

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
EAST LOS ANGELES
3RD STREET SPECIFIC PLAN
Findings of Fact/Statement of Overriding Considerations

Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH No. 2013071033
Project No. R2008-02449-(1)
Advance Planning Permit No. 200800012

Lead Agency:
Los Angeles County
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Prepared by:
Atkins
12301 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 430
Los Angeles, California 90025

September 2014

Contents

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 1 Introduction and Background.....	1-1
1.1 Project Description	1-3
1.1.1 3 rd Street and the Station Areas	1-6
1.1.2 The Corridors.....	1-7
1.2 Environmental Review Process.....	1-9
1.3 Findings Required by Lead Agency	1-10
CHAPTER 2 Environmental Impacts Found Not to Be Significant in the Initial Study	2-1
2.1 Aesthetics	2-1
2.2 Agriculture/Forestry Resources	2-1
2.3 Biological Resources.....	2-2
2.4 Geology/Soils	2-2
2.5 Hazards/Hazardous Materials	2-3
2.6 Hydrology/Water Quality	2-3
2.7 Land Use/Planning	2-4
2.8 Mineral Resources	2-4
2.9 Noise.....	2-4
2.10 Population/Housing	2-4
2.11 Recreation	2-5
2.12 Transportation/Traffic	2-5
CHAPTER 3 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant and Not Requiring Mitigation.....	3-1
3.1 Aesthetics	3-1
3.2 Air Quality	3-5
3.3 Cultural Resources.....	3-5
3.4 Geology/Soils	3-6
3.5 Hazards/Hazardous Materials	3-10
3.6 Hydrology/Water Quality	3-12
3.7 Land Use/Planning	3-20
3.8 Population/Housing	3-22
3.9 Public Services.....	3-23
3.10 Transportation/Traffic	3-26
3.11 Utilities/Service Systems	3-29
CHAPTER 4 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant Prior to Mitigation, Where Mitigation Nonetheless Provided to Further Reduce Impacts	4-1
4.1 Public Services.....	4-1
CHAPTER 5 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant With Mitigation	5-1
5.1 Air Quality	5-1

- 5.1.1 Potential Effect 5-1
- 5.1.2 Mitigation Measures 5-4
- 5.1.3 Finding 5-5
- 5.1.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-6
- 5.2 Biological Resources 5-6
 - 5.2.1 Potential Effect 5-6
 - 5.2.2 Mitigation Measures 5-9
 - 5.2.3 Finding 5-11
 - 5.2.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-11
- 5.3 Cultural Resources 5-11
 - 5.3.1 Potential Effect 5-11
 - 5.3.2 Mitigation Measures 5-14
 - 5.3.3 Finding 5-15
 - 5.3.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-15
- 5.4 Hazards/Hazardous Materials 5-15
 - 5.4.1 Potential Effect 5-15
 - 5.4.2 Mitigation Measures 5-17
 - 5.4.3 Finding 5-17
 - 5.4.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-18
- 5.5 Noise 5-18
 - 5.5.1 Potential Effects 5-18
 - 5.5.2 Mitigation Measures 5-19
 - 5.5.3 Finding 5-20
 - 5.5.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-20
- 5.6 Recreation 5-21
 - 5.6.1 Potential Effect 5-21
 - 5.6.2 Mitigation Measures 5-22
 - 5.6.3 Finding 5-22
 - 5.6.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-22
- 5.7 Transportation/Traffic 5-22
 - 5.7.1 Potential Effect 5-22
 - 5.7.2 Mitigation Measures 5-23
 - 5.7.3 Finding 5-24
 - 5.7.4 Facts Supporting Finding 5-24

CHAPTER 6 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Significant and Unavoidable after Mitigation 6-1

- 6.1 Air Quality 6-1
 - 6.1.1 Potential Effect 6-1
 - 6.1.2 Mitigation Measures 6-5
 - 6.1.3 Finding 6-5
 - 6.1.4 Facts Supporting Finding 6-5
- 6.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 6-6
 - 6.2.1 Potential Effect 6-6
 - 6.2.2 Mitigation Measures 6-8
 - 6.2.3 Finding 6-8
 - 6.2.4 Facts Supporting Finding 6-8

6.3	Noise.....	6-9
6.3.1	Potential Effects	6-9
6.3.2	Improvement Measures.....	6-13
6.3.3	Mitigation Measures	6-14
6.3.4	Finding	6-15
6.3.5	Facts Supporting Finding.....	6-16
6.4	Transportation/Traffic	6-16
6.4.1	Potential Effect.....	6-16
6.4.2	Mitigation Measures	6-17
6.4.3	Finding	6-18
6.4.4	Facts Supporting Finding.....	6-18
6.5	Utilities/Service Systems	6-18
6.5.1	Potential Effect.....	6-18
6.5.2	Finding	6-19
6.5.3	Facts Supporting Finding.....	6-19
CHAPTER 7	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	7-1
7.1	Summary of Findings	7-1
7.2	Project Objectives.....	7-1
7.3	Project Alternatives	7-2
7.3.1	Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration.....	7-2
7.3.2	Alternative 1: No Project/Continuation of Existing Community Plan and Zoning	7-4
7.3.3	Alternative 2: Reduced Plan Map Area	7-6
7.3.4	Alternative 3: Reduced Development	7-7
7.3.5	Facts Supporting Finding	7-8
7.4	Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	7-9
CHAPTER 8	Findings Regarding General Impact Categories	8-1
8.1	Potential Secondary Effects	8-1
8.2	Growth-Inducing Impacts.....	8-1
8.3	Significant Irreversible Impacts	8-2
8.4	Additional Lead Agency Considerations under CEQA	8-3
CHAPTER 9	Statement of Overriding Considerations.....	9-1

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 1 Introduction and Background

The Specific Plan area (SPA) is located in the geographic center of the unincorporated East Los Angeles community, which is located approximately 5 miles east of downtown Los Angeles. East Los Angeles is located between the City of Los Angeles to the west and the cities of Alhambra and Monterey Park to the north, Monterey Park and Montebello to the east, and Commerce to the south (see Draft EIR Figure 3-1 [Regional Location Map] and Draft EIR Figure 3-2 [Specific Plan Area Map]). More detailed setting can be found, as appropriate, in each of the technical sections in Draft EIR Chapter 4 (Environmental Analysis).

The Specific Plan was developed in response to the extension of the Metro Gold Line into East Los Angeles, with the expectation of new economic opportunities, transformative development, and jobs that would be facilitated by the extension. An extensive community outreach process was implemented, and the East Los Angeles Planning Advisory Committee (ELAPAC) was established in May and June 2009. The ELAPAC was comprised of twenty-one members who were both elected by the community and appointed by the Supervisor Molina of the First Supervisorial District. The discovery and outreach process included reviewing and evaluating relevant planning documents for the SPA, interviewing regulatory agencies and stakeholder groups, and performing a fieldwork analysis of the following:

- Street Network, Streets, and Circulation
- Walkability and Pedestrian Safety
- Open Space and Recreation
- Civic Uses
- Building Intensity and Compatibility
- Commercial/Retail Locations and Intensities
- Utility Infrastructure
- Existing/Pending Development

The analysis was compiled into a Discovery Catalog of analytical information that was ultimately presented to the community during four Discovery Workshops held in July 2009. The catalog framed the key planning issues. A number of subsequent workshops were conducted with stakeholders, interest groups, and citizens to define the set of issues that the Specific Plan would address. Two week-long charrettes were held in August and October 2009, with ELAPAC members, county departments, and other stakeholders the first focusing on policy strategies and the second on design solutions. After the charrettes, four workshops were held in the neighborhoods of East Los Angeles, which included an extensive question-and-answer session and roundtable discussions of issues, concerns, and opportunities.

During the workshop process, the planning team recorded hundreds of comments and observations from stakeholders, and subsequently developed proposed policy and regulatory changes. The following ten goals guided the Specific Plan and framed the residents' vision of their community:

1. Enforce development standards and regulations
2. Balance street design with community context
3. Design the 3rd Street public realm space to support job creation and housing

4. Change zoning to support feasible commercial development
5. Promote sustainable and green infrastructure
6. Create public space/joint-use arrangements with schools and churches
7. Identify key sites for economic development opportunities
8. Harmonize land use regulations with transit-oriented development opportunities
9. Pursue affordable housing through cooperative and joint ventures with other jurisdictions
10. Advocate the use of the Specific Plan as an integrated community vision

Six categories of goals and policies were developed in the Specific Plan, including Land Use and Urban Form, Housing, Economic Development, Historic Preservation, Mobility, and Public Realm. The text of the proposed goals and policies can be found in Specific Plan Chapter 1.

The Specific Plan was reviewed by the County (serving as lead agency) in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.). On September 23, 2014, the County Board of Supervisors approved the Specific Plan, certified the EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2013071033 and adopted CEQA Findings of Fact, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). As approved, the Specific Plan would:

- Transform 3rd Street through infill of vacant properties and reuse of underutilized buildings, and transform the areas around the Gold line stations into vibrant, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use centers
- Enhance the image of the community through visually attractive and high-quality development that is in scale with the adjoining neighborhoods
- Protect and enhance the character of residential neighborhoods through streetscape improvements, more open space, and improved property maintenance
- Cultivate new job creation and economic development
- Address parking through development regulations and strategies to ensure that adequate parking is provided for new uses and reasonable parking regulations for infill development and new businesses
- Achieve a balanced mobility system through improvement of pedestrian and bicycle connections to public transit and enhancement of the built environment
- Increase access to open space and recreation opportunities
- Protect and promote local history and culture, including protection of existing cultural and historical resources and opportunities for public art

The certified EIR contains technical reports supporting the environmental analysis for the Specific Plan as additional appendices to the Final EIR. The technical reports do not change any of the analysis or conclusions in the EIR but were provided as additional information for the public and decision-makers prior to the County's certification of the EIR.

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Specific Plan defines a vision and establishes standards and strategies for the revitalization of the SPA using the principles of TOD. TOD takes advantage of its location near transit to create a vibrant community, walkable streets, and safe access to transit. The SPA will include vibrant and diverse commercial corridors; well-designed buildings, attractive streetscapes, and engaging public spaces; multi-modal streets accommodating pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles; a mix of uses, with residential and employment densities that support transit use; and a range of housing options.

The Specific Plan presents a vision for the future transformation of the SPA. The proposed Plan is focused on the physical and economic change that is expected in East Los Angeles as a result of the Gold Line light-rail transit corridor. This will be achieved with a new development code that provides discrete development regulations for all new buildings and parking areas.

The four Metro station areas located along 3rd Street would be transformed into transit centers, with a mix of commercial and residential uses. Mixed-use buildings will incorporate amenities such as public plazas, outdoor dining, and public art as provided by the proposed development in Specific Plan Chapter 5 (Appendix B). The transit centers will serve residents, visitors, and employees. An increase in the variety and quality of goods and services is expected. The SPA's corridors would experience moderate change, with context-sensitive infill development, an improved streetscape, and an increase in the variety and quality of goods and services. Minor changes would be expected in the residential neighborhoods, consisting of improvements in streetscape, improvement in private property maintenance, and an increase in open space and green elements, such as street trees and landscaping.

The proposed Plan will complement and amend the East Los Angeles Community Plan to include a Specific Plan overlay for the SPA and changes to land use and zoning designations. The Specific Plan will allow existing development and uses and existing nonconforming development and uses in the SPA that legally exist at the time of adoption to continue until such time as such development is replaced and/or the uses are terminated by the property owner. Upon termination of existing uses or replacement of existing development by the owner, the Specific Plan would require all new land use and development activity on affected sites to conform to the Specific Plan.

The primary policy issues and expected land use changes associated with implementation of the Specific Plan will:

- Implement a form-based code that supersedes the Zoning Ordinance to better ensure good urban form, quality, and a pedestrian-oriented community.
- Establish mixed-uses by right (except in LMD, OS, and CV zone) to foster a more walkable, safer, and people-oriented area.

