites
Deleted NPL | National Priority List Deletions
NPL LIENS | Federal Superfund Liens
CERCLIS | Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
NCERL | CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned
LIENS | CERCLA Lien Information
CORRACTS | Corrective Action Report
RCRA-TSD | RCRA - Transports, Storage and Disposal
RCRA-LOGS | RCRA - Large Quantity Generators
RCRA-SQGS | RCRA - Small Quantity Generators
RCRA-CESIGS | RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator
RCRA NonGen | RCRA - Non Generators
US ENV CONTROLS | Engineering Controls Sites List
US INST CONTROLS | Sites with Institutional Controls
ERNS | Emergency Response Notification System
HMIRS | Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
DOT OPS | Incident and Accident Data
US CLD | Clandestine Drug Labs
US BROWNFIELD | A Listing of Brownfields Sites
DOD | Department of Defense Sites
FUDS | Formerly Used Defense Sites
LUCS | Land Use Control Information System
CONSIENT | Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees
ROB | Records Of Decision
UMTRA | Uranium Mill Tailings Sites
OD | Open Dump Inventory
DEHRS REGION | Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations
MINES | Mines Master Index File
TRIS | Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
TSCA | Toxic Substances Control Act
FTIR | FIFRA TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)
SITRAC | FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
SSTS | Section 7 Tracking Systems
ICIS | Integrated Compliance Information System
PADS | PCB Activity Database System
MLTS | Material Licensing Tracking System
RADINFO | Radiation Information Database
RAATS | RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
SCND DRYCLEANERS | State Coalition for Rededication of Drycleaners Listing

STATE AND LOCAL RECORDS
HIST Cal-Sites | Historical Cal-Sites Database
CA BOND EXP. PLAN, Bond Expenditure Plan
SCH, School Property Evaluation Program
SWIFL, Solid Waste Information System
SWIS, Waste Management Unit Database
SC, Statewide SLIC Cases
SARCC, San Gabriel Valley Areas of Concern
UST, Active UST Facilities
HIST UST, Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database
AST, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities
CHMIRS, California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
LA Co. Site Mitigation List
DEED, Deed Restriction Listing
VCP, Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties
CDL, Clandestine Drug Labs
RESPONSE, State Response Sites
HAULERS, Registered Waste Hauler Listing
ENVIROSTOR, EnviroStor Database
INDES, Indian Reservations
ODS, Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
LUST, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System
INDIAN UST, Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
VCP, Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties
EDR PROPRIETARY RECORDS
Manufactured Gas Plants, EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants
SURROUNDING SITES, SEARCH RESULTS
Surrounding sites were identified in the following databases.

Elevations have been determined from the USGS Digital Elevation Model and should be evaluated on a relative (not an absolute) basis. Relative elevation information between sites of close proximity should be field verified. Sites with an elevation equal to or higher than the target property have been differentiated below from sites with an elevation lower than the target property. Page numbers and map identification numbers refer to the EDR Radius Map report where detailed data on individual sites can be reviewed.

Sites listed in bold italics are in multiple databases.

Unmappable (orphan) sites are not considered in the foregoing analysis.

STATE AND LOCAL RECORDS

Cortese: The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board (LUST), the Integrated Waste Board (SWF/LS), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (Cal-Sites). This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.

A review of the Cortese list, as provided by EDR, and dated 04/01/2001 has revealed that there is 1 Cortese site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

LUST: The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System.

A review of the LUST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 07/03/2008 has revealed that there are 2 LUST sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

Notify 65: Notify 65 records contain facility notifications about any release that could impact drinking water and thereby expose the public to a potential health risk. The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board’s Proposition 65 database.

A review of the Notify 65 list, as provided by EDR, and dated 10/21/1993 has revealed that there is 1 Notify 65 site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1X MCKESSON DRUG CO</td>
<td>HAZNET, LUST, CHMIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION OIL SERVICE STATION LEAS</td>
<td>HIST UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1X SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN MARINO HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>ERNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUD’S CLEANERS</td>
<td>SUIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to poor or inadequate address information, the following sites were not mapped:
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Noise Appendix

Characteristics of Sound

Sound is a pressure wave transmitted through the air. When an object vibrates, it radiates part of its energy as acoustical pressure in the form of a sound wave. Sound can be described in terms of amplitude (loudness), frequency (pitch), or duration (time). The standard unit of measurement of the loudness of sound is the decibel (dB). The human hearing system is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. Sound waves below 16 Hz are not heard at all and are "felt" more as a vibration. Similarly, while people with extremely sensitive hearing can hear sounds as high as 20,000 Hz, most people cannot hear above 15,000 Hz. In all cases, hearing acuity falls off rapidly above about 10,000 Hz and below about 200 Hz. Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies, a special frequency-dependent rating scale is usually used to relate noise to human sensitivity. The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) performs this compensation by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear.

Because of the physical characteristics of noise transmission and noise perception, the relative loudness of sound does not closely match the actual amounts of sound energy. Table 1, Change in Sound Pressure Level, dB, presents the subjective effect of changes in sound pressure levels. Typical human hearing can detect changes of approximately 3 dBA or greater under normal conditions. Changes of 1 to 3 dBA are detectable under quiet, controlled conditions and changes of less than 1 dBA are usually indiscernible. A change of 5 dBA or greater is typically noticeable to most people in an exterior environment and a change of 10 dBA is perceived as a doubling (or halving) of the noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Apparent Loudness</th>
<th>Change in Sound Pressure Level, dB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3 dB</td>
<td>Threshold of human perceptibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5 dB</td>
<td>Clearly noticeable change in noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10 dB</td>
<td>Half or twice as loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+20 dB</td>
<td>Much quieter or louder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bel and Hansen, Engineering Noise Control, 1988

Point and Line Sources

Noise may be generated from a point source, such as a piece of construction equipment, or from a line source, such as a road containing moving vehicles. Because noise spreads in an ever-widening pattern, the given amount of noise striking an object, such as an eardrum, is reduced with distance from the source. This is known as "spreading loss." The typical spreading loss for point source noise is 6 dBA per doubling of the distance from the noise source.

A line source of noise, such as vehicles proceeding down a roadway, would also be reduced with distance, but the rate of reduction is affected by of both distance and the type of terrain over
which the noise passes. Hard sites, such as developed areas with paving, reduce noise at a rate of 3 dBA per doubling of the distance while soft sites, such as undeveloped areas, open space and vegetated areas reduce noise at a rate of 4.5 dBA per doubling of the distance. These represent the extremes and most areas would actually contain a combination of hard and soft elements with the noise reduction placed somewhere in between these two factors. Unfortunately the only way to actually determine the absolute amount of attenuation that an area provides is through field measurement under operating conditions with subsequent noise level measurements conducted at varying distances from a constant noise source.

Objects that block the line of sight attenuate the noise source if the receptor is located within the “shadow” of the blockage (such as behind a sound wall). If a receptor is located behind the wall, but has a view of the source, the wall would do little to reduce the noise. Additionally, a receptor located on the same side of the wall as the noise source may experience an increase in the perceived noise level, as the wall would reflect noise back to the receptor compounding the noise.

Noise Metrics

Several rating scales (or noise “metrics”) exist to analyze adverse effects of noise, including traffic-generated noise, on a community. These scales include the equivalent noise level \( L_{eq} \), the community noise equivalent level (CNEL) and the day/night noise level \( L_{dn} \). \( L_{eq} \) is a measurement of the sound energy level averaged over a specified time period.

The CNEL noise metric is based on 24 hours of measurement. CNEL differs from \( L_{eq} \) in that it applies a time-weighted factor designed to emphasize noise events that occur during the evening and nighttime hours (when quiet time and sleep disturbance is of particular concern). Noise occurring during the daytime period (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) receives no penalty. Noise produced during the evening time period (7:00 to 10:00 PM) is penalized by 5 dB, while nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) noise is penalized by 10 dB. The \( L_{dn} \) noise metric is similar to the CNEL metric except that the period from 7:00 to 10:00 PM receives no penalty. Both the CNEL and \( L_{dn} \) metrics yield approximately the same 24-hour value (within 1 dB) with the CNEL being the more restrictive (i.e., higher) of the two.

Regulatory Environment

To limit population exposure to physically and/or psychologically damaging as well as intrusive noise levels, the federal government, the State of California, various county governments, and most municipalities in the state have established standards and ordinances to control noise. Potential noise and vibration impacts were evaluated based on the State of California's interior noise standards and noise compatibility criteria, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria for vibration impacts, and the City of San Marino Municipal Code to determine whether a significant adverse noise impact would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

State of California Noise Standards

Interior Noise Standards

The state of California’s noise insulation standards are codified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Building Standards Administrative Code, Part 2, California Building Code. These noise standards are applied for new construction in California for the purpose of interior noise compatibility from exterior noise sources. The regulations specify that acoustical studies must be prepared when noise-sensitive structures, such as residential buildings, schools, or hospitals, are located near major transportation noise sources, and where such noise sources create an exterior noise level of 60 dBA CNEL or higher. Acoustical studies that accompany building plans must demonstrate that the structure has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. For new residential buildings, schools, and hospitals, the acceptable interior noise limit for new construction is 45 dBA CNEL.

Noise Compatibility

Table 2 shows a land use compatibility chart for community noise adopted by the State of California as part of General Plan Guidelines. This table provides urban planners with a tool to gauge the compatibility of new land uses relative to existing and future noise levels. It identifies normally acceptable, conditionally acceptable, normally unacceptable, and clearly unacceptable noise levels for various land uses. A conditionally acceptable designation implies new construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements for each land use is made and needed noise insulation features are incorporated in the design. By comparison, a normally acceptable designation indicates that standard construction can occur with no special noise reduction requirements.
### Table 2
**Community Noise and Land Use Compatibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>CNEL (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential-Low Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family, Duplexes, Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging – Motels, Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters, Concert Hall, Amphitheaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Businesses, Commercial and Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanatory Notes

**Normally Acceptable:**
Specified land use is satisfactory based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

** Normally Unacceptable:**
New construction development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements should be made. Noise insulation requirements must be designed into the design. Outdoor areas must be shielded.

**Conditionally Acceptable:**
New construction development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirement is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, will normally suffice. Outdoor environment will soon require noise reduction measures.

**Clearly Unacceptable:**
New construction development should generally not be undertaken. Construction costs to make the indoor environment acceptable would be prohibitive and the outdoor environment would be not usable.


---

### City of San Marino Noise Regulations

**City of San Marino Ambient Base Noise Level**

Where ambient noise levels are less than the ambient base noise level as set forth in the City of San Marino Municipal Code, Chapter XIV, Article 4, Section 14.04.04, and as shown in Table 3, the ambient base noise levels shall be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Zone</th>
<th>Time Interval</th>
<th>Ambient Base Noise Levels (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1 Residential</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 Residential Corridor*</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Residential corollary shall mean any residential property located within 150 feet of a commercial zone or from any portion of Huntington Drive not abutting a commercial area.

**City of San Marino Stationary Source Noise Level Restrictions**

The City of San Marino regulates noise through the Chapter XIV, Article 4, Section 14.04.05. Pursuant to the City’s Municipal Code, the City restricts any person from generating noise at any adjacent residential property line at a level that exceeds a noise level of 65 dBA from any parcel in an R-1 zone and 75 dBA from any parcel in a C-1 Zone, Park and Recreational Zone, or Historical and Cultural Zone. These standards do not gauge the compatibility of developments in the noise environment, but provide restrictions on the amount and duration of noise generated at a property, as measured at the property line of the noise receptor. The City’s noise ordinance is designed to protect people from objectionable nontransportation noise sources such as music, construction activity, machinery, pumps, and air conditioners.

**City of San Marino Construction Hours**

According to Chapter XIV, Article 4, Section 14.04.07, of the City’s Municipal Code, it is unlawful to operate equipment or perform any outside construction on buildings, structures, or projects within a residential zone or 500 feet within a residential zone that would require a building, plumbing, electrical or grading permit in a manner that the associated noise produced would violate the noise standard of Section 14.04.05 of the City Municipal Code, unless a permit has been obtained from the Planning and Building Director.

**Federal Transit Administration**

The City of San Marino prohibits vibration sources that generate vibration levels that can be felt beyond the property line of any residentially zoned property with or without the aid of an instrument. The human reaction to various levels of vibration is highly subjective. The FTA provides criteria, shown in Table 4, for acceptable levels of groundborne vibration for various
types of land uses that are sensitive to vibration based on the relative perception of a vibration event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Max L, (VdB)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Slightly felt vibration. Appropriate to workshops and non-sensitive areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Felt vibration. Appropriate to offices and non-sensitive areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Daytime</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Barely felt vibration. Adequate for computer equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Nighttime</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vibration not felt, but groundborne noise may be audible inside quiet rooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As measured in 1/3 octave bands of frequency over the frequency ranges of 8 to 63 Hz.

In addition to the vibration annoyance standards presented above, the FTA also applies standards for construction vibration damage, as shown in Table 5. Structural damage is possible for typical residential construction when the peak particle velocity (PPV) exceeds 0.2 inch per second. This criterion is the threshold at which there is a risk of damage to normal dwelling houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Category</th>
<th>PPV (in/sec)</th>
<th>VdB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Reinforced concrete, steel, or timber (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Nonengineered timber and masonry buildings</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: PPV velocity calculated from vibration level (VdB) using the reference of one microinch/second.
Appendix B

Responses to the Notice of Preparation

This appendix includes letters from the following agencies and individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Individual</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit</td>
<td>October 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Verbal Comments given at Scoping Meeting for Notice of Preparation and Initial Study</td>
<td>November 13, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td>November 21, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Barlow, AIA</td>
<td>November 24, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>November 25, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Hart, Historian</td>
<td>November 26, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Bortz, President San Marino Historical Society</td>
<td>November 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Dryden, Program Chairman San Marino Historical Society</td>
<td>November 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jarrett</td>
<td>November 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Morris</td>
<td>November 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Carter</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Dryden, Program Chairman San Marino Historical Society</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla Felber</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince Filutze</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margrith Jaeggi</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Heritage</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Conservancy</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shali Torres, et al.</td>
<td>December 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Holcomb</td>
<td>December 9, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Bortz, President San Marino Historical Society</td>
<td>December 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Huntington Library, Art Collection, and Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>December 19, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Buhler, Director of Advocacy</td>
<td>December 22, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary B. Cowles, Pasadena, California</td>
<td>January 11, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

Notice of Preparation

October 30, 2008

To: Reviewing Agencies
Re: San Marino High School Pool Expansion
SCH# 2008101154.

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the San Marino High School Pool Expansion draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Julie Boucher
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Assistant Deputy Director & Senior Planner, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
Project Title: San Marino High School Pool Expansion
Lead Agency: San Marino Unified School District
Type: NOP Notice of Preparation

Description: The proposed project involves the expansion of the San Marino High School swimming pool. Three scenarios are currently being considered by the District: Scenario A would entail the expansion of the pool in its current location, and Scenario B and Scenario C would involve relocating the pool to the area of the basketball courts, and relocating the basketball courts to the areas of the pool and Michael White Adobe. The proposed project would require the removal of the Michael White Adobe, a locally historic landmark. If technically and economically feasible, the building would be relocated. If it is determined that the relocation of the Adobe is infeasible, it would be demolished.

Lead Agency Contact
Name: Julie Boucher
Agency: San Marino Unified School District
Phone: 626-299-7000 x390
Fax: 626-299-7000
Address: 1665 West Drive
City: San Marino
State: CA Zip: 91108

Project Location
County: Los Angeles
City: San Marino
Region: Cross Streets
Lat / Long: 34° 7' 35.6" N / 118° 5' 57.7" W
Parcel No.: 5331-020-901
Township: 1N
Range: 12W
Section: 35
Base: SBBM

Proximity to:
Highways: 1-210 - 2 miles north
Airports: 
Railways: 
Waterways: Rubio Wash Flood Channel - directly west
Schools: Several
Land Use: Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Solid Waste; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies
Resources Agency; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Native American Heritage Commission; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Integrated Waste Management Board; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4

Date Received: 10/30/2008
Start of Review: 10/30/2008
End of Review: 12/01/2008

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Summary of verbal comments given at November 13, 2008 scoping meeting.

**Gene Dryden, San Marino Historical Society**
Stated that the Michael White Adobe is a historic resource, being the second oldest structure in San Marino, after the Old Mill. Stated that the San Marino Historical Society would like the building to be available to the public, and for that reason would support the relocation of the building, as it is currently not accessible.

**Gene Ruckh**
Stated that Michael White was not a significant historical figure, and that the Michael White Adobe has no historic value. Asked if the pool would be available to the general public, or if the City of San Marino would need to build a second pool for the general public.

**Ave Bortz, San Marino Historical Society**
Requested the expected cost of relocating the Michael White Adobe. 
Expressed concern that, because funding for the proposed project has not been secured, Phase I, consisting of the removal of the Michael White Adobe, could be completed, and Phase II could be abandoned. Suggested that the project may not appear appropriate to the public in the state of the current economy.

**Mary Falkenbury**
 Asked if the search for a buyer for the Adobe is being “gone about in the right way.”
Ms. Julie Boucher
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

Re: SCH#2008101154; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), for the San Marino High School Pool Expansion Project, San Marino Unified School District, Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Boucher:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) is the state 'trustee agency' pursuant to Public Resources Code §21070 designated to protect California’s Native American Cultural Resources. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Code of Regulations §15064.5(b)(c)CEQA guidelines). Section 15382 of the 2007 CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including... objects of historic or aesthetic significance." In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE)', and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:

- Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS) for possible 'recorded sites' in locations where the development will or might occur. Contact information for the Information Center nearest you is available from the State Office of Historic Preservation (916/653-7278) http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov. The record search will determine:
  - If a site or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.
  - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
  - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
- The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
- The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.

- The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) performed:
  - A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project 'area of potential effect (APE)'. The results: No known Native American Cultural Resources were identified. However the NAHC SLF is not exhaustive and local tribal contacts should be consulted from the attached list.
- The NAHC advises the use of Native American Monitors, also, when professiona
archaeologists or the equivalent are employed by project proponents, in order to ensure proper identification and care given cultural resources that may be discovered. The NAHC, FURTHER, recommends that contact be made with Native American Contacts on the attached list to get their input on potential impact of the project (APE) on cultural resources. In some cases, the existence of a Native American cultural resources may be known only to a local tribe(s) or Native American individuals or elders.

- Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f).
  - In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
  - Again, a culturally-affiliated Native American tribe may be the only source of information about a Sacred Site/Native American cultural resource.
• Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

• Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.

• CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens.

• Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) mandate procedures to be followed, including that construction or excavation be stopped in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery until the county coroner or medical examiner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. Note that §7052 of the Health & Safety Code states that disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.

• Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in §15370 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

Cc: State Clearinghouse
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
November 21, 2008

Ti’At Society
Cindi Alvitre
6515 E. Seaside Walk, #C
Long Beach, CA 90803
Calvitre@yahoo.com
(714) 504-2468 Cell

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA 90707
Gtongva@verizon.net
562-761-6417 - voice
562-925-7989 - fax

Gabrieleno Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
tattlaw@gmail.com
310-570-6567

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778
ChiefRBwife@aol.com
(626) 286-1632
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 Fax

Tongva/Council / Gabrieleno Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Tribal Secretary
781 Terminal Street; Bldg 1, 2nd floor
Los Angeles, CA 90021
Office @tongvatribe.net
(213) 489-5001 - Office
(909) 262-9351 - Cell
(213) 489-5002 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5997.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2008101154; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) and draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the San Marino High School Pool Expansion Project; San Marino Unified School District; San Marino; Los Angeles County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

Dear Julie:

I understand that you are coordinating the EIR on the Pool extension at the high school and the removal of the Michael White Adobe, and have the responsibility of collecting public comment on this issue.

Here's my perspective on the issue from 10 years on Planning Commission and involvement with the San Marino Historical Society, as well as a kid who hugely enjoyed summer use of the pool for years, got the Red Cross accreditation (I was born and raised here). I made this comment to City Council folks in October, and have urged from the beginning that the community relocate/rebuild the disintegrating White Adobe (Lacy Park is appropriate) so that the SMHS pool facility can be upgraded as necessary for school and community use. This can also create a lot of bang for the buck by upgrading the bleacher/shower/access area in the same project.

The White Adobe has tremendous historical value for San Marino, and unfortunately it has been virtually abandoned by encasing it in metal fencing and allowed to deteriorate after extremely damaging removal of and alteration of historic items and the addition of a bathroom that is clearly not part of its historic nature. Relocating it in an appropriate reconstruction (with supplemental funding from the community) would be of the highest value to the community. The relocated White Adobe can become a public education facility as well as a seminar and public reception venue, with a restoration to its approximate original condition.
Attached is a rough conceptual layout of how this can be accomplished, using a raised bleacher structure to accommodate the ancillary uses underneath, as well as provide covered passage and upgrade the gymnasiu and exterior areas. This integrates many of the loose and outdated functional areas in one contemporary structure that is actually very open, using minimal HVAC needs and also shading the bleacher and pool area from strong western exposure. It is a multifunctional, contemporary utility structure that provides much-needed space and organization to an area that is severely compressed in its functional spaces and traffic flow.

My architectural experience with the FUSD Measure Y projects (I did design work for a couple of the campuses) and the construction phase work has made me very aware of the importance of conceiving solutions that solve many problems simultaneously on one budget. There can be several contributors to this budget in a joint effort. When this is done appropriately under professional oversight, it can produce spectacular results without breaking the bank.

The pool needs to be upgraded for actual school needs, and also provide the community with a recreation facility on an alternate schedule as is allowed. This kind of joint use is encouraged by policies at the State level, since it provides the community access that generates support for the school itself, and allows for public support for a very intensive use. This kind of a layout also provides the necessary control for competitive swimming events that are not possible in the current facility. This is an opportunity for a structure that benefits the school, and can also provide an alternate source of revenue to maintain a pool and shower facility. I really enjoyed using that old pool as a kid, did some fabulous cannonballs off that high dive (also a few bellyflops).

I just want to show this conceptual diagram for the purposes of moving the dialogue forward in a coherent fashion, and to urge the community not to support more than one pool in this town. Pools will famously push budgets into the red, the Aquatic Center nearly went under a few years ago.

```
:: design :: Collaboration :: innovation
```

Laurie Barlow, AIA
http://www.barlowcoweb.com/
http://greenswardcivitas.blogspot.com/

PoolSuggestion.pdf

Content-Type: application/pdf
Content-Encoding: base64
1. "Olympic" Pool 164 x 32

2. Raised bleachers with Public Check-in, snacks, outdoor shower area below, gym access, etc.

Laurie Barlow, AIA  Oct. 2008
November 25, 2008

Ms. Julie Boucher (jboucher626@smusd.us)
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, California 91108

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR SAN MARINO HIGH SCHOOL
POOL EXPANSION, SAN MARINO, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
(SCH 2008101154)

Dear Ms. Boucher:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the Draft
Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), dated October 30, 2008, for the subject project.
The due date to submit comments is December 1, 2008. Based on a review of the
DEIR, DTSC would like to provide the following comments:

1. The project consists of one of three scenarios involving either the expansion or
   relocation of the San Marino High School swimming pool.

2. If demolition of an old structure will occur, lead based paint and organochlorine
   pesticides from termicide applications may be potential environmental concerns
   at the site. DTSC recommends that these environmental concerns be
   investigated and possibly mitigated, in accordance with DTSC’s “Interim
   Guidance, Evaluation of School Sites with Potential Soil Contamination as a
   Result of Lead From Lead-Based Paint, Organochlorine Pesticides from
   Termicides, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Electrical Transformers, dated
   June 9, 2006.”

3. If San Marino Unified School District (SMUSD) plans to use State funds for the
   project, then SMUSD shall comply with the requirements of Education Code
   sections 17213.1 and 17213.2, unless otherwise specifically exempted under
   section 17268.
If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact me at (818) 717-6617.

Sincerely,

Ken Chiang
Senior Hazardous Substances Scientist
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration

cc: State Clearinghouse (State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov)
Office of Planning and Research

Mr. Guenther W. Moskat (Gmoskat@dtsc.ca.gov)
CEQA Tracking Center – Sacramento HQ

Mr. Michael O'Neill (Moneill@cde.ca.gov)
Department of Education – Sacramento, CA

School Reading File – Chatsworth (cwherry@dtsc.ca.gov)

CEQA Reading File – Chatsworth
November 26, 2008

Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
San Marino Unified School District
1666 West Drive
San Marino, Ca. 91108

Re: Saving the Michael White Adobe

I have been the Vice President and General Manager for the past 40 years at Sunny Slope Water Company and have been very involved in the history of both San Marino and Pasadena. I understand that the proposed project would require the removal of the Michael White Adobe and due to the historical significance of this local landmark, it would be catastrophic to lose one of the few landmarks that remain in existence of the California Mission period.

Michael White was a historic figure for a number of reasons. He fought in the battle of Cahuenga along side, William Workman, B.D. Wilson and Dan Sexton, who are all important to the history of this area. He also helped build the 80 ton ship, the Guadalupe for the San Gabriel Mission along with the famous former pirate, Joseph Chapman. White was the captain of this ship along with Captain Richardson on numerous voyages for San Gabriel Mission in the 1830’s and 40’s. He married one of the Gabrieliño Indians who was one of the Daughters of Mrs. Eulalia Perez de Guillen. This marriage made him eligible for one of the early land grants in the 1840’s which is exactly where the adobe still stands.

I have mapped all the land grants along Huntington Drive and have copies of the original U.S. Surveyor General Maps from 1869 which show the Michael White adobe and it’s location on the 78 acre tract of land. This map also shows the road to San Gabriel Mission, the swamp area north of the adobe as well as the vineyard that Michael White planted in the 1840’s.

As you can see, Michael White is very important to the history of this area and how extremely important it is to preserve this structure and all and any necessary avenues should be researched to preserve this historic structure.

If you need more information or would like to speak to me, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Hart
Historian

Email: [redacted]
Home Phone: [redacted]
Address: LaVerne, Ca. 91750

cc: Judith Carter
    Gene Dryden
    Robert Dorame
    A. Roff
From: Ave Bortz  
Sent: Sun 11/30/2008 3:08 PM  
To: Barbara Wu Heyman; julie boucher  
Cc: Gene Dryden; Judith Carter; john morris; wthom35; Bill Ferry; Chris Datwyler;  
Dennis Kneier;  
ejelliott626; Kenneth Veronda; ave bortz  
Subject: NOP SM Pool Expansion

Dear Barbara,  
As a San Marino resident for over 55 years, I am well aware of the importance of the pool at SMHS. I watched the building of the pool, learned to swim and enjoyed summer days there as a child. Our own children also learned to swim there, played water polo and swam for SMHS, and then went on to teach Water Safety classes and lifeguard during the summers. I am very supportive of the pool at SMHS. It has played a big part in the lives of our family.

That being said, I am very disappointed that the November 13th School Board meeting paid far more attention to pool expansion plans than to the fate of the historic Michael White Adobe. I fear that the School Board regards the Adobe as merely a nuisance or roadblock to the implementation of their construction plans. The Michael White Adobe deserves better. As one of the few adobes that remain in southern California, the White Adobe is an important link with the history of an earlier era. Consequently, discussion of the funding for the expansion of the pool at the high school should include discussion of funding for the restoration/relocation of the Michael White Adobe.

San Marino has just begun to prepare for the celebration of 100 years of San Marino as a city. These preparations provide us with an opportunity to reflect on the role that our history has played in the development of the community that we live in today. The White Adobe is part of that history.

The SM Historical Society Board will meet on 12/1 to articulate a response to this issue. I urge that the Planning Center and the School District extend their deadline to include the comments from that meeting.

Sincerely,  

Ave Bortz  
President  
SM Historical Society
From: Gene Dryden
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2008 11:23 PM
To: Barbara Wu Heyman; Julie Boucher
Cc: Ave Bortz
Subject: Michael White Adobe

Barbara -- here are some of our thoughts on the Michael White Adobe issue. Please see the attachment, also.

Historical Society Studies Adobe Location Issues.

The oldest residence in San Marino is being examined by the San Marino Historical Society to determine the feasibility of moving it to a more accessible location. Built by a British Sailor, Michael White, in 1845, the adobe structure is located within the grounds of San Marino High School, adjacent to the swimming pool.

<>The Historical Society Board is interested in determining whether the structure can be successfully moved to a location where the residents of San Marino and other interested parties can better enjoy this historic house. A committee including Board Officers, City Officers, School Board Members, and Structural Engineers from several firms, has been meeting over an extended period of time to determine the feasbility and viability of such a move. Structural engineers involved in the process have included Ben Schmid, a structural engineer and a former resident of San Marino, Mel Green, a noted structural engineer familiar with adobe structures, move study proposals by Almas International and by deBretteville and Polyzoides, a move study report by Lawrence Williams, and representatives of heavy moving companies. All studies have indicated the feasibility of such a move, at a cost, including resighting, of the order of $500,000, presuming a move to the vicinity of the current Adobe, possibly in Lacy Park near the current Thornher House. <>

Included in an attached .pdf file are drawings which are part of a study performed by Ben Schmid to determine the means necessary to move the Adobe. He determined that the move can be feasibly performed if the structure is cut into two primary sections, and the sections are mounted upon concrete beam foundations. Suitable internal bracing is included for the walls. The removal of the current roof is necessary, followed by reconstruction at the new location. The original adobe consisted of a wood frame two story and an adobe one story structure, joined together. The two story structure was moved to a location in San Gabriel, but it is not the subject of the current EIR – only the single story adobe structure is of relevance. It is quite clear, from an historic preservation point of view, that such a move of the structure will have a detrimental effect on its historic value. It is equally clear, however, that the strengthening and moving of the structure to a location where it can be viewed by persons of all walks of life and all ages will be of inestimable value in teaching the public of the history and the historic persons of this area. The net result is highly positive and beneficial.

Gene Dryden
Program Chairman, San Marino Historical Society
and Former Mayor, City of San Marino
Dear Sirs:

I am writing in support of preserving the Michael White Adobe structure. I do not believe the demolition of such an important historical home is merited by the needed expansion of the SMHS campus (namely, the pool area). However, it would seem appropriate to move the Adobe to a new site, notably Lacy Park, where it would be a showcase for San Marino's past settlement, and the pool expansion could then proceed forward. I understand that moving the Adobe is a small cost (~10%) compared to the planned pool expansion, and therefore it seems reasonable that the pool expansion should include relocation of the unique 160 year-old Adobe home. It is a win-win scenario for the City of San Marino and its citizens and students: preservation of the Michel White Adobe home/museum and expansion/updating of the SMHS pool facility. We owe it to our SM forebears to do the right thing.

Sincerely submitted,

Thomas Jarrett
November 30, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been a resident (mostly) since 1958 and value the traditions and history of this unique city. My father was a local architect, a board member of the SM Historical Society for many years and taught me the value of preservation of historical buildings. He actively lobbied for the safekeeping of the Michael White Adobe and hoped that it could be moved to a place where it could be maintained as an important part of San Marino for generations to come. I am most concerned at this time that this wonderful piece of local history may end up being sacrificed for the sake of athletics for the high school. I certainly am not trying to deny the high school of having the best of facilities – I have always been a strong and vocal advocate for improving all the facilities at all the schools, but I would hope that during the formal process of the EIR, that some compromise could be reached that would preserve the White Adobe either in its present location or that funding for the move and subsequent re-construction could be addressed and fully considered in the final cost analysis for the total project.