- Foster the development of additional residential units by allowing mixed uses in the TOD, CC, FS, AB, and NC zones by right.
- Better balance parking standards for an established community within the context of the Gold Line by reducing the minimum amount of parking for all uses in the SPA, by allowing shared parking facilities, and by requiring no additional on-site parking for a change of use within an existing building.
- Improve pedestrian comfort and safety and access to transit by encouraging a mixture of housing, office, retail, service, and other neighborhood-serving amenities and development to be integrated into a walkable, people-oriented neighborhood.
- Foster streetscape improvements and traffic calming measures through tree plantings and landscaping in the public realm.
- Implement the County’s Bicycle Master Plan to foster a safer bicycling experience for both transportation and recreation.
- Improve enforcement of land use control standards through a discrete set of predictable development standards that better ensure good urban form and quality.
- Improve and increase access to open space and recreation by promoting the shared use of existing school recreational facilities.
- Protect the character of existing residential neighborhoods by focusing transformative changes in Specific Plan and the development code to the TOD, CC, FS, AB, and NC zones.

Table 1 (Summary of Proposed Zone Changes) shows the net change in acreage by zoning designation as a result of the proposed Plan.

Table 1 Summary of Proposed Zone Changes				
<i>Adopted Zoning</i>	<i>Description of Adopted Zoning</i>	<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	<i>Description of Proposed Zoning</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Civic				
CC	CC—Community Commercial	CV	Civic	0.519
CR	CR—Commercial Residential (30 du/ac)	CV	Civic	1.859
LMD	LMD—Low-Medium Density Residential (17 du/ac)	CV	Civic	4.959
MC	MC—Major Commercial	CV	Civic	0.590
MD	MD—Medium Density Residential (30 du/ac)	CV	Civic	8.564
P	P—Public Service Facilities	CV	Civic	113.216
<i>Subtotal Civic</i>				<i>129.707</i>
Low-Medium Density Residential				
CC	CC—Community Commercial	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	0.895
CM	CM—Commercial Manufacturing	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	2.033
CR	CR—Commercial Residential (30 du/ac)	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	6.177
LD	LD—Low Density Residential (8 du/ac)	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	2.136
LMD	LMD—Low/Medium Density Residential (17 du/ac)	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	372.895

Table 1 Summary of Proposed Zone Changes				
<i>Adopted Zoning</i>	<i>Description of Adopted Zoning</i>	<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	<i>Description of Proposed Zoning</i>	<i>Acres</i>
MC	MC—Major Commercial	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	5.643
MD	MD—Medium Density Residential (30 du/ac)	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	193.712
P	P—Public Service Facilities	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	3.640
TC	TC—Transportation Corridor	LMD	Low-Medium Density Residential	0.012
<i>Subtotal Low-Medium Density Residential</i>				<i>587.142</i>
Mixed Use				
MC	MC—Major Commercial	MU-AB	Mixed Use	8.790
MD	MD—Medium Density Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-AB	Mixed Use	0.075
CC	CC—Community Commercial	MU-CC	Mixed Use	30.428
CM	CM—Commercial Manufacturing	MU-CC	Mixed Use	1.019
CR	CR—Commercial Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-CC	Mixed Use	9.761
LMD	LMD—Low/Medium Density Residential (17 du/ac)	MU-CC	Mixed Use	1.980
MD	MD—Medium Density Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-CC	Mixed Use	40.226
P	P—Public Service Facilities	MU-CC	Mixed Use	6.374
LMD	LMD—Low/Medium Density Residential (17 du/ac)	MU-MS	Mixed Use	2.432
MC	MC—Major Commercial	MU-MS	Mixed Use	8.260
MD	MD—Medium Density Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-MS	Mixed Use	3.227
CC	CC—Community Commercial	MU-NC	Mixed Use	5.379
CR	CR—Commercial Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-NC	Mixed Use	19.550
LMD	LMD—Low/Medium Density Residential (17 du/ac)	MU-NC	Mixed Use	4.853
MC	MC—Major Commercial	MU-NC	Mixed Use	1.554
MD	MD—Medium Density Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-NC	Mixed Use	4.992
P	P—Public Service Facilities	MU-FS	Mixed Use	0.267
CC	CC—Community Commercial	MU-TOD	Mixed Use	17.837
CM	CM—Commercial Manufacturing	MU-TOD	Mixed Use	13.182
CR	CR—Commercial Residential (30 du/ac)	MU-TOD	Mixed Use	5.944
LMD	LMD—Low/Medium Density Residential (17 du/ac)	MU-TOD	Mixed Use	14.742
MC	MC—Major Commercial	MU-TOD	Mixed Use	6.700
P	P—Public Service Facilities	MU-TOD	Mixed Use	3.619
<i>Subtotal Mixed Use</i>				<i>211.194</i>
Open Space				
P	P—Public Service Facilities	OS	Open Space	200.572
Total Acres				200.572

The proposed Plan could result in up to 2,287 single-family and 10,982 multifamily residential units and 6,762,422 square feet (sf) of commercial area that would all be in mixed-use buildings (based on the assumption of ground-floor commercial with residential units in upper floors). Table 2 (Summary of Existing and Proposed Uses) illustrates the existing and proposed land uses.

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Net Increase</i>
Residential units: SFR	2,008	2,287	279
Residential units: MFR	5,842	10,982	5,140
Commercial	1,842,178 sf	6,762,422 sf	4,920,244 sf

Mixed-use buildings would be up to three stories in height, with a floor-area ratio (FAR)¹ for commercial uses as summarized for each zone in Table 3 (Summary of Proposed Building Heights and Density per Zone).

<i>Proposed Zone</i>	<i>Max. Lot Coverage</i>	<i>Max. Number of stories</i>	<i>FAR</i>
CV ^a	0.00	0.0	0.00
LMD	0.60	2.5	1.50
MU-AB	0.50	2.0	1.00
MU-CC	0.90	3.0	2.70
MU-FS	0.90	3.0	2.70
MU-NC	0.90	2.5	2.25
MU-TOD	0.90	3.0	2.70
OS ^a	0.00	0.0	0.00

SOURCE: County of Los Angeles Regional Planning (2013).

a. Values are 0 for CV and OS because these uses are not subject to these limitations.

1.1.1 3rd Street and the Station Areas

The Specific Plan would accommodate urban, mixed-use building types along 1st Street and Indiana Street to reinforce a “Main Street” character. Over time, the parcels between Indiana Street and Alma Avenue, just to the east of the station, would be intensified with transit-oriented buildings that accommodate multi-family housing (facing Alma Avenue), ground floor retail or live-work units (facing the station), and parking for Gold Line commuters. The massing and scale of buildings that face Alma Avenue would be residential in character, while the portion facing the station would be more commercial in character. To provide more open space, a joint-use agreement between the Ramona High School and

¹ “Floor-area ratio” is a term that is used only for commercial uses, not for residential, civic, or open space. It is the maximum allowable floor area expressed as a ratio of square footage of development to lot size.

the County would be enacted to enable local residents to utilize recreational fields after school, during weekends and summer months.

For the segment of 3rd Street between the freeways, Downey Road, Sunol Drive, and Eastern Avenue would become more pedestrian-friendly and bicycle-friendly, creating more inviting connections to the north and south. On 3rd Street, safer sidewalks and a new attractive streetscape would be introduced on both sides of the street, generating a more inviting walking and jogging experience. These improvements will benefit residents and visitors.

The Maravilla Station area would be transformed through the gradual infill and development of underutilized parcels into a vibrant, urban, mixed-use environment that would also serve as a destination for visitors and employees and a location for community gathering and activities. Mixed-use buildings, housing, commercial buildings, and a number of catalytic projects would be introduced on 3rd Street's various underutilized sites, particularly on the vacant parcels that exist on both the north and south sides of 3rd Street. New buildings would face the street with appropriate frontages and locate parking on the rear of the lot or on the ground floor, hidden from the view of the street by stores or offices.

In the Atlantic Station area, the Specific Plan would accommodate a variety of building types. More intense buildings would be introduced near the station (taller mixed-use buildings with retail ground floors); less intense types would be located near residential neighborhoods (lower-height court buildings and row houses). This would provide a suitable transition between the higher intensity station-area development and the adjacent residential areas.

1.1.2 The Corridors

East Los Angeles' corridors are the places where retail and business services are concentrated, along with some interspersed housing. Generally, these areas support the adjoining residential neighborhoods. The 1st Street, Cesar Chavez Avenue and Atlantic Boulevard corridors each have a distinctive built environment and economic functions, both of which would be improved in a manner that is consistent with existing characteristics. The Plan defines a palette of building types that are compatible with the historic scale and character of East Los Angeles. The palette accommodates a range of neighborhood-serving commercial activities and businesses, along with opportunities for many different types of residential housing units.

- **Atlantic Boulevard**—Attractive new buildings would be accommodated, located at the front of the lot, to define the edge of the street and create an attractive and comfortable place to walk. Parking would be located at the side or at the rear of the building, screened from the view of the street by hedges and/or low walls. In order to improve the urban character of the corridor and provide more valuable building frontage for retailers, the width of side yard parking lots would be minimized, so that buildings would be spaced as close to one other as practical. Primary and secondary vehicular access would be provided from the alley, dispersing departing customers onto the side streets which have lower traffic volumes and speeds than Atlantic Boulevard.
- **1st Street**—The Specific Plan would accommodate new infill buildings that reinforce the historic shop front pattern. Parking would be accommodated at the rear of the lot in open parking lots or in structured parking lined by upper floor uses. In either case, parking would be hidden behind 1st Street-facing shops. To provide additional options for higher-density infill projects, some

residential lots behind and immediately adjacent to 1st Street-facing commercial lots would be zoned to allow for lot consolidation.

- **Cesar Chavez West**—The Plan would accommodate commercial and mixed-use buildings placed at or near the right-of-way and accessed directly from the sidewalk. The scale of the individual building masses would be similar to the scale of the existing historic buildings along the street, with large buildings being broken down into smaller building volumes. Parking would be located behind the building and accessed from the alley, when present. Sidewalks would be enlivened with storefronts, sidewalk dining, new street trees, lighting, and street furniture.
- **Cesar Chavez East**—The Specific Plan would accommodate new buildings built up to the street right-of-way, rather than being located behind street-facing parking lots. Typical infill building types would include courtyard buildings comprised primarily of housing units with small retail or live-work spaced fronting Cesar Chavez Avenue; simple one-story commercial buildings; and two-story mixed-use buildings. Parking would be located beneath the residences and/or on the rear of the lot with customer and visitor parking located on the street.

In the Public Realm Plan (Specific Plan Chapter 2), the open space strategy would improve the park network by using streets and pedestrian connections, bringing these amenities within a reasonable walking and biking distance for all residents. In addition to accommodating the needs of pedestrians, motorists, and bicyclists, Green Streets components would include a mature tree canopy that enhances the pedestrian experience, safer street crossings, integrated bike lanes and jogging paths, traffic calming measures, drought-tolerant plant material, and integrated lighting and way-finding signs.

Sustainable storm water treatment strategies are included in the Plan as well as implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) wherever feasible, which could include the inclusion of bioswales, rain gardens, planting of native and drought-tolerant plants, pervious paving, cisterns, and an infiltration system.

Large-canopy deciduous trees would be planted in parking lots and along streets to provide shade and reduce the heat island effect. Reclaimed water would be used wherever feasible for sustainable landscape irrigation and water conservation. The Public Realm Plan also includes providing wide, continuous sidewalks, safer and well-defined street crossings, clearly marked bicycle routes, traffic calming measures where appropriate, regional bike linkages, and amenities for bicyclists and bicycle parking in the station areas. Opportunities for parks, paseos, and other open spaces are identified in the Plan, as well as improving neighborhood connections and shared use of public and institutional facilities.