My grandson, who with his parents, recently moved to San Marino, deserves to have the history of the city available for him to learn and appreciate as have previous generations, as well as have outstanding school facilities. The Michael White Adobe is an integral piece of that history.

Thank you,

Sandra H. Morris
Barbara Wu  
Planning Center Inc.  
December 1, 2008

San Marino High School Pool Expansion

Comments on Notice of Preparation  
From Judith Carter, [Redacted], San Marino, CA, [Redacted]

Two conflicting issues appear to be involved in this project.

First, there is a need for a new or upgraded swimming pool at San Marino High School. As a parent of three children who learned to swim in that pool in the early 1970s, I know what an important resource it is to the community and its children.

Second is the fact that the expansion of the pool would necessitate the removal or demolition of one of the oldest residences in the San Gabriel Valley. For those of us for whom history is important, the historical aspect of this project is of major concern.

In combing through the records of the San Marino Historical Society, I found that the Michael White Adobe is one of the few remaining adobe structures in the area. It figures significantly in the mission period of the San Gabriel Valley. Michael White was a colorful character in the history of San Marino over fifty years before its incorporation. His wife was one of the daughters of Eulalia Perez de Guillen, who received the land on which the adobe stands from the San Gabriel Mission. In the 1950s, K.L. Carver led well-documented restoration efforts. At several times during the past few decades, the relocation of the adobe has been studied but these efforts never came up with a satisfactory solution.

As a long time supporter of San Marino Schools, I am alarmed at the lack of transparency in the process that has led to the plan, which I only learned of on November 24, 2008. The December 1, 2008 deadline for input gave very little time for response. I feel that there has been scant information on meetings, agendas and reports so that the wider public could be informed. It was only through a phone call from a Los Angeles preservation organization that I was informed of the notice that the San Marino School District is offering to sell the Michael White Adobe for $1, with a deadline for questions of January 30. The public notice states, “It is critical that the structure must be moved from the current site between June 22, 2009 and August 7, 2009.”

Why the rush? Have the funds to modify, build or restituted the swimming pool been secured? If so, that should be public knowledge. If not, why not spend a little extra time to come up with a workable solution for the community where current needs and historical needs are balanced. Given the current economic climate and the budget shortfalls the district faces, perhaps a thoughtful study of the alternatives would lead to a workable solution which benefits the whole community.
From: Gene Dryden  
To: Barbara Wu Heyman  
Cc: Julie Boucher; Ave Bortz; Jenna Snow  
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2008 9:26 PM  
Subject: Re: Michael White Adobe

Hi, Barbara.

I was a member of the San Marino City Council for 13 years and remember discussions about relocating the Adobe, but don't remember any action being taken. I will take the responsibility of running down the answer to that question and will also bring up to the City Council the request for concurrence on such a move--on the basis of no required City funding...

With regard to your three issues: 1) We, too, have had structural engineers tell us that such a move is feasible, but I'm aware that it never has been done. It's clearly a calculated risk, and we may end up with nothing more than a pile of sand. 2) I'll work to obtain confirmation of permission to relocate to a specific location--like Lacy Park. 3) We don't currently have adequate funds to relocate the structure--that is our current largest problem (assuming a successful move). Had we the funds--at least for the move--we probably would have proceeded before this. I am given to understand that the cost of just the move (not including necessary re-siting) would be around $100,000.

Gene
December 1, 2008

Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

RE: Notice of Preparation—San Marino High School Pool Expansion—Michael White Adobe

Dear Ms. Boucher:

I am a parent with two children in the San Marino School District. The proposed pool expansion project seeks to relocate or demolish the 163-year old Michael White Adobe, the second oldest structure in San Marino. As part of the City’s scoping process for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), I submit the following comments to ensure fair and thorough consideration of less destructive alternatives.

**Historical significance of the Michael White Adobe**

The Michael White Adobe is an extremely rare historic resource not only in the San Marino School District, but in all of Southern California. The history and significance of the Michael White Adobe, also known as the Blanco Adobe, is well documented. Michael White was an English sailor who embarked on a number of sea voyages through Mexico and Hawaii finally arriving in California in 1829. At that time, Michael White changed his name to Miguel Blanco so he could own land and marry. After marrying Maria del Rosaria Guillien, the daughter of an influential figure in the San Gabriel Mission, White received a land grant of approximately 77 acres north of the San Gabriel Mission, and built his family home. That Adobe still stands in its original location.

As one of the earliest foreign settlers in California, Michael White was interviewed by the Bancroft Library in 1877 as part of its oral history efforts. As documented in the interview, White and his family continued to live in the adobe for many years after California was annexed by the United States in 1846.

In 1928, the San Marino School District acquired the Adobe and its remaining land for construction of a future school. The athletic facilities that currently envelop the Adobe date back to the mid-1950s when San Marino High School relocated to the site.
Suggested Alternatives for Consideration in the EIR

- The Draft EIR should prioritize an alternative that would retain the Adobe in place, as part of either Scenario B or C described in the Notice of Preparation. An alternative that retains the Adobe in place would significantly decrease or eliminate adverse impact to this cultural resource.

- The Adobe’s on-campus location provides a unique, hands-on educational opportunity that could integrate into the District’s curriculum on San Marino and California history and engage high school students in volunteer opportunities. Restoration of the Adobe and its settings could transform the Adobe into a community showpiece for enjoyment by students and residents alike.

- The Draft EIR should explore the feasibility of relocating the Adobe only as a last resort. Relocation is not an ideal preservation solution as it potentially jeopardizes the Adobe’s structural and historic fabric. The Draft EIR should also take into account potential impacts on archaeological resources.

- The Draft EIR should also explore the traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods of having a stadium seating swimming pool and football stadium in the same facility, especially traffic impacts along Huntington Boulevard and parking in the neighborhood adjacent to the high school.

- The Draft EIR should also take into consideration the fact that under the District’s proposals in Scenarios B & C, it will not be possible to fit three new basketball courts in the existing swimming pool location and at the Adobe site. The site plan shows there is only room for two basketball courts at best.

The Michael White Adobe is an extremely rare historic resource that should be cherished in not only in the San Marino School District, but in all of Southern California. Its setting on a high school campus offers an incomparable opportunity to further the District’s educational mission through a tangible genuine artifact. I urge the school district to welcome this exceptional teaching tool and obtain alternatives that retain and preserve the Michael White Adobe as a legacy to San Marino.

Regards,
Marla Felber
From: Vince Filutze
to: Julie Boucher
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2008 3:10 PM
Subject: Fwd: News from San Marino Unified School District

When I was on the council we had many discussions about moving it and got a price of about $300,000.00 to $500,000.00 to the corner of Huntington Dr. and Gainsborough which is school propriety. I believe that may have been in 1994 or 1995 Gene Dryden or Paul Crowley would know. I can't imagine what it would cost now to move it to Lacy Park. I don't think the Historical Society has the funds to do it. The house has been altered so I don't believe it has that original history value.

Good Luck

Vince Filutze
Hi Julie,

as a parent of two water polo players and swimmers, I would love if the Adobe would be moved. There is simply not enough pool time available for all the SMHS programs and the Tsunamis, due to the size of the pool. There is always a group of kids, girls/boys pre polo or girls/boys pre swim, or regular season polo and swim, who has to practice at 5:30 am!! I do not believe that this is beneficial for the kids to get up so early.

Our boys will not profit, if any changes will be made. Our older son is in college now, and our younger one is a senior.

But I hope for all the kids who will swim and play polo, and their parents, that there will be a bigger pool in the very near future!

Margrith Jaeggi
From: Latino Heritage [mailto:latinoheritage@mindspring.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2008 4:40 PM
To: Barbara Wu Heyman
Subject: NOP San Marino Pool Extension

To Whom it May Concern:
It has been my pleasure to research the history of Pasadena and cities in the San
Gabriel Valley. I have learned much about this history from books, papers and
transcripts. In some parts of our country there are living history sites that
provide history at a level that can be experienced by many in the community. While
we have the San Gabriel Mission and some ranchos where students and member of the
community can enjoy this sort of interaction, we have no local buildings that
represent the pivotal era that is represented by the Michael White Adobe. Its
value is significant; two of the few oral histories that are in the Bancroft Library
were "taken" at the adobe. I hope that all care will be taken to assure that this
building remains available to the public that they might learn more about our shared
history.

Roberta H. Martinez
Latino Heritage
latinoheritage@mindspring.com
145 N. Raymond Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91103
December 1, 2008

Submitted via fax and mail
Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
San Marino Unified School District
1665 West Drive
San Marino, CA 91108
Fax: 626.299.7010

RE: Notice of Preparation—San Marino High School Pool Expansion—Michael White Adobe

Dear Ms. Boucher:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Conservancy, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an environmental impact report for the San Marino High School Pool Expansion project. The Conservancy is the countywide historic preservation organization for the Los Angeles area and is the largest local historic preservation organization in the United States, with over 7,000 household members. The proposed pool expansion project seeks to relocate or demolish the 163-year-old Michael White Adobe, the second oldest structure in San Marino and one of a handful of 19th century adobes remaining in the region. As part of the city’s scoping process for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), we submit the following comments to ensure fair and thorough consideration of less harmful alternatives.

Historic Significance of the Michael White Adobe

Constructed around 1845, the history and significance of the Michael White Adobe, also known as the Blanco Adobe, is well documented. Michael White was an English sailor with a sense of adventure, having embarked on a number of sea voyages before arriving in California in 1829. Because California was under Mexican rule at the time, White adopted the name Miguel Blanco and became a Mexican citizen in order to marry and own land. Soon after marrying Maria del Rosario Guillien, the daughter of an influential figure at San Gabriel Mission, White received a land grant of about 77 acres north of the San Gabriel Mission, where the adobe still stands today. Reflecting Spanish colonial architectural influences and constructed by indigenous labor, the Michael White Adobe was similar to many other dwellings that once dotted former mission lands granted to private citizens under the Mexican government’s Secularization Act of 1834.1

Remarkably, as one of the earliest foreign settlers in California, the Bancroft Library conducted an oral history interview with White in 1877 that chronicled his personal travels as well as many significant historic events and prominent figures from the Mexican era and early United States history of California. As documented in the interview, White and his family continued to live in the adobe for many years after California was annexed by the United States in 1846. Over time, the ranch was parcelled off to White’s children as they wed and had families of their own, and the adobe was eventually sold to a neighbor.

In 1928, the San Marino School District acquired the adobe and its remaining land for construction of a future school. The adobe was leased to a family for years before construction of an elementary school started on the property after World War II. San Marino High School relocated to the site in the mid-1950s and constructed the pool and athletic facilities that currently envelop the then 100-plus year old structure.

The Michael White Adobe is locally designated as a San Marino landmark and has been deemed eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. As an indication of exceptional significance, the adobe was among the first buildings to be documented under the federal Historic American Building Survey (HABS) in 1935, not long after the program was established in 1933, and remains the only HABS-documented structure in San Marino today. The White Adobe is also featured in John R. Kielbas’ book *Historic Adobes of Los Angeles County*.

**Suggested Alternatives for Consideration in the EIR**

A key policy under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is the lead agency’s duty to “take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with... historic environmental qualities...and preserve for future generations...examples of major periods of California history.” To this end, CEQA “requires public agencies to deny approval of a project with significant adverse effects when feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures can substantially lessen such effects.” In other words, if less harmful alternatives are identified in the EIR that meet most project objectives, the lead agency should not approve the proposed project.

As described in the NOP, the proposed project would either adversely impact or destroy an irreplaceable and exceptionally rare historic resource through relocation or demolition, even

---

2 White’s interview with Thomas Savage, *California All the Way Back to 1828*, is available online at the Library of Congress’s collection of first person narratives from California’s early years, 1849-1900, entitled “California as I Saw It.”

3 “Casa de Miguel Blanco,” available at the Library of Congress website, [www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov). A later wood-framed two-story wing with wooden ship siding seen in the HABS documentation has since been removed and only the earlier adobe section remains.

4 Public Resources Code §§21001 (b), (c).

5 *Sierra Club v. Gilroy City Council* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 30, 41, italics added; also see PRC §§21002, 21002.1.

6 “The fact that an alternative may be more expensive or less profitable is not sufficient to show that the alternative is financially infeasible. What is required is evidence that the additional costs or lost profitability are sufficiently severe as to render it impractical to proceed with the project.” *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1998) 197 Cal.App.3d 1167, 1181.
though funds have yet to be secured for the desired pool expansion. Given the significance of the Michael White Adobe, the Conservancy strongly feels that demolition should not be considered under any circumstances. Likewise, we believe that any discussion of moving the adobe is premature until funds have been secured to pay for both relocation of the adobe and the pool expansion project. Accordingly, we propose the following alternatives for consideration in the Draft EIR:

- **Retention in Place:** The Draft EIR should prioritize an alternative that would retain the adobe in place, as part of either Scenario B or Scenario C described in the NOP. Under these options, a new pool would be developed where the basketball courts are currently located, while the existing pool would be filled in and replaced with two full basketball courts. An alternative that retains the White Adobe in place and allows basketball court(s) to be built around the adobe would significantly reduce or eliminate adverse impacts to cultural resources.

- **Restoration of the Michael White Adobe and its Setting:** As San Marino High School was developed around the White Adobe, the setting and relationship of the adobe to the landscape was severely compromised. Restoration of the adobe and its setting based on historic research and documentation, in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, would transform the adobe into a community centerpiece for interpretation and enjoyment by students and residents alike. The adobe's on-campus location provides a unique, hands-on educational opportunity that could be integrated into the district's curriculum on California history and engage high school students in volunteer opportunities.

- **Relocation and Restoration:** The Draft EIR should explore the feasibility of relocating the adobe only as a last resort. Relocation is not an ideal preservation solution for any building, but particularly in this situation, where this type of move is called "risky" in the conservation options report drafted by structural engineers Melvyn Green and Associates. Relocation may potentially jeopardize the adobe's structural stability and historic fabric, as well as its eligibility for the National Register. Such a drastic measure must be predicated on securing an appropriate destination site and sufficient funds (committed by the school district) to pay for relocation, stabilization and restoration of the adobe. In considering relocation alternatives, the EIR should also take into account potential adverse impacts on archaeological resources and prescribe appropriate mitigation measures.

The Michael White Adobe is an exceptionally rare historic resource that is a treasure not only for the San Marino School District, but for Southern California. Its location on a high school campus offers an unparalleled opportunity to further the district's educational mission and teach early California history through a tangible, authentic artifact. We urge the school district to embrace this remarkable teaching tool and seek alternatives that retain and preserve the Michael White Adobe as a legacy of San Marino's past.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the San Marino High School Pool Expansion project. Please feel free to contact me at (213) 430-4211 or fchou@laconservancy.org should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Flora Chou
Preservation Advocate
December 1, 2008

Ms. Julie Boucher  
Assistant Superintendent  
San Marino Unified School District  
1665 West Dr.  
San Marino, California 91108

Re: Notice of Preparation – San Marino High School Pool Expansion – Michael White Adobe

Dear Ms. Boucher:

As residents of the City of San Marino and/or parents of children enrolled in the San Marino School District, the undersigned submit this in response to the District’s call for public comments in response to the draft EIR for the District’s proposed construction of a new and larger swimming pool on the SMHS campus. We are concerned how that project may impact the Michael White Adobe. As we read with interest the San Marino Tribune article on the same proposal (“Michael White Adobe Would Be Scrapped to Expand Swimming Pool” – 11/20/08), we have sent a copy of this letter to the Editor.

The demolition of this historic home should not be an option. The cost to move or restore the Adobe would be small compared to the loss if the District decided to demolish this rare surviving link to our earliest days.

Built in 1845, the Michael White Adobe represents our rich but overlooked past. As the finest town in the region, we should celebrate that past. European settlement came to Southern California before the Declaration of Independence with the San Gabriel Mission in 1775. San Marino’s earliest days were joined to the Mission through the Old Mill and La Presa Dam. Indeed, San Marino grew up in the birthplace of the Southern California region and played an important role in its formation.

Michael White’s biography, California All The Way Back to 1828, was identified by the Library of Congress as one of the most prominent voices in early pioneer history. White was a young English immigrant who came by sea to Mexico, to Hawaii, and then to San Marino. His life was the stuff of high adventure. Once he landed in California, White was swept up in the Mexican revolution battles fought here, and he was imprisoned by Spanish authorities. Like other early European settlers, Mr. White married a local girl from the San Gabriel Mission (Ms. Maria Del Rosario Guillen). They settled on the San Ysidro Rancho in San Marino. This is the kind of history that some towns celebrate with a parade or a pageant (Ramona et al.).

For their home, Michael White and his bride built an Adobe characteristic of the time and place. That Adobe still stands at SMHS. Unfortunately, its fascinating history is lost on most students, and apparently some of the District’s administrators. According to the SM Historical Society’s essay on the Adobe, “San Marino High School students walk by this significant building unaware that they have an authentic history lab on the campus.” An enormous and unique learning opportunity has been lost to those students and will be lost forever, if the Adobe were demolished. That loss would scandalize the District and our community which work so hard together to achieve academic excellence.

The Adobe is our city’s “family heirloom”. Many family heirlooms get dusty, fall into disrepair or take
up precious space. Still, we keep them for our children and grandchildren to look at and wonder. We do not demolish them. Nor should the District think to demolish the Michael White Adobe.

Very truly yours,

1. Shali Torres
2. Margaret Tom
3. Mariel S. Mulet, Esq.
4. Tim Lindsay
5. Marguerite Lindsay
6. Meredith Don
7. Betty Lee
8. Ann Dromsky
9. Dave Dromsky
10. Mark Montoya
11. Anni McConnell
12. Sandy Snider
13. Donald McClelland
14. Shelley M. Enger
15. William K. Enger

Cc: Editor, San Marino Tribune.
Julie I've been meaning to send this for a while. This is based on what I've heard about the proposed plans for the pool. I just wanted to get in my thoughts.

The pool should be expanding to as big as possible. For example, if we take the current pool and square it off if would give us approximately 25 yds by 25 meters. This would give us a 10 lane pool with 8 lanes available for competition. 2 lanes would be shallow but should still be marked with a center lane marking and anchors in the wall for lane lines.

Also, the depth should be a minimum 6 1/2 feet (minimum depth for water polo) although 8 feet would be better and is the current depth.

However, in the current space we are able to expand the width to possibly 30 meters, which would give us 12 lanes for swimming practice. (2 lanes shallow). This would benefit us the most as we could almost swim the entire swimming team together. It would also allow us to practice the water polo team together and to train full court using two fields play. For competition it would allow us to play games North to South instead of East to West. This is important as the East end of play has the sun shining in the eyes of the goalie.

Expanding the pool to as large as possible would allow the swim team to hold an invitational meet. With the extra space it would allow us to practice more groups at the same time, thus, freeing up pool time for the tsunamis.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to ask.

Thanks

Casey Holcomb
San Marino HS
San Marino Boys Water Polo & Swimming
Dear Julie,

The San Marino Historical Society would like to thank the San Marino Unified School District for recognizing the historical importance of the Michael White Adobe in the initial study undertaken as part of a request for a new pool at San Marino High School. In addition, we appreciate both your sensitivity to the historical importance of the structure and your commitment to finding a way to preserve the Michael White Adobe. We also understand that preservation of the Michael White Adobe in place may be in conflict with the projected plans for this new swimming pool. Consequently, although preservation of the White Adobe in place is our first preference, our second choice would be to preserve and relocate the Adobe within San Marino city limits.

Therefore, the San Marino Historical Society requests that the School District identify potential local, state, and federal sources of grants or other monetary assistance for the purpose of preservation of the Michael White Adobe as part of the mitigation process of the Environmental Impact Report. We understand that responsibility for mitigation falls on the shoulders of the SMUSD, the lead agency here. The Historical Society also requests that the Draft EIR be submitted by you to the SHPO (State Historical Preservation Office) in order to insure adequate and proper review by SHPO officials.

The Historical Society Board recognizes that this is a sensitive issue for both of us. We are appreciative of your efforts to keep the Historical Society “in the loop” and we are willing to work with you to resolve this issue to our mutual satisfaction.

Sincerely,

Ave Maria Bortz, President
San Marino Historical Society
December 19, 2008

Mr. Henry Kaplan  
Assistant Planner  
The Planning Center  
9841 Airport Blvd., Suite 1010  
Los Angeles, CA  90045-5409

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

Thank you for your letter of December 17, inquiring whether The Huntington has any interest in the Michael White Adobe in San Marino.

We appreciate your diligence in contacting us, but we would not be interested in the property.

Thank you again.

Best regards,

Steven S. Koblik

cc:  Randy Shulman  
Julie Boucher, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
Henry - To follow up on our call on Friday, the Conservancy feels that any discussion of selling and/or relocating the Michael White Adobe is premature before less harmful alternatives are considered as part of the CEQA process. As detailed in our comment letter on the Notice of Preparation (attached), the Conservancy believes that there are feasible alternatives to relocation (or demolition) that would allow for preservation of the adobe in place. We look forward to meeting with district officials in January to tour the site and discuss these possibilities.

Sincerely,
Mike Buhler
Director of Advocacy
Los Angeles Conservancy
523 West 6th Street, Suite 826
Los Angeles, CA 90014
213/430-4203
From: Gary Cowles  
To: Barbara Heyman  
Subject: NOP San Marino Pool Extension

Dear Ms. Wu - I hope every reasonable effort will be made to spare the Miguel Blanco adobe from demolition. These historical relics of California are so rare and precious! If possible, please keep me informed as to what is being done in this regard.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely - Gary B. Cowles, Pasadena, California
Appendix C

Loss Control Field Inspection
West San Gabriel Liability and Property Joint Powers Authority

Loss Control Field Inspection

The Michael White Adobe
San Marino Unified School District
San Marino High School
2701 Huntington Drive in San Marino, California

August 12, 2008

Conducted by:

Brent Escoubas, CSP
Alliant Loss Control Services
2465 Campus Drive
Irvine, CA 92612
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Overview

This report contains the findings of an independent Loss Control Field Inspection. The purpose of this report is to identify any violations of regulatory requirements and/or consensus standards which exist at The Michael White Adobe, San Marino High School, 2701 Huntington Drive in San Marino, California.

The Michael White Adobe was built in approximately 1845 with restorations occurring in the early 1950's. The three-room building is less than 1,200 square feet, and is single story with wood shake roof and adobe wall construction. The property is listed as a historical building through the local historical society. The loss control field inspection was conducted on August 12, 2008.

Observations and recommendations are found on the following pages. The photographs are representative of concerns or issues documented during the audit process. These conditions may exist in multiple locations on the same site; consequently, the photographs should be considered as being representative of these conditions and not as depictions of every instance where these conditions were observed.

Any recommendations made by Alliant Loss Control Services are drawn from limited conditions physically observed at the time of the site visit, and do not necessarily address each and every possible loss potential, code or other statutory violation, or exception to good practices and procedures. Furthermore, the absence of comment or recommendation on a given area does not mean the area was in compliance with all acceptable codes and statutes, was in conformation with good practices and procedures, or was without a loss potential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following recommendations focus on exterior exposures of the property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-08-01</td>
<td>Trees encroaching on the roof of the building create a fire hazard as well as providing building access to vandals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-08-02</td>
<td>Excessive brush growth, provides a haven for vermin as well as a hiding place for trespassers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-08-03</td>
<td>Close proximity of the Adobe to the school swimming pool and parks creates an attractive nuisance to students and patrons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-08-04</td>
<td>Exterior walking surfaces surrounding the Adobe are cracked and uneven, presenting a trip and fall hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trim or remove trees that exceed fence lines and make contact with exterior portions of the building.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain decorative shrubs and plants to a level below 18 inches high.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure that only authorized persons enter the Adobe area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exterior fence height should match the fence height adjacent to the swimming pool.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repair cracked and uneven surfaces surrounding the Adobe. Surfaces should be smooth and level.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interior areas of the Adobe indicate water damage and termite infestation. Most interior walls contain significant horizontal cracks near the base. Crumbling adobe is present near horizontal cracks and the building foundation.

The photos above indicate significant water damage to the interior portions of the building, including ceiling areas. It is not apparent the effect water damage has had to the structural integrity of the building.

Base board areas have indications of significant termite damage.

08-08-05
The fireplace should be sealed or removed to ensure it is never used.
Infrared scanning of electrical equipment was completed on the Adobe. Thermograms with matching color photographs of each problem detected, location, and probable cause are listed below. Other areas of electrical concern are noted in the attached photos.

**08-08-06**
Worn insulation and exposed junction box is causing heat build-up in the wiring.
- Enclose junction box, replace wiring leading to junction box.
- Do not use this junction box until repaired.

**08-08-07**
Damaged insulation, possibly due to water intrusion is causing heat build-up in outlet. Inspect, clean, and tighten all connections.

**08-08-08**
Water damage has caused the electrical outlet in the bedroom to pull away from the wall.
- All damaged electrical outlets should be removed or repaired in order to prevent electrical shock and to reduce fire hazards.
**Summary**

Due to the building's age (over 160 years) and its close proximity to the high school, it presents a higher than normal general liability risk. Vacant or unoccupied properties significantly increase the chances of vandalism.

In the event of a fire, prevailing wind could cause the fire to spread to neighboring school buildings. As noted in the recommendations above, the property can easily be accessed by scaling the short fence, leading to an increased chance of arson and vandalism.

The structural integrity of the building foundation and the roof structure is unknown. Due to the age of the building and lack of anchorage, it is unlikely that the building would withstand a major earthquake.

It is advisable not to occupy this building other than for maintenance and periodic inspections.

In addition to the recommendations on the previous pages, the following steps should be taken to help prevent losses due to electrical system malfunctions, water damage, vandalism or other causes.

1. Check the Adobe regularly (at least once a week) to ensure electrical and water systems have not malfunctioned.
2. Inspect the main electrical panel, wiring and outlets. Repair or replace any defective or deficient items.
3. Keep the electrical system shut off; it should be shut off at the main circuit breaker and the breaker locked open.
4. Inspect and clean any chimneys to ensure they are free from obstructions, such as nesting birds. Install chimney guard screeencaps to help prevent infestation.
5. Turn off water to the building.
6. Regularly inspect the roof for any evidence of damage, leaks, missing or worn shingles/ridges and replace or repair them to help prevent damage from wind or rain.
7. Promptly repair any significant hazards (e.g., missing or broken steps, broken windows, etc.)
8. Install exterior lighting. Exterior light should be on from dusk to dawn.
9. Install smoke detectors (preferably tied into a centrally monitored fire alarm system so the fire department will automatically be notified in case of an alarm), and confirm that the sensors and system are tested regularly.
10. Place no trespassing signs on the property. Ensure there are no obstructions blocking any parts of the signs.
    - Warning signs must be at least 12 inches high and 18 inches wide
    - Lettering on warning signs must be at least 1.5 inches high with any graphics visible by a person with normal vision from 50 feet away.
    - Warning signs must be regularly maintained to ensure that they are still visible and in good condition.
Disclaimer

The recommendations above are based on information gathered through meetings, jobsite surveys, observations, and interviews with the account's representatives, unless otherwise specified. These recommendations do not necessarily recognize all exposures present for the account. Alliant Insurance, Inc. its subsidiaries and subcontractors, do not make any warranties or representations in regard to compliance with local, state or federal workplace standards or OSHA requirements. These recommendations are made only for the purpose of identification of insurance underwriting exposures and are made for no other purpose. Alliant Insurance, Inc. its subsidiaries, and subcontractors do not assume any legal liability due to incorrect or incomplete information given to our representatives, nor any inaccuracies, human error, etc., contained within these recommendations, nor do we assume any liability for making or failure to make any recommendations for this account. The information and recommendations contained in this report are, in the judgment of Alliant Insurance, Inc. its subsidiaries and subcontractors consistent with generally recognized practices for handling the conditions and circumstances discussed. Other methods of dealing with these may exist. Alliant Insurance, Inc. its subsidiaries and subcontractors, make no warranty or representation with respect to the accuracy of the information or with respect to the suitability of the use of such information, nor do Alliant Insurance, Inc. its subsidiaries, and subcontractors assume responsibility for any injury, illness, or damage that may result directly, or indirectly, from the use of such information.

To the extent this information is made available to entities or persons, it is offered solely as a convenience to such entities or persons with the understanding that such entities or persons will review and verify the suitability of the use of such information for application to their specific conditions and circumstances. Since law, government regulations and use conditions are subject to change. Alliant Insurance, Inc. its subsidiaries and subcontractors makes no representation that this information or its use complies with current. Federal, state, or local laws or regulations. Any such determination shall be the sole responsibility of the persons or entities to which such information is given.
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INTRODUCTION
The proposed project, which is the subject of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), involves removal of the Michael White Adobe (subject property or “Adobe”) from the San Marino High School campus. The project site is located in the City of San Marino on the grounds of San Marino High School, which is situated on the north side of Huntington Drive between Winston Avenue on the west and Gainsborough Drive on the east. Immediately surrounding the subject property are athletic facilities, with an L-shaped swimming pool to the south and west, a baseball diamond to the east, and additional recreational facilities north of the adjacent access road.

The following report summarizes the history of subject property, highlighting its character-defining features with the goal of informing an analysis of impacts of removal of the Adobe. The report first establishes the regulatory setting, followed by a physical description of the subject property and review of its alterations. The next section describes the historical context of the subject property with a summary of significance. Finally, the report describes impacts of removal.

REGULATORY SETTING
The following evaluation establishes the regulatory setting, including a summary of national, state and local historical resource designations for the subject property.

National Register of Historic Resources (National Register)
The National Register is the nation’s official list of historic and cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the National Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect the country’s historic and archaeological resources. Properties listed in the National Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service (NPS), which is part of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

As defined in National Register Bulletin #15, “How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,” resources are eligible for the National Register if they:

A) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B) are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or
C) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D) have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.”

Once a resource has been determined to satisfy one of the above-referenced criteria, then it must be assessed for “integrity.” Integrity refers to the ability of a property to convey its significance, and the degree to which the property retains the identity, including physical and visual attributes, for which it is significant under the four basic criteria. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities of integrity: location, design, setting, materials,
workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain its historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these aspects.

Relationship to Project
The subject property was previously surveyed in 1977 (Figure 29) and found to appear eligible for listing the National Register under criterion B for its association with Michael White. The property has sufficient integrity and continues to be National Register eligible for its association with White with the period of significance 1845-1878 for its relationship with an important person. While considered under criterion C for its adobe construction technique, the property does not appear to retain sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship and setting to be found eligible for architecture or construction technique. While the high probability that the Adobe site can yield important archaeological or subsurface information about the adobe construction technique and evidence of 19th century domestic use was considered for eligibility under criterion D, due to losses of integrity, principally of setting, the site does not appear eligible for archaeology or information potential. The property was considered for eligibility under criterion A as a rare and unique property type in the Los Angeles region. However, given the reasons noted above for architecture, the property does not appear National Register eligible under this criterion.

California Register of Historical Resources (California Register)
The California Register was established to serve as an authoritative guide to the state’s significant historical and archaeological resources (PRC §5024.1). State law provides that in order for a property to be considered eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found by the State Historical Resources Commission to be significant under any of the following four criteria; if the resource:

1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values.
4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one of the four above criteria, California Register-eligible properties must also retain sufficient integrity to convey historic significance. California Register regulations contained in Title 14, Chapter 11.5, §4852 (c), provide that “it is possible that historical resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but they may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.” The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) has consistently interpreted this to mean that a property eligible for listing in the California Register must retain “substantial” integrity.

The California Register also includes properties which: have been formally determined eligible for listing in, or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register); are registered State Historical Landmark Number 770, and all consecutively numbered landmarks above Number 770; points of historical interest, which have been reviewed and recommended to the State Historical Resources Commission for listing; and city and county-designated landmarks or districts (if criteria for designation are determined by OHP to be consistent with California Register criteria). PRC §5024.1 states:
(g) A resource identified as significant in an historical resource survey may be listed in the California Register if the survey meets all of the following criteria:

1. The survey has been or will be included in the State Historical Resources Inventory.
2. The survey and the survey documentation were prepared in accordance with [OHP]... procedures and requirements.
3. The resource is evaluated and determined by the office to have a significance rating of category 1-5 on DPR [Department of Parks and Recreation] form 523.
4. If the survey is five or more years old at the time of its nomination for inclusion in the California Register, the survey is updated to identify historical resources which have become eligible or ineligible due to changed circumstances or further documentation and those which have been demolished or altered in a manner that substantially diminishes the significance of the resource.

Relationship to Project
As the subject property has been previously surveyed and found to be eligible for listing in the National Register, it is also eligible for listing in the California Register under criterion 2 for its association with Michael White. The period of significant association with an important person is 1845-1878, when White lost the property in a sheriff’s sale. Given that California Register-eligible properties need not retain National Register level integrity, the Adobe appears significant under criterion 2 as a rare and unique property type in the region and under criterion 3 for its archaic construction technique for the period 1845, its date of construction. The site of the Adobe also appears significant under criterion 4 for the information potential it may yield about archaic construction techniques and evidence of domestic life for period 1845- circa 1920s, when sewer systems became prevalent.

San Marino
The local register of historic resources as established under Section 2, Article 12 of the San Marino City Code adopted in March 1989, allows for City Council to “designate a building, landmark or other property within the City as a local historical landmark in special recognition of the property’s role during the formation and existence of the City.” Nomination is by petition of an individual or organization.

Relationship to Project
Designated in May 1989, the subject property is one of only two local historical landmarks in San Marino and was the first property to be identified as such.¹ San Marino City Council found the property to be significant as “one of the oldest buildings in San Marino still standing...[that] is referenced in the early history of San Marino and is a part of the City’s historical culture.”²

¹ The Armin Thurnher House, constructed in 1929 and located in Lacy Park, was designated a local historical landmark December 11, 2002.
² City of San Marino Resolution No. 1921, dated May 10, 1989.
HISTORIC CONTEXT
The following discussion of the history of the City of San Marino is adapted from a “A San Marino Overview” prepared by the San Marino Historical Society:3

The story of San Marino is a rich part of California's history. The site of San Marino once consisted of large fruit ranches and vineyards owned by early day pioneers whose names were known to all Californians, such as Benjamin Wilson, James DeBarth Shorb, L. J. Rose, Edward J. Kewen, and General George Stoneman. Although not as well known, Michael White, whose adobe home still stands on the high school campus, was the most enduring of the pioneers. The flag of Spain still flew over the Californias when the young English sailor arrived in 1817. He played a part in historical events through the Mexican period and well into American statehood.

In an earlier era, this area was part of the vast California mission system, providing rich yields of food, tallow, and hides. As the San Gabriel Mission grew, a need arose for a grist mill to process the grains. Such a mill was built about 1816 and is, today, our El Molino Viejo - the Old Mill - the oldest building in San Marino and a historic landmark of Southern California. San Marino's most famous resident was Benjamin D. Wilson, who, in 1854, established his Lake Vineyard Ranch home on what is now Euston Road. He lived there until his death in 1878. He once described the area as "one of the most beautiful places that heart could desire."

Serving as state Senator for two non-consecutive terms, Wilson often entertained important Southland visitors at his ranch. When Wilson's daughter Maria Jesus married James DeBarth Shorb, they received the top knoll of the estate as part of her inheritance. The Shorbs built a home where the Huntington mansion now stands, and named their 600 acre ranch "San Marino". Shorb chose the name after his grandfather's plantation in Maryland which, in turn, had been named for the tiny Republic of San Marino. Henry E. Huntington often visited the Shorb estate and loved the location. He purchased the Shorb property in 1903 and, in time, the old three story ranch house gave way to the Huntington mansion. Today, the City of San Marino is well-known throughout the world for the extensive and priceless collection of art treasures, plantings, books, and papers in the Huntington Library, Art Gallery, and Botanic Gardens. Wilson's daughter Ruth married George S. Patton, who not only became the first mayor of San Marino after incorporation in 1913, but was the father of another famous figure in world history – General George S. Patton, Jr.

DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY
The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form prepared for the subject property prepared in 1977 describes it as:

Located in the northwest corner of the San Marino High School campus, the one-and-a-half story adobe has a wood shake roof, wood frames around the doors and windows and two chimneys.4

---

Exterior
The subject property is an L-shaped adobe house sided with smooth stucco (Figures 1-21, 30-41). A one story wing is arranged in a north-south orientation (north wing), and a one-and-a-half story wing arranged in an east-west orientation (south wing). Clad in shingles, the gable roof has slightly overhanging eaves, which is fairly steep above the south wing and shallower along the north wing. Wood clapboard siding is arranged horizontally in the gable ends. Corredores (roof-covered porches) supported by two wood posts are placed along the east elevation of the north wing and an additional porch is located along the south elevation of the south wing. While two chimneys were present in 1977 when the DPR 523 form was prepared, there is currently only one chimney, centered in the south wing. Fenestration generally consists of wood frame and sash double hung windows with metal grates on the exterior. Wood doors are located along the east elevation of the north and south wings, as well as an additional door centered along the south elevation.

The building is surrounded on all sides by a steel fence. Yucca and other succulents line the east porch, while a Cyprus tree shades the north elevation. The porches are paved with brick. A swimming pool encircles the subject property on the west and south sides and is approximately ten-feet from it. Contained by a retaining wall, it is located approximately five-feet below the level of the adobe house. Bleachers for baseball spectators are located east of the building. North of the building is a paved access road.

Interior
The interior of the adobe house is separated into three rooms, with one room in the north wing that retains evidence of a chimney along the east wall, and two rooms in the south wing that are separated by fireplace (Figures 22-23, 42-57). The connection between the north wing and the two rooms in the south wing is particularly wide. Typical of adobe construction, window and door openings reveal thick exterior wall dimensions. Floors are brick while walls are generally finished with smooth plaster. A wood panel is removed from the doorway connection between the north and south wings to reveal the adobe construction. Chair rails are present in the south wing. It should be noted that while the roof appears to provide a watertight assembly, there is evidence of rising damp or moisture penetration along the interior of the east elevation wall of the south wing (Figures 54-55).

Alterations
Although the Michael White Adobe has been altered many times since it was constructed in 1845, it retains substantial integrity from 1977 when it was found eligible for listing in the National Register for its association with an important person. Because there are not extant building or alteration permits, a description of alterations has been pieced together through review of historic photographs, aerial photographs, historic drawings, and extant historic fabric.

The 1977 DPR form states,
The numerous alterations include exterior wiring for electricity, addition of wire cages covering the windows and doors, and addition of several windows. White stucco now covers the original adobe foundation. K.L. Carver restored the residence in 1953 but the interior and exterior have since been vandalized. Earliest historic photographs from 1936 taken as part of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) show the adobe house with a two-story addition (Figures 1-4). Historic photos also show a lean-to along the north elevation of the south wing accessed from the east by double doors as well as the porch along the east elevation enclosed (used for parking). It is estimated the wood frame addition was constructed between 1865 and 1880, by Michael White to house his growing family of thirteen children. The subject property was located at the time in a rural landscape with no other buildings evident. The Adobe is surrounded by mature trees and a dirt road runs along the east elevation. An aerial photograph from 1928 shows the Adobe set far back from Huntington Drive surrounded by citrus groves (Figure 58). A 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map also shows two ancillary buildings, not readily visible in the aerial photograph (Figure 59). A 1938 aerial photograph shows the groves replaced by fields while residential neighborhoods began to develop to west of Gainsborough Drive and south of Huntington Drive (Figure 60).

The two-story, wood frame addition was removed around 1947 when Tony Garcia, who worked for the San Marino School District’s maintenance department and resided at the property from 1942-1947, moved the two-story wood frame addition to 704 El Monte Avenue, where he reconstructed it as a two-story duplex. Photos from circa 1947 show the Adobe with the wood frame two-story addition removed, while the lean-to is still evident (Figures 8-10). Although there is some evidence of deterioration of whitewashed mud over the adobe walls on the west elevation, the house appears to be in relatively good condition in these photographs. A site plan from 1947 shows proposed removal of ancillary buildings. An aerial photograph from 1949 shows a school complex facing Huntington Drive while the Adobe is evident behind (Figures 61). The adobe house appears to be surrounded by trees and open space in this photo with dense residential development on all sides.

In contrast, photographs from 1952 show large areas of deterioration with significant portions of the roof missing in the south wing (Figures 11-16). It is possible the Adobe suffered damage due to the July 1952 Tehachapi earthquake. The lean-to has been removed in these photographs, as well as the enclosure around porch along the east elevation. In addition, door leaves and window sash have been removed.

A “restoration” of the Adobe began in 1952 was completed in 1956, which brought the building back to “exactly as it was when the swashbuckling White — solider and sailor of fortune, gold-seeker, reluctant gun fighter and father of 13 — lived there” (Figure 17).

---

6 Midge Sherwood, San Marino; From Ranch to City (San Marino Historical Society, 1977), 25. Only nine of his 13 children survived passed childhood. (Michael C. White, Written by Thomas Savage, California all the Way Back to 1828; Early California Travels Series XXXII, Bancroft Library, 1877)
Interestingly, the two-story wood frame addition is still evident in the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps dated 1950. Its presence in 1950 is not supported by photographic or other documentary evidence.
An aerial photograph from 1953 shows grading in progress on all of the land surrounding the Adobe and school (Figure 63). A 1952 site plan shows the Adobe, identified as “existing historical monument,” with proposed boys and girls gyms to the west and south. A 1953 site plan shows proposed pools.

Undated photos after the 1952-1956 restoration shows the Adobe with reconstructed porches, new windows and doors including window grates, new roof, new brick paving on the exterior and interior, cement plaster cladding, and plantings along the north wing. Although a chimney is evident at the north wing in these photographs, it is no longer extant. A plaque on a pedestal was added southeast of the adobe in 1956. By 1959, the area immediately surrounding the adobe was fenced on the west and south with chain link above retraining walls enclosing the pool (Figures 18-20). At an undetermined date, a fence with steel pickets on the north and east adjacent to walkways leading to athletic fields was added to fully enclose the Adobe. There do not appear to have been any alterations since the Adobe was surveyed as appearing eligible for listing in the National Register in 1977 or since it was designated local historical landmark in 1989.

HISTORY
The 1977 DPR form states,

Michael Clarington White, called Miguel Blanco in California, was born in England and came to California in 1829. He was an accomplished sailor who served in that capacity as well as a mail courier for the Mexican government of California in the mid 1830’s. In 1831, White married Maria del Rosario, daughter of Doña Eulalia de Giullen, a politically powerful woman in Southern California. White was granted land from the Mexican government in 1843 and built his adobe several years later. An orchard and vineyard were also located on the property. Later owners included L.H. Titus and James Ford. San Marino High School has been built around the original structure.

*Michael White (1802 – 1885)*
As a participant and witness to the early history of Los Angeles, Michael White’s Adobe house continues to appear eligible for listing in the National Register under criterion B for this association. When he was 76, Michael White (also known as Miguel Blanco) gave an oral history to Thomas Savage for the Bancroft Library in 1877. Thomas Savage wrote in his introduction that he found Michael White to be
genial and obliging, willing to impart what he knew. It is evident that he is a man who gave but little of his attention to politics, and would take no part in civil strife…Mr. White is in very feeble health; his hand is extremely shaky, his memory seems to be quite fresh, and I am led to believe…that he is a truthful

9 The oral history of Michael C. White is one of approximately 125 dictations undertaken by Bancroft of important figures within the California community. These “Bancroft Dictations” (also known as “Testimonios” or “Recuerdos”) provide an important counter narrative to traditional histories. The Bancroft Library, [<http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/collections/westernamericana.html>](http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/collections/westernamericana.html), site accessed December 11, 2008. Although only 300 copies of the book have been published, the complete text is available at [http://webroots.org/library/usahist/catwb000.html](http://webroots.org/library/usahist/catwb000.html).
man, a man who means always to speak the truth.\textsuperscript{10}

In the oral history, Michael White tells the colorful narrative of his life chronologically. Born in Kent, England in 1801, he was apprenticed to a whaling ship in 1814, arriving in Baja California in 1817. His sailing adventures continued along the Alta and Baja California coast, as well as to the Sandwich Islands (Hawaiian Islands), interspersed with overseeing construction of boats in Santa Barbara and San Pedro around 1928.\textsuperscript{11}

It was likely during construction of the schooner Guadalupe in San Pedro for the Mission San Gabriel in 1830 that he met his wife Maria del Rosario Guillen. They were married in 1831 at Mission San Gabriel and he promptly left for Mazatlan, Mexico. Daughter of the famous centenarian Doña Eulalia Perez de Guillen, who lived until 1878 to be over 100 years old and was known as “Mother Superior” of San Gabriel mission and “keeper of the keys,” White’s marriage appears quite strategic. By this point, Michael White had become a Mexican citizen, correspondingly changing his name to Miguel Blanco to reflect his new citizenship.\textsuperscript{12} Returning from Mazatlan, White and his family settled at Rancho Los Nietos.\textsuperscript{13} His first child of thirteen (13) was born soon thereafter.\textsuperscript{14}

In 1836, while White was still living at Rancho Los Nietos, Judge Jose Sepulveda tried to convince him to fight in a skirmish in San Diego. Declining, White replied, “Yes, I am a citizen of Mexico, but not a citizen of revolutions.”\textsuperscript{15} This attitude against aggression was one he took throughout the turbulent years leading up to the Treaty of Guadalupe in 1848 and American control of California, although he reluctantly participated in the Battle of Cahuenga in a company led by William Workman in late February 1845 that overthrew Micheltorena as well as the Battle of Chino in a raid led by Benjamin Wilson in September 1846. Loyal to his English ancestors and Mexican citizenship, White felt “that the Americans have treated him badly; he accuses Americans of having swindled him out of lands and robbed him of other property…All this misfortune he lays at the door of Americans, their authorities, and laws.”\textsuperscript{16}

In 1839, White traveled to New Mexico with 50 horses and mules, ending up in Taos, where he sold his livestock.\textsuperscript{17} Two years later, he returned to California with the renowned Rowland and Workman Party, which also included Benjamin Wilson, who became a close friend and neighbor of White.

While Rowland and Workman were together granted 48,000 acres of Rancho La Puente, in 1843, White had his first foray as a landholder when he was granted Rancho Muscupiabe in the Cajon Pass in San Bernardino by Mexican Governor Micheltorena. At the confluence of several overland routes, White lasted only one year on the land and quickly abandoned it as indefensible.

In 1845, he was granted 500 varas (or approximately 75 acres) from the new Mexican Governor

\textsuperscript{10} Michael C. White, Written by Thomas Savage, \textit{California all the Way Back to 1828}; Early California Travels Series XXXII, Bancroft Library, 1877, 15-16.
\textsuperscript{11} White, 15-32.
\textsuperscript{12} White, 15.
\textsuperscript{14} 1850 United States Census, Los Angeles County, sheet 32.
\textsuperscript{15} White, 33.
\textsuperscript{16} White, 15.
\textsuperscript{17} White, 43-46; Kielbasa, 210
Pio Pico and called his ranch San Isidro (or San Ysidro) where he constructed the subject property and later the two-story wood frame addition. It is possible he received his ranch in connection with his service to Mission San Gabriel or for his role in construction of the schooner Guadalupe or, as others suggest, as Doña Eulalia’s son-in-law. White planted a vineyard and orchards containing a variety of fruit trees on his ranch and permanently settled down from his adventures. White’s rancho was a sliver between the vast ranchos of San Pasqual, which was nearly 14,000 acres, later purchased by Wilson, and the Santa Anita ranch, which was 13,319 acres owned by Hugo Reid, and later made famous as the “Arcadia” of E.J. “Lucky” Baldwin.

White parceled off portions of his rancho to his children as they had their own families. Notably, one daughter married Francisco Alvarado, brother of Mexican Governor Jose Alvarado while another daughter married Joseph Heslop (Jose Eslope). In 1878, White lost his ranch to L.H. Titus in a sheriff’s sale. To save the ranch, his mother-in-law, Dona Eulalia considered joining the Barnum circus as the oldest woman in the world, but she died the same year. He purchased a $2000 cottage in Los Angeles which burned down the same year. Until his death in 1885, White lived with his children.

Other Owners of Subject Property
Luther Harvey Titus (1822 – 1900), who owned adjoining property, came to California in 1869. He grew oranges on his 65 acres, selling his land in 1887 for $15,000. The property was allegedly sold to the San Francisco silver baron James C. Flood (1826-1889), and was later owned by Governor Henry Harrison Markham (1840-1923) and Louis Leonard Bradbury (b. 1823) who gained on-going fame through his development of the Bradbury Building in downtown Los Angeles. The property was deeded to Isaac Newton Van Nuys (1836-1912) by 1899. Given extensive land holdings of these prominent men and well-known residences, there is no evidence that any of them or their families lived at the property.

San Marino High School
The first school in San Marino opened in 1918 with 58 students at a site on Huntington Drive between Virginia and West drives. School enrollment grew over 600% between 1917 and 1928 causing the school board to purchase a site for another elementary school at the intersection of Huntington Drive and Granada Avenue, as well as a site that would become San Marino High School. In 1928, 18 acres of White’s former ranch property was purchased by the San Marino School District, which leased it as a flower and vegetable farm to a Japanese family. When the

---

21 Doña Eulalia was also invited by the Philadelphia committee for the United States Centennial observance to go on exhibit as oldest living woman in the country as the Centennial celebration. According to Mission records, she was 138 years old (which would have meant she gave birth to her youngest daughter Maria in her 70s). At the thought of her mother being a “sideshow,” Maria del Rosario Guillian, married to Michael White, was so upset, she took her mother to court to get a judge to prohibit it. (Midge Sherwood, Days of Vintage, Years of Vision (San Marino, CA: 1982) 391.)
24 Kielbasa, 210
25 San Marino Historical Society, unpublished manuscript, 7.
Japanese family was interred during World War II, the subject property was occupied by Tony Garcia, who worked in the maintenance department of the San Marino School District.

Although the intention of purchasing the 18 acres was as a future high school, the site was initially used for Carver Elementary School, named for K.L. Carver and constructed in 1947 with school buildings bordering on Huntington Drive. Kauffman L. Carver (1888–1971) served on the school board for 19 years, with 13 of those as president.

Until 1921 when South Pasadena and San Marino formed a new school district, San Marino students attended high school in adjacent cities. In 1952, after heated debate and a City-wide election, it was decided to separate from South Pasadena and form a separate San Marino High School. Carver Elementary School was converted and expanded to accommodate the high school in 1952, with a new elementary school located on San Gabriel Boulevard. San Marino High School appears to have opened at the subject property by 1955 and by 1959, the adobe was surrounded on west and south by the high school swimming pool and on the north and east by athletic fields. The San Marino Unified School District was formed in 1957.

A longtime San Marino resident, Carver spearheaded preservation of the Adobe. “It was planned at that time, 1952, that the house would become an integral part of the community used partly as an historical site and partly as a meeting place for campus organizations.” After the 1952-1956 restoration, the Adobe was used briefly as a historical museum exhibiting Indian collections of Aileen White and Laurie Coleman, as well as miscellaneous artifacts donated by Collis H. Holladay. By 1972, the Adobe was known as the “Pep Adobe” and used by the Pep Squad for storage. The bronze marker was placed by the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West after the restoration.

Ranchos in Southern California
The following chart identifies the 35 extant adobes in Los Angeles County described in Historic Adobes of Los Angeles County by John Kielbasa, published in 1997 and an additional four adobes identified from further research. A corresponding map is included as Figure 67.

Five other adobe houses are located in the vicinity of the Michael White Adobe. The San Gabriel Adobes were associated with the San Gabriel Mission, the “social, economic and religious center of Southern California.” The recently restored Hart Adobe is located in Sierra Madre and was constructed by John Jacob Hart. The substantially altered Hermitage Adobe was constructed for James Craig. The Flores Adobe, was so called for General Jose Maria Flores who led the Mexican Army of California during Mexican War and retreated to this site. The Flores Adobe was constructed by Juan Perez, a cousin of Dona Eulalia, on Rancho San Pasqual, which she is credited for opening to settlement. Finally, the Hugo Reid Adobe in was located on the adjoining Santa Anita rancho.

---

26 San Marino Historical Society, unpublished manuscript, 7.
28 Midge Sherwood, San Marino; From Ranch to City (San Marino: San Marino Historical Society, 1977) 18-19.
30 San Marino Historical Society, unpublished manuscript, 7.
31 Midge Sherwood, San Marino; From Ranch to City (San Marino Historical Society, 1977), 26.
32 San Marino Historical Society, unpublished manuscript, 7.
33 Kielbasa, 214.
34 Midge Sherwood, Days of Vintage, Years of Vision (San Marino, CA: 1982), 467.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pico Adobe (Ranchito Romulo)</td>
<td>10940 Sepulveda Boulevard</td>
<td>Mission Hills</td>
<td>Closed, earthquake damage</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lopez Adobe</td>
<td>1100 Pico Street</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rancho Los Encinos (De la Osa Adobe)</td>
<td>16756 Moorpark Street</td>
<td>Encino</td>
<td>Closed, earthquake damage</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Miguel Leonis Adobe</td>
<td>23537 Calabasas Road</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>Historical Museum</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Reyes Adobe</td>
<td>Reyes Adobe Road at Rainbow Crest Drive</td>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>Closed, city plans to restore and turn site into historical museum</td>
<td>1797-1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sepulveda Adobe</td>
<td>Mulholland Highway at Las Virgenes Canyon Road</td>
<td>Malibu Creek State Park</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Catalina Verdugo Adobe</td>
<td>2211 Bonita Avenue</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Park ranger HQ for Glendale Rec and Parks, plan to turn into museum</td>
<td>1860-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 La Casa Adobe de San Rafael</td>
<td>1330 Dorothy Drive</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Owned by city, open to public 2 days/week</td>
<td>1872-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Rancho La Liebre Adobe</td>
<td>Tejon Ranch Company, State Route 138</td>
<td>10 mi. e. of Gorman</td>
<td>Private land, not open to public</td>
<td>late 1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 La Casa de Miguel Ortiz</td>
<td>13980 Elizabeth Lake Road</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lake</td>
<td>Private residence, not open to public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Avila Adobe</td>
<td>10 E. Olvera Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Available for tours</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rancho Los Feliz Adobe</td>
<td>Griffith Park, 4730 Crystal Springs Drive</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>HQ for park rangers, Griffith Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Rancho La Brea Adobe (Gilmore Adobe)</td>
<td>6333 W. 3rd Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Private office</td>
<td>1828-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Rocha Adobe</td>
<td>2400 Shenandoah Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Rancho La Cienega O'Paso de La Tijera</td>
<td>3725 Don Felipe Drive</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Private offices</td>
<td>late 1770s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 The Centinela Adobe</td>
<td>7634 Midfield Avenue</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Houses local artifacts, open to public</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Rancho San Pedro (Dominguez Ranch Adobe)</td>
<td>18127 Alameda Street</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>Museum, open to public</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Rancho Los Cerritos Adobe</td>
<td>4600 Virginia Road</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Museum and library, open to public</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Rancho Los Alamitos Adobe</td>
<td>6400 Bixby Hill Road</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Adobe and gardens open to public as a museum</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Juan Matias Sanchez Adobe</td>
<td>946 Adobe Avenue</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>open to public for guided tours</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Flores Adobe</td>
<td>1804 Foothill Street</td>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Michael White Adobe</td>
<td>2701 Huntington Drive</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>Private property, on school site</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 San Gabriel Adobes</td>
<td>315 Orange Street</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>early 1770s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hugo Reid Adobe</td>
<td>Los Angeles State and County Arboretum, 601 Baldwin Avenue</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Interior not open but viewable through windows; Part of LA State and County Arboretum in Arcadia</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pio Pico Mansion</td>
<td>6003 Whittier Blvd.</td>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>Museum, open to public</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 William Workman Adobe</td>
<td>15415 East Don Julian Road</td>
<td>City of Industry</td>
<td>Major alterations,</td>
<td>1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 William R. Rowland Ranch House</td>
<td>Lemon Creek Park, 130 Avenida Alipaz</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>By appointment only</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 La Casa Primera</td>
<td>1569 N. Park Avenue</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Museum, open to public</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 La Casa Alvarado</td>
<td>1459 Old Settlers Lane</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Adobe de Palomares (La Casa Madera)</td>
<td>491 E. Arrow Highway</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Open to public</td>
<td>1850-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 La Casa de Carrion</td>
<td>919 Puddingstone Drive</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>Private residence</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adobe construction
The predominant mode of construction prior to the population boom of the 1880s was adobe. The benefits of adobe construction include climatic considerations. As a slow conductor of heat, adobe structures maintained a stable interior temperature despite wide climate fluctuations. Adobe structures were relatively small and consisted of only a few rooms, usually rectangular in plan, but less commonly L-, U-, or H-shaped. Ideally, adobe structures were constructed on high ground near a fresh water source. Stones cleared from the site were often used in the foundation. Made from readily available materials, adobe bricks were composed from mixture of water, earth, and clay found near the home site combined with straw or horse hair and sand to hold the mixture together. The wet mud-like substance was then poured into rectangular wood frames, typically eighteen inches by twenty four inches, and formed into bricks that were spread out and allowed to partially dry. At that point, the frames were removed, leaving the adobe brick to completely dry in the sun.

When the bricks were dry they were stacked on the foundation to create thick walls and held together with a mud mixed with sand. Traditionally, Southern California adobes were single-story buildings. By the mid-1800s, larger, more elaborate adobes and two-story adobe started to appear. Primitive adobes houses had thatched roofs made from tree-branches or tules.

---

(swamp rushes) found near rivers or streams. Later roofs were made from wood beams and planks. Brea was used to caulk the space between the planks. Generally roofs were flat. However, in the 1860s, adobes began adopting gabled roofs covered with wood shake. Although interior floors were initially packed earth, they were later lined with clay tile. Plaster was applied to walls. While this form of construction is generally quite durable, heavy rains can easily melt the walls without sufficient protection.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE
The Michael White Adobe was previously assessed in 1977 and found to be eligible for listing in the National Register under criterion B for its association with Michael White. This report confirms that finding of significance and eligibility. As evidenced by his oral history in 1877, Michael White was witness and participant to events pivotal to the development of Los Angeles County and Southern California. Constructing and residing at the property for 33 years, from 1845 until 1878, the subject property is the only extant property directly associated with Michael White. As the property is National Register eligible under criterion B, it is also California Register eligible under criterion 2 for the period 1845-1878, when White lost the property in a sheriff's sale.

The subject property is eligible for listing in the California Register under criterion 1 for its rare and unique property type as one of 39 remaining adobe houses in Los Angeles County. With only 39 examples, some of which are significantly altered, extant adobe structures are an increasingly rare and important building type. The Adobe is also California Register eligible for its method of construction under criterion 3. The period of significance for eligibility under criteria 1 and 3 is 1845, the construction date. Despite alterations, the subject property continues to express its adobe construction through its form, thick walls and deep openings.

While National Register eligibility under criterion A and C was considered, given losses of design, materials, workmanship and setting, the property was found to only meet California Register integrity standards which allow for some loss of integrity.

The subject property was designated a local historical landmark as one of the oldest buildings in San Marino. The only other building from this period is the Old Mill. This significance corresponds with National and California register criterion A/1, “associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.” This presumptive significance aligns with application of California Register criterion 1 noted above.

Due to the age of the subject property and the length of residency by Michael White and his family, there is the potential that the property could be eligible under criterion 4 for its ability to yield information important in history, specifically the adobe foundations as evidence of archaic construction technique or household artifacts as evidence of 19th century domestic use. Additional research by a Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA)-certified historic archaeologist would be required to document this significance, however given the high probability the site would yield significant information potential, it is found California Register eligible under criterion 4 for historic archaeology with a period of significance of 1845-circa 1920s, when sewer systems became prevalent.

IDENTIFICATION OF CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES
Based on alterations to the subject property described in detail above, it appears that character

---

36 Kielbasa, viii.
defining features are limited to the adobe walls. All other features appear to have been replaced or restored during the 1952-1956 restoration. Although some time has passed (53 years) since the restoration, none of the alterations appear to have taken on significance as they do not date from the period of significance when Michael White and his family resided at the subject property (1845–1878).

INTEGRITY
In addition to meeting one of the four criteria of the National or California Registers, properties must also retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance. A property either retains its integrity, the physical and visual characteristics necessary to convey its significance, or it does not. The seven aspects of integrity are: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. To retain its historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these aspects.

The subject property retains its integrity of location, as it has not been moved. In addition, the subject property retains its integrity of design. As seen in historic photographs, the existing form, plan, space, structure, and style of the subject property reflects its earlier period. Its integrity of setting (defined in part as relationships between buildings and other features, or open space), has been significantly compromised by surrounding athletic facilities, specifically construction of a swimming pool on two sides. Construction of the school and facilities obliterated any sense of an earlier rural setting of vineyards or orchards. The subject property generally retains its integrity of materials. Its most important material, adobe brick, is still evident in interpretive panels as well as in the deep openings for windows and doors. As the adobe construction is still evident, the subject property also generally retains integrity of workmanship, or evidence of artisans' labor and skill in constructing or altering a building.

Despite the loss of setting, the subject property’s feeling, or presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property’s original character, is still present. For its integrity of association to be retained, the property must be sufficiently intact to convey its earlier relationships to an observer. Comparing it with historic photographs, subject property appears to retain sufficient integrity of association.

Although there have been substantial physical alterations to the subject property since it was constructed, it appears to retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance and appears to retain its general form and structure from its period of significance.

THRESHOLDS FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS
Background
According to CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact to historical resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment as defined in §15064.5(b).

A substantial adverse change is defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(4)(b)(1), as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired, according to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(4)(b)(2), when a project:
(A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

(B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to §5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of §5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA. 37

Examples of substantial adverse change include, but are not limited to, the following:38

**Changes to the Resource**
- Physical destruction of, or damage to, all or part of an historical resource;
- Alteration of an historical resource, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines or technical advisories, where appropriate;39
- Relocation of an historical resource from its historic location in a manner that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines or technical advisories, where appropriate;40
- Change of the use that contribute to its historic significance;
- Neglect of an historical resource, which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and
- Transfer, lease, or sale of property without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.

**Changes to the Immediate Surroundings of the Resource**
- Change of the character of physical features within the historical resource’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;
- Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of an historical resource’s significant historic features;

CEQA Guidelines also specify a means of evaluating the relative significance of project impacts on historical resources. CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b)(3) state:
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37 §15064.5(4)(b)(2). Emphasis added.
38 These examples were taken from 36 CFR 800.5(2) of Section 106 Regulations.

Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Secretary’s Standards, Weeks and Grimmer, 1995), shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.  