The Mobility Strategy of the Plan is intended to provide tools to foster and create pleasant and convenient walking and biking facilities, street trees, landscaping, plazas and other pedestrian amenities within the public realm. This approach would preserve and improve the interconnected, historic street pattern and create a welcoming environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. A multi-modal approach to street design would enhance the quality of life, improve health and safety, increase property values, and improve the business climate.

Streetscape improvements are recommended for nearly all streets in the SPA. Street improvements would be required for specific development projects under the Plan to improve pedestrian and bicycle comfort and safety, reduce noise and enhance the living conditions, moderate the speed of vehicles without unreasonably impeding movement, provide convenient curbside parking for visitors or

customers, and plant or replant street trees to shade and shelter pedestrians and to improve the quality of the public realm. Guidelines are included in the Plan concerning curb extensions, crosswalks, tree wells, street furniture, and street lights. A Parking Strategy is also identified to ensure sufficient on-site parking for individual development. The strategy provides options to conventional parking requirements and the provision of alternatives that are well-suited for a mature, transit-oriented community. Finally, the Plan includes a Bicycle Sharing Strategy to encourage the use of bicycles in the community and support the development of a multi-modal transportation network in East Los Angeles.

Currently, there is no historic designation or review process in place in the County of Los Angeles that would help protect historic, architectural, or cultural resources or help in the revitalization to restore the historic character to the area. The Historic Preservation Strategy of the Plan puts together a framework for a preservation strategy to foster historic preservation through community education, technical assistance and financial incentives for property owners to assist with redevelopment. The goals of the Historic Preservation Strategy are organized around concept areas of preservation policy: (1) public awareness; (2) identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources; (3) incentives; and (4) integration with community development programs.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

As the Lead Agency for the proposed project, the County of Los Angeles is responsible for administering the environmental review for the Specific Plan. The County completed an Initial Study dated July 1, 2013, and determined that an EIR would be prepared in conformance with CEQA, CEQA Guidelines, and the County's guidelines for implementing CEQA. The Draft EIR analyzed the potential environmental effects of the Specific Plan. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the County issued an NOP to announce its intent to prepare an EIR for the Specific Plan. The NOP was distributed on July 11, 2013, to the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR), various public agencies, and other interested parties for the required 30-day public review period to solicit comments on the scope and content of the environmental information that should be addressed in the EIR. Additionally, a Public Scoping meeting was held on August 3, 2013, at the East Los Angeles County Library community room, to solicit public comments on the proposed Specific Plan. The NOP (including the Initial Study), NOP comments received by the County, and the Scoping Meeting comments are contained in Draft EIR Appendix A. Agencies or interested persons who did not respond during the public review period of the NOP had an opportunity to comment during the public review period for this Draft EIR, as well as at subsequent hearings on the Specific Plan.

The Draft EIR was prepared under the direction and supervision of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP), Advanced Planning Section. The Draft EIR was subjected to a 30-day County internal department review, prior to the required 45-day public review period as mandated by CEQA Guidelines Section 15105. During the 45-day public review period, this Draft EIR was available for general public review on the County's website (<http://planning.lacounty.gov/ela>) and at the following locations:

- East Los Angeles Library, 4837 East 3rd Street, Los Angeles
- Anthony Quinn Library, 3965 East Cesar E Chavez Avenue, Los Angeles
- El Camino Real Library, 4264 Whittier Boulevard, Los Angeles

■ Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

Interested public agencies and members of the public submitted written comments on the Draft EIR to the County of Los Angeles to the following address:

Phillip Estes, Principal Planner
Department of Regional Planning
County of Los Angeles
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: (213) 974-6425
Email: thirdstplan@planning.lacounty.gov

During the 45-day public review period, an open house was held before the Los Angeles County Hearing Examiner to take testimony on the Draft EIR, followed by hearings by the Regional Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses to all comments raised with respect to environmental issues discussed in the EIR were prepared and incorporated into the Final EIR. Furthermore, written responses to comments received from any public agencies were made available to these agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors during which the EIR and Specific Plan were considered. These comments, and their responses, were included in the FEIR for consideration by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, as well as any other public decision-makers. Finally, the Board of Supervisors completed the public hearing process by adopting or rejecting the EIR and the proposed Specific Plan.

1.3 FINDINGS REQUIRED BY LEAD AGENCY

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15090(a), prior to approving a project, the Lead Agency shall certify that:

- (1) The final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
- (2) The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR prior to approving the project; and
- (3) The final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

When an EIR has been prepared for a project, CEQA Guidelines Section 15092(b) provides that the lead agency shall not approve the project as proposed if:

- (1) The project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment, or
- (2) The agency has:
 - (A) Eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment where feasible as shown in findings under Section 15091, and
 - (B) Determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable under Section 15091 are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15093.

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, upon consideration of the proposed Plan are presented below. All significant impacts of

the proposed Plan identified in the Final EIR are included herein and are organized according to the resources (environmental topics) affected.

The Findings in this document are for the East Los Angeles 3rd Street Specific Plan and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR, which includes the Draft EIR, and other evidence in the administrative record. For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Plan that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

A narrative of supporting facts follows each Finding. Whenever Finding “3” is made, the County has determined there will be, even after mitigation, an unavoidable significant level of impact due to the proposed Plan, and sufficient mitigation is not feasible to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Such impacts are always specifically identified in the supporting discussions. The Statement of Overriding Considerations applies to all such unavoidable significant impacts, as required by CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15092 and 15093.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 2 Environmental Impacts Found Not to Be Significant in the Initial Study

The County prepared and circulated for public review an Initial Study for the proposed Plan dated July 1, 2013, which determined that the following environmental topics would have a less-than-significant impact or no impact and thus did not warrant further study in the Draft EIR, and no mitigation measures would be necessary. These Findings summarize the specific environmental topics and the rationale to not study them further in the Draft EIR.

2.1 AESTHETICS

The closest regional riding or hiking trail is located in Griffith Park in the Los Feliz area of Los Angeles, approximately 10 miles north of the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan area is not readily visible from this area, and redevelopment as a result of the Specific Plan would not be visible from or obstruct views from this hiking and equestrian area. There would be no impact.

There are no state scenic highways in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area. The nearest designated scenic highway is the historic Arroyo Parkway, which is the north extension of I-110 and is north of the City of Los Angeles. There are no other scenic resources that could be affected by implementation of the Specific Plan. There would be no impact.

2.2 AGRICULTURE/FORESTRY RESOURCES

The Specific Plan would involve the construction of urban uses within the existing urbanized SPA. The SPA is not used, nor has it been used in the recent past, for agricultural purposes. The SPA is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection. Thus, the Specific Plan would not 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 nonagricultural use. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

There are no parcels in the Specific Plan area that are zoned for agricultural use, located in an Agricultural Opportunity Area, or subject to a Williamson Act contract. There would be no impact.

There is no land zoned for forest or timberland in the Specific Plan area or in the adjacent communities. There would be no impact.

There is no land zoned as forest land in the Specific Plan area or in the adjacent communities. There would be no impact.

2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

There are no sensitive natural communities in the SPA or in the adjacent communities. The SPA is in a highly urbanized portion of Southern California. There would be no impact.

There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that is applicable to the SPA. Therefore, implementation of the Plan would not conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

Implementation of the proposed Plan would not convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10 percent canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inches in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, Southern California black walnut, etc.), as there are no oak woodlands in the Specific Plan area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Implementation of the proposed Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6). The Specific Plan area is not in a Wildflower Reserve area, an SEA, or an SERA, nor are there protected oak trees in the Specific Plan area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

2.4 GEOLOGY/SOILS

Landslides are a type of erosion in which masses of earth and rock move down slope as a single unit. Susceptibility of slopes to landslides and other forms of slope failure depend on several factors, including steep slopes, condition of rock and soil materials, presence of water, formational contacts, geologic shear zones, and seismic activity. According to the California Seismic Hazard Zones Map, Los Angeles Quadrangle, the SPA is not located within an area identified by the California Geologic Survey as a landside zone (CDC 1999). Therefore, landslides are not considered a geologic constraint. No impact would occur.

All development pursuant to the Specific Plan would be required to connect to the County public sewer system and there would be no on-site alternative wastewater treatment or disposal systems for any development pursuant to the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

The SPA is not located within a Hillside Management Area and would not be subject to the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Section 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element. As the SPA topography is relatively flat with no significant hillsides within the Plan area, no impact would occur.

2.5 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The SPA is not located within airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport. Implementation of the Specific Plan would have no impact, and further analysis of this threshold is not required in the EIR.

There are no existing private airstrips within the SPA. As a result, no safety hazard associated with location near a private airstrip would result from the Specific Plan. Consequently, implementation of the Specific Plan would have no impact.

The SPA is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4) as outlined in the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) map. The SPA lies within a Local Responsibility Area, which signifies a low-risk potential for fire hazards within the SPA. As such, adherence to the Los Angeles County Fire Department requirements for fire sprinkler systems with the respective developments of the SPA would assure that no significant inadequacies with water and pressure within the SPA would occur and that fire flow standards would be met. Additionally, there are no immediate surrounding areas are designated as a Fire Hazard Severity Zone that may present a potential hazard to the SPA. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Plan would have no impact. Because wildlands are not adjacent to any of the urbanized areas within the East Los Angeles Community, implementation of the proposed Plan would have no impact.

The proposed uses under the Plan would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. The Plan would allow for infill development of mixed uses and TOD, which would not include uses that would constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. There would be no impact.

2.6 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

The SPA is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain (Los Angeles County 2013a). The project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard zone. Therefore, there would be no impact.

The SPA is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain, and would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, there would be no impact.

The SPA is not located in the path of flooding from any dam or levee (Los Angeles County 2013a). Therefore, there would be no impact.

The SPA is not located in a tsunami inundation zone. There are no foothills or mountains in proximity to the SPA that would present a risk of mudflow to visitors, residents, or businesses in the SPA (Los Angeles County 2013a). Therefore, there would be no impacts, and further evaluation of this threshold is not required.

Implementation of the proposed Plan would have no impact related to groundwater or surface water limitations from on-site treatment (if any) because groundwater is over 100 feet deep in the SPA, and there are no streams or drainage courses in or adjacent to the SPA.

2.7 LAND USE/PLANNING

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not physically divide an established community. There is no impact.

There are no applicable Hillside Management criteria for the SPA. No SEAs are currently located within the Community of East Los Angeles or the SPA. No other applicable land use criteria other than as discussed below exist for the SPA. No impact would result.

The proposed Plan would not be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property due to the established provisions in the SPA superseding the County zoning ordinance in such cases of conflict and the applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance establishing regulations when the Specific Plan does not apply. No impact would result.

2.8 MINERAL RESOURCES

The SPA is not located within an area containing significant mineral deposits (i.e., Mineral Resource Zone 2 [MRZ-2] areas), nor is it located within a surface mining district. Thus, the Specific Plan would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state and no significant impacts would occur.

The SPA is not designated as a locally recognized area containing notable mineral deposits. Thus, the Specific Plan would not 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 and no significant impacts would occur.

2.9 NOISE

The SPA is not located within the influence area of an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, there would be no impact and no further analysis of this threshold is required in this EIR.

The SPA is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, there would be no impact and no further analysis of this threshold is required in this EIR.

2.10 POPULATION/HOUSING

The proposed Plan would redevelop vacant parcels and underutilized parcels within the SPA and would not affect existing neighborhoods. The proposed Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement of replacement housing elsewhere, nor would it displace substantial numbers of people. Because no housing is being converted, nor persons displaced, as a result of the Specific Plan, implementation of the proposed Plan would have no impact.

2.11 RECREATION

The SPA and vicinity have been previously developed and located in an urbanized area. As discussed in the following impact analyses, the proposed Plan would not construct new uses on any designated open space, but would result in infill development on vacant and underutilized parcels in the SPA. There are no regional trails or bicycle paths that would be affected by implementation of the proposed Plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.

2.12 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that could result in substantial safety risks, as no airports are located near the SPA. Implementation of the proposed Plan would have no impact.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 3 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant and Not Requiring Mitigation

The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning prepared an Initial Study for the Project in which it required analysis of the following environmental impact areas in an EIR: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Noise, Population/Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities/Service Systems.

The following impact areas were determined to be less than significant without mitigation, and based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the Project, the County finds and determines that the following environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed.

3.1 AESTHETICS

■ Effect on Scenic Vista

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The SPA is currently characterized by a linear pattern of strip-mall style commercial and retail development with associated surface parking lots along 3rd Street. Building heights associated with all of the development areas within the SPA of nonresidential development would be a maximum of three stories and minimum of 9 feet for the basement, 14 feet for the ground floor, and 10-foot min for the upper floor. Residential building heights associated with the additional development within the SPA consists of a three-story maximum with a 9-foot minimum height for the basement floor, 11-foot minimum for the ground floor, and 9-foot minimum for the upper floor. Additional commercial, retail, and residential development, which generally consists of low-rise building heights, as well as open spaces, is located in the areas surrounding the 3rd Street corridor. Due to the low building heights of existing buildings within the SPA, intermittent views of distant mountains can be seen from various points throughout the planning area.

According to the East Los Angeles Community Plan (1988), there are no designated scenic vistas within the community boundaries. Even though there are no designated scenic vistas within the SPA, a maximum building height of three stories would be implemented through the proposed Specific Plan's Development Code. Because development projects under the Specific Plan would be limited to a maximum three-story building height, future development would not be expected to block any views of the distant mountains compared to existing conditions because proposed building heights would be similar to the maximum existing building heights. In addition, development under the SPA would also not be expected to block these views from other vantage points outside of the SPA boundaries. Public

art, such as murals, have been incorporated throughout the SPA to help establish aesthetic features of value, community pride and a sense of identity. As the proposed project is intended to upgrade the visual character of the SPA, aesthetic features of value would not be significantly affected with implementation of the proposed project and existing aesthetic features of value would be preserved when applicable with regards to redevelopment associated with the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would also be less than significant. Existing development in the defined geographic area consist primarily of older buildings of various sizes and forms. There are intermittent views of the distant mountains from various vantage points in the area, including from elevated freeways, higher elevations in topography, and neighborhood streets. However, because the Los Angeles Basin is highly urbanized, even if future development were to block scenic vistas, this would occur in discrete locations and would not be anticipated to combine to result in a significant effect. Development in the SPA would be limited to three stories and would not block scenic vistas. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ Visual Character and Quality

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This impact would be *beneficial*. New development pursuant to the Specific Plan would be concentrated on underutilized and vacant parcels. As noted above, the Specific Plan defines a vision and establishes goals and policies for the revitalization of the East Los Angeles community. Components include design and architectural guidelines for vibrant and diverse commercial corridors; well-designed buildings, attractive streetscapes, and engaging public spaces. The visual improvements associated with the new development would serve to enhance the visual quality along the corridors, visually unify the SPA as a whole while still establishing each individual corridor's own identity, and create an attractive environment that fosters pedestrian activity.

In terms of improving the aesthetic character of the SPA, the proposed Specific Plan includes objectives to enhance the image of the community through visually attractive and high-quality development, which would be developed in scale with adjoining neighborhoods; to protect and enhance the character of the residential neighborhoods through improvements in streetscaping, additional open spaces, and improved property maintenance; to protect existing cultural and historic resources; and to provide opportunities for the inclusion of public art in the development and urban design process. The proposed Specific Plan would achieve these objectives through the implementation of the Development Code, which contains zone specific standards for development project under the Specific Plan.

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, as the Specific Plan would improve the existing urban landscape of strip-mall-style commercial and retail development with intermittent residential units to a visually interesting landscape focused on enhancing the historic character and context with an urban update that still exhibits the East Los Angeles identity and culture. Therefore, implementation of the

proposed Specific Plan would result in a ***beneficial impact*** on the visual quality of the planning area. Since no adverse effect would result from the proposed Specific Plan, no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Future projects would comply with the Specific Plan Development Code, which would result in aesthetically pleasing urban development that is consistent with the overall character and context of East Los Angeles. As a result, the proposed Specific Plan would not degrade the existing visual quality of the SPA and, thus, the proposed Specific Plan would result in a ***less-than-significant cumulative*** impact with regard to changes in visual character.

■ Light Effects

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in the development of existing vacant parcels, redevelopment, intensification, and reuse of existing buildings, as well as improvement in the streetscaping. Nighttime lighting would be included in future project development in a variety of forms, including security lighting; signage; street and parking area lighting; interior lighting for commercial, retail stores/restaurants, and residential uses; as well as increased vehicle headlights due to the intensified uses and increase in traffic in some areas of the SPA. However, due to the urbanized nature of the surrounding area, a significant amount of ambient light currently exists and, thus, the increase in nighttime light that could occur in the SPA under the Specific Plan would not significantly affect nighttime views of the sky (ability to see the stars), because such views are already limited in an urban setting.

The proposed Specific Plan Development Code addresses the impacts from light with lighting regulations. Furthermore, the proposed Specific Plan Development Code addresses impacts from surface parking areas by relocating parking areas either beneath residential units, in the rear of the lot, or otherwise screened and obscured from view, which would shield vehicle headlights compared to existing front or side parking lots and street parking. Therefore, light impacts would be ***less than significant***, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

East Los Angeles (as well as the entire Los Angeles Basin) is nearly built out and contains numerous existing sources of nighttime lighting typical of a highly urbanized area. Cumulative development would constitute further intensification of an already urban area and would generally occur through infill development. Although cumulative new development could include direct illumination of project structures, features, and/or walkways, the increase in ambient nighttime lighting levels in these areas would only rise minimally because a significant amount of ambient lighting currently exists due to the urbanized nature of the region as a whole. Thus, increases in nighttime lighting that would occur with future cumulative development would not significantly affect nighttime views of the sky because such views are already limited. Thus, cumulative development, in combination with development under the proposed Plan, would not result in the creation of substantial new sources of light that could negatively

affect nighttime views and cumulative impacts associated with ambient nighttime lighting would be considered *less than significant*.

■ Glare Effects

Project Impacts

The Specific Plan would result in greater intensity and density of development over that which exists currently, resulting in a greater potential for glare impacts. Glare from reflective surfaces would occur with development that uses large expanses of glass, bright lights, and other reflective surfaces for building façades. However, with implementation of the Development Code, which prescribes the use of nonreflective building materials to the greatest extent possible, redevelopment in the SPA would not result in a substantial net increase in nighttime lighting or daytime glare sources. Glare impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development could result in some increase in glare, as specific building materials and configurations are uncertain. However, these potential increases are likely to be minor and consistent with the existing built environment due to limited development potential and existing County regulations. Further, future discretionary projects would, in many cases, be subject to CEQA review and would require mitigation for these effects, which would likely also reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, cumulative glare within the surrounding area would be less than significant. As implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in a significant daytime glare impact, the proposed Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with glare would not be cumulatively considerable and would be *less than significant*.

■ Shadow Effects

Project Impacts

There are no sensitive receptors within the SPA that would be affected by shade effects expected to occur with the implementation of the proposed project. The existing low- and medium-rise residential buildings within the SPA presently create limited shade and shadow patterns that are contained within close proximity to each building. Additionally, there are no high-rise buildings within the SPA that would create more extensive shade and shadow patterns on other buildings in their immediate vicinity and in open space.

Cumulative Impacts

Sensitive receptors such as Calvary Cemetery and Belvedere Park exist within the SPA. However, there is no significant redevelopment pending that would create a significant shading effect on these receptors. Therefore, shade impacts would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

■ Exposure to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations (CO)

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could increase carbon monoxide concentrations as a result of increased traffic. Maximum existing plus project CO concentrations were calculated for the ten intersections within the SPA that would be affected by project-related traffic volumes. No intersection currently exceeds national or state standards for 1-hour or 8-hour CO concentrations. Therefore, CO hotspots would not be created with the implementation of the proposed Plan. Impacts from CO-related vehicle emissions are considered *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development could result in localized significant impacts with regard to CO hotspots. This is a potentially significant cumulative effect. CO concentrations were calculated for the ten intersections within the SPA that would be most affected by project-related traffic volumes at building with the implementation of the proposed Plan and other foreseeable future projects. No intersection exceeds national or state standards for 1-hour or 8-hour CO concentrations. Therefore, CO hotspots would not exist in the SPA after the build-out of the Plan development. The cumulative impact on sensitive receptors from the localized emission of CO is considered *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

3.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

■ Disturbance of Human Remains

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The proposed Plan includes the installation of a walking trail around the perimeter of the Calvary Cemetery and could potentially result in ground disturbance on vacant lots to transform underutilized areas, which have likely been developed at some point. However, no changes are proposed within any of the cemetery boundaries and the potential for development to occur within previously undisturbed soils is considered low. Therefore, the potential to disturb human remains within the project area is considered low. Nonetheless, given the level of historic human occupation of the study area, it is possible that unknown human remains could be located within the project area and that future development could encounter these remains (if present within the subsurface). In the event of the inadvertent discovery or recognition of any human remains during future, project-related ground disturbance, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that, if human remains are unearthed during construction, then no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. Section 5097.98 outlines the NAHC notification process and the appropriate procedures if the County Coroner determines the human remains to be Native American. Compliance

with applicable regulations would protect unknown and previously unidentified human remains, and impacts related to unknown human remains would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

There is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during future construction may uncover previously unknown and buried human remains. Treatment of human remains is covered under standard regulatory requirements as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and PRC Section 5097.98. Compliance with these regulations, which is assumed for all development in the State of California, would ensure a *less-than-significant cumulative* impact on human remains.

3.4 GEOLOGY/SOILS

■ Rupture of Earthquake Fault

Project Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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. As required by the County Grading Code, all future development requiring a grading permit must prepare a site-specific Soil Engineering Report and Engineering Geology Report which includes design and foundation recommendations to be incorporated into grading plans and specifications as a condition of project approval. Section 1613 (Earthquake Loads) of the 2010 CBC, adopted by County Building Code Title 24, requires the seismic-resistant design for future buildings to factor in a design earthquake that would create average peak ground accelerations of at least 1.0 g (the unit “g” refers to the acceleration due to the earth’s gravity, equivalent to “g-force”). Damage resulting from a design earthquake could include general damage to foundations, shifting of frame structures if not bolted in place, and breaking of underground pipes. In addition, active and potentially active regional faults are capable of producing seismic groundshaking throughout the SPA. Consequently, implementation of the proposed Plan would have *less-than-significant* impact associated with the exposure of people or structures to a rupture of a known earthquake fault. No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Risks associated with rupture of a ground fault would occur in those areas with identified Alquist-Priolo or other identified faults. Cumulative development could result in the exposure of persons or structures to risk from rupture of these faults. Compliance with the 2010 CBC, which would be required for all cumulative development, would reduce these risks, similar to the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to these risks. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed Plan would be less than significant with regard to rupture of a known earthquake fault.