Compliance with the Secretary’s Standards indicates that a project may have a less than significant impact on an historical resource. The converse of this does not hold; that is, failure to comply with the Secretary’s Standards is not, by definition, a significant impact under CEQA. CEQA recognizes that alterations that are not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards may still not result in significant impacts to the historical resource. Therefore, the significance of project impacts on an historical resource can be evaluated by determining:

- Whether a project is in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards (less than significant impact);
- Whether a project is in substantial conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and does not result in material impairment (less than significant impact);
- Or whether a project is not in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and results in material impairment (significant impact).

**Criteria for Determining Significant impacts**

For purposes of this analysis, the following are thresholds for determining if the project will result in a significant impact:

1. It results in alteration of an historical resource that is not in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and results in material impairment of the resource.
2. It results in a change of the character of the historical resource’s setting, through the introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that are not in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards, and results in material impairment of the resource’s setting.

**ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

The proposed project involves removal of the Michael White Adobe from the campus of the San Marino High School by demolition.

**Demolition**

Demolition of the Michael White Adobe would be accomplished by removing and disposing of the steel picket fence to the north and east, removing landscape plantings, demolishing both the north and south wings of the house including roof, wall and chimney structures, removing concrete and brick flatwork within the fenced area and brick floors inside the Adobe. Utilities would be capped and removed at the line of existing fencing. The existing plaque on pedestal from 1956 would be retained in situ or in place in the demolition scenario. Demolition of the former adobe would remove approximately six inches of the top surface of soil in order to provide for paving with asphalt or concrete with adequate drainage flow. No drawings were prepared for the demolition, however a description of the work was provided by contractor C.A.C. Construction, Inc. in a proposal dated July 7, 2009. No civil engineering drawings were
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41 §15604.5(b)(3).
provided to document asphalt or concrete flatwork necessary to cap the former site of the adobe.

Demolition of the adobe would materially impair the qualities that make the historical resource significant and render it ineligible for listing in the National and California Registers. Demolition activities would also disturb the soil surface surrounding and beneath the building and likely harm potentially significant subsurface cultural resources including archaic construction techniques such as may be found in the foundation, footing, or other materials bearing on native soil that support the adobe walls. In addition, evidence of domestic use may be disturbed. Thus, demolition would be a significant impact to both historical and cultural resources under CEQA.

Mitigation measures
The following mitigation measure for documentation will reduce but not eliminate significant historical resources impacts of demolition.

*Mitigation Measure for Documentation*
San Marino Unified School District shall engage a professional architectural photographer and an architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (Architectural Historian) to implement Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation of the current status of the adobe and its setting consisting of both photographs and a written narrative. The Architectural Historian shall direct the photographer to take images that duplicate views shown in the 1936 HABS documentation as well additional views. No less than 15 photographs shall be used to document the current status of the adobe and its setting. The photographs shall be large format, 4-inch by 5-inch, black and white negatives (two sets), contact prints (one set) and 8-inch by 10-inch prints (two sets). All shall be archivally processed and prints shall be made on fiber-based paper. Two original negatives shall be made at the time the photographs are taken. One set of negatives shall travel with set of contact prints to the National Park Service for entry into the HABS collection in the Library of Congress; the second set of negatives shall be transmitted to the San Marino Public Library along with one set of 8-inch by 10-inch prints. A second set of 8-inch by 10-inch prints shall be transmitted to the San Marino Historical Society. The written narrative shall reformat the information contained in this assessment and be transmitted to all the repositories named. Photocopies of the previous HABS documentation including drawings and photographs prepared in 1936 shall be transmitted to both the San Marino Public Library and San Marino Historical Society along with the contemporary work. The draft documentation shall be assembled by the Architectural Historian and submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval prior to submittal to the repositories. The District Superintendent or designee shall accept the final documentation prior to work on the Adobe site.

As provided in CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(b)(2), documentation will not reduce significant direct impacts of demolition of the Adobe to a less than significant level. Therefore, demolition of the Adobe will constitute a substantial adverse change in significance of an historical resource, and potential impacts to the historical resource shall not be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The following mitigation measure will reduce archaeological impacts to a level of less than significant.
Mitigation Measure for Archaeology

San Marino Unified School District shall engage a Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) certified archaeologist (Archaeologist) to prepare a predictive archaeological model and treatment plan, including a monitoring program. The treatment plan shall include a plan for recovery of significant information including documentation of any foundations, footings or other subsurface evidence of adobe construction and 19th and early 20th century domestic use. The Archaeologist shall implement the treatment plan by monitoring construction activities on the Adobe site at all times that ground disturbing work is under way. Artifacts recovered from the Adobe site shall be made available to local repositories including the San Marino Historical Society, Old Mill Foundation and Huntington Library, however the recovered artifacts may be disposed of if no local repository is willing or able to accept them. The draft predictive archaeological model and treatment plan shall be assembled by the Archaeologist and submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval and the District Superintendent or designee shall accept the final predictive archaeological model and treatment plan prior to work on the Adobe site. The final report documenting information and artifact recovery shall be submitted to the District Superintendent or designee for review and approval and when approved, shall be transmitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton for entry into the records of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS).

Recovery of the scientifically consequential information will reduce significant impacts of demolition of archaeological or cultural resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, demolition of the Adobe with application of the Mitigation Measure for Archaeology will not constitute a substantial adverse change in significance of a cultural resource, and potential cultural resources impacts shall be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The following recommendation is made to address personal property at the Adobe site.

Recommendation for Salvage

The period furnishings, ephemera and other personal property contained within the Adobe appear to be the property of the San Marino Historical Society and shall be returned to the owner or set aside prior to commencement of any construction activity, including demolition and site preparation, on the property.

As none of the personal property was identified as a historical or cultural resource, this is only a recommendation for project implementation.

Level of significance after Mitigation

Demolition cannot be accomplished in conformance with the Secretary's Standards and demolition by its nature is material impairment of the historical resource and thus, impacts would remain significant after mitigation. Cultural resources impacts can be mitigated to a less than significance level with implementation of the Mitigation Measure for Archaeology.
ALTERNATIVES
Alternatives to the project were evaluated in attempt to consider impact reducing measures. All alternatives strive to achieve the basic program elements of the proposed project to remove the Adobe from the high school campus while minimizing historical and cultural resources impacts. It must be stated at the outset the California Historical Building Code (CHBC, Part 8 of Title 24, California Building Code) was considered as an essential component each alternative analysis and would be used as the code alternative for implementation should a feasible alternative be selected by decision makers. Relocation off site would be permitted by the City of San Marino and stabilization in situ or in place would be permitted by the Division of the State Architect (DSA). As noted in greater detail below, while DSA has a policy in place to address existing non-conforming buildings on school campuses, it is unlikely that the CHBC would provide any relief from the prevailing code.

No Project
The no project alternative would not meet the project objective of removing the Adobe from the high school campus. The no project alternative would maintain or preserve the Adobe in its current condition with limited public accessibility. Preservation of the Adobe in situ or in place with the same level of maintenance afforded it over the last several years is a cause of concern. Evidence of rising damp and thus moisture infiltration in the east wall of the south wing could be a condition found elsewhere in the building and could eventually lead to severe damage if unchecked. The San Marino Unified School District is not in the business of maintaining non-school function buildings and has no plan to do so. Without a formal agreement with another organization, such as the San Marino Historical Society, to maintain the Adobe and provide for limited public use, the building is seen as an eyesore, restricts student use and will continue to be poorly maintained. While maintenance is preservation under the Secretary’s Standards, there is no maintenance, stabilization or mothballing implementation plan, and thus the no project alternative will continue to have a potentially significant impact on the historical resource.

Level of significance after mitigation
The no project alternative would be conformance with the Secretary’s Standards if steps were taken to maintain the adobe structure and make it available to the public. As neither of these approaches are workable for the San Marino United School District, the no project alternative appears to have a potentially significant impact.

Relocation and Stabilization at Lacy Park
Relocation of the Michael White Adobe would be accomplished by removing and disposing of the steel picket fence to the north and east, removing landscape plantings, demolishing roof and chimney structures, removing concrete and brick flatwork within the fenced area and brick floors inside the Adobe. Utilities would be capped and removed at the line of existing fencing. The existing plaque on pedestal from 1956 would be moved in the relocation scenario. Relocation of the Adobe would remove approximately four feet of the top surface of soil in order to provide for jacking, cribbing and steel girders to facilitate the move. Relocation would require the same work to cap the site as noted under demolition. The relocation work is described in sketches prepared by structural engineer Michael Krakower, SE of Krakower & Associates (Krakower) dated June 18, 22 and 23, 2009 (Figures 80-82). These drawings were prepared in consultation with the author Robert Chattel, AIA (Chattel), project architect Tammy Schaeffer, AIA of Carmichael-Kemp Architects (Carmichael-Kemp), mover Ralph Clark of American Heavy Moving and Rigging, Inc. and contractor Jeff Seidner of Eagle Restorations Group, Inc. (Eagle) (collectively, A/E team). In addition to the three Krakower sketches, construction steps for
staging and relocation are further described in a report prepared by Carmichael-Kemp dated June 23, 2009 (Figure 83, pages 1-3).

The following is a summary of steps for staging and relocation of the Adobe from San Marino High School (donor site) to Lacy Park (receiver site). In order to prepare the Adobe, once the site flatwork, brick flooring and chimney are removed, the footings of each wing of the adobe would be exposed by excavating in a sequential pattern below the adobe walls to replace the existing footing with a new reinforced concrete bond beam. The new bond beam installed at the base of the adobe walls will be used both during the relocation process and as part of the new foundation at the receiver site. The existing ceiling and roof structures will be removed and the adobe walls sandwiched with plywood and wood stud temporary walls (falsework) on both sides of the adobe wall. The adobe wall will be protected with batt insulation prior to placement of the plywood falsework and all thread with washers will be through-bolted in the adobe walls. In order to stabilize the top of the adobe walls, additional temporary steel X-braces or a plywood diaphragm will be applied. There will also be bolster or other temporary structures applied to the interior of the two wings to ensure their stability during the move. It is the opinion of the A/E team that relocation of the Adobe from the donor site, following the procedure outlined in the sketches and report, to the receiver site is technically feasible.

The preliminary move route is described in a map (Figure 69) and the general location at the receiver site in Lacy Park is described as the receiver site zone (Figures 70-79). The San Marino City Council has approved Lacy Park and the receiver site zone as an acceptable location for relocation of the Adobe on its property. A map showing a specific location described as Alternate 3 (Figure 71) was provided for City Council consideration; however it is understood that a more suitable location in proximity to the Thurnher House at the entrance to Lacy Park is an acceptable minor modification of the City Council-approved receiver site. The relocation site shown in Figure 71 would place the Adobe immediately east of the Thurnher House on a site currently occupied by a lawn and several old growth trees, including at least three substantial oak trees. As proposed at this specific receiver site, relocation and placement of the Adobe may require removal of some of these trees as placing an adobe structure within the canopy of a tree would be inappropriate. In addition, Figure 71 appears to change the compass orientation of the relocated Adobe, which should be carefully considered.

When the Adobe is relocated it will be placed on a new foundation as shown in a Krakower sketch. Grading, compaction and other preparation of the receiver site including stubbed out utilities would need to further documented. It should be noted that the relocation scenario does not include full rehabilitation of the Adobe, but rather stabilization only. Stabilization in the relocation involves placement of the adobe structure on the new foundation with sufficient site work to ensure water flow away from the adobe structure, construction of new roof structures and sheathing, and patching of exterior surfaces as necessary all to provide a watertight assembly. It is anticipated that a new chimney, flooring, and other work will be required to fully rehabilitate the relocated Adobe for use.

Relocation of the Adobe from the donor to receiver site will require implementation of the Mitigation Measure for Documentation, Mitigation Measure for Archaeology and Recommendation for Salvage. In addition, the following mitigation measure is provided to ensure that feasibility of the relocation and stabilization of the Adobe on the receiver site is successful. The following mitigation measure will reduce historical resources impacts to a level of less than significant. As the exact siting of the relocated adobe is in flux, the following mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts of inappropriate siting.
Mitigation Measure for Relocation and Stabilization

San Marino Unified School District shall engage a qualified architectural and engineering team (preservation consultants) to plan and move the Adobe from the donor site at San Marino High School to the receiver site at Lacy Park. The preliminary maps, sketches and reports prepared for the relocation shall serve to guide all future associated work through design development, construction documents, and construction administration. The architect on the team shall meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in historic architecture and the structural engineer shall have a minimum of 10 years experience in historic preservation projects of a similar nature including work on adobe structures. The mover and contractor responsible for implementing the work shall meet like minimum qualifications standards. The preservation consultants shall recommend the final receiver site employing the criteria contained in Moving Historic Buildings, particularly with respect to appropriate solar orientation and relationship to other site features and the Secretary’s Standards shall be employed to minimize harm and maximize preservation of physical character. Construction documents prepared by the preservation consultants, including the final relocation route, shall be reviewed and approved by the District Superintendent or designee and receive all required clearances from governmental agencies with jurisdiction over the relocation route prior to commencing any work on the donor site. The San Marino Unified School District and preservation consultants shall seek early consultation with local governmental agencies and shall use the California Historical Building Code (Part 8 of Title 24) to the maximum extent possible.

Level of significance after Mitigation
The level of significance after mitigation for the relocation to and stabilization of the Adobe at Lacy Park would be less than significant because the important character-defining feature of the Adobe, essentially the adobe walls, would remain intact and be visible to the public. The Adobe would be stabilized on a new foundation and be watertight. The Adobe would be operated in a manner similar to the Thurnher House and accessible on a regular basis to the public. While there are impacts caused by the work necessary to move the structure, relocation and stabilization can be accomplished in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards. Cultural resources impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of the Mitigation Measure for Archaeology.

In addition, the relocation to Lacy Park would provide the Adobe with a more appropriate setting than its current location at the San Marino High School campus. Rehabilitation guidelines42 of the Secretary’s Standards define setting as, “The area or environment in which a historic property is found,” and recommends, “Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and landscape features of the setting.” The current setting is has been severely compromised and is inappropriate an adobe built in the 1800s would not have been constructed within a school campus surrounded by athletic facilities, but rather would have been located in a more rural setting appropriate for residential use. Relocation and stabilization at Lacy Park would provide a more historically appropriate setting for the Adobe than its current placement within the high school campus, supporting the notion that relocation and stabilization is an environmentally superior choice when compared to leaving the adobe in place.

42 The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (National Park Service, 1997), 77.
The following alternatives were considered but rejected as infeasible.

**Relocation and Stabilization at Huntington and Gainsborough Drive**

Relocation of the Adobe elsewhere on the San Marino High School campus including possible placement at the northwest corner of Huntington and Gainsborough Drives was considered but rejected as infeasible. Use of the Rotary Park as the receiver site would severely restrict available parking allocated to school use. In addition, because the proximity of placing the relocated Adobe adjacent to the Thurnher House in Lacy Park, which is operated by the San Marino Historical Society, would provide for greater accessibility by the public. If the Adobe were relocated to Huntington and Gainsborough Drives and not used by students and fenced from the campus, this option would have the same impacts but with limited public use similar to the no project alternative. Relocation to Lacy Park due to the fact it would provide greater access to the public was thus found to be preferable, critical parking at the high school not be displaced, and thus the Huntington and Gainsborough Drives site was not further studied.

The following alternatives were considered but rejected for the reasons noted. The first rejected alternative involves reconstruction brick by brick at either Lacy Park. Reconstruction is a more invasive alternative than rehabilitation and would likely cause greater loss of historic building fabric due the fragility of the material. As this more invasive approach is less preferable to alternative for relocation described above, it was rejected. Retention of the Adobe *in situ* or in place was also considered and rejected because of the requirements for compliance with the Field Act and associated Division of the State Architect policies regarding existing non-conforming buildings proposed for public school and student use. This alternative would not retain visibility of the adobe walls and thus was rejected.

**Relocation and Stabilization by reconstruction**

An alternative method of relocating the Adobe was also considered by the Krakower and Eagle. The alternative method by careful removal of plaster of each side of the adobe walls and taking the adobe walls apart brick by brick, documenting the location of each brick for reconstruction. Damaged brick would be replaced with stabilized and unstabilized adobe units. In this method, the adobe walls at the receiver site would have embedded reinforced concrete columns at corners that continue down into the subgrade analogous to a flag pole. Stone footings could be placed between the columns subgrade and adobe brick placed between the columns above grade. While this may be a cost effective way of relocating the Adobe, it appears this methodology would fall in the range of reconstruction rather than rehabilitation. As reconstruction involves the potential greater loss of fragile archaic material, including material infilling joints in the adobe brick walls, it seems this approach would be less preferable in a strict application of the *Secretary's Standards* because it is more invasive than relocating the two adobe structures as described above. This reconstruction method would nevertheless have a less than significant impact to the historical resource. It may have a reduced cost, but a potentially higher loss of historic building material or fabric. Therefore, this alternative method of relocation, which applies to the Lacy Park receiver site, is less preferable because of the potential loss of historic building fabric involved in the more invasive reconstruction approach.

**Stabilization in situ or in place**

If the Adobe remained on the campus, it could remained fenced and be operated as it has for the last several years with limited public use and no student use. If the Adobe were to be used by students for any period of time, it would require further stabilization under Division of the State Architect (DSA) requirements prepared and promulgated for existing non-conforming buildings for school use (*Figure 85*). It should be noted again that the CHBC would apply to the Adobe, however because DSA regulations outweigh the structural provisions of the alternative
code, its application would be limited. Chattel, Krakower and Carmichael-Kemp met with regional representatives of DSA to explore the opportunity to allow limited student use of the Adobe. It should be noted that the Los Angeles Regional Office of DSA has not approved any non-conforming building for school use and it appears that no adobe construction exists for use by students on any campus governed by DSA requirements in the region. Based on the conversation with DSA representatives, Krakower and Carmichael-Kemp prepared a sketch dated June 23, 2009 (Figure 84) and report dated June 23, 2009 describing construction steps for upgrading the Adobe in place for use by students (Figure 83, pages 4-6). The sketch describes the need to remove a sufficient area of the existing footing or foundation to install a new reinforced concrete footing to support plywood and wood stud walls which will permanently encase or encapsulate the existing adobe structure. The new foundation for the plywood and wood stud walls would placed so as to avoid the existing condition of the foundation supporting the adobe wall. The existing ceiling and roof structures will be supplemented with plywood diaphragms and provide additional support at the top of the adobe wall with installation of permanent anchors set in epoxy resin. Similar to the relocated adobe, the adobe walls will be protected with batt insulation prior to placement of the permanent plywood and wood stud walls and all thread with washers will be through-bolted in the adobe walls.

While stabilization of the Adobe in situ or in place would allow the adobe structure to remain, it would no longer be visible on either the exterior or interior of the building. Permanent encapsulation of the adobe walls might be considered in conformance with the reversibility concept described in rehabilitation standard 10, “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.” However, the most important feature of the historical resource would no longer visible and thus would violate rehabilitation standard 2, “The historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.” Concern is also expressed for encapsulating the adobe walls in a manner that might accelerate deterioration by retaining moisture behind the enclosure walls. This could cause possible future deterioration to go unchecked. As such, the permanent encapsulation of the adobe walls, while it would allow for student use, would not conform to the Secretary’s Standards. Disturbance of the potential archaeological information in the area of the new foundations would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the Mitigation Measure for Archaeology.
CONCLUSION
The subject property is identified herein as appearing eligible for listing in the National and California Registers and is thus a historical resource. The proposed project includes removal of the Adobe from the high school campus by demolition. Demolition is found to have a significant adverse impact on the historical resource and while mitigation measures are applied to the demolition scenario, historical resources impacts remain significant and cultural (archaeological) resources impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. The alternative considered for relocation and stabilization in a potential relocation zone at Lacy Park is found to have a less than significant impact on the historical resource as well as on cultural resources and would also have a beneficial impact on setting, highlighting relocation and stabilization at Lacy Park as environmentally superior. To ensure less than significant impacts of the relocation and stabilization scenario additional mitigation measures are provided. Other alternatives including relocation to Gainsborough and Huntington Drives and reconstruction were also considered but were not found preferable. The Secretary’s Standards and California Historical Building Code are used in both the evaluation of the proposed project and in the mitigation measures, as well as in consideration of alternatives.
Historic Photographs and other documentation
Figure 1: South elevation (left) and north elevation of south wing (right), note two story wood frame addition, view northwest (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)

Figure 2: North elevation (left) and south elevation (right), note two story wood frame addition, view southeast (Los Angeles Public Library, 1936)

Figure 3: East elevation, south wing (left) and north wing (right), note east porch used as a garage, view southwest (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)

Figure 4: West elevation, view northeast (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)
Figure 5: South elevation (left) and east elevation of south wing (right), note two story wood frame addition, view northwest (San Marino Historical Society, nd)

Figure 6: East elevation, note two story wood frame addition, view west (Huntington Library from the collection of Helen S. Giffen, nd)

Figure 7: East elevation, view southwest (Los Angeles Public Library, nd)

Figure 8: South elevation, view northwest (San Marino Historical Society, 1947)
Figure 9: West elevation (left) and south elevation (right), view northeast (San Marino Historical Society, 1947)

Figure 10: South elevation, view northwest (San Marino Historical Society, 1947)

Figure 11: North elevation, south wing (left) and north wing (right), view southwest (San Marino Historical Society, 1952)

Figure 12: South and east elevations, view northwest (San Marino Historical Society, 1952)
Figure 13: Detail of east elevation (San Marino Historical Society, 1952)

Figure 14: West elevation, view northeast (San Marino Historical Society, 1952)

Figure 15: Detail of east elevation (San Marino Historical Society, 1952)

Figure 16: South and east elevations, view northwest (San Marino Historical Society, 1952)
Figure 17: South elevation, view northwest (San Marino Historical Society, c. 1950s)

Figure 18: South elevation, note swimming pool, view north (San Marino Historical Society, nd)

Figure 19: East elevation corredores, view west (San Marino Historical Society, nd)

Figure 20: West and south elevations, view northeast (San Marino Historical Society, nd)
Figure 21: School children visiting Adobe (San Marino Historical Society, 1977)

Figure 22: K.L. Carver inside adobe, note earlier photographs (Figures 20-24) on mantel (San Marino Historical Society, c.1950s)

Figure 23: Interior of adobe with students (San Marino Historical Society, c.1950s)
Figure 24: Drawing of “South Front Elevation” (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)

Figure 25: Drawing of “East Side Elevation” (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)
Figure 26: Drawing of “North Side Elevation” (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)

Figure 27: Drawing of “Ground Floor Plan” (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)
Figure 28: Drawing of “Second Floor Plan” (Historic American Building Survey, 1936)
Figure 29: Michael White Adobe
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HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY

IDENTIFICATION
1. Common name: Miguel Blanco Adobe
2. Historic name, if known: Michael White Adobe
3. Street or road address: 2103 Huntington Drive
   City: San Marino
   ZIP: 91108
   County: Los Angeles
4. Present owner, if known: City of San Marino
   Address: 1655 West Drive
   City: San Marino
   ZIP: 91108
   Ownership: Public
5. Present use: Storage Building
   Original use: Private Residence

DESCRIPTION
6. Briefly describe the present physical appearance of the site or structure and describe any major alterations from its original condition.

Located in the northwest corner of the San Marino High School campus, the one-and-
half story adobe has a wood shake roof, wood frames around the doors and windows,
and two chimneys. The numerous alterations include exterior wiring for electricity,
addition of wire cages over the windows and doors, and addition of several windows.
White stucco now covers the original adobe foundation. K.L. Carver restored the
residence in 1959 but the interior and exterior have since been vandalized.

NOTE: The following items 14-16 are for structures only.
   f. Other
15. Is the structure a. On its original site b. Moved c. Unknown
16. Year of initial construction: 1892
17. Architect (if known):
18. Builder (if known):
   f. Windmill g. Watershed house h. Other i. Other

SIGNIFICANCE
20. Briefly state historical and/or architectural importance (include dates, events, and persons associated with the site when known).
   Michael Clarksfield White, called Miguel Blanco, was born in England and came to California in 1874. He was an accomplished artist who served
   in that capacity as well as a mail carrier for the Mexican government of California
   in the mid 1830's. In 1872 White married Maria del Rosario, daughter of Don Dolores
   de Ojuel, a politically powerful woman in Southern California. White was granted
   land (the Mexican government in 1861) and built his adobe several years later.
   In orchard and vineyard were also located on the property. Later owners included
   E.R. Titus and James Poore. San Marino High School has been built around the original
   structure.

21. (cont.)
22. (cont.)
23. Date of inventory: July 1977

Historical Society of Southern California. ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS, V. XIX., PART 1, 1958.
White, Michael C. CALIFORNIA: THE FIFTY YEARS 
Los Angeles: Glen Dawson, 1951. (cont.)
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Historical Society of Southern California. ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS, V. XIX., PART 1, 1958.
White, Michael C. CALIFORNIA: THE FIFTY YEARS 
Los Angeles: Glen Dawson, 1951. (cont.)
Contemporary Photographs
Figure 30: East elevation, south wing (left) and north wing (right), view southwest (Chattel Architecture, Planning & Preservation, Inc. (CA), 2008)

Figure 31: North wing, east elevation (left) and north elevation (right), view southwest (San Marino School District (SMSD), 2008)

Figure 32: Detail of porch along east elevation, south wing, view south-east (SMSD, 2008)

Figure 33: West elevation, north wing (left) and south wing (right), view northeast across pool (CA, 2008)
Figure 34: South elevation, south wing (left) and east elevation, south wing (right), view northwest (CA, 2008)

Figure 35: Detail of porch along south elevation, south wing, view west (SMSD, 2008)

Figure 36: Porch along south elevation, south wing, view east (CA, 2009)

Figure 37: Detail of porch roof along south elevation, view west (CA, 2009)
Figure 42: Interior of north wing, view northeast (CA, 2008)

Figure 43: Detail of window on north wing, view northwest (CA, 2009)

Figure 44: Interior of north wing, view southwest (CA, 2008)

Figure 45: Interior of north wing, view northeast, note evidence of chimney remnant in upper right corner of photo, (CA, 2008)
Figure 46: Detail of north wing, view west (CA, 2009)

Figure 47: Interior of north wing with infilled window, view east (CA, 2009)

Figure 48: Connection between north and south wings, note panel removed to reveal adobe construction, view south-east (CA, 2008)

Figure 49: Detail of adobe construction, view east, note north wing wall (left) and south wing wall (right) with gap (CA, 2009)
Figure 50: Interior of south wing, west room, view northeast (CA, 2008)

Figure 51: Fireplace in south wing, west room, view southeast, note door to south elevation porch (CA, 2008)

Figure 52: Interior of south wing, east room, view northeast (CA, 2009)

Figure 53: Interior of south wing, east room, view southeast (CA, 2009)
Figure 54: Interior of south wing, east elevation (background), note cracked wall (CA, 2009)

Figure 55: Detail of cracked wall (CA, 2009)

Figure 56: South wing attic, view west, note contemporary roof framing (CA, 2009)

Figure 57: South wing attic, view east, note contemporary roof framing (CA, 2009)
Maps and Aerial Photographs
Figure 58: 1928 aerial photograph, subject property circled in red (source: Fairchild)

Figure 59: 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map
Figure 60: 1938 aerial photograph (source: USDA-ASCS)

Figure 61: 1949 aerial (source: Fairchild)
Figure 62: 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

Figure 63: 1953 aerial (source: USDA-ASCS)
Figure 64: 1959 aerial of San Marino High School campus (source: San Marino Historical Society)

Figure 65: 1961 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map
Figure 66: "The Old Spanish and Mexican Ranchos of Los Angeles County" (source: Title Insurance and Trust Company)

Figure 67: Extant adobes in Los Angeles County.
Engineering drawings and
Division of the State Architect Policy
Scope and Intent

Introduction

The historic Michael White Adobe in San Marino is located on the grounds of San Marino High School. There is a community interest in preserving this structure representing the early history of San Marino as well as the Los Angeles region.

The adobe, being located on the grounds of the San Marino High School, is restricted from use by several factors. In addition there are issues relative to the preservation of the building due to environmental and site condition.

In support of the efforts to determine the preservation possibilities for the building, Melvyn Green and Associates was retained by the San Marino Historical Society with additional support from the City of San Marino and the San Marino School District.

This report summarizes the observations and findings for consideration by the involved parties.
Methodology and Limitations

The building was inspected in the field and the materials and details of its construction were identified.

Informal discussions were held with representatives of the Division of State Architect (DSA) which regulates school building construction, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) personnel.

Figure 1 - Plan of the Michael White Adobe in San Marino.
Building Structural Description

Overview

The building is a three room structure apparently constructed in two phases. A plan is shown in Figure 1. The planning of the construction and the specific era of the work is not known but should be studied by a historian.

The building is "L" shaped. The southern two rooms are in an adobe building that measures about 31 feet 9 inches by 20 feet outside to outside. The dividing wall is wood construction. It is possible that this was initially one large room later divided into two rooms. There is a brick fireplace approximately in the center of the space.

The north room measures about 14 feet 4 inches by 17 feet 8 inches outside to outside. This room has a bathroom in the north west corner.

It appears that the building may have been constructed as two structures as the wall between the north and south rooms is double wide, 3 feet 3 inches total thickness.

Each wing has a gable type roof. The gable ends are wood.

There is a porch on the south side of the building and one on the north part of the east side of the structure. The porch construction has very attractive detailing at the post and beam connections.

Structural Description

Foundations

The foundations were not visible. Typically the construction of adobe buildings begins with a rubble stone foundation. The foundation extends above grade by 6 inches or more. The stones are not mortared. This type of construction permits any ground water, rising damp, to be evaporated at grade. In this manner the water does not enter the adobe wall causing deterioration.

Often, in the building's later life the stones are mortared by later owners. As the years progress, the foundation stones are often covered with earth and planting. (Historically the environment was desert with sparse landscaping on the site and adjacent to buildings.)

The floor is of red brick construction, possibly over a concrete slab on grade. Traditionally adobe buildings had dirt floors, later these were covered with wood on sleepers. Termites and moisture deteriorated the wood, ultimately resulting is their replacement with a concrete slab.

Adobe Walls

The adobe walls of the south portion of the building are of earthen material measuring about 1 foot 8 inches in thickness. Wall height was measured at between 7 and 8 feet. No concrete bond beam was observed at the top of the walls.

The adobe walls of the north building measured 13 inches in thickness. The height was measured as approximately 7 feet. The roof slope is such that the walls are much lower than the ceiling.

Roof Construction

The roof construction consists of typical rafter and ceiling joist type construction. Observed rafters were 2 X 4 lumber spaced at 16 inches on center. The sheathing on top of the roof was not observed but assumed to be 1 X 6 spaced sheathing.

Porch roofs were framed with 2 X 4 rafters at 24 inches on center with solid sheathing. These are supported by 6 inch by 8 inch beams. Beams are supported by 6 inch by 6 inch posts. The porch post foundations were not observed.

The roof of the north building is quite steep, a 6:12 slope. The adjacent porch has a 3:12 slope. The roof covering is wood shingles.

Interior Walls and Ceiling

The interior walls are wood frame construction. All adobe walls have a gypsum plaster finish. The toilet room has wooden boards as the wall finish.

The ceilings are 1 X wood boards nailed to the ceiling joists.
Photo 2 - Northeast view of the structure.

Photo 3 - Interior of north room. Sloped ceiling is the building’s roof.

Photo 4 - Interior of southwest room showing wall and ceiling finish.

Photo 5 - Brick floor. Water damage on wall. This is caused by moisture rising from the ground.
Issues and Options

Overview

The community faces several choices for the building. These are preservation in place, relocating the building to a new site and third documenting the building in an archival manner and consider demolition.