■ Seismic Groundshaking or Ground Failure

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading. Adherence to the 2010 CBC and the County Grading Code would ensure the maximum practicable protection available for all future development throughout the SPA. Design of all future development under the Specific Plan would be required to include the application of CBC seismic standards as the minimum seismic resistance. The applicable code requirements include seismic-resistant earthwork and construction design criteria, based on site-specific recommendations of the project's California-registered geotechnical and structural engineers; engineering analyses that demonstrate satisfactory performance of any unsupported cut or fill slopes, and of alluvium and/or fill where they form part or all of the support for structures, foundations and underground utilities; and analyses of soil expansion, collapse, and subsidence potential and appropriate remediation (compaction, removal-and-replacement, etc.) prior to using any soils for foundation support. All future development pursuant to the Specific Plan would be built in compliance with the seismic safety requirements of the 2010 CBC, the County Grading Code, and site-specific design recommendations contained in a Soil Engineering Report and Engineering Geology Report. These recommendations would be incorporated into grading plans and specifications as a condition of project approval, the proposed Specific Plan's impact on exposure to seismically induced groundshaking and seismic-related ground failure would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Buildings and facilities in the SPA would be sited and designed in accordance with the geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations of the County Grading Code. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Adherence by the project and related projects to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations would ensure that the proposed Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding geologic hazards, and therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be *less than significant*.

■ Erosion of Topsoil

Project Impacts

Construction and operation of future development under the Specific Plan would not result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the County Grading Code require erosion and sediment controls for construction projects with land disturbance. CBC addresses the issue of soil loss for construction periods. The requirements include preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), with both construction-period and permanent erosion and sediment

controls; preparation and implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan, describing both construction-period and permanent erosion and sediment controls; and construction site inspection by the County. Future development under the Specific Plan would be required to comply with these existing regulations. Additionally, since the SPA is a highly urbanized area with only limited underdeveloped or underutilized lots, impacts would be limited to these sites and sites undergoing demolition and construction. Adherence to these requirements would prevent substantial on-site erosion and would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level from the perspective of soil loss at the construction site.

Any project sites 1 acre in size or larger are subject to the provisions of the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit adopted by the SWRCB. Applicants for specific development projects must submit a notice of intent (NOI) to the SWRCB for coverage under the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and must comply with all applicable requirements, including the preparation of a SWPPP, applicable NPDES regulations, and BMPs. The SWPPP must describe the site, the facility, erosion and sediment controls, runoff water quality monitoring, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of sediment and erosion control measures, maintenance responsibilities, and stormwater management controls. Inspection of construction sites before and after storms would be required to identify stormwater discharge from the construction activity and to identify and implement controls where necessary. Such compliance would ensure that erosion and other soil instability impacts resulting from future construction within the project site would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts from erosion and loss of topsoil from site development and operation can be cumulative in effect within a watershed. The Los Angeles River Watershed forms the geographic context of cumulative erosion impacts. Development throughout the County and the SPA is subject to state and local runoff and erosion control requirements, including applicable provisions of the general construction permit, BMPs, and Phases I and II of the NPDES permit process, as well as implementation of fugitive dust control measures in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403. These measures are to be implemented as conditions of approval for project development and related project development, which are subject to continuing enforcement. As a result, it is anticipated that cumulative impacts on the Los Angeles River Watershed District caused by runoff and erosion from cumulative development activity would be less than significant. Project sites of more than 1 acre in size would be required to comply with the provisions of the NPDES permitting process and local implementation strategies, which would minimize the potential for erosion during construction and operation of the facilities. Compliance with this permit process, in addition to the legal requirements related to erosion control practices, would minimize cumulative effects from erosion. Therefore, cumulative impacts on erosion would be less than significant. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact and, therefore, would be *less than significant*.

■ Subsidence and Liquefaction

Project Impacts

Construction and operation of future development under the Specific Plan could be located on subsidence-prone and potentially liquefiable soils. Subsidence could result in the settlement of in-place subgrade soils caused by loads generated by large earthmoving equipment during construction. Subsidence that could potentially occur would depend on the types of earthmoving equipment used. Due to the timeframe of the proposed Specific Plan with build-out estimated in 2035, the potential extent of settlement that could occur during this time is currently unknown. However, future development would be designed, constructed, and operated in conformance to 2010 CBC Section 1802.2.1 (Questionable Soils) and the County Grading Code. Therefore, potential risks to life and property from unstable soil conditions caused by subsidence would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Buildings and facilities in the SPA would be sited and designed in accordance with the geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations of the County Grading Code. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Adherence by the project and related projects to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations would ensure that the proposed Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding subsidence and liquefaction, and therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be *less than significant*.

■ Shallow Groundwater

Project Impacts

Because future structures would be designed, constructed, and operated in conformance with 2010 CBC Section 1802.2.1 (Questionable Soils) and the County Grading Code, potential risks to life and property from unstable soils caused by groundwater saturation or withdrawal would ensure that stormwater would be diverted properly and not contribute to potentially significant impacts. As such implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Buildings and facilities in the SPA would be sited and designed in accordance with the geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations of the County Grading Code. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Adherence by the project and related projects to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations would ensure that the proposed

Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding geologic hazards such as groundwater saturation, and therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be *less than significant*.

■ Expansive Soil

Project Impacts

Future development in the Specific Plan area could be located on expansive soil. Development would be subject to the above-mentioned treatments as required by the 2010 CBC and the County Grading Code. Site-specific Soil Engineering Report and Engineering Geology Report, as required by the County Grading Code, would identify expansive characteristics and recommend appropriate remediation measures to be incorporated into grading plans as a condition of approval. Because future structures would be designed, constructed and operated in conformance with the County Grading Code potential risks to life and property associated with expansive soil would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level. No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Buildings and facilities in the SPA would be sited and designed in accordance with the geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations of the County Grading Code. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Adherence by the project and related projects to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations would ensure that the proposed Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding expansive soils, and therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be *less than significant*.

3.5 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

■ Routine Use or Transport of Hazardous Materials

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The types and amounts of hazardous materials that would be used within the SPA would vary according to the nature of the activity at individual development sites. To ensure that workers and others at individual development sites within the SPA are not exposed to unacceptable levels of risk associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials, employers and businesses are required to implement existing hazardous materials regulations, with compliance monitored by state (e.g., OSHA in the workplace or DTSC for hazardous waste) and local jurisdictions (e.g., LACoFD). Compliance with existing safety standards related to the handling, use, and storage of hazardous materials, and compliance with the safety procedures mandated by applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations (RCRA, California

Hazardous Waste Control Law, and principles prescribed by the California Department of Health Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and National Institutes of Health) would be required for those business. Should the use and/or storage of hazardous materials at individual development sites rise to a level subject to regulation, those uses would be required to comply with federal and state laws to eliminate or reduce the consequence of hazardous materials accidents resulting from routine use, disposal, and storage of hazardous materials on the project site during both the construction and operation phases of a project. Therefore, compliance with applicable regulations would reduce the risk of project-induced upset from hazardous materials to a *less-than-significant* level for future uses that could be developed under the Specific Plan. No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Future hazardous materials use, storage, disposal, and transport could result in a foreseeable number of spills and accidents. Cumulative development could occur on properties listed on hazardous materials sites or that were previously used for oil production activities, and/or the demolition of existing structures, which may contain hazardous materials. Future development in the County could increase the amount of hazardous materials transported, used, and disposed. New development would be subject to hazardous materials regulations codified in CCR Titles 8, 22, and 26. Furthermore, all construction and demolition activities in the County, including projects pursuant to the proposed Plan, would be subject to Cal/OSHA, SCAQMD, and Cal/EPA regulations concerning the release of hazardous materials. Compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations during the construction and operation of new developments pursuant to the proposed Plan would ensure that cumulative impacts from the routine transportation, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials would be *less than significant*.

■ Handling of Hazardous Materials within 0.25 Mile of School

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of sensitive land uses, but would not create a risk to human health from such activities. With compliance with existing regulations, this impact would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative projects could result in construction and operational activities that result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. In particular, past and present projects have been regulated to ensure that any development on hazardous materials sites involves appropriate site investigation and remediation prior to issuance of building permits. Future projects in the County would be similarly regulated to ensure that either new development would not occur on hazardous materials sites, or for project sites that are listed, impacts would be required to be mitigated by appropriate remediation prior to development. As all contaminated sites are required to be remediated prior to development, this cumulative impact would be less than significant. Development pursuant to the Specific Plan that would occur on any listed hazardous materials sites could similarly require appropriate remediation in compliance with existing regulations. This cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Emergency Response Plan

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This impact would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development would be subject to local regulations pertaining to emergency response, including emergency access. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact related to implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.

3.6 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

■ Violation of Water Quality Standards/Waste Discharge Requirements

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. To comply with the NDPES MS4 permit, under County Code Section 12.80, future development projects under the Specific Plan would, as noted above, be required to develop and implement a SUSMP throughout the operational life of the proposed Plan. The SUSMP requirements contain a list of minimum BMPs that must be employed to infiltrate or treat stormwater runoff, control peak flow discharge, and reduce the discharge of pollutants from stormwater conveyance systems. The SUSMP requirements define, based upon land use type, the types of practices that must be included and issues that must be addressed as appropriate to the development type and size. Such BMPs would include source control BMPs to prevent pollutants from entering into stormwater discharges and treatment control BMPs to remove pollutants from stormwater discharges. In addition, operation and maintenance measures would be implemented to separate stormwater from potential pollutants, and per County Ordinance 2008-0063 (County Code 12.84), Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs would be implemented to promote infiltration, in accordance with the County's LID Manual.

LID standards are intended to distribute stormwater runoff across development sites to help reduce adverse water quality impacts and replenish groundwater supplies. The development standards are reflected in separate low impact development plans, the preparation of which is required for all development projects. LID builds on conventional design strategies by utilizing every softscape and hardscape surface in a development to perform beneficial hydrologic function by retaining, detaining, storing, changing the timing of, or filtering stormwater runoff. LID encompasses the use of structural devices, engineered systems, vegetated natural designs and education in order to distribute stormwater and urban water runoff across a development site. LID reduces the impacts of development by: replenishing groundwater supplies, improving the quality of surface water runoff, stabilizing natural stream characteristics, preserving natural site characteristics, and minimizing downstream impacts. Examples of LID measures that could be incorporated into future projects implemented under the Specific Plan include use of drought-tolerant landscaping and incorporation of green building practices,

including those that reduce waste or conserve water, electricity or natural resources. Compliance with LID standards is determined by the County, which conducts formal review of all LID plans. Further, as described above, all future development projects under the Specific Plan would be required to prepare an SUSMP, which would include BMPs designed to control pollutants in stormwater runoff to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), details specific sizing criteria for BMPs, and specifies flow control requirements.

Stormwater and wastewater from the SPA would be directed to the County's infrastructure, and discharges from that system are required to demonstrate compliance with applicable water quality standards. SUSMP's required for all future projects would be required to identify the potential and expected pollutants of concern that may be generated by development under the Specific Plan, which would include pollutants for which there is a TMDL. Additionally, compliance with the County's LID Ordinance would be required for all future projects. Adherence to these requirements would ensure the appropriate BMPs are incorporated into development such that pollutants in project-generated stormwater flows would not interfere with achievement of adopted TMDLs. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development in the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) would be required to comply with these requirements and no cumulative effect would occur. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed Plan would be less than significant.

■ Depletion of Groundwater

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not 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. Given the availability of existing supply, and the fact that development of the SPA would be incremental, the project's demand on groundwater, as a component of total supply, would not result in a depletion of groundwater supplies. Installation of additional wells by the District would occur regardless of whether the proposed Plan is implemented and would not be required for project development.

The SPA is an urbanized area and would be redeveloped with infill uses under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no substantial increase in impervious surfaces would occur with implementation of the proposed Plan. Further, there are no significant recharge areas or spreading grounds within the SPA. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not interfere with groundwater recharge. Where applicable, the incorporation of stormwater BMPs and LID design principles into future development projects under the Specific Plan would help improve local recharge to shallow groundwater.