These three options are discussed below.

Preservation in Place

The preferred preservation approach is for the building to remain to be preserved in place.

Current Condition

The building is an unreinforced masonry building. It is considered a potential earthquake hazard. It may not be used by students or school personnel.

State regulations require that the building be fenced. The building is currently fenced on all sides. Public access is only by appointment. Therefore it is currently in compliance with state school safety regulations.

Options

If the building is to be used, by the public or students, it would require seismic strengthening. Under the State Historic Building Code (SHBC) it is considered as providing a reasonable degree of life safety if the walls are within a certain height to thickness (h/t) ratio, that there is a bond beam at the top of the walls and that the shear in the walls meets a calculated stress limit.

This building does not have a bond beam. The walls of the north room have an h/t ratio of 6.5 which exceeds the 6.0 limit of the SHBC. Walls of the south rooms have an h/t of 4.5, which is within the limit.

Since the building has only a few windows, the shear is within the allowable limit.

Regardless of the SHBC criteria, the DSA would express great concern about the safety of the adobe structure. To meet their requirements for school use, the walls of the building would have to be reinforced. This would be accomplished by placing a layer of reinforcing steel on the interior side of the wall, attaching the reinforcing steel to the adobe with epoxy anchors, and applying a 3 inch, or more, layer of Shotcrete to the surface. (Shotcrete is a spray-on concrete.) In addition
there may have to be a concrete foundation constructed under the new structure material. The roof would have to be anchored to the new wall material and have a layer of plywood applied to act as a diaphragm to brace and transfer the loads. It is not probable that part or all of the roof framing would require replacement.

New electrical would probably be required. A decision on whether to retain the toilet would be necessary.

Obviously work on school property would have to meet the construction safety requirements as well as prevailing wage rules for public projects.

Costs
In earlier discussions we discussed the possible costs. Currently we would expect the cost to be more than $500,000.

Relocation to a New Site
Relocation in place would permit rehabilitation of the structure and its continued reuse.

Current Conditions
The building is adobe construction and the individual masonry units are not bonded together with a mortar of reasonable strength.

Options
If the building were to be relocated the general procedure would be as follows:

The interior walls would be braced on both the interior and exterior surfaces. This would be accomplished by placing a layer of plywood on both surfaces, placing vertical "studs" about every two feet. Over this would be horizontal 4 X 6 timbers near the top, bottom and center. These would be tied through the wall with bolts. In addition there would have to be a diagonal bracing system in each direction.

A platform of steel beams would be placed under the building to lift it onto wheels for moving.

It is expected from the observations of the building, that this is actually the moving of two buildings, the north structure and the south structure.

In order to move the building, it is probable that the roof would have to be removed. Whether it can be reused would depend on its condition. (Historical research may show a different shaped roof on the building than the current configuration.)

At the new site a foundation would have to be constructed. This would be a "simple" concrete foundation. The relocated building would be set on the new foundation. Then a bond beam would be cast at the top of the walls. The roof would then be placed on the structure or a new roof constructed. This would be followed by interior repairs and construction including the wood walls and plaster. The fireplace is not expected to be moved but would be reconstructed.

It is not expected that the building on the new site would have any interior toilet facilities. New electrical and lighting would be necessary.

This type of move is risky. It is possible that some of the adobe may come loose during the move and require additional repair and reconstruction.

Costs
The cost for this move might be in the range of $40,000 or less including new electrical work. Work to prepare the new site is not included in this estimate.

Retain the Building in Place
The status quo remains an option for the building. At this time it meets all safety requirements to remain on the school grounds. It should have a bond beam constructed to improve seismic safety.

There is the potential for continuing deterioration to the structure from the adjacent uses. It is unclear how much water may be working its way into the building with the potential for damage.

Costs for improving seismic safety would be in the range of $100,000.

Demolition
Demolition of the building would permit the school district to use the area where the building is currently exist and create a plan for the athletic facilities.

As an historical building its demolition would require an Environmental Impact Report. The report would require review of all options, such as discussed herein and mitigation measures. As a minimum the building would have to be documented to meet the archival requirements of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and the Library of Congress. Recent court rulings have limited the documentation option without rigorous examination of alternatives.

This cost would have to be borne by the school district.
Summary and Next Steps

The building, as it is, is not under any legal requirements for any construction work as long as students and school staff are kept out of the building.

A plan for use of the building at the school site or at a relocation site is necessary create a path for activities, regardless of which path is followed. The following activities should be considered:

Historic and Archival Research

A more in-depth documentation and history of the building should be developed. Whether it was constructed as two building is a question. What did the original roof look like, the pitch is the north room is very steep. What other historic evidence is available.

Design

Reuse of the building will require the services of a knowledgeable preservation architect to assist in developing a reuse and rehabilitation plan.

If the building is relocated a set of engineering constraction documents must be developed.

Grant Search

The opportunities for obtaining grants should be explored.

Listing

While it is an historic building of local interest, it is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It should be verified whether it is listed on the State Register or on a local survey. This information will assist in determining if any grants are available for future work.

Resolution of Program

Understanding the options presented in this report should permit the Historical Society and the city to develop a plan for use or relocation of the building.
Figure 69: Map of relocation route from San Marino High School (donor) to Lacy Park (receiver).
(Google Maps)

Distance: ~1.4 mi.

Figure 70: Map of Lacy Park showing proposed relocation site. Note that alternative locations within Lacy Park are also under consideration. (Base map located online, http://www.ci.san-marino.ca.us/pdf_forms/publicworks/MAP8A_Reservation_Areas.pdf)

Figure 71: Sketch detailing proposed relocation site within Lacy Park.

ALTERNATE 3
Figure 72: Entrance to Lacy Park, possible receiver site for Adobe, view southwest (CA, 2009)

Figure 73: View of potential relocation site for Adobe from Virginia Road, view southwest (CA, 2009)

Figure 74: Historic Thurnher House in Lacy Park, south elevation, view northeast, note Adobe would be relocated near the house (CA, 2009)

Figure 75: East elevation of Thurnher House, view west (CA, 2009)
Figure 80: Jacking plan for Adobe relocation, June 18, 2009. (Drawing prepared by Michael Krakower)

Figure 81: Sketch detailing stabilization of adobe walls for relocation, June 22, 2009. (Drawing prepared by Michael Krakower)
Figure 82: New (receiver) site schematic for Adobe relocation. (Drawing prepared by Michael Krakower)
Figure 83: Report detailing Construction Steps for Staging and Relocation of Adobe prepared by Carmichael Kemp Architects
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MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE AT SAN MARINO HIGH SCHOOL
CONSTRUCTION STEPS FOR STAGING & RELOCATION OF ADOBE

1. The following description is based on 3 sketches prepared by Michael Krakower as follows, all attached:
   - dated June 18, 2009, entitled "MOVE"
   - dated June 22, 2009, entitled "MOVE"
   - dated June 23, 2009, entitled "NEW SITE SCHEMATIC"

2. The preliminary cost estimates will be based on prevailing wage labor rates, and will assume normal working hours and shifts.

3. There will be an Archaeological Monitor and/or Historical Monitor present during the staging and relocation of the adobe.

4. Demolition shall be with rotary non-impact type equipment only. Impact type tools are not permitted.

5. Building will be split into two sections for moving and relocation at the existing construction joint between the two sections of the building. A steel plate or some sort of sheeting will be slipped in between the two sections to stabilize the adobe when the first building section is pulled away from the remaining building section.

6. The roof will be removed and discarded. A new roof will be constructed at the new site. A plywood diaphragm will be installed to brace and anchor the tops of the adobe walls for relocation, after the existing roof is removed.

7. The existing window and door openings will be braced with 2x wood members.

8. The existing brick floor and/or slab will be removed and discarded.

9. The existing fireplace will be demolished.

10. The existing interior stud framed partition walls and the toilet shall be removed.

11. All doors have to be removed to allow the bottom bond beam to be continuous through the door-ways. It might be easier to remove the windows also.

12. All adjacent conflicting underground and above ground site utilities, exterior porches, 2 trees on the north side, planters and landscaping have to be removed prior to the move.

13. The existing exterior plaster finish on the adobe walls will remain. The assumption is that the existing adobe walls have no structural integrity or value. The adobe walls will be encapsulated and braced for relocation and structural stabilization by installing two stud framed walls, one on each side of the existing adobe walls, with plywood adjacent to the adobe face. Some thru bolting, stud wall to stud wall, sucking the plywood tight to the adobe may be required, yet the adobe walls should not be crushed. In order to prevent crushing or damaging the adobe, there should be a compressable layer of material between the encapsulating plywood sheathing and the plaster of the adobe. One method might be by fastening batt insulation to the adobe prior to the plywood sheathing.

14. Some steel angles may be installed to protect corners of adobe walls.

15. The lower section of the existing adobe walls around the perimeter of the two building sections will be removed and replaced with a reinforced concrete bond beam to support the adobe walls during relocation. This bond beam will be continuous through door openings, and will be wide enough to provide support for a stud encapsulation wall which will be installed on the inside and outside of the existing adobe walls. The lower section of the existing adobe walls will be cut out and the new grade beam poured in alternating slot cut sections to maintain the stability of the existing walls.

   Prior to slot-cutting the base of the adobe walls to form the new reinforced concrete bond beam, the adobe wall base has to be stabilized to minimize caving. This may be done with injection of a polyacrylate cement that sets as a gel or similar soil cement mixture. The injection is done through a series of injection holes drilled into both sides of the walls. The stabilization zone will be wider than the final height of the bond beam.

16. Once the grade beam is in place, the existing foundation (which is anticipated to be a cobble type foundation) will be excavated in locations where jacks will be installed. The jacks will be installed on each side of each opening, and at 4 ft. on center in between openings, all around the perimeter walls of the two building sections. The jacks will raise the building to a level to allow for installation of a grid steel beams (probably 4 ft to 5 ft on center) to support the building during relocation. The preliminary layout of the beams will be determined by the relocation contractor (Ralph Clark of American Heavy Moving & Rigging Inc.) and Mike Krakower will design rebar in the grade beams to span between the steel beam supports.

17. In order to prepare the building for relocation and move the building sections out, the existing pool must be protected. This may require shoring or of the retaining wall along the East side of the pool (west side of the adobe) where the adobe walls are only about 3-4 ft. from the pool retaining wall. There is slightly more room between the south wall of the adobe and the pool retaining wall – maybe 8 to 10 ft. Hand work may be required in these areas due to space constraints. Additionally, some sort of solid barricades will need to be constructed on the pool decks to keep construction debris from falling into the pool. For reasons of safety, the pool will be shut down for use while the building is being prepared for relocation, and until the building sections actually leave the site.
18. The concrete flatwork/walkway to the east of the adobe and alongside the seating of the baseball field, from the top of the stairs to the north will need to be replaced after the adobe is removed. It will undoubtedly be damaged by the relocation.

19. The path of travel to move the adobe building sections through the high school site to the street may require some modifications to provide the required width for transporting the building sections. It may be necessary to remove part of the chain link fence at the corner of the pool.

20. At Lacy Park, there will also need to be some modifications to allow the adobe building units to be moved into the site location adjacent to the Thurnher House. Most likely at least one of the brick pilasters and maybe a section of the tubular fence will have to be removed and replaced after the building sections are moved in. Additionally, 2 to 3 trees may be required to be removed and the large oak trimmed.

21. At Lacy Park, a new permanent building foundation will be created and the building sections will be set on and anchored to the building foundation. The encapsulating framed walls on either side of the adobe walls will be removed and all holes patched. The plywood diaphragm on top of the existing adobe walls may remain and the new roof will be constructed on top of the plywood diaphragm. Braces and other temporary members installed for the move will be removed. The building will be made stable and watertight, which may require some patching of the exterior plaster surfaces damaged during the move, however no further restoration work will be completed at this time. Additionally, the area around the building will be patched back in, but no new site improvements (patios, new landscape areas, etc.) will be constructed.

22. Back at the High School site, the area remaining after the adobe is removed will be leveled and topped with either asphalt or concrete. The fence on top of the retaining wall between the pool and the adobe site will remain during construction, except as removed and reinstalled to accommodate the building move. Other than this fence, the paved area where the adobe was located will be open to the rest of the campus. The new paved area shall be designed in such a way as to provide for drainage so as not to collect or pond water. The existing monument shall remain and be incorporated into the site area.

---

MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE AT SAN MARINO HIGH SCHOOL
CONSTRUCTION STEPS FOR UPGRAADING ADOBE IN PLACE FOR USE BY STUDENTS (Per Title 24 & DSA Standards)

1. The following description is based on the sketch prepared by Michael Krakower, dated June 23, 2009, entitled “DSA STABILIZE IN PLACE ALT”, copy attached.

2. The preliminary cost estimates will be based on prevailing wage labor rates, and will assume normal working hours and shifts.

3. There will be an Archaeological Monitor and/or Historical Monitor present during the upgrading of the adobe.

4. Demolition shall be with rotary non-impact type equipment only. Impact type tools are not permitted.

5. The roof will be removed and discarded. New ceiling joists with a new plywood diaphragm and new roof will be installed, which will be attached to the existing adobe rod through the use of vertical anchors inserted down into the adobe walls. The new roof will be a shake roof (over plywood) to match that of the existing roof being removed.

6. The assumption is that the existing adobe walls have no structural integrity or value. The adobe walls will be encapsulated and structurally stabilized by installing two stud framed walls, one on each side of the existing adobe walls, with plywood on each side of the new stud walls. In order to prevent crushing or damaging the adobe, there should be a compressible layer of material between the encapsulating plywood sheathing and the plaster of the adobe. One method might be by fastening batt insulation to the adobe prior to the plywood sheathing. Gypsum board will be installed over the plywood on the interior face and will be finished with plaster like finish. Lath and plaster will be installed on the plywood on the exterior face, with a finish to resemble that of the original adobe.

7. A new concrete footing will be installed to support the new stud walls on both sides (interior and exterior) of the existing adobe walls at the building perimeter. These new footings will be installed alongside the existing footing (believed to be cobble) supporting the existing adobe walls.

8. Existing window and door openings will be removed and replace as necessary — many of these are out of square and have some dry rot. Doors and window units may need to be replaced. Door hardware shall be ADA compliant for the main entry door and at doors between rooms. Any door openings less than 30” in width may be required to be widened for ADA access.
9. Since the existing toilet is quite small, and since it is not original, it would make sense to remove the existing toilet rather than trying to make it ADA compliant. The toilet room could be converted to a small storage room. Accessible restrooms will be identified for use in nearby adjacent buildings. (A path of travel to these restrooms will be required.)

10. The interior surfaces which are not covered by the new encapsulating walls will need to be patched and the interior will be completely prepped and painted.

11. The exterior exposed wood framing at the porch, door or window openings, or any other areas not covered by new construction at the walls or roof will need to be prepped and stained. Any members which have dryrot damage should be removed and replaced. All new plaster wall surfaces will be prepped and painted.

12. Fire Sprinklers: Will not be required.

13. Fire Alarm: An automatic, stand alone fire alarm system will be installed.

14. Other Electrical: Provide adequate power outlets, lighting, telephone, Public Address speakers and data outlets tied to school network and public address system. Remove all obsolete lighting and power currently installed.

15. HVAC: The existing adobe does not have heating or cooling. Some sort of heating and air conditioning (or at a minimum, ventilation through the use of operable windows) needs to be provided.

16. Site Upgrades:
   a. If existing tube steel fence is to remain, the gates will need to be made ADA compliant (retrofitted with lever hardware). The fence could be removed on the North and East sides of the adobe.
   b. Existing trees at the North side may need to be removed or trimmed to allow for the work at the roof level.
   c. Existing site improvements disturbed by the installation of the new foundations will need to be restored.
   d. Existing landscaping and irrigation should be modified and/or upgraded. Landscaping should be located away from adobe walls to keep moisture away from exterior walls.
   e. The main entry ramp will need to be modified if it is not ADA compliant. It is not known without shooting grades if the existing ramp is less than 1:12.
   f. In order to create an accessible path of travel to the south, to the main building campus and to the accessible restrooms in the Gym Bldg. or at the Science Bldg. S, the existing stairs and sidewalk (east and just south of the

Adobe) will need to be removed and replaced with an ADA compliant ramp approximately 85-70 ft. long.

17. ADA compliant parking will be identified as the existing ADA parking at the Gym Circle, south of the Gym building. The path of travel to the adobe will be from the south, via the new ramp discussed above.

18. ADA compliant room, entry, and path of travel signage will need to be installed.
Figure 84: Sketch detailing DSA stabilization option, June 23, 2009. (Drawing prepared by Michael Krakower)
Figure 85: Division of the State Architect requirements for converting existing non-conforming buildings for school use
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A project can transition from an Intake Professional to a Supervising Structural Engineer.

Process by which a project is changed from one state to another. Example: Transition project package submittals and processing.

DSA Regional Office Supervisor overseeing construction
Supervising Structural Engineer

disagreement between clients, Peer Review Consultants and/or reviewers.

materials; provides final recommendation to the Regional Manager for resolution of

Xrefs External references to a CAD file

Regional Offices and Peer Review Consultants reviewing Evaluation and Design Criteria Reports; may attend preliminary ... Approval personnel at the DSA-HQ utilizing USPI processes to promote consistent application and evaluation of alternate methodologies and retrofit materials when collaborating with or providing guidance to the DSA

SSS Structural Safety Section

SHBC State Historical Building Code

the regulations and procedures for the rehabilitation of non-conforming existing buildings into

school buildings; provides a knowledge/experience base in rehabilitation technologies,

Rehabilitation Coordinator

Lead for the DSA in promoting consistency in implementation of

compliance with applicable codes and regulations.

PC - based CAD products. It was created by AutoDesk for the AutoCAD system.

DXF Data Exchange File; a two-dimensional graphics file format supported by virtually all

Rehabilitation Coordinator

A consultant hired by the owner, distinct from the project design professionals, to provide independent review and commentary on the design criteria in accordance with the requirements of Division VI-R, Title 24, C.C.R.

Owner’s Peer Reviewer

A consultant hired by the owner, distinct from the project design professionals, to provide independent review and commentary on the design criteria in accordance with the requirements of Division VI-R, Title 24, C.C.R.

read me file: A file that a submitting architect will send along with their drawings that provides file details like plot sizes for CAD files.

eTransmit: Refers to electronic file transfers.

Evaluation and Design Criteria Report: Also known as “the Report,” this comprehensive document establishes the criteria for evaluation and design to be used by the project design professionals and by DSA staff during the project plan review. The Report establishes criteria for structural, fire and life safety, accessibility, mechanical, electrical and historical disciplines of construction. See Appendices C-M for detail.

Interpretation of Regulations (IR): A series of publications by the DSA intended for use by the plan review and field engineers of the DSA to indicate an acceptable method for achieving compliance with applicable codes and regulations.

Owner’s Peer Review: An independent review of the evaluation and design criteria proposed by the project design professionals for the development of the Evaluation and Design Criteria Report in accordance with the requirements of Division VI-R, Title 24, C.C.R.

Owner’s Peer Reviewer: A consultant hired by the owner, distinct from the project design professionals, to provide independent review and commentary on the design criteria in accordance with the requirements of Division VI-R, Title 24, C.C.R.

Owner’s Peer Review

A series of publications by the DSA intended for use by
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Interpretation of Regulations (IR)
Preface: For the purposes of this document, references to “public school”, “school building” and “school site” shall be intended to include California public schools, Kindergarten through 12th grade, charter school entities and California Community Colleges.

1. BUILDING SELECTION

1.1 Owner’s Initial Facility Assessment

It is the responsibility of the owner and their project team to initially assess any non-conforming site and facility being considered for rehabilitation to public school use. Initial facility and site assessment should be performed by California licensed design professionals, architects and engineers specializing in structural, fire/life safety, accessibility, mechanical, plumbing and electrical disciplines, who are knowledgeable in rehabilitation of existing structures and familiar with the design and construction of California public schools and community colleges. Likewise, when historical buildings are being considered, assessment should be performed by California licensed design professionals who are knowledgeable in preservation of existing historical structures. Owners are advised to refer to the Division of the State Architect (DSA) feasibility guideline Adaptive Reuse: An Option for California’s Schools as an assessment tool along with other methods recommended by their design professionals. The guideline can be found on the DSA Webpage at:


1.2 Applicability of Regulations

The regulations of Title 24, C.C.R. apply to any existing non-conforming building for purchase or lease by a district for use as a public school building or by a charter school entity for use as a charter school building required to comply with the Field Act.

The regulations of Title 24, C.C.R. may be utilized for California Community College buildings when:

1) DSA approval of the plans/specifications and certification of construction is required by the Education Code;
2) DSA approval is requested by the district for rehabilitation of any existing non-conforming building for purchase or lease for use as a California Community College school building.

NOTES: Section 81149 of the Education Code remains in effect for qualifying buildings and is not superseded by these regulations. All references to California Building Code (CBC) sections are to Title 24, Part 2, C.C.R. unless indicated otherwise.

The regulations prescribed in Sections 4-306 and 4-307 of Part 1, Title 24, C.C.R., are not required for seismic retrofit of existing certified school buildings when the rehabilitation is being constructed voluntarily by the district, and when the provisions of Section 4-307(c) that require structural rehabilitation are not met. However, these regulations and procedures may be utilized for any voluntary rehabilitation, thereby providing a standard to which the construction can be certified.

2. PRE-APPLICATION PROCEDURE

For each rehabilitation project, an Evaluation and Design Criteria Report (hereafter referred to as the Report) shall be prepared and shall include chapters for each of the disciplines of building construction: structural, fire/life safety, accessibility, mechanical, plumbing and electrical. When applicable, the Report shall include a chapter for historic buildings. The Report, to be approved by the DSA, establishes:

1) the criteria for the evaluation and design to be used by the project design professionals;
2) the material/system/equipment testing and condition assessment requirements.

Summary of Fees (fully defined in the following procedures):

1) Retainer fees will be required with submittal of a project Pre-Application;
2) DSA will prepare and submit to the applicant a cost estimate to complete full review of the Report for all disciplines, including consultants. Review will commence upon receipt of payment. Any estimated fees not expended in review shall be refunded to the applicant upon approval of the Report;
3) DSA may invoice for further fees if costs for review of the Report significantly exceed the estimated fees;
4) DSA may invoice for further fees if changes to the approved Report require significant further review for approval.

2.1 Design Professional Tasks

2.1.1. Historic Building Site Determination. Owner/design professional may determine whether the proposed facility is a registered historic building or site; if historic, the procedures specified in Appendices L and M shall be followed.

2.1.1.1. Per the procedures of Appendix M, the architect or owner’s representative shall:

1) Contact the DSA Supervising Structural Engineer to notify the DSA of the historic project proposal;
2) Discuss requirements for a preliminary Historic Structures Report (HSR),
3) Schedule an appointment with the DSA Supervising Structural Engineer and the DSA Historic School Program Manager for a pre-Report consultation meeting to discuss use of the State Historic Building Code (SHBC).

2.1.1.2. A preliminary HSR (2 paper copies or electronic file) shall be submitted to the DSA Regional Office Supervising Structural Engineer per Appendix L prior to the pre-Report consultation meeting.

2.1.1.3. Conduct a pre-Report consultation meeting with the DSA Supervising Structural Engineer and the DSA Historic School Program Manager.

2.1.2. Initial Evaluation. Consult with project structural, mechanical, electrical engineers and specialty consultants, as appropriate, to conduct an initial evaluation of the building and develop a retrofit scheme for the analysis and design of the building.

2.1.2.1. Selection of structural rehabilitation methodology:

The structural engineer shall propose the method of structural evaluation and design as defined in Division VI-R, which includes Method A, Method B and the current effective edition of the CBC.

2.1.2.2. When Method B for structural rehabilitation is utilized:

The owner shall contract with an independent structural Peer Reviewer (consultant) to provide subject matter expertise to the design team in accordance with Section 1649A, Division VI-R.

2.1.2.3. The architect or owner’s representative may request a preliminary meeting for any rehabilitation project involving Methods A or the CBC and shall schedule an appointment for any rehabilitation project involving Method B with a structural engineer, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer and a DSA representative for a pre-Report consultation meeting discussing and establishing:

- Scope of work for the rehabilitation of the building and site for all disciplines.
- Appropriate structural evaluation and design methodology.
- Scope of work of the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer.
2.1.3. Evaluation and Design Criteria Report. The Report shall propose criteria for rehabilitation of the structural, fire life-safety (FLS), accessibility (ACS), mechanical, plumbing and electrical disciplines, and criteria for historic buildings when applicable. (For structural, see Section 1640A.8.2, Division VI-R; for FLS, ACS, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, and historic, see Appendices C-M.)

2.1.3.1. When Method B for structural rehabilitation is utilized, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer shall review the Report and prepare a report on his/her findings and the proposals; see Section 1640A.8.3, Division VI-R.

2.1.4. Project Pre-Application. Begin the Pre-Application process included in the Report per one of the two processes described below. Both processes utilize a web-based FTP site as a portal to the DSA-IMS system which will provide communication between the DSA and design professionals. Notifications will be provided by the DSA-IMS system at specific milestones.

2.1.4.1. Semi-electronic Submittal Process:

Submit to the DSA Regional Office a Pre-Application (DSA-1 REH); pre-application retainer fees; and provide an electronic file (on CD) that includes the following:

- The Report electronically signed by the design professional in responsible charge of the design;
- Existing plans and specifications (or as-built plans);
- Available construction documents including test and inspection reports and
- Any change documents.

See Appendix A for specifications on formatting the electronic files on CD.

Upon notification by the system, the design professional uses the Login and Password information provided by the DSA to retrieve the FTP system online:

- The DSA approved Report; or
- DSA recommendations to the Report that will require response.

The DSA will register the design professionals and owner’s representatives into the IMS and notify them that the project is ready to proceed.

2.1.4.2. On-line (Fully Electronic) Submittal Process:

The online submittal process requires that the design professional registers his/herself and the project on FTP. The registration process establishes the Login and Password into the system, the Pre-Application number for the project, and the folder into which the project files are to be uploaded.

See Appendix A for specifications on formatting the electronic files.

See Appendix B for the online, fully electronic, process.

Upon notification by the system, the design professional uses the Login and Password information to access the FTP system online for retrieval of:

- The DSA approved Report; or
- DSA recommendations to the Report that will require response.

Mail a paper copy of the Pre-Application and the retainer fee to the Cashier at the DSA Regional Office, or submit the retainer fee through the Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) process (contact the DSA-HQ Accounting Office, (916) 445-8100, for information).

2.1.5. Initial Fees Review. Upon receipt of the Pre-application, the DSA Supervising Structural Engineer will assess the workload scope for review of the Report by all disciplines and, if greater than the initial retainer fee, provide an invoice for any additional estimated fees for the complete review. The applicant shall provide the additional estimated fee prior to start of the Report review. For information regarding Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) process, contact the DSA-HQ Accounting Office.

2.1.6. Final Fees Review. When all aspects of the Report have been reviewed and the Report is ready for Supervising Structural Engineer’s approval, the DSA may invoice any final fees incurred above the initial retainer and estimated fees, for the complete review of all disciplines of the Report. If estimated fees exceed the final fees by more than $25.00, then the DSA will refund the difference. Final fees must be received by the DSA prior to approval of the Report.

2.1.7. Returned Report. If the DSA does not approve the Report as proposed and returns the Report with recommendations for response, the design professional shall:

1) Make amendments to the Report as appropriate, and
2) Return amended Report to the DSA reviewer for approval.

Repeat steps 2.1.2.1 (if necessary), 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 until the DSA approval is achieved.

2.1.8. Approved Report. Upon receipt of a DSA approved copy of the Report, design development of the project may begin, as directed by the owner.

2.5 Owner’s Independent Structural Peer Reviewer Tasks

When Method B for structural is used, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer shall review the design professional’s Report, provide guidance to the design team and prepare an independent report in accordance with Section 1640A.8.3, Division VI-R.

3. DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE

3.1 Design Professional Tasks

3.1.1. Analysis Methods. Conduct analyses compliant with the methodologies defined in the approved Report.

3.1.2. Changes to Approved Criteria. If changes to the approved criteria are necessary, submit an electronic file of the specific amended section(s) of the Report to the DSA for approval. Amendments shall be clearly identified with the amendment date and a sequential amendment identification/reference number; and shall be electronically signed by the design professional in responsible charge. The DSA may charge fees incurred for review of changes.

3.1.2.1. When Method B for structural is used, changes to the approved Report shall be reviewed by the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer, and a supplemental report shall be provided addressing the change similar to Section 2.1.2.1.
3.4 Owner’s Independent Structural Peer Reviewer Tasks
- When Method B for structural is used, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer shall: Review the design development progress and structural calculations for conformance with the approved design criteria defined in the Report.
- Prepare a report in accordance with Section 1640A.8.3, Division VI-R.

If changes to the approved criteria are required, the changes to the approved Report shall be reviewed and a supplemental report provided addressing the change (similar to Section 2.5).

4. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT PHASE

4.1 Design Professional Tasks
4.1.2. Changes to approved criteria. If changes are necessary, submit an electronic file of amendments in accordance with Section 3.1.2.

4. Owner’s Independent Peer Reviewer Tasks
When Method B for structural is used, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer shall review the construction documents prior to submittal to the DSA for plan review for conformance with the approved design criteria defined in the Report, and prepare a report in accordance with Section 1640A.8.3, Division VI-R.

4.4.1. Changes to approved criteria. If changes are necessary, see Section 3.4.1.

5. PROJECT APPLICATION SUBMITTAL

5.1. Design Professional Tasks
Prepare project application package and submit to the appropriate DSA Regional Office: project application, plans and specifications, and all changes to project plans and specifications during construction; submit required documents for project certification in accordance with Part 1, Title 24, for a new building.

5.6. PLAN REVIEW, CONSTRUCTION REVIEW AND PROJECT CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES

6.1. Design Professional Tasks
Obtain approval of project plans and specifications, and all changes to project plans and specifications during construction; submit required documents for project certification in accordance with Part 1, Title 24, for a new building.

6.1.1. If change(s) to the approved structural criteria — as incorporated into the approved plans and specifications — are necessary during construction, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer shall review the change.

6.4. Owner’s Independent Peer Reviewer Tasks (when consulted)
If changes to the approved structural criteria, as incorporated into the approved plans and specifications, are necessary during construction, the Owner’s independent structural Peer Reviewer shall review the change and provide a report in accordance with Section 1640A.8.3, Division VI-R.

---

SPECIFICATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC FILE FORMAT

APPENDIX A

TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTING ELECTRONIC FILES

A.1. File Format:
- CAD Drawings: DWG for AutoCAD, DGN for Microstation, non-AutoCAD users (e.g. DataCAD Plus, VectorWorks) are to export drawings into DWG or DXF format. Translation into DXF may lead to incompatibility and other performance issues. For more information, the white paper by OpenDWG Alliance is available at: http://www.opendwg.org/about/whitepaper/whynot.htm
- Images (Scans): TIFF, JPEG and BMP for image files and reference drawings.
- Other Document Formats: PDF (preferred choice), DOC, WPD for specifications, calculations, soil reports, etc.

A.2. Packaging Electronic Information: CD or FTP
- For FTP & CD, the files should be compressed by WinZip. This reduces the collective size of transferred files and makes submittal a single file transfer. For submittal with CD, ensure the CD is unlocked and is readable by any standard CD-ROM drive.
- AutoCAD users can use the “eTransmit” feature to pack the drawings and all associated files into a self-extracting executable compressed transmittal set. (For eTransmit, enable the command on “remove paths from Xrefs and images.”)