Therefore, the proposed Plan would not 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. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cal Water's service area is mostly built out and population growth will only occur through redevelopment, which is reflected in the Cal Water future demand projections. According to the District's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the District has sufficient groundwater production rights to supply over 50 percent of the projected 2040 demand. Cumulative development within the service area would comply with BMPs and LID design principles to eliminate interference with groundwater recharge in any areas identified as a groundwater recharge area. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ **Alteration of Drainage Patterns**

Project Impacts

There are no streams or rivers within or near the SPA. The SPA is an urbanized area already served by an established drainage system. As noted above, storm water runoff for the SPA is collected by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Flood Control District (LACFCD) storm drain infrastructure, which ultimately drains to the Los Angeles River. The SPA is generally flat and does not contain any natural topographic features or LACFCD infrastructure that would be altered such that substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site would occur.

According to the drainage study conducted for the proposed Plan, development under the SPA is likely to reduce the amount of runoff from the SPA, due to today's more stringent local and federal standards related to open space/landscaping, storm water detention/retention, and water quality/LID, per County Ordinance 2008-0063, as described above.

Therefore, although the Specific Plan would facilitate further development in the SPA, such development would be infill in nature and would not result in substantial changes in land use cover that would modify drainage patterns in a manner that would cause on- or off-site erosion or siltation. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site. The Specific Plan would facilitate infill development within an urbanized area, and would not alter the course of any river or stream. Although development under the Specific Plan would intensify land uses and increase population within the SPA, this would not result in substantial changes in land use cover that would, in turn, generate substantial increases in runoff, because future development would be required to incorporate design features that would limit surface runoff. Such measures would be outlined in LID plans, as described above, that would be required by the County of all future development projects within the SPA. In addition, it has been determined there is adequate capacity in the storm drain system, indicating project flows would be accommodated without increasing the risk for on- or off-site flooding.

There are no natural surface water drainages that would directly receive storm flows from the proposed Specific Plan. Stormwater flows from the SPA currently combine with those from surrounding development in the greater Los Angeles area and are discharged into the storm drain system. Drainage in the SPA is regulated by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW), which has jurisdiction over regional drainage facilities and local drainage facilities within the unincorporated portions of the County. The LACDPW Hydrology Manual requires a storm drain conveyance system be designed for a minimum 25-year storm event and the combined capacity of a storm drain and street flow system accommodate flows from a 50-year storm event. The County also limits the allowable discharge into existing storm drain facilities. The proposed Plan is almost entirely built out with impervious surfaces, and flows from those areas are already accounted for in system capacity. Further, as described above, potential projects that could be implemented under the proposed Plan would not result in substantial increases in impervious surfaces because development within the SPA is expected to result in a reduction in overall runoff due to the increased stringency of local and federal requirements and guidelines applicable to new development. As discussed above, these requirements would be implemented through preparation, review, approval, and implementation of SUSMPs and LID plans, along with compliance with local, state, and federal permitting requirements.

With implementation of County required measures for limiting surface runoff, it is expected that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in an overall reduction in the amount of runoff within and from the SPA, because future development would incorporate on-site features such as open space and landscaping to increase the attractiveness of the corridor, which would help reduce runoff. Therefore, flooding on- or off-site is not expected to occur with implementation of the Specific Plan. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

These requirements also would be applicable to other cumulative projects within the service area. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to drainage would be *less than significant*.

■ Disease Vectors

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use. No water features are proposed as part of the Specific Plan. However, it is possible that impacts related to standing water could occur as a result of implementation of permanent or structural best management practices (BMPs) such as vaults, sumps, and the like may hold water longer than 72 hours, allowing for the reproduction of mosquitoes, black flies, and midges and increasing the risk to public health from mosquito and other vectors. “Vault type” stormwater capture devices often breed mosquitoes nearly year-round. In addition, the underground space provides safe harborage for adult resting and over-wintering mosquitoes. Future development projects within the SPA would include permanent and/or structural BMPs for water quality treatment purposes. With implementation of BMPs and project requirements, the potential increased risk of mosquito production would be minimal. However, to ensure this impact is avoided or minimized all future development projects implemented under the Specific Plan would be required to coordinate with

the Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District to ensure that no standing water is allowed to remain in stormwater capture devices for longer than 72 hours and to ensure proper design of BMPs so as to minimize the risk of standing water. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development County-wide would be required to implement BMPs and coordinate with the Vector Control District if water features are proposed. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ Polluted Runoff

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The proposed Plan is expected to result in a reduction in stormwater runoff, and no capacity problems have been identified in the storm drain infrastructure. All future development projects under the Specific Plan would be required to develop and implement a SUSMP, which would contain a list of minimum BMPs that must be employed to infiltrate or treat stormwater runoff, control peak flow discharge, and reduce the discharge of pollutants from stormwater conveyance systems. Additionally, all future projects would be required to develop and implement LID standards to further reduce the adverse effects of surface runoff. With adherence to these requirements, the Specific Plan would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

All cumulative development would be required to comply with NPDES permit requirements and implement BMPs and LID features to reduce the adverse effects on surface runoff. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ Water Quality

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would generate runoff but would not violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality. The Specific Plan would include infill development of vacant properties and redevelopment/reuse of underutilized buildings as well as streetscape and pedestrian/bicycle circulation improvements along 3rd Street. Residential neighborhoods would include streetscape improvements and an increase in open space and green elements such as street trees and landscaping. As noted above, implementation of the Specific Plan is expected to reduce overall stormwater runoff within the SPA. This would be accomplished through the implementation of BMPs contained in County-required SUSMPs and LID plans, the development and implementation of which would be required of all future projects under the proposed Plan. However,

redevelopment of vacant and underutilized properties has the potential to generate construction and postconstruction stormwater runoff that could contain pollutants that could affect water quality. There are NDPEs permits that apply to stormwater runoff from construction and postconstruction activities. These permits are also intended to minimize potential effects on surface water quality and groundwater quality. Compliance with permit requirements would ensure that future development under the Specific Plan would not generate runoff during construction that would significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Similar to existing conditions, stormwater runoff with implementation of the Specific Plan would be generated from roadways, parking areas, rooftops, and hardscaping. Because the types of uses in the SPA would not change substantially, the types of pollutants in runoff would continue to be oil and grease, metals, pesticides/herbicides, bacteria, sediment, and trash. To comply with the NDPEs MS4 permit, under County Code Section 12.80, the projects implemented under the proposed Plan would be required to develop and implement a SUSMP throughout the operational life of the proposed Plan. Treatment control BMPs would also be required. In accordance with NPDES requirements, the treatment control BMPs would mitigate (infiltrate or treat) the first 0.75 inch of stormwater runoff from a first flush storm event. BMPs could include vegetated swales, detention basin (which could include vegetation and infiltration), and energy dissipaters. The specific BMPs would be determined for each individual project, and their incorporation into project design would be required as a condition of project approval and verified by the County prior to the issuance of grading or building permits. The Specific Plan reinforces these permit requirements by including its own requirements incorporating BMPs into project design. Because future development under the proposed Plan would implement applicable NPDES requirements, SUWMP and LID BMPs, and Specific Plan Strategies, which would be monitored and enforced by the County to demonstrate that surface water or groundwater quality is not adversely affected by the proposed Plan, this impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

With respect to construction, all development within the Los Angeles River watershed is required to conform to applicable WDRs. Cumulative development projects within the watershed would be required to implement construction BMPs, as would projects facilitated by adoption and implementation of the proposed Plan. Both the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County are required to impose these requirements. Stormwater runoff from cumulative development in the watershed, including development that could be facilitated by the proposed Plan, could contribute to water quality impairments if measures are not implemented to minimize pollutant levels in runoff. Therefore, a cumulative impact would occur.

All foreseeable development projects, including those within the SPA, also would be required to implement operational BMPs to control the release of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Required BMPs would be documented in SUSMPs and LID plans prepared for individual development projects. Requirements of SUSMPs prepared for individual development projects would be enforced through the County's project approval and permit process, and all new development projects would be subject to inspection. Furthermore, all applicable projects must comply with County Code Section 12.80 and Section 12.84, which govern pollutant control requirements and construction activity requirements. Redevelopment/TOD typically would be limited to infill projects, the nature of which would not significantly change the types or amounts of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Further, the proposed Plan

is expected to result in an overall reduction in runoff within and from the SPA. Therefore, the Specific Plan's contribution to known water quality impairments would not be cumulatively considerable and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ Conflicts with Ordinance

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 12, Chapter 12.84, and Title 22, Chapter 22.52). As described above, County Code Chapter 12.84 requires the use of Low Impact Development (LID) principles in development projects. All new development and redevelopment under the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County is required to meet LID requirements. This would apply to all future development under the proposed Plan. All projects implemented under the Specific Plan would be required to prepare and implement an LID plan that would be submitted to the County for review and approval. BMPs required per approval of the LID plan would be included as conditions of approval for all projects. Because the County is responsible for ensuring projects implemented under the Specific Plan comply with LID requirements and the Specific Plan includes design strategies that, at a general level, are intended to demonstrate how projects would comply with LID requirements, this impact would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

All cumulative development in the County of Los Angeles is required to comply with the LID Ordinance. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

■ Discharges to Area of Special Biological Significance

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would indirectly result in nonpoint source pollutant discharges into a State Water Resources Control Board-designated Area of Special Biological Significance. Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, cities and other public jurisdictions, and private property owners own and maintain dozens of storm drains that discharge into ASBS-24, an Area of Special Biological Significance located along the coast of Ventura County and Los Angeles County, extending from Mugu Lagoon to Latigo Point, approximately 20 miles from the SPA Stormwater runoff from the SPA would discharge into the County's storm drain system, which could ultimately drain, in combination with other flows from numerous other sources, to ASBS-24. The Specific Plan and NPDES permitting requirements would require that project proponents incorporate stormwater quality BMPs and LID principles into project design which would reduce pollutants in runoff. These measures would also be included as conditions of project approval. Further, no substantial change in the types of pollutants is expected, and it is anticipated there would be a reduction in stormwater runoff. Therefore, the proposed Plan would have a *less-than-significant* impact on ASBS-24, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

All foreseeable development projects, including those within the SPA, also would be required to implement operational BMPs to control the release of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Required BMPs would be documented in SUSMPs and LID plans prepared for individual development projects. Requirements of SUSMPs prepared for individual development projects would be enforced through the County's project approval and permit process, and all new development projects would be subject to inspection. Furthermore, all applicable projects must comply with County Code Section 12.80 and Section 12.84, which govern pollutant control requirements and construction activity requirements. Redevelopment/TOD typically would be limited to infill projects, the nature of which would not significantly change the types or amounts of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Further, noted above, the proposed Plan is expected to result in an overall reduction in runoff within and from the SPA. Therefore, the Specific Plan's contribution to known water quality impairments would not be cumulatively considerable. The cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ **Otherwise Degrade Water Quality**

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Potential water quality impacts of implementing the proposed Plan are described above. No other potential types or sources of water quality impairment as a result of implementing the proposed Plan have been identified. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

All foreseeable development projects, including those within the SPA, also would be required to implement operational BMPs to control the release of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Required BMPs would be documented in SUSMPs and LID plans prepared for individual development projects. Requirements of SUSMPs prepared for individual development projects would be enforced through the County's project approval and permit process, and all new development projects would be subject to inspection. Furthermore, all applicable projects must comply with County Code Section 12.80 and Section 12.84, which govern pollutant control requirements and construction activity requirements. Redevelopment/TOD typically would be limited to infill projects, the nature of which would not significantly change the types or amounts of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Further, noted above, the proposed Plan is expected to result in an overall reduction in runoff within and from the SPA. Therefore, the Specific Plan's contribution to known water quality impairments would not be cumulatively considerable. The cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ **Inundation by Seiche**

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche. There is only one enclosed water body in the SPA that could result in seiche (oscillating water movement due to seismic events that can result in overtopping of the water body and subsequent flooding),

identified as the 2.4-acre Belvedere Park Lake. The Lake is centrally located in the 31-acre Belvedere Park, and is set at a lower elevation than the surrounding grassy slopes. Therefore, even if subject to seiches during a seismic event, the surrounding higher elevations would be anticipated to contain the water and prevent off-site flooding. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*. No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development subject to seiche would be limited and site-specific. Those areas closest to bodies of water and the coastline in the County of Los Angeles could be exposed to such risk. However, there is no history of substantial seiche in the County and the cumulative risk is quite low. Therefore, the cumulative impact with regard to seiche would be *less than significant*.