A.3. - Font, Typeface (CAD Submittals): Submit all custom fonts and any non-standard fonts. User may submit a font-mapping file to identify any alternate substitution.

A.4. - Xref (CAD Submittals): Bind all external references to the drawing. All Xrefs such as title block, keynotes and legends are to be bound.

A.5. - Layers And Scaling (CAD Submittals): Flatten all layers on all images files. Paper space strongly recommended on all drawings to be reviewed by the DSA.

A.6. - List Of Content And Files Organization (CAD Submittals):
- Provide an index file and organize drawings into folders such as Architectural, Structural, Electrical and Mechanical.

A.7. - Plotting Instruction (CAD Submittals): A simple “read me” file to explain the plotting configuration or if certain layers should be turned off. Indicate the use of any required object enabler.
Phase 1: REGISTER A REHABILITATION PROJECT ONLINE

1. Registering for online submittal (required for each project). This can be accomplished by calling 916.322.3727 or going to www.applications.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/preapp/step1a.asp and filling out the registration form. A return email address is mandatory for all online submittals.
2. Following registration, an email will be sent out to the address provided in the registration form. This email will include:
   a. A phone contact 916.445.6944 to schedule web-based training.
   b. Web location for do-it-yourself instructions on how to upload and download files.
   c. Instructions on how to prepare files for submittal to DSA.
   d. Login and password for the system.
3. The consultant logs into ftp://dsaftpHQ.dgs.ca.gov and downloads the information into eTracker. Cashier processes checks.
4. When files are uploaded to a folder, email notification is sent to the Cashier at the DSA Regional Office. Mail retainer check to DSA Regional Office with login and password provided in training or do-it-yourself instructions.

Phase 2: SUBMIT PRE-APPLICATION & UPLOAD FILES

1. Go to www.dsa.dgs.ca.gov/forms and click Pre-Application. Fill out the Pre-Application (Pre-App), sign the form using an Entrant digital signature, and save the original Pre-Application to your local PC.
2. Move electronic copies of plans or scanned images of plans, Pre-Application report, specifications, construction documents, test and inspection reports and the Evaluation and Design Criteria (EDC) report electronically signed by the design professional, into a folder on your local PC.
3. On conclusion of the review process, structural reviewer verifies all disciplines and transitions the project to the next phase.
   a. Instructions on how to prepare files for submittal to DSA.
   b. Web location for do-it-yourself instructions on how to upload and download files.
   c. Instructions on how to prepare files for submittal to DSA.
   d. Login and password for the system.

Phase 3: DSA PROJECT INTAKE

1. The upload folder name will be the same as the Pre-App number. An architect with more than one project will have a single login that shows multiple folders. He/she uploads files to the appropriate project.
2. Once the SSE has made the above determination and estimated fees have been received, then he/she transitions the project to the appropriate reviewer next in the workflow (plan review staff, Rehabilitation Coordinator or DSA Peer Review Consultant). The SSE selects from a list of plan review staff, Rehabilitation Coordinator and contract firms.
3. The consultant contacts the SSE and goes through the contracting amendment process. The consultant logs into ftp://dsaftpHQ.dgs.ca.gov and downloads the project files (using pre-assigned login and password).
   - The consultant contacts the SSE and goes through the contracting amendment process.
   - The consultant logs into ftp://dsaftpHQ.dgs.ca.gov and downloads the project files (using pre-assigned login and password).

Phase 4: PROJECT SCHEDULING

1. Upon receipt of retainer, the Cashier opens the Pre-Application in ftp://dsaftpHQ.dgs.ca.gov and enters the information into eTracker. Cashier processes checks.
2. The Cashier clicks the Notify button in eTracker, and the IMS Administrator is notified that a new project is now available for upload.
3. The IMS Administrator uploads all files from FTP to the IMS, and transitions. Email notification is sent to the DSA Regional Office Supervising Structural Engineer (SSE) upon transition.
   - The transition process will provide the SSE with a list of possible staff, contractors and the Rehabilitation Coordinator to whom the project may be transitioned.
   - The DSA Peer Review Consultant evaluates report, interacts with the SSE, Rehabilitation Coordinator and/or Regional Office Reviewer.
   - The Cashier clicks the Notify button in eTracker, and the IMS Administrator is notified that a new project is available for upload.

Phase 5a: PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW BY THE DSA

1. Upon receipt of retainer, the Cashier opens the Pre-Application in ftp://dsaftpHQ.dgs.ca.gov and enters the information into eTracker. Cashier processes checks.
2. The Cashier clicks the Notify button in eTracker, and the IMS Administrator is notified that a new project is available for upload.
3. On conclusion of the review process, structural reviewer verifies all disciplines and transitions the project to the next phase. Each reviewer updates status and inputs time in eTracker status screen.

Phase 5b: PRE-APP REVIEW BY DSA PEER REVIEW CONSULTANT

1. To transition a project between phases, a user “right clicks” the mouse while on the application document and selects “Transition”. The next person in the workflow is notified that they now have control of the project. The workflow is defined in the IMS.
2. Once the SSE has made the above determination and estimated fees have been received, then he/she transitions the project to the appropriate reviewer next in the workflow (plan review staff, Rehabilitation Coordinator or DSA Peer Review Consultant). The SSE selects from a list of plan review staff, Rehabilitation Coordinator and contract firms.
3. When a Peer Review Consultant is assigned, the IMS Coordinator is notified so he/she can register the consultant and grant them rights to FTP for this project, i.e., the login and password to the system and the project Pre-App number.

What is Transition?

Transitioning is a process by which a project is changed from one state to another. For example, a project can be transitioned from Intake to the Supervising Structural Engineer.
Phase 6: SSE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF REPORT

1- Structural reviewer notifies the SSE that the Pre-Application Report is ready for approval. (Notification is sent when the SSE transitions the project out of review)
2- The SSE logs into the IMS, performs a summary review of the work, and if acceptable:
   a. Notifies Cashier to prepare Actual Fee Worksheet and determine if final fees are required. If so, Cashier invoices applicant.
   b. Upon receipt of final payment, Cashier notifies SSE.
   c. Applies an electronic Approved stamp and digital signature to the Pre-Application Report;
   d. Transitions the project to the approved state.
3- Transition sends email to the IMS Administrator who moves the final documents to the external folder in FTP and transitions the project for return to the architect.

Phase 7: RETURN OF APPROVED REPORT

1- The architect and owner’s representative may receive final invoices when the Report is ready for approval. The DSA will only approve the Report upon receipt of final payment.
2- Upon approval, the architect and owner’s representative receive email notification that a Pre-App Report has been approved and is ready for retrieval from FTP.

Requirements for the Evaluation and Design Criteria Report – Accessibility Chapter

Appendix C

C.1 - Procedures for DSA Approval of the Evaluation and Retrofit Design
During the schematic phase of the project, the owner or the design professional in responsible charge of design shall perform initial data collection and assessment of the building and prepare and sign an Evaluation and Design Criteria Report for Accessibility. The Report shall establish the design criteria for the rehabilitation by identifying deficiencies in the existing conditions and propose remediation in compliance with Title 24 accessibility regulations as defined in Appendix D. The Report shall be submitted to the DSA for review and approval of the proposals prior to proceeding with design development of the rehabilitation. The DSA shall review the Report to determine that each item identified in this Appendix has been satisfactorily addressed. If the DSA determines that one or more items are not satisfactorily addressed or the DSA does not concur with any of the proposals, the Report shall be returned to the design professional for correction. Upon concurrence that all items have been satisfactorily addressed by the proposals in the Report, the DSA shall approve, sign and return a copy of the signed Report to the owner.
If changes to the approved criteria are determined to be necessary during design development and completion of construction documents, the project design professional shall submit an amendment to the Report for the particular discipline to the DSA for approval.
Upon completion of the design, the plans and specifications shall be submitted to the DSA for approval per the provisions of Part 1, Title 24.

C.2 - Initial data collection and assessment
Initial data collection and assessment shall include:
1. Visit(s) to the sites, buildings and facilities.
2. Data collection, analysis and evaluation of existing site, building and facility conditions in accordance with Appendix D.
3. Review of original plans, specifications and associated construction documents. Where original building and site plans and specifications are not available, “as-built” plans shall be prepared that accurately depict the existing building and site.

C.3 - Evaluation and Design Criteria Report
The Evaluation and Design Criteria Report shall include a chapter for accessibility, be signed by the design professional in responsible charge of the design, and shall:
1. Identify and document all elements of the site, buildings, and facilities, or portions thereof, which do not fully comply with the Title 24 accessibility regulations as required for new construction in accordance with Appendix D.
2. Where elements of the buildings, sites, or facilities, or any portion thereof do not fully comply with Title 24, indicate the proposed method for remediation of the deficiency.
3. Identify any additional data collection and condition assessment to complete the design. Identify locations and specific elements for the additional assessment.

Submit with the Evaluation and Design Criteria Report:
Approved or “as-built” building plans, specifications and associated construction documents that accurately depict the existing construction related to accessibility.
PROVISIONS FOR ACCESS COMPLIANCE DESIGN, REVIEW AND APPROVAL FOR REHABILITATION OF EXISTING NON-CONFORMING BUILDINGS, SITES, AND FACILITIES FOR USE AS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

APPENDIX D

D.1 - General.

(a) A site, which is not currently a school site, on which one or more non-conforming buildings exist, shall be rehabilitated for use and considered to be a new school site for application of accessibility regulations contained in Title 24, California Code of Regulations, currently effective edition (herein referred to as “Title 24”). All existing buildings, sites, and facilities at a new school, regardless of use, shall be rehabilitated for accessibility. Such rehabilitation shall be reviewed and approved by the Division of the State Architect/Access Compliance (DSA/AC).

(b) Rehabilitation of any new school, including all buildings and facilities, shall comply with the regulations adopted by the DSA/AC which are contained in Title 24, currently effective edition.

Reference: Title 24, Part 1, Chapter 4, Sections 4-302 and 4-307(a) & (b); Chapter 5, Sections 5-101, 5-102, 5-109, and 5-110.

D.2 - Scope.

These provisions shall apply to all buildings, sites, and facilities (including temporary and emergency buildings and facilities) utilizing state funds, county, or municipal funds, or the funds of any political subdivision of the state, for the rehabilitation of any elementary school, secondary school, or community college including the University of California, the California State University, and the various community college districts.

Reference: Title 24, Part 1, Chapter 4, Section 4-307(a) & (b); Chapter 5, Section 5-101; Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 1, Section 101.17.11; Government Code 4451(e).

D.3 - Application of State Building Standards for Accessibility.

When applying accessibility building standards per Title 24, all existing non-conforming buildings, including related sites and facilities that are rehabilitated, regardless of use, are considered to be new construction, and shall fully comply with all accessibility regulations as required for the construction of new buildings, sites, and facilities as contained in Title 24, currently effective edition. Since rehabilitation projects are considered new construction, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 11B, Section 1134B for existing buildings does not apply.

Reference: Title 24, Part 1, Chapter 4, Section 4-307(a) & (b).


Rehabilitation of buildings, sites, and facilities shall meet or exceed the requirements of Title III, Subpart D of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 for new construction including the ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG).

Reference: Government Code 4451(d); Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 1, Section 101.17.11.

D.4 - DSA/AC Definitions.

New School Site: location with one or more existing non-conforming buildings not currently a school site.

Non-Conforming Building: any building that (1) has not been rehabilitated for accessibility and approved by the DSA/AC, and (2) exists on a location which is not an existing school site.

Rehabilitation: the accessibility evaluation, report, design, and all construction work —to construct any new elements, or the alteration of any existing elements — required to bring the buildings, sites, and facilities, or portions thereof, into full and complete compliance with the accessibility regulations contained in Title 24, currently effective edition.

D.5 - Accessibility Evaluation

The accessibility evaluation shall include visit(s) to the sites, buildings, and facilities. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation of existing site, building, and facility conditions shall be performed in order to comply with Provision 3.

D.5.1 - Data Collection and Analysis:

(a) In compliance with Title 24 accessibility regulations and in accordance with Provision D.3, the accessibility evaluation shall include (but shall not be limited to) the analysis and evaluation of the following items:

Approach: Off-site paths of travel, on-site paths of travel, parking, passenger drop-off and loading zones, ground surface, walks and sidewalks, curb ramps, pedestrian ramps, stairs, and hazards.

Building Plan/Design: Entrances, horizontal access, vertical access, floors and levels.

Note: new schools are not entitled to elevator exemptions.


General Construction Requirements: Bathing and toilet facilities, elevators, special access (wheelchair) lifts, water fountains, telephones, kitchens, swimming pools, signage, employee areas, doors and gates, stairs, ramps, built in seating, tables, counters, vending machines, storage, space allowance and reach ranges, parking structures, turnstiles and pedestrian-controls, corridors, hallways, exterior exit balconies, aisles, areas for evacuation assistance, alarms, controls and operating mechanisms, ATM and point-of-sale machines, floor surfaces.

Reference: Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 11B.

(b) The data collection and analysis of items in Provision D.5.1 (a) shall be utilized to develop an Accessibility Evaluation Report. The Accessibility Evaluation Report shall be submitted with the design documents indicated in Provision 8 and shall be in accordance with Provision D.6.

D.6 - Accessibility Evaluation Report

(a) The Accessibility Evaluation Report shall be based on the data collection, analysis, and evaluation indicated in Provisions D.5 and D.5.1. The report shall identify and document all elements of the site, buildings, and facilities, or portions thereof, which do not fully comply with the accessibility regulations as required for new construction per Provision D.3. Where the Accessibility Evaluation Report indicates that the buildings, sites, or facilities, or any portion thereof do not fully comply with Title 24 per Provision 3, the rehabilitation shall be designed to comply with all accessibility requirements of Title 24, currently effective edition. The Accessibility Evaluation Report shall be the basis for review of plans and specifications submitted per Provision D.8, for the rehabilitation required per Provision D.1.

(b) The design professional in responsible charge of design, shall stamp, sign and submit the Accessibility Evaluation Report to the DSA/AC, along with the other documents required per Provision D.8.

D.7 - Application, Review, and Approval of Drawings and Specifications.

The application, review, and approval of the rehabilitation of non-conforming buildings, sites and facilities shall be in accordance with Title 24, Part 1, Section 5-103, 5-109, and 5-110.
(a) Documents including plans and specifications for the rehabilitation of any existing non-conforming buildings, sites, and facilities or portion thereof, shall be submitted to the DSA/CAC and provide for the design necessary for full compliance with all accessibility regulations contained in Title 24, currently effective edition. The design professional shall indicate the rehabilitation design needed for all elements identified in the Accessibility Evaluation Report per Provision D.6 (a), and shall stamp and sign all rehabilitation plans and specifications.
(b) Plans shall clearly show all elements and features that are required to comply with accessibility regulations to the same degree and level of detail as if they were being submitted as new buildings, sites, or facilities for DSA access compliance review. Plans shall be legible, sufficiently detailed, cross-referenced, and shall have sufficient dimensions to be readily interpreted for DSA access compliance review.
(c) “As-built” documents (plans and specifications) can be submitted, however such documents shall contain the same degree and level of detail as indicated in Provision D.8 (b). The design professional in responsible charge of design shall confirm and certify by stamp and signature that the “as-built” documents accurately and fully depict the existing building, site, and facility conditions related to accessibility. In addition to “as-built” documents, the design professional shall submit plans and specifications per Provision D.8 (a) (b), to indicate the rehabilitation design needed for all elements identified in the Accessibility Evaluation Report per Provision D.6(a).
(d) Where the original “as-built” building plans and specifications are not available, “as-built” plans and specifications shall be prepared that accurately depict the existing building, site, and facility conditions per Provision D.6 (a) & (b) in order to confirm compliance with the items listed in Provision D.5.1 (a).

Reference: Title 24, Part 1, Chapter 4, Section 4-317; Sections 5-103 & 5-109.

D.9. - Historical Buildings and Properties

The California Building Code (CBC) requires non-conforming buildings converted to school use to fully comply with the current building regulations for new construction. However, the State Historical Building Code (SHBC)—contained in C.C.R., Title 24, Part 8 (reprinted in CBC, Chapter 34, Division II)—requires state agencies to apply the SHBC to qualified historical buildings and properties, at the discretion of the school district or property owner, to preserve the historical significance or character-defining features of the building or property. Adopted regulations governing construction of new buildings for accessibility for persons with disabilities (regular code) must be applied to existing, non-conforming, qualified historical buildings or properties converted to school use, unless strict compliance with the regular code will threaten or destroy the historical significance or character-defining features of the building or property. If the historical significance or character-defining features are found to be threatened, alternative provisions for access may be applied—pursuant to the SHBC—provided that, in addition to other conditions, sufficient justification is submitted to the DSA to substantiate such alternatives. The proposals, supporting justification, and proposed alternative provisions shall be submitted as a component of the Historic Structures Report outlined in Appendices L and M.

The application of any alternative standards for qualified historical buildings providing accessibility to persons with disabilities—done on a case-by-case or item-by-item basis—shall not be applied to an entire building or structure without individual consideration of each item. This same case-by-case, item-by-item analysis shall also apply to a designated historic site beyond the immediate structure, if these elements are considered an integral part of, and significant to the historic structure or district.

Requirements for the Evaluation and Design Criteria Report – Fire & Life Safety Chapter

APPENDIX E

E.1 - Procedures for DSA Approval of the Evaluation and Retrofit Design

During the schematic phase of the project, the owner or the design professional in responsible charge of design shall perform initial data collection and assessment of the building and prepare and sign an Evaluation and Design Criteria Report. The Report shall establish the criteria for evaluation and design of the rehabilitation by identifying deficiencies in the existing site and building conditions—and any elements intended for reuse—and proposing remediation in compliance with Title 24 regulations and Appendix F. The Report shall be submitted to the DSA for review and approval prior to proceeding with design development of the rehabilitation. The DSA shall review the Report to determine that each item identified in this Appendix has been satisfactorily addressed. If the DSA determines that one or more items are not satisfactorily addressed, or the DSA does not concur with any of the proposals, the Report shall be returned to the design professional for correction. Upon concurrence that all items have been satisfactorily addressed by the proposals in the Report, the DSA shall approve, sign and return a copy of the signed Report to the owner.

If changes to the approved criteria are determined necessary during design development and completion of construction documents, the project design professional shall submit an amendment to the Report to the DSA for approval.

Upon completion of the design, the plans and specifications shall be submitted to the DSA for approval per the provisions of Part 1, Title 24.

E.2 - Initial data collection and assessment

Initial data collection and assessment shall include:
1. Site visit(s) to the building.
2. Data collection of existing site and building(s) fire protection systems, water supply, equipment and devices, access, and methods of egress in accordance with Appendices F and H.
3. Review of original plans, specifications and associated construction documents. Where original building and site plans and specifications are not available, “as-built” plans shall be prepared that accurately depict the existing site and building(s) fire and life safety concerns, per Item 2 above.

E.3 - Evaluation and Design Criteria Report

The Evaluation and Design Criteria Report shall include a chapter for fire and life safety, be signed by the design professional in responsible charge of the design, and shall:
1. Describe the site and building(s) fire protection systems, water supply, equipment and devices, access, and methods of egress in accordance with Appendix F.
2. Identify proposed new systems, equipment and devices for fire and life safety.
3. Identify and describe the physical condition of the existing systems, equipment and devices that will be intended for reuse.
4. Based on data collection and review of original construction documents, identify potential deficiencies in the proposed existing systems, equipment and devices that are intended for reuse; and propose the method for remediation of the deficiencies.
5. Propose the program for additional data collection and condition assessment to complete the design. Identify locations and specific systems, equipment and devices for the additional assessment.

Submit with the Evaluation and Design Criteria Report:
1. Approved or “as-built” building plans, specifications and associated construction documents that accurately depict the existing construction.
2. Available system test reports of the existing construction.
F.1. - Fire Protection
In accordance with Section 4-307, Part 1, Title 24, C.C.R., an existing non-conforming building rehabilitated for use as a school building is considered, for the purpose of the application of Title 24, to be a new school building. Furthermore, a site, which is currently not an existing school site, on which one or more existing non-conforming buildings are rehabilitated for use as school building(s) is considered to be a new school site for the purpose of application of Title 24. Therefore, such sites and buildings, if rehabilitated for public school use with state School Facility Program (SFP) funds, shall be subject to the Green Oaks Family Academy Elementary School Fire Protection Act (Section 17074.50 of the Education Code). If SFP funds are not utilized for rehabilitation, such sites and buildings shall comply with current code regulations and shall not be subject to the requirements of the Green Oaks Family Academy Elementary School Fire Protection Act.

This means that existing non-conforming buildings rehabilitated for school use with state funds, must be equipped with automatic fire sprinklers and automatic fire alarm and detection systems throughout. With regard to installation of automatic fire sprinklers in existing, unequipped, non-conforming building(s), school districts must evaluate the adequacy of water supply for fire sprinklers, fire hydrant locations and distribution to support fire fighting operations in buildings being considered for conversion to school use. (Refer to Division III, Fire Protection, State Appendix III-AA, Fire-Flow Requirements for Buildings; State Appendix III-BB, Fire Hydrant Locations and Distribution within the California Fire Code, Part 9, Title 24.)

F.2. - Fire Department Access and Egress
Existing, non-conforming buildings or sites rehabilitated for school use require vehicle access from all-weather hard-surfaced (suitable for use by fire apparatus) right-of-way not less than 20 feet in width. Such right-of-way shall be unobstructed and maintained only as access to the public street. Gate entrances to school grounds shall also be provided for entrance by fire apparatus, ambulances and police vehicles. Gate openings shall be of sufficient width to accommodate the emergency vehicles used by the fire protection and law enforcement agencies serving the school. (Refer to Sections 3.05 and 3.16, Title 19.)

F.3. - Location on Property
Existing non-conforming buildings, and/or portions within, to be rehabilitated for school use shall front directly on a public street or an exit discharge not less than 20 feet in width. The exit discharge to the public street shall be a minimum 20-foot wide right-of-way, unobstructed and maintained only as access to the public street. At least one required exit shall be located on the public street or on the exit discharge. (CBC Section 305.3)

School grounds may be fenced and gates therein may be equipped with locks, provided that safe dispersal areas based on 3 square feet per occupant are located between the school and the fence. Such required safe dispersal areas shall not be located less than 50 feet from school buildings. (CBC 1007.3.11)

F.4. - Construction, Height and Allowable Area
Existing, non-conforming buildings being considered for conversion to school use, should be limited to single-story if possible, as school buildings two or more stories in height are required to be a minimum of one-hour fire-resistive construction. The allowable area of a school building is 9,100 square feet for Type V-N construction, which is the most common building construction type. The area or size of a school building may be increased if it is adequately separated by yards, if travel distance to exits is reduced, or if the building is provided with automatic fire sprinklers throughout. (CBC 305.2)

In evaluating an existing building for rehabilitation as a public school, all of the exiting provisions for educational occupancies within the current code shall be applied, especially those dealing with one-hour corridors, number and width of exits, and travel distance to exits. However, this list is not all inclusive.

School districts evaluating the rehabilitation of existing, non-conforming buildings for use as primary or elementary schools, should pay close attention to the special provisions of CBC 305.2-3 summarized below.

Rooms used for daycare purposes, kindergarten, first- or second-grade pupils shall not be located above or below the first story.

Exceptions:
1. Basements or stories having floor levels located within 4 feet, measured vertically, from adjacent ground level at the level of exit discharge, provided the basement or story has exterior exit doors at that level.
2. In buildings equipped with an automatic sprinkler system throughout, rooms used for kindergarten, first- and second-grade children or for day-care purposes may be located on the second story, provided there are at least two exterior exit doors for the exclusive use of such occupants.
2. Available system test reports of the existing construction.

Asbestos/hazmat removal/Related Safety: See respective appendices.

Water supply (available water pressure)

6. Propose the program for additional data collection, condition assessment and system testing requirements for new building systems, equipment and devices intended for reuse, and propose the method for remediation of the deficiencies. Upon completion of the design, the plans and specifications shall be submitted to the DSA for approval per the provisions of Part 1, Title 24.

H.3 - Condition assessment. Condition assessment is the determination of both physical configuration and physical condition of the building’s systems, equipment and devices. Assessment shall be performed by visual inspection of assessable equipment/devices, and may require removal of finish materials or fireproofing or the use of scoping equipment to obtain access. The condition of the existing structural framing shall be verified for support of the equipment/devices.

The minimum number of samples for condition assessment to be performed shall be as required to validate all existing systems, equipment and devices proposed for reuse, including identification of support framing.

H.4 - Systems, Equipment and Device Testing. Existing systems, equipment and devices that are intended for continued use shall be evaluated by standardized or state-of-the-practice test procedures when necessary to validate conformance with performance and safety requirements of current model code, and may include, but not be limited to the following. Testing shall be performed by a DSA approved laboratory or a nationally Recognized Testing laboratory as appropriate.

Electrical: See Appendix K.

- Panels
- Breakers
- Feeders
- Available Fault Current

Mechanical: See Appendix J.

- Test and balance (pre-test including outside air quantities)
- Duct leakage
- Indoor air quality
- Efficiency for whole building by qualified energy auditor

Fire Life Safety: See Appendix F.

- Fire sprinkler system
- Fire alarm and detectable warning systems
- Water supply (available water pressure)

Related Safety: See respective appendices.

- Asbestos/hazmat removal
POLICIES AND PROVISIONS FOR DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF MECHANICAL/PLUMBING SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE REHABILITATION OF EXISTING NON-CONFORMING BUILDINGS FOR USE AS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

APPENDIX J

J.1 - General
For rehabilitation of any existing building or portion of a building for use as a public school, regardless of whether the rehabilitation constitutes a change in occupancy/use, new or existing mechanical/plumbing systems and equipment shall comply with the requirements of Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition. These policies and provisions are applicable to existing non-conforming buildings currently being used or having previously been used for educational purposes. The systems, equipment and components should be evaluated for their configuration, condition and capacity to service the rehabilitated space.

The existing mechanical systems and equipment shall include, but not be limited to: air-handling units, fan coil units, furnaces, steam and hot water boilers, refrigeration systems, exhaust fans, evaporative coolers, water heaters, and associated equipment. The existing plumbing systems shall include, but not be limited to, the water, sewer, fuel, and fire sprinkler systems. Evaluation of inaccessible systems may necessitate removal of existing finishes or framing materials for observation.

Definition:
Rehabilitated space is defined as the area of the building that is undergoing a change in use to a public school building. Where only a portion of a building is undergoing change to a public school building, the rehabilitated space:

- Shall be separated vertically from the adjacent non-school portion by code-compliant rated wall assemblies, including area/occupancy separation walls, and by seismic separation joints where required by structural regulations.
- Shall be separated horizontally from the adjacent non-school floors, immediately above or below, by code-compliant rated floor assemblies; and, the entire building shall be equipped with an approved automatic fire sprinkler system while the portion of the building occupied by the school, shall be equipped with an approved automatic fire alarm and detection system.
- Shall include any area(s) required for egress/exiting from the public school that is located outside the public school area.

J.2 - Mechanical/Plumbing Policies for Rehabilitation of Existing Systems and Equipment

1. All newly constructed mechanical/plumbing elements, components and systems in the rehabilitated space shall comply with Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition, including anchorage/bracing for structural forces and displacements.

2. Existing mechanical/plumbing systems and components of the rehabilitated space intended for continued use shall be evaluated for compliance with Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition. All existing mechanical/plumbing systems and components not in compliance with the code shall be retrofitted to comply with Title 24, C.C.R., with the following exceptions:

   a. Continued use of existing mechanical equipment that meets all current code requirements other than energy provisions, will be acceptable provided equipment meets minimum efficiency standards per 1995 Title 24, C.C.R.; or,
   b. If the existing building, systems and equipment, including all modifications for rehabilitation meet current energy performance standards per Title 24, C.C.R., no individual equipment upgrades will be required provided that the individual equipment meets all current code requirements other than energy provisions.

3. For rehabilitated buildings served by a remote central plant not located on the school site, and in which the central plant is not owned by the school district, the central plant may be considered as a utility and the existing elements, components and systems at the plant will not require retrofit to compliance with current Title 24 requirements, provided the existing elements, systems and components have sufficient capacity to serve the school use. Any newly constructed or retrofitted mechanical/plumbing elements, components and systems required to support the school facility at the central plant shall comply with Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition.

4. New or existing HVAC/plumbing systems and equipment sharing service to both the school and non-school facilities within the building shall comply or be retrofitted to comply with Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition, in accordance with Items 1 and 2 above. Components of systems crossing building separation joints shall be capable of accommodating the combined displacements of the respective portions during a seismic event.

5. The presence of toxic or hazardous materials/substances in existing systems, equipment or components (asbestos, lead, etc.) shall be disclosed/identified and remediated in accordance with the currently effective federal, state, and local regulatory requirements.

J.3 - Evaluation of Existing Mechanical and Plumbing Systems and Equipment for Continued Use

The policies above provide the basis for evaluation of the existing mechanical/plumbing systems, equipment and devices being considered for continued use in a building undergoing rehabilitation. Considerations include condition assessment, determination of the capacity/performance of the existing systems and equipment, and determination of the proposed demands for comparison with the capacities.

J.3.1. - Condition Assessment of Mechanical/Plumbing Systems and Equipment for Continued Use:

The existing mechanical systems and equipment for continued use shall include, but not be limited to: air-handling units, ducting, fan coil units, furnaces, steam and hot water boilers, refrigeration systems, exhaust fans, evaporative coolers, water heaters, and associated equipment. The existing plumbing systems shall include, but not be limited to, the water, sewer, fuel, and fire sprinkler systems. Evaluation of inaccessible systems may necessitate removal of existing finishes or framing materials for observation.

1. The existing mechanical/plumbing systems and equipment shall be evaluated for compliance with Title 24, C.C.R., and any deficiencies related to the following considerations shall be identified:
   a. Physical Configuration and Condition:
      i. The physical system and equipment shall be evaluated for any deficiencies or missing components that may need to be retrofitted or added to comply with current model code.
      ii. Existing equipment and devices shall be listed, labeled or certified by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL). Equipment not so identified may require replacement, unless it can be tested in place by a NRTL.
      iii. Adequate clearance around existing equipment for serviceability; may require relocation.
      iv. Existing ducts shall be evaluated and tested for leakage.
   b. Age and Serviceability: The age of the equipment may determine whether it is serviceable and still supported by the original manufacturer. Original equipment may be obsolete and replacement parts may be unavailable. Equipment that is unserviceable, or unable to be retrofitted to meet current code, shall be replaced.
   c. Operating Condition:
      i. Equipment shall be maintained in conformance with the applicable code provisions at the time of construction. Any missing parts shall be identified and replaced.
      ii. Equipment and its enclosure should have no damage or open holes exposing live parts. Any damage, including water damage and rust, shall be identified and replaced.
J.3.2. - Determine Capacity/Performance of Existing Mechanical/Plumbing Systems and Equipment for Continued Use

Existing mechanical/plumbing systems and equipment that have been deemed appropriate for continued use in accordance with Section J.3.1., must be evaluated for their capacity/performance to service the proposed school use and for compliance with Title 24, C.C.R. Compliance shall be substantiated by calculation and data collection, including tests of the systems and equipment, in accordance with Appendix H. Considerations shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

MECHANICAL SYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS:

Hazardous and Combustible Materials:
1. Plenum return combustibles: Systems and equipment must be suitable for plenum construction, such as plenum-rated cabling.
2. Opening protection: Protection at penetrations of all rated wall, floor, roof and ceiling assemblies shall be provided; such as fire/smoke dampers in duct penetrations of rated walls.
3. Asbestos/hazmat removal: Existing equipment, duct lining and materials concealing mechanical components may contain toxic or hazardous substances which will require removal prior to retrofitting work, per currently effective regulatory requirements, including but not limited to, asbestos duct insulation, removal of lead based paints or asbestos based wall and framing materials.
4. Mold elimination: Existing equipment, condensate drain pans and finish/framing materials around the equipment may be subject to mold growth requiring remediation in accordance with state and local regulatory requirements. The building air-handler shall have a sloped drain pan to prevent water accumulation.

Water Heating Systems, Combustion, Cooling Refrigeration and Heat Rejection Equipment:
5. New Occupancy/Use System: Evaluation of the existing building systems and equipment should be based on the minimum cooling/heating demands and required energy efficiencies for the proposed new occupancy/use requirements in accordance with the Policy Statements above.
6. Chillers and boilers in same room: Per current Title 24, C.C.R., boilers require a separate one-hour rated room from chillers.

Space Conditioning and Climate Control:
7. Pre-Test and Balance of HVAC System (including outside air quantities): A pre-test and balance of the system, conducted by a Test and Balance Agency, shall be required to determine if the existing HVAC system has adequate capacity to provide required ventilation air, system pressurization (CFM), and conditioned air. The pre-test and balance of the system shall identify deficiencies in the system, retrofitting requirements for existing equipment, and/or whether rebalancing will satisfy system requirements for the proposed use.
8. Outside air: The existing air handling system shall be evaluated for outside air quantities suitable for the new occupancy use based on the minimum rate of outside air per occupant as listed in the current Title 24, C.C.R.
9. Indoor air quality: The building shall be evaluated for potential indoor air quality hazards, which include, but are not limited to:
   a. Current and proposed minimum ventilation rates per Title 24, C.C.R. requirements. Ventilation is required for all areas housing equipment which produce hazardous fumes, such as copy machines, break rooms, janitor closets, etc.
   b. Filtered air supply and contaminant control – All air supply to building shall be filtered for control of contaminants, and shall be evaluated for filter efficiency, location and gages.
   c. Building's outdoor air intakes shall be located away from plumbing vents, building exhaust, traffic areas where fumes from vehicles can be pulled into the building.

Energy Efficiency:
10. High-rise building stairwell requirements: Stairwell pressurization and smoke removal in high-rise buildings shall comply with the requirements of Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition. High rise exit stairwells shall be pressurized by supplying outdoor air directly into stairwell to prohibit smoke leakage into the stairwell during a fire.
11. Atrium requirements: Pressurization and ventilation systems are required to prevent the collection of smoke and to exhaust smoke in case of fire.

PLUMBING SYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS:
The general requirements above should provide the basis for evaluation of the existing plumbing systems, equipment and components of the building and site identified, but not limited to, below:

Water and Sewer Systems:
1. Water supply: The water supply to the site and/or facility shall be evaluated for capacity to service the school building.
2. Pipe materials: Pipe materials for continued use in water distribution shall be evaluated for compliance with Sections 604 and 811, California Plumbing Code (C.P.C.), currently effective edition, and the usage capacity of the new school. ABS and PVC piping shall be acceptable as follows:
   a. For sanitary drainage systems (e.g. toilet and lavatory drainage), the use of ABS or PVC (Schedule 40 DWV) is unlimited to relocatable school buildings.
   b. For storm drainage systems (e.g. roof drainage), the use of ABS or PVC (Schedule 40 DWV) is allowed without exception.
   c. For vent systems (venting of sanitary drainage systems) the use of ABS or PVC (Schedule 40 DWV) is allowed without exception.
3. Plumbing fixtures: Where existing plumbing fixtures are being considered for continued use of the rehabilitated space, additional fixtures, replacement or fixtures retrofitted for accessibility requirements shall be determined and included in the demand for water supply and sewer capacity.
4. Sewer capacity: The sewer system servicing the site and/or facility shall be evaluated for capacity to service the school building.
5. Roof drainage: Roof drainage will be required to comply with current code requirements.

Fuel Systems:
6. Fuel supply: The fuel supply to the site and/or facility shall be evaluated for capacity to service the school building(s). Anchorage will be required per structural requirements.
7. Gas piping: Gas piping shall be evaluated for capacity to meet the maximum demand without undue loss of pressure between the point of supply (meter) and the appliance. Anchorage will be required per structural requirements.
8. Earthquake Actuated Shut-off Valve: Gas piping system shall be evaluated to determine if an automatic shut-off valve is present within the existing fuel gas piping system. The DSA/SS requires this valve for school building construction in the event of a seismic disturbance and, given a change in use/occupancy, this valve may not be part of the existing fuel gas piping system.
Hazardous Materials:
9. Asbestos/lead hazmat removal: Existing equipment, plumbing and piping and materials concealing plumbing components may contain toxic or hazardous substances which will require removal prior to retrofitting work per Department of Toxic Substances Control (California Environmental Protection Agency) and Department of Health Services (DHS) regulations, including but not limited to, lead pipe, lead solder, asbestos insulated pipes, removal of lead based paints or asbestos based materials to gain access to systems.
10. Drinking water: All drinking water samples should be analyzed in accordance with DHS requirements by a DHS-certified laboratory. In 1986, lead solder was banned from use in drinking water plumbing systems. Therefore, buildings constructed prior to 1986, and those plumbed with copper pipe, must receive the water sampling. All tap samples for lead must be collected in accordance with DHS requirements and should be first draw samples (i.e., the first water to flow out of the tap). Piping shall be replaced if the water lead content level is unacceptable as defined by DHS.

Fire Sprinkler Systems:
10. The existing building shall be evaluated for fire sprinkler system equipment: refer to Appendix F. Existing fire sprinkler systems, equipment and devices that are non-compliant will require retrofit or replacement to comply with Title 24, C.C.R. requirements.

J.3.3. - Determine Projected Load/Demand to Establish Adequacy of Existing Systems, Equipment and Devices for Continued Use:
The projected loads of the mechanical/plumbing system and equipment for the new school use, including adjustments for any new HVAC demands on the system, shall be determined and compared with the capacity of the existing systems and equipment Section J.3.2 above. If the existing mechanical/plumbing systems or equipment will not support the proposed use, then either new equipment or retrofit/replacement of the existing equipment will be required.

K.1 - General.
For rehabilitation of any existing building or portion of a building for use as a public school, regardless of whether the rehabilitation constitutes a change in occupancy/use, new or existing electrical systems and equipment shall comply with the requirements of Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition. These policies and provisions are applicable to existing, non-conforming buildings currently or previously in use for educational purposes. The systems, equipment and components should be evaluated for their configuration, condition and capacity to service the rehabilitated space. Evaluation of inaccessible systems may necessitate removal of existing finishes or framing materials for observation.

Definition:
Rehabilitated space is defined as the area of the building that is undergoing a change in use to a public school building. Where only a portion of a building is undergoing such change, the rehabilitated space:
- Shall be separated vertically from the adjacent non-school portion by code-compliant rated wall assemblies, including area/occupancy separation walls, and by seismic separation joints where required by structural regulations.
- Shall be separated horizontally from the adjacent non-school floors, immediately above or below, by code-compliant rated floor assemblies; the entire building shall be equipped with an approved automatic fire sprinkler system while the portion of the building occupied by the school shall be equipped with an approved automatic fire alarm and detection system.
- Shall include any area(s) required for egress/exiting from the public school that is located outside the public school area.

K.2 - Policies for Rehabilitation of Electrical Systems, Equipment and Devices
1. All newly constructed electrical systems and equipment in the rehabilitated space shall comply with Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition. Electrical equipment and components shall be anchored/braced per structural requirements of Title 24.
2. Existing electrical systems and equipment within the rehabilitated space intended for continued use shall be evaluated for the proposed capacity requirements and for compliance with Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective edition. Existing systems and equipment may be deemed to comply with Title 24 requirements when supported by appropriate testing. All existing electrical systems and equipment not meeting the proposed capacity/performance requirements or not in compliance with the currently effective code shall be retrofitted to comply with Title 24, C.C.R.
3. For a rehabilitated school building served by a remote electrical facility not located within the rehabilitated building, any new or existing electrical systems and equipment servicing the facility shall comply with the provisions of Items 1 and 2 above.
4. For buildings in which only a portion of the building is being rehabilitated into a public school, any new or existing electrical systems and equipment located in the same building sharing service to both the school and non-school facilities shall comply with the provisions of Items 1 and 2 above. Components of systems crossing building separation joints shall be capable of accommodating displacements between the building portions that may occur during a seismic event.
5. The presence of toxic or hazardous materials/substances in existing electrical systems and equipment (asbestos, PCB, etc.) shall be identified/disclosed and remediated in accordance with currently effective federal, state and local regulatory requirements.
6. Electrical equipment and devices for new or continued use in the rehabilitated space shall be listed, labeled or certified for its use by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL) as recognized by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

K.3 - Evaluation of Existing Electrical Systems and Equipment for Continued Use

The policies above provide the basis for evaluation of the existing electrical systems, equipment and devices of the building and site intended for continued use. Considerations include condition assessment, determination of the capacity of the existing systems and equipment, and determination of the proposed demands for comparison with the capacities.

K.3.1. - Condition Assessment of Existing Electrical Systems/Equipment and Fire Alarm Systems Proposed for Continued Use:

The existing electrical systems and equipment shall include, but not be limited to: switchboards/switchgear, panelboards, motor control centers, transformers, feeders, and associated equipment. The existing fire alarm systems shall include the fire alarm system and devices, the fire alarm panel and notification devices. Evaluation of inaccessible systems may necessitate removal of existing finishes or framing materials for observation.

1. The existing electrical systems/equipment and fire alarm/detachable warning systems shall be evaluated for compliance with Title 24, C.C.R.; deficiencies related to the following considerations shall be identified:
   a. Physical Configuration and Condition:
      i. The physical system/equipment/wiring shall be evaluated for any deficiencies or missing components that may need to be retrofitted or added to comply with current model code. Evaluation should include safety provisions, including but not limited to: electrical grounding systems, panel enclosures, feeder protection devices.
      ii. Existing equipment and devices shall be listed, labeled or certified by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL). Equipment not so identified may require replacement unless it can be tested in place by a NRTL.
      iii. The physical space and configuration of the existing equipment shall be identified to determine if space exists to add any devices necessary for the new school use. (Example: Space in distribution panels for additional breakers.)
   b. Archaic systems, equipment or components shall be identified for replacement, including, but not limited to:
      a) Fused distribution panels,
      b) Deteriorating wiring.
   c. Operating Condition:
      i. Equipment and wiring shall be maintained in conformance with the applicable code provisions at the time of construction. Any missing or defective parts shall be identified and replaced.
      ii. Equipment and its enclosure shall have no damage or open holes exposing live parts. Any damage, including water damage and rust, shall be identified and replaced.

K.3.2. - Determine Capacity of Existing Electrical Systems and Equipment for Continued Use:

2. Existing electrical systems and equipment that have been determined appropriate for continued use in accordance with Section K.3.1 must be evaluated for the capacity to service the proposed school use. Existing systems and equipment may be deemed to comply with Title 24 requirements when qualified/quantified by the following tests and/or calculations:
   a. Utility: Ability of the existing service utility to provide adequate power for the new usage. If inadequate, the district may be required to replace transformers as directed by the service utility.
   b. Panels: Load calculations or load testing may determine whether the existing electrical “panel” equipment will support the proposed new school use.
   c. “Panel”, as used herein, is defined as any panelboard, switchboard, motor control center, distribution panelboard, etc. Transfer switches and transformers are not defined as panels.
   d. Load requirements of the existing panel system may be determined by either:
      i. Calculation of the connected load in accordance with CEC, Article 220, or
      ii. Continuous Ammeter Recording Load Test (7 days), which reflects the maximum loading of the equipment over a minimum 7 day period. The maximum value recorded over this period shall be multiplied by 125% to establish the maximum demand.
   e. Breakers: Main and feeder breakers being proposed for continued use shall be tested by an approved electrical testing laboratory to verify that the breaker mechanisms function in compliance with original manufacturers specifications.
   f. Feeders: The condition of the insulation of the existing feeders must be determined. Feeders that have been in service for more than 15 years shall be tested to insure that the cable insulation is within tolerance. High Potential test on older cable must be performed or the cables must be replaced. If aluminum cables are encountered, the terminations must be checked to insure they were made per factory specifications; re-termination may be required.
   g. Equipment and Devices: Available Fault Current at each panel should be determined. The Interrupting Capacity (AIC) rating of existing equipment shall be checked to insure that it is adequately rated. New equipment will be rated for the available fault current.

K.3.3. - Determine Projected Load/Demand to Establish Adequacy of Existing Systems, Equipment and Devices for Continued Use:

3. The projected loads of the electrical system and equipment for the new school use, including adjustments for any new HVAC or fire alarm demands on the system, shall be determined and compared with the capacity of the existing electrical systems and equipment per Section K.3.2 above. If the existing electrical system or equipment will not support the proposed use, then either new equipment or retrofit/replacement of the existing equipment will be required.
    a. A schematic single-line diagram shall be prepared with the major equipment labeled to identify equipment capacity and demand on the system, and shall include the following:
       i. Voltage.
       ii. Phase.
       iii. Amperage.
       iv. Utility demand information, if available.
       v. Breaker and fuse sizes.
       vi. Cable size and insulation.
       vii. Load calculated for the school use in accordance with the current CEC.
   b. The projected loads shall be calculated for the school use in accordance with the current CEC.

K.3.4. - Fire Safety Systems:

4. The existing building shall be evaluated to determine if equipped with a complete automatic fire alarm system intended for continued use. Refer to Appendix F. Existing fire alarm systems, equipment and devices that are non-compliant may require retrofit or replacement of electrical components to comply with Title 24, C.C.R. requirements.
L.3. - Preliminary Historic Structures Report (HSR)
The second step of the historic building rehabilitation process to use the CHBC will be submission of a preliminary HSR that must be reviewed, and the proposals accepted, by the DSA before submitting the project Report. A final HSR will be required within the Report. The preliminary HSR will focus on identifying and determining the character defining features which will be affected by the rehabilitation and which will require use of alternative design or construction methods from that required for non-historic structures.

The preliminary HSR will provide the following:
1. Copy of the approved nomination or documentation of the listing.
2. Concise history of the property including date of construction, dates of identifiable alterations, other significant dates such as change of use or end of occupancy.
3. Identification of areas of work required for rehabilitation of the building or structure.
4. Identification of character defining features affected by rehabilitation where use of the CHBC is proposed.

L.4 - Evaluation and Design Criteria Report
The fourth step of the historic building rehabilitation process requires the preparation and submittal of a project Evaluation and Design Criteria Report for review and approval by the DSA. The Report shall include a Final Historic Structures Report (HSR) and a Project Design and Code Analysis.

Final HSR:
The final HSR in the Report will:
1. Document only the historic fabric requiring SHBC application per design and code analysis below.
2. Provide a significance ranking of the affected fabric (described below) to be used by the HSP Manager to assess the individual fabric elements for applicability of CHBC provisions.

The rating system shall use the following rankings: 1 through 5, where 1 is non-historic fabric and 5 is the most significant historic fabric. While the scope of the HSR is limited to documenting the areas of work, the ranking system should be in relationship to the entire building. Example: The areas of work where application of the CHBC is required may be in the lobby and entrance areas of a building where the significance of the historic fabric is at its highest in relationship to the entire building. The HSR shall further define the ranking system specifically for the subject project.

Example: (5) The highest rank, unique or singular element of character defining features of the building, such as an ornamental entranceway or mural; (4) character defining features that occur in relatively few locations, such as similar decorative entrances in several locations; (3) common character defining feature, such as baseboards, architraves and fenestration; (2) historic fabric, common throughout the building, such as lath and plaster or common flooring element; (1) non-historic fabric.

3. Include the following:
   a. Copy of the approved nomination or documentation of the listing.
   b. Concise history of the property including date of construction, dates of identifiable alterations, other significant dates such as change of use or end of occupancy.
   c. Identification of areas of work required for rehabilitation of the building or structure.
   d. General photographs showing the entire building and the important character defining features.
   e. Photographs describing the character defining features necessitating application of the CHBC.

L.2 - Initial data collection and assessment
Initial data collection and assessment of historical features shall be performed in accordance with Section 1650A, Division VI-R, Title 24, C.C.R. and Appendix H, and shall include:

1. Site visit(s) to the building.
2. Data collection of the existing site and building’s structural, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems; water supply; equipment and devices; accessibility; and methods of egress in accordance with Appendices C through K and M.
3. Review of original plans, specifications and associated construction documents. Where original building and site plans and specifications are not available, “as-built” plans shall be prepared that accurately depict the existing site and building(s) per Item 2 above.

Words underlined in this document are defined in Chapter 2, 2001, CHBC.
Project Design and Code Analysis:
To invoke the CHBC provisions of Chapters 8-1, 8-3 thru 8-6, 8-9 and 8-10, the designer must perform preliminary design and code analyses based on the provisions of regular code. Where a character-defining feature is affected by application of the regular code, alternate design using the CHBC may be proposed in the final Report (as defined in this Appendix).

Justification of the proposals shall be included in the Report, and shall:
1. Note the issue or problem and related code section;
2. Indicate alternate designs considered to determine if an alternative can alleviate the conflict with regular code;
3. Document where using the regular code affects character defining features, and explain how alternate methods achieve code compliance using the CHBC.

For structural rehabilitation, compliance with Chapter 8-7, CHBC, Alternate Structural Regulations, shall require compliance with Division VI-R, Title 24, in accordance with Section 4-307, Part 1, Title 24, C.C.R.

On a complex project, a “matrix” of the regular code issues and alternatives may help the designers and the DSA better understand the use of the CHBC. A table may be created with columns for the issues that are in conflict with the regular code and another column with proposed alternatives using the CHBC. Similar items may be “grouped” for simplicity (such as similar elements in multiple similar locations and circumstances). The DSA may require specific information on the design alternatives and the designer should be prepared to provide it. An example of a matrix is available from the DSA Historic School Program Manager.

Submit with the Evaluation and Design Criteria Report:
Approved or “as-built” building plans, specifications and associated construction documents accurately depicting existing construction and historical features of the building.

POLICIES AND PROVISIONS FOR THE REHABILITATION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL USE
APPENDIX M

Words undefined in this document are defined in Chapter 2, 2001 CHBC.

M.1 - Background
For rehabilitation of existing buildings to public schools, owners of qualified historical buildings may request use of currently effective regulations in the State Historical Building Code (SHBC), and the implementing regulations of the California Historical Building Code (CHBC), when strict compliance with the regular code adversely affects the historic fabric of the building.

Why use the CHBC? Buildings and structures identified to contribute to the culture, community or heritage of a locality — and qualified as historical — are recognized by the state as being eligible for special consideration to retain those attributes that are historic during rehabilitation or subsequent change of use. The DSA recognizes that strict use of the regular code may create difficulties where rehabilitation attempts to retain the historic characteristics of a building or structure. The CHBC provides alternatives that 1) allow most of the historic characteristics to be retained while 2) achieving the performance objectives of the regular code.

The CHBC also provides provisions to address specific preservation issues not under DSA authority including The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, CEQA, and local design and preservation ordinances.

M.2 - Definitions and Terminology
Terminology of historic preservation and school construction utilizes many of the same words, but with different meanings. For preservation terms, refer to Chapter 2 of the 2001 California Historical Building Code .

State Historic Building Code. The sections of the Health and Safety Code creating the SHBC program.
California Historical Building Code. The regulation created for application to qualified historical buildings and properties under the SHBC.
Regular Code. The adopted regulations governing design and construction or alteration of non-historical buildings, structures and properties within the jurisdiction of the enforcing agency. For school buildings, the adopted regulations are Title 24, C.C.R., currently effective regulations enforced by DSA.

M.3 - Determine If Your Building or Structure is a Qualified Historical Building or Structure
There are a number of ways under the SHBC to qualify a building as historic. At its simplest:
1. Designation must follow the basic rules of the California Register of Historical Resources, and
2. Buildings shall have been identified to contribute to the culture, community or heritage of a locality.
3. Buildings and structures may be of significance to the local area.
4. A school district board may designate structures under their jurisdiction as historic.

M.4 - DSA Acceptance of the State Historical Building Code (SHBC) for Rehabilitation of an Existing Historical Building to a Public School
To substantiate that the SHBC and the implementing regulations of the CHBC are applicable for use on a public school rehabilitation project, a five-step process shall be followed:
1. First, the school district or design team shall contact the DSA Regional Manager (who will then contact the Historic School Program Manager) at the earliest opportunity during the building/property selection process. The purpose is to notify the DSA of the historic project, discuss requirements for a preliminary Historic Structures Report (HSR), and to schedule a pre-Report consultation.

2. Second, the design team shall prepare and submit a preliminary HSR, as described in Appendix L, to the DSA for review and discussion by the Historic School Program Manager before the pre-Report consultation meeting.

3. Third, the DSA will conduct a pre-consultation meeting to discuss the proposals in the preliminary HSR and the requirements for the project Evaluation and Design Criteria Report.

4. Fourth, the design team shall prepare and submit the project Evaluation and Design Criteria Report as described in Appendix L.

5. Fifth, the DSA shall review and approve the Report prior to design development of the project.

M.5 – Alternate Accessibility Provisions of Historical Buildings and Properties

The California Building Code (CBC) requires non-conforming buildings converted to school use to fully comply with the current building regulations for new construction. However, the SHBC contained in C.C.R., Title 24, Part 8 (also reprinted in CBC, Chapter 34, Division II) requires state agencies to apply the SHBC to qualified historical buildings and properties in order to preserve the historical significance or character-defining features of the building or property.

Unless strict compliance with the regular code will threaten or destroy the historical significance or character-defining features of the building or property, adopted building regulations governing the construction of new (non-historical) buildings for accessibility for persons with disabilities (regular code) must be applied to existing, non-conforming, qualified historical buildings or properties converted to school use. If the historical significance or character-defining features are found to be threatened, alternative provisions for access may be applied pursuant to the SHBC — provided that, in addition to other conditions, sufficient justification is submitted to the DSA to substantiate any claims that may be made regarding the use of such alternatives. Such claims, along with supporting justification and the proposed alternative provisions, shall be submitted as a component of the HSR (outlined in Appendix L).

The application of any alternative standards for qualified historical buildings providing accessibility to persons with disabilities shall be done on a case-by-case, item-by-item basis, and shall not be applied to an entire building or structure without individual consideration of each item. This same case-by-case, item-by-item analysis shall apply to a designated historic site, beyond the immediate structure, if these elements are considered as an integral part of, and significant to the historic structure or district.

M.6 – Alternate Structural Regulations of Historical Buildings

For structural rehabilitation of a qualifying historic building, compliance with Chapter 8-7, Alternate Structural Regulations, and Chapter 8-8, Archaic Materials and Methods of Construction, of the CHBC shall require compliance with Division VI-R, Title 24, in accordance with Section 4-307, Part 1, Title 24, C.C.R.

M.7 – Alternate Mechanical, Plumbing and Electrical Regulations of Historical Buildings

Continued use of the existing mechanical, plumbing and electrical building systems and equipment of a qualifying historic building may utilize the provisions of Chapter 8-9, Mechanical Plumbing Electrical Requirements, CHBC, and shall meet the provisions of Appendices G and K.

M.8 – Alternate Fire Protection Requirements

Alternate fire protection systems in a qualifying historic building may utilize the provisions of Chapter 8-4, Fire Protection, CHBC, and shall meet the provisions of Appendices E and F.
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Appendix E
Agency Information Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Individual</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td>October 9, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation</td>
<td>October 22, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County</td>
<td>November 5, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 9, 2008

Mr. Henry Kaplan, Assistant Planner
THE PLANNING CENTER
9841 Airport Boulevard, Suite 1010
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Sent by FAX to: 310-670-9512
No. of Pages: 2

Re: Request for a Sacred Lands File records search and Native American Contacts list for the proposed San Marino High School Project located in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County, California

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

The Native American Heritage Commission was able to perform a record search of its Sacred Lands File (SLF) for the affected project area/area of potential effect (APE). The SLF failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not guarantee the absence of cultural resources in any project area.

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Enclosed are the names of culturally-affiliated Native American Contacts that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. A list of Native American contacts is attached to assist you. It is advisable to contact the persons listed; if they cannot supply you with specific information about the impact on cultural resources, they may be able to refer you to another tribe or person knowledgeable of the cultural resources in or near the affected project area. A local tribe or Native American individual may be the only source of a Native American cultural resource.

Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in Section 15370 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when significant cultural resources could be affected by a project. Also, Public Resources Code Section 15064.5(f) and Section 15097.98 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archaeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a dedicated cemetery. Discussion of these should be included in your environmental documents, as appropriate.

If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton, Program Analyst

Attachment: Native American Contact List
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
October 9, 2008

Ti'At Society
Cindi Alvitre
6515 E. Seaside Walk, #C
Long Beach, CA 90803
calvitre@yahoo.com
(714) 504-2468 Cell

Gabrielson Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA 90707
gtongva@verizon.net
562-761-6417 - voice
562-925-7989 - fax

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
tattlaw@gmail.com
310-570-6567

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 593
San Gabriel, CA 91778
ChiefRBwife@aol.com
(626) 286-1632
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 Fax

Gabrieleno/Tongva, Council / Gabrieleno Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Tribal Secretary
761 Terminal Street; Bldg 1, 2nd floor
Gabrieleno Tongva
Los Angeles, CA 90021
office @tongvatribe.net
(213) 489-5001 - Office
(909) 262-9351 - cell
(213) 489-5002 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 597.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 597.30 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed San Marino High School Project located in the City of San Marino; Los Angeles County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
From: Johnnmy Rosas  
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2008 5:02 PM  
To: Henry Kaplan; Dave Singleton  
Subject: Re: San Marino High School Pool Expansion Project  

Categories: San Marino

HI I WILL BE SURPRISED IF YOU DONT HIT BONES HERE, THIS AREA IS A KNOWN SITE , LOOK AROUND AND SEE ALL THE POST CONTACT INDIAN HISTORY, YOU WILL NEED TO DO TESTING AND PRESERVE IN PLACE [IN SITU ] IF THAT IS NOT ADOPTED AS A MITIGATION CONDITION TO THE PROJECT WE WILL OBJECTING AND OPPOSING ANY EXCAVATION THERE.

ALSO PLEASE FOLLOW ALL NAHC RECOMMENDATIONS, THANKS JOHN TOMMY

On Wed, Oct 22, 2008 at 4:53 PM, Henry Kaplan <hkapan@planningcenter.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Rosas,

The Planning Center is assisting the San Marino Unified School District in the preparation of environmental documentation for a proposed expansion of athletic facilities at San Marino High School. We are contacting Native American groups and individuals to help identify any prehistoric sites, sacred sites, or traditional cultural properties located in the vicinity of the project area. Attached to this email is a pdf file with a more information. If you have any information that would be relevant to this project and its possible effect on cultural resources, please contact me with a written response.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Henry Kaplan, Assistant Planner

THE PLANNING CENTER

9841 Airport Boulevard, Suite 1010 | Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Tel: 310.670.9221, ext. 50 | Fax: 310.670.9512  
Email: hkapan@planningcenter.com  
www.planningcenter.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
JOHN TOMMY ROSAS
TRIBAL ADMINISTRATOR
TRIBAL LITIGATOR
TONGVA ANCESTRAL TERRITORIAL TRIBAL NATION
OFFICIAL TATTN E-MAIL CONFIDENTIAL
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
TATTN / TRIBAL NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY:

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, use, disclosure, or distribution by unintended recipients is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

TRUTH IS OUR VICTORY AND HONOR IS OUR PRIZE >TATTN ©
The Planning Center  
9841 Airport Boulevard, Suite 1010  
Los Angeles, CA 90045-5409

Attn: Henry Kaplan, Assistant Environmental Planner

re: Vertebrate Paleontology Records Check for paleontological resources for the proposed San Marino High School Pool Expansion Project, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County, project area

Dear Henry:

I have conducted a thorough search of our paleontology collection records for the locality and specimen data for the San Marino High School Pool Expansion Project, in the City of San Marino, Los Angeles County, project area as outlined on the portions of the Mt. Wilson and El Monte USGS topographic quadrangle maps that you sent to me on 8 October 2008. We have no vertebrate fossil localities that lie directly within the proposed project area, but we do have localities nearby from the same or similar sedimentary deposits as occur mostly subsurface within the proposed project area.

In the very northern portion of the proposed project area there are surficial deposits composed of older Quaternary Alluvium, while the remainder of the proposed project area has surficial deposits composed of younger Quaternary Alluvium, primarily derived as fan deposits from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north or possibly as fluvial deposits from the Eaton Wash drainage immediately to the east. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils, at least in the uppermost layers, but they are likely underlain, possibly at relatively shallow depths, by deposits of older Quaternary Alluvium. Our closest vertebrate fossil locality in these older Quaternary deposits is LACM (CIT) 342, in Eagle Rock just south of west of the proposed project area east of the Pasadena Freeway (I-110) and Eagle Rock Boulevard just south of York Boulevard, that produced fossil specimens of turkey, *Parapavo californicus*, and mammoth, *Mammuthus*, at a depth of 14 feet below the surface. The fossil turkey specimen from locality LACM (CIT) 342 was published in the scientific literature by L.H. Miller in 1942 (A New Fossil Bird Locality. *Condor*, 44(6):283-284) and the mammoth specimen was a rare, nearly complete skeleton and was published in the scientific literature by V.L. Roth in 1984 (How Elephants Grow: Heterochrony and the Calibration of Developmental Stages in Some Living and Fossil Species. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 4(1):126-145).
Surface grading or very shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed in the proposed project area probably will not uncover significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deeper excavations that extend into older Quaternary deposits, as well as any excavations in the older Quaternary deposits exposed in the northern portion of the proposed project area, however, may well encounter significant fossil vertebrate specimens. Therefore, any substantial excavations in the proposed project area should be monitored closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains discovered while not impeding development. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations.

This records search covers only the vertebrate paleontology records of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. It is not intended to be a thorough paleontological survey of the proposed project area covering other institutional records, a literature survey, or any potential on-site survey.

Sincerely,

Samuel A. McLeod, Ph.D.
Vertebrate Paleontology

closure: draft invoice
Appendices

Appendix F
Noise Appendix
## Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

**Report date:** 7/27/2009  
**Case Description:** Michael White Adobe - demolition

### --- Receptor #1 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Impact Device</th>
<th>Usage(%)</th>
<th>Spec Lmax(dBA)</th>
<th>Actual Lmax(dBA)</th>
<th>Receptor Distance (feet)</th>
<th>Shielding (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculated (dBA)**

Backhoe: 56.9 52.9  
Front End Loader: 58.4 54.4  
Total: 58.4 56.7

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.

### --- Receptor #2 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Classrooms</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Impact Device</th>
<th>Usage(%)</th>
<th>Spec Lmax(dBA)</th>
<th>Actual Lmax(dBA)</th>
<th>Receptor Distance (feet)</th>
<th>Shielding (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculated (dBA)**

Backhoe: 66.9 63.0  
Front End Loader: 68.5 64.5  
Total: 68.5 66.8

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.*
## Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

**Report date:** 7/23/2009  
**Case Description:** Michael White Adobe - relocation

### Receptor #1

#### Baselines (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-site from School</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spec Device</th>
<th>Usage(%)</th>
<th>Actual Lmax (dBA)</th>
<th>Receptor Distance (feet)</th>
<th>Estimated Shielding (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Calculated (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Lmax</th>
<th>Leq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.