3.7 LAND USE/PLANNING

■ Conflicts with Land Use Plans

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed Plan defines a vision and establishes standards and strategies for the revitalization of the SPA using the principles of TOD. Components of a TOD neighborhood include vibrant and diverse commercial corridors; well-designed buildings, attractive streetscapes, and engaging public spaces; multi-modal streets to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles; mix of uses with residential and employment densities that support transit use; and a range of housing options. The proposed Plan is focused on the physical and economic change that is expected in the SPA with operation of the Gold Line light-rail transit corridor.

The primary policy issues and expected land use changes associated with implementation of the proposed Plan include:

- Implement a form-based code that supersedes the Zoning Ordinance to better ensure good urban form, quality, and a pedestrian-oriented community.
- Establish mixed-uses by right (except in LMD, OS, and CV zone) to foster a more walkable, safer, and people-oriented area.
- Foster the development of additional residential units by allowing mixed uses in the TOD, CC, FS, AB, and NC zones by right.
- Better balance parking standards for an established community within the context of the Gold Line by reducing the minimum amount of parking for all uses in the SPA, by allowing shared parking facilities, and by requiring no additional on-site parking for a change of use within an existing building.
- Improve pedestrian comfort and safety and access to transit by encouraging a mixture of housing, office, retail, service, and other neighborhood-serving amenities and development to be integrated into a walkable, people-oriented neighborhood.

- Foster streetscape improvements and traffic calming measures through tree plantings and landscaping in the public realm.
- Implement the County's Bicycle Master Plan to foster a safer bicycling experience for both transportation and recreation.
- Improve enforcement of land use control standards through a discrete set of predictable development standards that better ensure good urban form and quality.
- Improve and increase access to open space and recreation by promoting the shared use of existing school recreational facilities.
- Protect the character of existing residential neighborhoods by focusing transformative changes in Specific Plan and the development code to the TOD, CC, FS, AB, and NC zones.

Overall, the land use policies outlined by the Los Angeles County General Plan, East Los Angeles Community Plan and the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Compass Growth Vision goals and policies encourage projects that provide a mix of uses, are compatible and harmonious with surrounding development, and offer amenities that enhance the image and quality of life and the environment. The proposed Plan's policies are designed to create vibrant and diverse commercial corridors; well-designed buildings, attractive streetscapes, and engaging public spaces; multi-modal streets to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles; mix of uses with residential and employment densities that support transit use; and a range of housing options. These policies directly address the image of the community and promote compatibility between land uses. The proposed Plan would not conflict with existing policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental effect. Instead, the Specific Plan would provide the County with a TOD development in an area that could support high density uses in specific zones while maintaining the existing character and fabric of the well-established SPA. The project would provide a new mix of development to enhance the SPA's economic viability and provide employment, retail and housing opportunities which directly benefit the community. The project would also encourage the development of local parks in urban areas through the generation of new open space in tandem with new development, as well as improving the park network via pedestrian and biking connection. Consequently, this impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative land use impacts have the potential to occur where a number of projects have the potential to negatively change the overall land use of an area by affecting adjacent existing uses. Adherence to existing land use plans, policies, and regulations generally prevent such occurrences. Future discretionary development, as well as those projects subject only to site plan review, in this unincorporated portion of the County and neighboring cities would be reviewed for consistency with adopted land use plans and policies and the requirements of CEQA, which require findings of plan and policy consistency prior to approval of entitlements for development. It should be noted that future projects could also include General Plan amendments and/or zone changes. However, modifications to existing land use patterns that require such amendments do not necessarily represent an inherent negative effect on the environment, particularly if the proposed changes do not conflict with the policies that were specifically adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Past and present development has been determined to be consistent with applicable land use plans, although there may have been individual variations from certain policies in those plans. Inconsistencies with one or more specific policies of applicable land use plans do not necessarily result in inconsistency with the overall plan. It is expected that there will at times be deviations from individual policies. The essential factor in determining consistency is whether the project, overall, conforms to the intent and ultimate goals of the applicable land use plans. Three of the six identified cumulative projects would occur within the SPA. The fourth is under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles. As all cumulative projects would be subject to the guidelines of either the County or the City of Los Angeles, it is expected that the land uses of the cumulative projects would be consistent with existing land use plans. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative effect.

The proposed Plan focuses on intensifying mixed-use development in transit-centers, such as near the Gold Line Station areas and along 3rd Street, 1st Street, South Atlantic Boulevard, and Cesar Chavez Avenue. The changes proposed under the proposed Plan would not represent a significant departure from the existing land uses and would be compatible with the land uses that surround the SPA, as demonstrated in the consistency analyses of this section. Further, the proposed Plan would be consistent with SCAG principles and goals to direct new development in transit areas. As such, the proposed Plan, combined with related projects within the surrounding vicinity, would not have a cumulative adverse impact related to land use and planning. The cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

3.8 POPULATION/HOUSING

■ Induce Substantial Population Growth

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly, or cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. As of 2010, East Los Angeles had an inventory of 32,201 dwelling units (U.S. Census). The SPA currently has an inventory of 7,850 dwelling units. The proposed Plan would result in the development of up to an additional 5,419 dwelling units, increasing East Los Angeles' housing inventory to 37,620 dwelling units. Although full build out of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of dwelling units in the SPA by 17 percent, this growth is still in line with the County's General Plan Housing Element.

Based on the current dwelling unit mix, implementation of the proposed Plan could result in a maximum of 54,271 residents. Given that the current SPA population is 32,107, the proposed Plan would increase population by 41 percent over the planning horizon of 20 years. The population increase as a result of the proposed Plan would account for 4 percent of SCAG's projected unincorporated area population in 2035 of 1,399,500.

The County General Plan establishes maximum development capacities for the entire County. As development occurs in one area, development is balanced in other areas so as not to exceed the overall population projections. Therefore, while there would be increased development in the SPA, less development would occur elsewhere in the County so that population increase would not exceed overall population projections. The population increase under the proposed Plan would be substantial, but is a

direct result of TOD focused on the Gold Line stations in the East Los Angeles community. This development would be consistent with SCAG's RTP/SCS, which promotes infill development centered on existing and proposed transit. The increase in population in the SPA would, therefore, be balanced by decreased population increase/development elsewhere in the County, and, while the Specific Plan would result in a substantial increase in population in the SPA, the population increase would fall within the overall population projections for the County as a whole. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Full build-out of the proposed Plan would result in a potential increase of 22,164 County residents and 5,419 dwelling units. Currently, there are no other approved residential projects in the SPA and two apartment projects (totaling 28 units) pending adjacent to the SPA, as noted in Table 3-3 (List of Related Projects) in Chapter 3 (Project Description). Using the U.S. Census' 2010 average persons per household (pph) number of 4.09 for East Los Angeles, the related project would increase population by 115 people. In consideration of build-out of the proposed Specific Plan as well as known residential projects outside the SPA, the area's population could grow by 22,279 residents, for a total population of 54,386 residents in 2035. As SCAG projects that the countywide unincorporated area population would be 1,399,500 in 2035, build-out of the proposed Specific Plan would account for 2.8 percent of that number.

The nonresidential uses under the Specific Plan would not result in a substantial indirect increase in population, as it is anticipated that a majority of the employment force would be culled from the existing East Los Angeles population. Some population increases would be expected from other residential and nonresidential development outside of the SPA, but this would not be anticipated to represent a substantial increase.

Therefore, considering the population and housing impacts of the proposed Specific Plan in conjunction with past, present, and future known and approved cumulative development in Los Angeles County, the *cumulative* impact on population growth would be *less than significant*.

3.9 PUBLIC SERVICES

■ Fire Protection

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency response. Full build-out of the SPA could result in the addition of up to 5,419 dwelling units. Based on an estimated 4.09 persons per household in the SPA, the Specific Plan could result in approximately 22,164 new residents by build-out. This increase in residential development, as well as the proposed increase in development intensity, would result in an increase in the number of fire service calls to the area compared to existing conditions.

Based on accessibility, the SPA would be served by LACoFD Fire Stations 1, 3, and 22. These stations are currently operating within established level of service standards. Furthermore, based on an annual capacity of responses per unit, each of these stations is operating below capacity with respect to staffing and available apparatus. Development under the proposed Plan would be required to pay development fees that fund, in part, infrastructure and public service needs.

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in a direct population increase by introducing new residential development, and would increase development intensity within the SPA, potentially resulting in an increase in calls for fire services provided to the SPA by the LACoFD. However, the scope of the proposed Plan is accounted for within the General Plan build-out projections and the LACoFD also accounts for growth during the annual budgeting process, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

All development would be required to comply with provisions of the amended 2010 California Building Code and 2010 California Fire Code, as set forth in the Los Angeles County Fire Code, pertaining to fire protection systems and equipment, general safety precautions, and many other general and specialized fire safety requirements for new and existing buildings and premises, such as emergency access provisions.

As development occurs within the County, the LACoFD will continue to monitor response times to ensure the LACoFD is operating within the established level of service standards. While the LACoFD does not anticipate that the project will generate impacts that exceed LACoFD's existing capacity, if capacity is exceeded, the LACoFD will determine if additional fire protection facilities or equipment are necessary and partner with the County of Los Angeles to provide those improvements. As such with adherence to existing County policies and regulations, the cumulative impact of the proposed Plan would be *less than significant*.

■ Police Protection

Project Impacts

The expected growth in resident population per build-out of the Specific Plan would result in an approximate net increase of 22,164 residents. The Los Angeles County General Plan requires a staff level of one deputy sheriff per 1,000 individuals. Assuming this present standard and expected level of growth for the SPA, an additional 22.16 deputies would be required to service the SPA. A variety of approaches can be employed to ensure adequate staffing levels, including, but not necessarily limited to, hiring (temporary and/or full-time), authorizing overtime and/or reassignments. Therefore, increases in staffing are evaluated by the LASD during its annual budgetary process, and personnel are hired, or overtime pay is funded for existing personnel, as needed, to ensure that adequate police protection services are provided. Therefore, no new or physically altered governmental facilities would be required to maintain adequate levels of police protection. Future development under the proposed Plan is not expected to notably affect LASD resources given that General Fund monies from increased property tax revenue associated with development under the Specific Plan, as well as other fee revenues, may be used to augment equipment levels and provide for adequate staffing levels such that the County's police response

times can be maintained. Therefore, persons on-site or elsewhere in the SPA would not be exposed to increased risks as a result of the proposed Plan's additional demands on the LASD. Consequently, impacts to police services would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

As additional development occurs in the County, there may be an overall increase in the demand for police services, including personnel and/or equipment. The provision of adequate police services is of critical importance to the County, and funds are allocated to these services during the annual monitoring and budgeting process to ensure that police protection services are responsive to changes in the County. Funds collected in the form of plan check fees, inspection fees, and permit fees (for new development) are deposited into the General Fund and allocated to County services, as needed. Similarly, staffing levels are evaluated by the LASD annually, and personnel are hired, as needed, to ensure that adequate police protection services are maintained. The cumulative impact, therefore, on police services in the County would be *less than significant*.