### Receptor #2

#### Baselines (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-site from Lacy Park</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spec Device</th>
<th>Usage(%)</th>
<th>Actual Lmax (dBA)</th>
<th>Receptor Distance (feet)</th>
<th>Estimated Shielding (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Calculated (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Lmax</th>
<th>Leq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.
Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

Report date: 7/23/2009
Case Description: Michael White Adobe - relocation

--- Receptor #3 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baselines (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Classrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spec Impact Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Lmax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 74.6 72.5

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.

--- Receptor #4 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baselines (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurnher Picnic Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spec Impact Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Lmax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 79.2 77.1

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.
## Construction Generated Vibration at Lacy Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Location: Off-Site Single-Family Residential</th>
<th>Small Bulldozer</th>
<th>Closest Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vibration Annoyance Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Velocity at 25 ft (VdB)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Velocity (VdB) at Receptor (Closest)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Velocity (VdB) at Receptor (Average)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Damage Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate RMS Velocity at 25 feet (inch per second)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Velocity (inch/sec) at Receptor (Closest)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Receptor Location: On-Site Buildings at Lacy Park    | 5               |                  |
| **Structural Damage Assessment**                     |                 |                  |
| Approximate RMS Velocity at 25 feet (inch per second)| 0.003           |                  |
| Approximate Velocity (inch/sec) at Receptor (Closest)| 0.034           |                  |
| **Criteria**                                         | 0.2             |                  |

Notes: RMS velocity calculated from vibration level (VdB) using the reference of one microinch/second.

ARTICLE 04 – Back to top

NOISE CONTROL

SECTION:
14.04.01: Declaration Of Policy
14.04.02: Definitions
14.04.03: Noise Level Enforcement Criteria
14.04.04: Ambient Base Noise Level
14.04.05: Noise Level Restrictions
14.04.06: Special Noise Sources
14.04.07: Construction Of Buildings And Projects
14.04.08: Vehicles
14.04.09: Sound Trucks
14.04.10: Excessive Noise Prohibited
14.04.11: Standards
14.04.12: Excessive Noise Near Schools Prohibited
14.04.13: Exclusions
14.04.14: Violations And Penalties

14.04.01: DECLARATION OF POLICY:
It is hereby declared to be the policy of the City to prohibit unnecessary, excessive and annoying noises from all sources subject to its police power and contrary to the public interest. At certain levels, noises are detrimental to the health and welfare of the citizenry and in the public interest, should be systematically proscribed. (1954 Code §14.7.101)

14.04.02: DEFINITIONS:
As used in this Article, unless the context otherwise clearly indicates, the words and phrases used in this Article are defined as follows:

AMBIENT BASE NOISE LEVEL: Reasonable and representative ambient noise levels in various land use categories in the City and at various times as established by the City’s Technical Background Study for Noise, of March 1975.

AMBIENT NOISE LEVEL: The all-encompassing noise associated with a given environment, usually being a composite of sounds with many sources excluding the alleged offensive noise at the location and approximate time at which a comparison with the alleged offensive noise is to be made.

COMMERCIAL PURPOSE: Means and includes the use, operation or maintenance of any sound-amplifying equipment for the purpose of advertising any business or any goods or any services or for the purpose of attracting the attention of the public to or advertising for or soliciting patronage or customers to or for any performance, show, entertainment, exhibition or event or for the purpose of demonstrating any such sound equipment.

DECIBEL (dB): A unit of level which denotes the ratio between two (2) quantities which are proportional to power; the number of decibels corresponding to the ratio of two (2) amounts of power is ten (10) times the logarithm to the base ten (10) of this ratio.

EMERGENCY WORK: Work made necessary to restore property to a safe condition following a public calamity or work required to protect persons or property from an imminent exposure to danger.

MOTOR VEHICLES: Includes, but is not limited to, off-road vehicles, mini-bikes and go-carts.

NOISE LEVEL: The “A” weighted sound pressure level in decibels obtained by using a sound level meter at slow response with a reference pressure of twenty (20) micronewtons per square meter. The unit of measure is the dBA.

NONCOMMERCIAL PURPOSE: The use, operation or maintenance of any sound-amplifying equipment for other than a “commercial purpose”. Noncommercial purpose shall mean and include, but shall not be limited to, philanthropic, political, patriotic and charitable purposes.

PERSON: A person, firm, association, co-partnership, joint venture, corporation or any entity, public or private in nature.

SOUND-AMPLIFYING EQUIPMENT: Any machine or device for the amplification of the human voice, music or any other sound.

SOUND LEVEL METER: An instrument meeting American National Standard Institute's Standard S1.4-1971 for Type 1 or Type 2 sound level meters or an instrument and the associated recording and
analyzing equipment which will provide equivalent data.

SOUND PRESSURE LEVEL: Sound pressure level, in decibels, of a sound shall mean twenty (20) times
the logarithm to the base ten (10) of the ratio of the pressure of this sound to the reference pressure,
which reference pressure shall be explicitly stated.

SOUND TRUCK: Any motor vehicle, or any other vehicle regardless of motive power, whether in motion
or stationary, having mounted thereon, attached thereto or used on or within any sound-amplifying
equipment. "Sound trucks" shall not include standard automobile radios or tape decks when used and
heard only by the occupants of the vehicle in which the automobile radio is installed. "Sound trucks" shall
not include warning devices on authorized emergency vehicles or horns or other warning devices on any
City-owned vehicle used only for traffic safety purposes. (1954 Code §14.7.102)

14.04.03: NOISE LEVEL ENFORCEMENT CRITERIA:
Enforcement of the provisions of this Article shall be based on a noise level measurement to establish
the noise level. Said measurement shall be taken in accordance with court-accepted practices or as
indicated in the noise element of the General Plan concerning noise level measurement procedures.
(1954 Code §14.7.103)

14.04.04: AMBIENT BASE NOISE LEVEL:
Where the ambient noise level is less than designated in this Section, the ambient base noise level in
this Section shall govern.

AMBIENT BASE NOISE LEVEL
10:00 P.M. To 7:00 A.M. To
Zone 7:00 A.M. To 10:00 P.M.

R-1 Residential 45 55
R-1 Residential corridor* 45 60
Commercial 50 65

Any noise at a level which exceeds the ambient base level as set forth in this Section by more than ten
(10) dB, when measured at any adjacent privately owned residential property line, shall constitute proof
of a violation of Section 14.04.05 of this Article.

* Residential corridor shall mean any residential property located within one hundred fifty feet (150') of a
commercial zone or from any portion of Huntington Drive not abutting a commercial area. (1954 Code
§14.7.104)

14.04.05: NOISE LEVEL RESTRICTIONS:
It shall be unlawful for any person to wilfully make or continue or wilfully cause to be made or continued
any noise from any source or place at a level which exceeds a decibel level measured at any adjacent
residential property line of:
65 dB from any parcel in an R-1 Zone.
75 dB from any parcel in a C-1 Zone, Park and Recreational Zone or Historical and Cultural Zone.

A violation of this Section shall be a misdemeanor or an infraction, as determined by the City Prosecutor.

14.04.06: SPECIAL NOISE SOURCES:
A. Radios, Television Sets And Similar Devices: It shall be unlawful for any person within any residential
zone of the City to use or operate any radio receiving set, musical instrument, phonograph, television set
or other machine or any sound-amplifying equipment in a manner which constitutes a violation of Section
14.04.05 of this Article. (1954 Code §14.7.201)
B. Hawkers And Peddlers:
1. It shall be unlawful for any person within the City to sell anything by outcry within any area of the
City zoned for residential uses. (1954 Code §14.7.202)
2. It is hereby declared to be a nuisance and it shall be unlawful for any person vending, advertising
or soliciting the sale of or assisting in vending, advertising or soliciting the sale of any kind of notions,
merchandise or medicines in the City to use a musical instrument or device or to sing or call out to
make any noise to attract persons for the purpose of vending, advertising or soliciting the sale of
notions, medicines or merchandise. (1954 Code §14.6)
C. Drums: It shall be unlawful for any person to use any drum or other instrument or device of any kind
for the purpose of attracting attention for commercial purposes by the creation of noise within the City.
This subsection shall not apply to any person who is a participant in a school band or duly authorized
parade or who has been otherwise duly authorized to engage in such conduct by the City Manager. 
(1954 Code §14.7.203)

D. Schools And Churches: It shall be unlawful for any person to create any noise on any street, sidewalk 
or public place adjacent to any school, institution of learning or church while the same is in use if such 
noise unreasonably interferes with the workings of such institution or which would constitute a violation of 
Section 14.04.05 of this Article. (1954 Code, §14.7.204)

E. Animals And Fowl:
1. No person shall keep or maintain or permit the keeping of, upon any premises owned, occupied or 
   controlled by such person, any animal or fowl otherwise permitted to be kept which, by any loud or 
   continuous cry, bark, howl or other sound shall violate Section 14.04.05 of this Article.
2. No person shall keep or maintain, or permit the keeping of, upon any premises owned, occupied, 
or controlled by such person, any dog or other animal or fowl otherwise permitted to be kept which, 
by any loud or continuous cry, bark, howl, or other sound unreasonably disturbs other persons.
3. Violations of subsection E1 and E2 of this Section may be enforced as provided in Section 
   14.04.14 of this Article and shall also constitute a nuisance which may be abated pursuant to Chapter 
   VIII, Article 03 of this Code. (Ord. 096-1102, 11-13-1996)

F. Portable Engine Or Motor-Powered Blowers:
1. Definition: For the purposes of this subsection, a “portable blower” shall mean any mechanically 
powered device, regardless of the source of power, which is not stationary and used for the purpose 
of blowing leaves, dirt or other debris off sidewalks, driveways, lawns or other surfaces.
2. Permitted Hours Of Use: No portable blower shall be used within the City except during the 
   following hours:
   Monday through Friday 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. 
   Saturday 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.
3. Number Of Permitted Portable Blowers:
   a. No more than one portable blower shall be used in operation at a given time on any parcel in 
      Area Districts III, IV, V, VI, VII of the R-1 Zones.
   b. No more than two (2) portable blowers shall be used in operation at a given time on any parcel 
      in Area Districts I, IE and II of the R-1 Zones, the Park and Recreational Zone, the Historical and 
      Cultural Zone or the C-1 Zone.
4. Extension Nozzle Required: No portable blower shall be operated in the City unless it is equipped 
   with an extension nozzle at least three feet (3’) in length. The extension shall be used at all times the 
   portable blower is in operation.
5. Prohibited Acts:
   a. No portable blower shall be operated in a manner which will permit leaves, dust or debris to be 
      blown onto neighboring property.
   b. No portable blower shall be operated in a manner which will permit leaves or debris to be blown 
      onto public streets or alleyways.
6. Effect Of Repeated Violations: No person who operates a portable blower in violation of this 
   subsection or Section 14.04.05 of this Article a total of more than three (3) times during any twelve 
   (12) month period may use any portable blower within the City until said person has:
   a. Attended a course of instruction approved by the City Manager on the proper use of portable 
      blowers; and
   b. Obtained a permit from the City Manager for each portable blower used or to be used by the 
      person within the City during the subsequent twelve (12) months certifying that the portable 
      blower is incapable of producing sound exceeding sixty (60) decibels (dBA) when measured at a 
      point fifty feet (50’) from the portable blower.
7. Violation: A violation of this subsection shall be a misdemeanor or an infraction, as determined by 
   the City Prosecutor. Each and every day on which there is a violation of this subsection at any parcel 
   shall be a separate infraction. (Ord. 937, 1-25-1988; amd. 1994 Code)

14.04.07: CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS AND PROJECTS:
It shall be unlawful for any person within a residential zone, or within a radius of five hundred feet 
(500’) therefrom, to operate equipment or perform any outside construction or repair work on 
buildings, structures or projects or to operate any pile driver, steam shovel, pneumatic hammer, 
derrick, steam or electric hoist or other construction-type device on construction requiring a building, 
plumbing, electrical or grading permit in such a manner that noise is produced which would constitute 
a violation of Section 14.04.05 of this Article unless, beforehand, an additional permit therefor has
been duly obtained from the Planning and Building Director. (Ord. 096-1098, 9-11-1996)

14.04.08: VEHICLES:
A. Vehicle Repairs: It shall be unlawful for any person within any residential zone of the City to repair, rebuild or test any motor vehicle, thereby producing noise which would constitute a violation of Section 14.04.05 of this Article. (1954 Code §14.7.401)
B. Motor-Driven Vehicles: It shall be unlawful for any person to operate any motor-driven vehicle within the City in such a manner producing noise which would constitute a violation of Section 14.04.05 of this Article. (The mechanical equipment of motor vehicles driving on public streets shall be controlled by applicable provisions of the Vehicle Code.) (1954 Code §14.7.402)

14.04.09: SOUND TRUCKS:
A. Purpose: The Council enacts this Section for the sole purpose of securing and promoting the public health, comfort, safety and welfare for its citizenry. While recognizing that the use of sound-amplifying equipment for certain purposes is protected by the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly, the Council nevertheless feels obligated to reasonably regulate the use of sound-amplifying equipment in order to protect the correlative constitutional rights of the citizens of this community to privacy and freedom from public nuisance of loud and unnecessary noise. (1954 Code §14.7.501)
B. Commercial Use Prohibited: It shall be unlawful for any person to install, use or operate within the City for commercial purposes a sound truck in a fixed or movable position or upon any sound truck. (1954 Code §14.7.502)
C. Noncommercial Use:
1. Registration Requirements: It shall be unlawful for any person, other than personnel of law enforcement or governmental agencies, to install, use or operate within the City for noncommercial purposes any sound truck for the purposes of giving instructions, directions, talks, addresses, lectures or transmitting music to any persons or assemblages of persons in or upon any street, alley, sidewalk, park or other public property without first filing a registration statement and obtaining approval thereof as hereinafter set forth:
a. Registration Statement: Every user of a sound truck for noncommercial purposes shall file a registration statement with the Chief of Police ten (10) days prior to the date on which the sound-amplifying equipment is intended to be used, which statement shall contain the following information:
   (1) The name, address and telephone number of both the owner and user of the sound-amplifying equipment;
   (2) The maximum sound-producing power of the sound-amplifying equipment which shall include the wattage to be used, the volume in decibels of sound which will be produced and the approximate distance for which sound will be audible from the sound-amplifying equipment;
   (3) The license and motor number if a sound truck is to be used;
   (4) A general description of the sound-amplifying equipment which is to be used; and
   (5) The nature of the use of the sound-amplifying equipment proposed to be used for noncommercial purposes.
b. Approval Of Statement: The Chief of Police shall return to the applicant an approved, certified copy of the registration statement unless he/she finds that:
   (1) The conditions of the motor vehicle movement are such that, in the opinion of the Chief of Police, use of the equipment would constitute a detriment to traffic safety; or
   (2) The conditions of pedestrian movement are such that use of the equipment would constitute a detriment to traffic safety; or
   (3) The registration statement required reveals that the applicant would violate the provisions set forth in Section 14.04.11 of this Article or any other provisions of this Code.
c. Disapproval: In the event the registration statement is disapproved, the Chief of Police shall endorse upon the statement his/her reasons for disapproval and return it forthwith to applicant.
d. Revocation: Any such permit may be revoked for violation of this Article. (1954 Code §14.7.503)
2. Appeals: Any person aggrieved by disapproval of a registration statement may file an appeal to the City Council within ten (10) days of the date of disapproval. The City Council shall hear and decide such appeal at its next regular meeting. (1954 Code §14.7.504)
3. Regulations: The noncommercial use of sound trucks shall be subject to the following regulations:
a. The only sound permitted shall be either music or human speech or both.
b. The operation of sound trucks shall only occur between the hours of eight o’clock (8:00) A.M. and
six o'clock (6:00) P.M. each day, except on Sundays and legal holidays. The operation of sound
trucks on Sundays and legal holidays shall only occur between the hours of ten o'clock (10:00) A.M.
and six o'clock (6:00) P.M.
c. No sound emanating from sound trucks shall exceed fifteen (15) dB above the ambient, as
measured at any property line, for more than three (3) minutes in any three (3) hour period.
d. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection C3c of this Section, sound trucks shall not be
operated within two hundred feet (200') of churches, schools or City or County buildings.
e. In any event, the volume of sound shall be so controlled that it will not be unreasonably loud,
raucous, jarring, disturbing or a nuisance to reasonable persons of normal sensitiveness within the
area of audibility. (1954 Code §14.7.505)

14.04.10: EXCESSIVE NOISE PROHIBITED:
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Article, and as a separate flexible standard to the rigid
requirements of Section 14.04.05 hereof, it shall be unlawful for any person to willfully make or
continue or willfully cause to be made or continued any loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which
disturbs the peace or quiet of any neighborhood. (1954 Code §14.7.601)

14.04.11: STANDARDS:
The standards which may be considered in determining whether a violation of the provisions of this
Article exists shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
A. The loudness of the noise;
B. The intensity of the noise;
C. Whether the nature of the noise is usual or unusual;
D. Whether the origin of the noise is natural or unnatural;
E. The loudness and intensity of the background noise, if any;
F. The proximity of the noise to residential sleeping facilities;
G. The nature and zoning of the area within which the noise emanates;
H. The density of the inhabitation of the area within which the noise emanates;
I. The time of the day or night the noise occurs;
J. The duration of the noise;
K. Whether the noise is recurrent, intermittent or continuous; and
L. Whether the noise is produced by a commercial or residential activity. (1954 Code §14.7.602)

14.04.12: EXCESSIVE NOISE NEAR SCHOOLS PROHIBITED:
Notwithstanding any other provision of this Article, it shall be unlawful for any person to willfully make
or continue or willfully cause to be made or continued any noise in excess of fifty two (52) dB when
measured within any classroom in a public or private school during hours that said classroom is being
used for instruction. (Ord. 096-1101, 10-25-1996)

14.04.13: EXCLUSIONS:
The provisions of this Article shall not apply to:
A. Sound produced by motor vehicles as regulated by sound limitation provisions of the California
   Vehicle Code when such vehicle is located or operated on any public street or highway.
B. Aircraft operated in conformity with Federal law.
C. Public and private school organized activities, including sports, carnivals, assemblies and other
   related activities.
D. Intermittent noise continuing for less than thirty (30) seconds at intervals greater than once every
   three (3) hours.
E. Noise as to which there is specific consent from all affected persons. (Ord. 096-1101, 10-25-1996)

14.04.14: VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES:
Any person violating any of the provisions of this Article shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor or
infraction as determined by the City Prosecutor and punishable as provided in subsection 01.04.03A

14.04.15: EFFECT OF PROVISIONS:
Nothing in this Article shall authorize any use otherwise prohibited or regulated by this City Code.
Appendix G
Cost Estimates of Alternatives Considered
# Preliminary Estimate of Probable Cost

## Demolition of Michael White Adobe
San Marino Unified School District

### Description of Work Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work Scope</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Photographic Documentation</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Architectural Historian (packaging &amp; follow up with NPS)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Archaeological Reports &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demolition (see attached contractor quote)</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Restoration (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$22,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimate of Probable Construction Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work Scope</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL PROJECT CONTINGENCY @ 10%</td>
<td>$12,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCALATION @ 5% PER YEAR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT RELATED (SOFT) COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing (Compaction tests)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E Fees (Bid plans &amp; specs)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Soft Costs</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work Scope</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</td>
<td>$176,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST
DEMOLITION OF MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE
SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

4. DEMOLITION OF ADOBE & SITE IMPROVEMENTS

C.A.C. CONSTRUCTION, INC.
MAILING: PO BOX 1406, MORONO VALLEY, CA 92556
2405 MESA RIDGE LANE, MORONO VALLEY, CA 92557
(951) 242-6247 FAX (951) 247-5206

JULY 07, 2009

PROPOSAL

TO: SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1665 WEST DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

ATTN: JULIE HERRIG
(626) 357-9880 FAX (626) 357-9880

PROJECT: MICHAEL WHITE HOUSE
2761 HUNTINGTON DR
SAN MARINO, CA

THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERING C.A.C. CONSTRUCTION, INC. AS A POTENTIAL CONTRACTOR FOR YOUR PROJECT NEEDS.

SCOPE: C.A.C. CONSTRUCTION, INC. TO SUPPLY ALL LABOR, MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT TO COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1. DEMOLITION ONE HOUSE STRUCTURE.
2. REMOVE 1,200 SQ. FT. OF CONCRETE AND BRICK SLAB.
3. REMOVE VARIOUS AND MATERIAL.
4. CAP OFF OR REMOVE ALL UTILITIES TO STRUCTURE.
5. REMOVE WROUGHT IRON FENCE.
6. SITE TO BE LEVELED ONCE DEMO IS COMPLETE.

NOTE:
1. COMPLETION OF WORK FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS.
2. ALL SALVAGE ITEMS SHALL BE REMOVED BY OTHERS.
3. ALL POOL PROTECTION BY OTHERS.
4. ALL HAZARDOUS MATERIAL SHALL BE REMOVED BY OTHERS.

TOTAL TAX INCLUDED $34,000.00

PROPOSAL VALID FOR THIRTY (30) DAYS.
DIRECT QUESTIONS TO IKE BEAVOR (760) 617-3317 OR JOE ANDERSON (951) 212-8297
THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO BID

IKE BEAVOR
W.P.

CARMICHAEL-KEMP, ARCHITECTS
302 W. Foothill Blvd., Monrovia Phone (626) 357-9880
# PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST

## DEMOLITION OF MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE

**SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New ac paving for parking, 4&quot; over 6&quot; base, w/ sealcoat</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$8,265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripe out new parking spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace concrete walk damaged by construction</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New conc vee gutter at edge of conc walk</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New catch basin in vee gutter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 4&quot; storm drain to connect to existing storm drain</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6ft CL fence between parking and sidewalk</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking bumpers at parking stalls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
Design Contingency 15%  
OH & P 15%  
**TOTAL - BLDG. RELOCATION**  

$22,356.86
PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST
RELOCATION OF MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE TO LACY PARK
SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF WORK SCOPE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PHOTOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN (packaging &amp; follow up with NPS)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS &amp; MONITORING</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BUILDING PREPARATION / STAGING FOR MOVE (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$531,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. BUILDING MOVE / RELOCATION (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$149,668.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SITE PREPARATION AT LACY PARK (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$108,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SITE RESTORATION AT SAN MARINO HIGH SCHOOL (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$22,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST
$917,298

- OVERALL PROJECT CONTINGENCY @ 10% $91,730
- ESCALATION @ 5% PER YEAR
- PROJECT RELATED (SOFT) COSTS
  - Inspection (based on 5-6 mos. of construct.) $30,000
  - Testing (Compaction tests) $10,000
  - A/E Fees (Bid plans & specs) $104,300
  - Agency Fees (Permit) $5,000
  - Legal Fees
  - Subtotal · Soft Costs $149,300

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET * $1,158,328

* Not including restoration, reroofing, electrical, plumbing, flooring, wall surfaces upgrades, etc., estimated at $500,000 to $700,000+.
### PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST

**RELOCATION OF MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE TO LACY PARK**

Preparation & Staging for Relocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Material Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Equipment Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demo all areas</td>
<td>355.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$17,217.50</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$17,217.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo/expose footings</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$33,750.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$33,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inject wall base/consolidate</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$11,882.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$11,882.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut walls int.&amp; ext.</td>
<td>335.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$16,247.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$16,247.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut/Install anchorage</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$9,215.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,215.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation prep</td>
<td>195.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$9,457.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,457.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removes/replace foundation sections</td>
<td>912.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$44,232.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$44,232.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour foundation sections</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$20,370.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$20,370.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure all openings</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>hrs.</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$4,122.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,122.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection Material at lower walls</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>gallons</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$9,375.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$9,375.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection pump</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar ply 4x4 misc</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>pcs.</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$19,250.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$19,250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel bands/machine</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete/form lumber</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$33,750.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$33,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All interior masonry, nuts</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>pcs.</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epoxy</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>cart</td>
<td>$27.50</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>pcs.</td>
<td>$28.50</td>
<td>$17,100.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$17,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>$29.50</td>
<td>$5,900.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$3,800.00</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General conditions</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpsters</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$203,994.50</td>
<td>$80,575.00</td>
<td>$82,200.00</td>
<td>$366,769.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Direct Labor                          | $203,994.50|
2. Labor Burden                          | 34.0% | $69,358.13|
3. Material                              | $80,575.00|
4. Equipment                             | $82,200.00|
5. Sales Tax on Material & Equipment     | 8.75% | $14,242.81|
6. Direct Work Sub-Total (1+2+3+4+5)     | $460,370.44|
7. Contractor's OH&P on Direct Work      | 18.0% | $81,066.68|
8. Subtotal (6+7)                         | $531,437.12|
9. Subcontractor's Work                  | $0.00 |
10. Contractor's Direct Work Total (8)    | $531,437.12|
11. Subcontractor's Work Total (9)       | $0.00 |
12. Contractor's OH&P on Subcontract     | 15.0% | $0.00 |
13. Sub Total (10+11+12)                 | $531,437.12|
14. Contractor's Bond Cost               | 0.00% | $0.00 |
15. Grand Total (13+14)                  | $531,437.12|

Estimate prepared by: Eagle Restorations Group, Inc.  
Jeff Seidner, President  
5441 Cogswell Rd, #A  
Arcadia, CA 91006  
Phone: 626-930-0188  
Fax: 626-930-0192  
eaglerestor@telis.net
# Preliminary Estimate of Probable Cost
## Relocation of Michael White Adobe to Lacy Park

Building Move / Relocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site visit - preplanning</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit acquisitions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of equipment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work prior to install of steel grid system</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set hydraulic jacks</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise building &amp; install moving equipment</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of steel grid system</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move building</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$9,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position building and lower onto foundation at Lacey</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove equipment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $108,850

Contingency 10% $10,885

OH & P; Bonds, Insurance, Gen. Conds. 25% $29,934

TOTAL - BLDG. RELOCATION $149,668.75

Estimate prepared by: American Heavy Moving & Rigging, Inc.
Ralph O. Clark, Vice Pres.
11532 East End Ave.
Chino, CA 91710
Phone: 909-590-5662
Fax: 909-590-3635
ralph-ahmri@att.net
## PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST
### RELOCATION OF MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE TO LACY PARK
#### Work at Lacy Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perimeter footing</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>l/f</td>
<td>$177.00</td>
<td>$26,550.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excavation</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>$38.50</td>
<td>$5,775.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc steel</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$2,812.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc labor</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$5,820.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temp roof system</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumpsters</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temp. board up</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$727.50</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$5,820.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contingency</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,692.50</td>
<td>$15,762.50</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$71,955.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Direct Labor $54,692.50
2. Labor Burden 34.0% $18,595.45
3. Material $15,762.50
4. Equipment $1,500.00
5. Sales Tax on Material & Equipr 9.75% $1,683.09
6. Direct Work Sub-Total (1+2+3+4+5) $92,233.54
7. Contractor’s OH&P on Direct W $16,602.04
8. Subtotal (6+7) $108,835.58
9. Subcontractor’s Work $0.00
10. Contractor’s Direct Work Total (8) $108,835.58
11. Subcontractor’s Work Total (9) $0.00
12. Contractor’s OH&P on Subcontr 15.0% $0.00
13. Sub Total (10+11+12) $108,835.58
14. Contractor’s Bond Cost 0.00% $0.00
15. Grand Total (13+14) $108,835.58

---

Estimate prepared by: Eagle Restorations Group, Inc.
Jeff Seidner, President
5441 Cogswell Rd, #A
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone: 626-930-0188
Fax: 626-930-0192
eaglerestor@telis.net
## PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST

### RELOCATION OF MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE TO LACY PARK

Site Restoration at San Marino High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New ac paving for parking, 4” over 6” base, w/ sealcoat</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$8,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripe out new parking spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace concrete walk damaged by construction</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New conc vee gutter at edge of conc walk</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New catch basin in vee gutter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 4” storm drain to connect to existing storm drain</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6ft CL fence between parking and sidewalk</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking bumpers at parking stalls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Contingency</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OH &amp; P</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - BLDG. RELOCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,356.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Preliminary Estimate of Probable Cost

## Upgrade Michael White Adobe for Student Use

**San Marino Unified School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work Scope</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Photographic Documentation</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Architectural Historian (packaging &amp; follow up with NPS)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Archeological Reports &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building Upgrades / Modifications (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$425,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Work (see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>$281,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimate of Probable Construction Cost**

$787,606

- **Overall Project Contingency @ 10%**
  - $78,761
- **Escalation @ 5% Per Year**
  - $-
- **Project Related (Soft) Costs**
  - Inspection (based on 5-6 mos. of construct.) $30,000
  - Testing (Compaction, conc, etc) $30,000
  - A/E Fees (Bid plans & specs) $106,640
  - Agency Fees - DSA Plancheck $7,000
  - Legal Fees $-
  - **Subtotal - Soft Costs** $173,640
- **Total Project Budget**
  - $1,040,007
## PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST

### UPGRADE MICHAEL WHITE ADOBE FOR STUDENT USE

**Building Upgrades / Modifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demo all</td>
<td>460.00 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$22,310.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frame roof/walls</td>
<td>550.00 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$26,675.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new footings</td>
<td>220.00 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$10,870.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>110.00 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>$188.00</td>
<td>$20,970.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form lumber</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$20,790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drill and prep anchors</td>
<td>237.00 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$11,494.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,494.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lumber</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$24,750.00</td>
<td>$24,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epoxy</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27.50</td>
<td>$4,812.50</td>
<td>$4,812.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door/window openings prep</td>
<td>15.00 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$727.50</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$1,627.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48.50</td>
<td>$4,850.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scaffolding</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumpsters</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29.50</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general conditions</td>
<td>10.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29.50</td>
<td>$5,900.00</td>
<td>$5,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean-up</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,856.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. elect</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. fire alarm</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. HVAC</td>
<td>$25,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. plaster/int/ext</td>
<td>$25,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. sheet metal, flashings</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Subcontractor's Work</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Contractor's Direct Work Total (B)</td>
<td>$299,596.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Contractor's OH&amp;M on Subcontractor's</td>
<td>$19,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Sub Total (10+11+12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Contractor's Bond Cost</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Grand Total (13+14)</td>
<td>$425,856.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimate prepared by:** Eagle Restorations Group, Inc.
Jeff Seidner, President
5441 Cogswell Rd, #A
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone: 626-930-0188
Fax: 626-930-0192
eaglerestor@telis.net
# Preliminary Estimate of Probable Cost

**Upgrade Michael White Adobe for Student Use**

**Sitework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace stairs with new accessible ramp - 5'w x 50'l</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert RR's in Bldgs. J&amp;K to accessible Girls &amp; Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert RR's in Bldgs. J&amp;K to accessible Mens &amp; Womens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide wheelchair lift or ramp at walkway btwn J &amp; K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor upgrades to existing HDCP parking at Gym circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify gate hardware at tube steel fence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. landscape/hardscape improvements/signage, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency 15% $245,000

**OH & P 15%**

**TOTAL - SITEWORK**

$281,750.00

**Note:**
Upgrading the adobe house in place for student use will require DSA approval, which in turn results in the need to provide certain accessibility upgrades relative to the path of travel, accessible restroom facilities, etc.