■ Schools

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for schools. According to the LAUSD, residential units would generate 0.1141 elementary school students, 0.0571 middle school students and 0.0694 high school students. Therefore, based on full residential build-out of the Specific Plan of 4,831 new multifamily residential units and 279 single-family units, approximately 583 elementary school students, 292 middle school students, and 355 high school students for a total of 1,230 new students could be generated over build-out of the proposed Specific Plan. However, this is a worst-case scenario, as it is unlikely that the proposed Plan would result in the projected number of students based on SGRs because of the targeted resident population (which are invariably empty nesters or young professionals seeking transit-oriented development), as described in detail in Section 4.11 (Population/Housing) of this PEIR. Based on the capacity of each of the schools serving the project site and the estimated number of elementary-school-, middle-school-, and high-school-age students generated from build-out of the proposed Plan, Brooklyn Avenue Elementary School, Morris K. Hamasaki Elementary School, Humphreys Elementary School, Monterey Continuation High School, Hilda L. Solis Learning Academy, and Alfonso Perez Special Education Center would continue to operate below capacity, and Belvedere Elementary School, Rowan Avenue Elementary School, Belvedere Middle School, Marianna Avenue Elementary School, David Wark Griffith Middle School, and James A. Garfield Senior High School would continue operate above capacity with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, consistent with existing conditions. As such, the proposed Specific Plan would contribute to existing overcrowded conditions at the high school serving the SPA. Refer to Table 4.12-2.

To assist in providing facilities to serve students generated by new development, the governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any

construction within the boundaries of the district, for the purposes of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 65885(3)(h) (SB 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees "... is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization."

As described above, the LAUSD is eligible to receive new construction funding under the School Facilities Program and may impose Alternative Fees. Depending on the availability of state funds for new construction, future residential development would be subject to varying fees per assessable square footage of new residential development when funds are not available. The Alternative Fees will be used to fund (i) new school facilities, (ii) expansion of existing school facilities, and (iii) other upgrades to existing school facilities, but only to the extent that such items are needed to accommodate the projected student population generated from future residential development. The payment of these school fees would offset any additional increase in education demand at the elementary, middle and high schools serving the project site, and satisfy any potentially significant impacts per CEQA. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

Cumulative Impacts

Increases in residential development throughout LAUSD boundaries could generate additional demand for public school classroom seating capacity in local schools. The degree to which this demand would be satisfied is dependent upon future enrollment trends. The LAUSD is operating above capacity, and is projected to continue to operate above capacity. All new private development is required to pay statutory impact fees to the school district to help fund construction of additional classrooms and offset any additional increases in education demand at elementary, middle, and high schools. Given the payment of these fees, the cumulative impact of future development, including development under the proposed Specific Plan, on the LAUSD would be less than significant. In addition, the incremental effect of the proposed Plan on this impact would not be cumulatively considerable for the same reasons. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the project on schools would be *less than significant*.

3.10 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

■ Design Hazards

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The SPA is currently developed, including the circulation network. The Specific Plan proposes a development pattern to support existing transit service in the area and does not propose new intersections or changes to existing roadways that would create a design hazards. As discussed in Section 4.9 (Land Use/Planning), the Specific Plan would accommodate new commercial and residential land use that is generally consistent with existing development, but at a higher intensity. Individual development would be required to undergo design review to ensure that driveways and other features meet County and proposed Specific Plan standards and would not create a hazard. Therefore, a hazard

would not result from incompatible land use. Additionally, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in development of a more pedestrian-friendly circulation network, including requirements, such as setbacks for development, that would increase visibility and overall roadway network safety. Safety features encouraged in the Specific Plan include clearly marked crossings, curb extensions, use of striping to enhance crosswalk visibility, and in-pavement lighted sidewalks. These safety features are particularly encouraged along streets that provide accessibility to Gold Line stations and would improve safety at railroad crossings. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts related to hazards are site-specific and not cumulative in nature because a hazardous design feature in one area would generally not contribute to a hazard elsewhere. Additionally, the proposed Plan would not result in any hazardous design features or incompatible land uses. Individual developments would be required to undergo design review that would ensure project elements such as driveways would not create a hazard. Therefore, *a less-than-significant cumulative impact* would occur.

■ Conflicts with Applicable Plans and Policies

Project Impact

The County maintains a set of Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines that establish the criteria based upon which an individual project is determined to have a significant impact on the transportation network. However, the East Los Angeles 3rd Street Specific Plan is a policy-level document that establishes policies guiding development, but it does not dictate the development pattern of the area; therefore, it cannot predict where and when impacts, if any, will occur within the Specific Plan area.

The County does not specify acceptable LOS for the purpose of long-range planning. However, in conformance with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), the minimum acceptable level of service on arterial roads (i.e. major, secondary, and limited secondary highways) is LOS E, except where base year LOS is worse than LOS E. In such cases, the base year LOS is the minimum acceptable level of service.

The following intersections would operate at LOS F without project implementation:

- Indiana Street & Cesar E Chavez Avenue—LOS F (PM peak hour)
- Eastern Avenue & 3rd Street—LOS F (PM peak hour)
- Ford Boulevard & 3rd Street—LOS F (PM peak hour)

Implementation of the maximum-density build-out allowed per zoning and land use regulations under the proposed Plan would result in a significant impact to all of the above intersections by increased delay and furthering worsening and further deterioration of LOS at all three intersections identified as operating at LOS F without the proposed Plan. Such a scenario would significantly increase delay also deteriorate level of service to LOS F at nineteen additional intersections that would operate at an acceptable LOS E or higher without the proposed Plan.

While the proposed Plan establishes policies guiding development in the Specific Plan area, it does not dictate the development patterns of the area nor does it propose individual projects with measurable impacts on the level of service of the transportation network. The County would monitor the impacts of

any future individual projects resulting from implementation of the proposed Plan, including restricted commercial, major institutional facilities, major entertainment, and places of assembly, and condition such uses to mitigate these impacts to less-than-significant levels as part of its approval process. Further, projects that meet the criteria of statewide, regional or area wide significant would be required to submit a traffic impact analysis to both the County and Caltrans for review and approval. The impact would, therefore, be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

The analysis of the proposed Plan impacts on the study area transportation network includes cumulative growth through year 2035. Three intersections would operate at LOS F as a result of cumulative growth without the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan could potentially result in significant increase in congestion at these intersections, and cause the level of service at twenty-three additional intersections to deteriorate to LOS F. The County would require project-level traffic impact analyses and coordination with Caltrans for cumulative projects and condition them to mitigate these impacts to less-than-significant levels as part of its approval process. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative effect, and the *cumulative* impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Construction Effects on Emergency Access

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. Individual projects under the proposed Plan would be required to comply with County requirements for maintaining emergency access at all times. The impact would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Construction of cumulative development would not result in inadequate emergency access, a potentially significant effect. Individual projects under the proposed Plan as well as the cumulative projects would be required to comply with County Code requirements, including adequate egress and fire apparatus access for maintaining emergency access at all times. The *cumulative* impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Conflicts with Adopted Policies

Project Impacts

The applicable alternative transportation plans for the Specific Plan are the CMP and the County Bicycle Master Plan. The Specific Plan would encourage use of alternative transportation, consistent with CMP. The Specific Plan is intended to be a transit-oriented development plan. Components include vibrant and diverse commercial corridors; well-designed buildings; attractive streetscapes; engaging public spaces; multi-modal streets accommodating pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles; a mix of uses, with residential and employment densities that support transit use; and a range of housing options. Examples of Specific Plan requirements include wide sidewalks, bicycle parking, safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections, improved lighting for safety, and improved pedestrian crossings. The Specific Plan

does not include land uses of other components that would conflict with existing alternative transportation facilities or decrease performance of these facilities. Individual developments under the Specific Plan would be required to comply with applicable CMP requirements for transit coordination to ensure that development would not result in adverse impacts to transit facilities.

The Specific Plan would implement the bicycle facilities planned for the SPA in the Bicycle Master Plan. The bicycle circulation network identified in the Specific Plan is consistent with the proposed Bicycle Master Plan network and the plan includes several policies that require implementation of the plan. Future development in the SPA would be required to demonstrate consistency with the planned circulation network through the design review process. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative growth in the region could result in a cumulative impact to alternative transportation facilities such as bicycles and public transit if development did not provide new facilities concurrent with demand, or include design features to promote transit use and bicycle and pedestrian safety. As discussed under Impact 4.14-5, implementation of the proposed Plan would promote the use of alternative transportation and increase pedestrian and bicycle safety. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution and the *cumulative* impact would be *less than significant*.

3.11 UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS

■ Water System Capacity

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create water system capacity deficiencies or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Specific projects implemented as a result of implementation of the proposed Plan would be required to meet applicable Los Angeles County Department of Building and Safety and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) requirements for on-site needs of domestic and private fire flow and off-site needs for public fire flow. Any water system upgrades that are necessary for a specific project would be specified by the County during project-level review and would be implemented at the developer's expense. Individual project sponsors would be responsible for payment of development fees to support infrastructure upgrades.

Additionally, any development resulting from the proposed Plan and implementing ordinances would be required to provide Cal Water and LACFD required upgrades to the water distribution systems serving the proposed Plan. As with the code requirements for fire access, fire flows, number of hydrants, and fire suppression measures, these upgrades would be addressed for new development occurring under the proposed Plan in conjunction with individual project approvals and in accordance with Specific Plan and existing General Plan policies. As stated previously, the majority of existing major water supply facilities

in the plan is considered to be adequately sized for the anticipated growth. However, the upgrading and/or expansion of existing local distribution systems may be needed at certain locations within the proposed Plan on a project-by-project basis.

Cal Water will likely need to perform a series of water system analyses as redevelopment projects associated with the proposed Plan are brought forth. This would include Specific Plan parameters to confirm that Cal Water's existing facilities can support the scope of each new development component. Given the information currently available, Fuscoe Engineering determined, based on pipe size capacity alone it appears the existing water mains within the current water distribution system could support the proposed build-out of the proposed Plan. Regardless of the redevelopment associated with proposed Plan, some [water] lines could be at least 50 years old, and new water mains and/or upsizing existing lines will likely be necessary. Therefore, based on the availability of sufficient remaining capacity at LAAFP of 125 mgd to handle the projected water needs and included policies of the proposed Plan, implementation of the proposed Plan would have a *less-than-significant* impact on water facilities including treatment facilities, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

To accommodate the increased demand for water resulting from increased development, water treatment facilities have been periodically expanded. The FEWTP has rated treatment capacity of 520 mgd per day and based on current information treats up to 420 mgd with a remaining capacity of about 100 mgd per day. If necessary, MWD can add another water treatment basin within its existing FEWTP facility and has recently added ozone treatment to meet increasing water quality regulations. MWD's treatment plants have a combined treatment capacity of up to 2.1 billion gallons of water a day and remaining capacity can easily accommodate water treatment demand anticipated at build-out of the proposed Plan, which includes present and future development in the MWD service area. As implementation of the proposed Plan would be within the overall growth projected for the County of Los Angeles, the proposed Plan, in combination with future development in the MWD service area, would have a *less- than-significant* cumulative impact on water treatment.

■ Wastewater

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, or result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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. New development under the proposed Plan would comply with all provisions of the NPDES program, as enforced by the RWQCB. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in an exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements. All future projects under the proposed Plan would be required to comply with all applicable wastewater discharge requirements issued by the SWRCB and RWQCB.

Existing LACSD requirements within its required functions address wastewater issues by monitoring generation and flow quantities, treating wastewater to the standards set by law and regulatory agencies, and expanding the system's capacity to accommodate growth and development. These requirements would apply to existing and future development in the proposed Plan area. Further, future development under the proposed Plan would be required to adhere to federal, state, regional, and those local regulations.

Over the planning horizon, even with anticipated growth in the proposed Plan average annual wastewater generation is only expected to grow by 2.51 mgd in 2030. As stated above, the SPA is served by the JWPCP. Currently, the Joint JWPCP has the capacity to provide tertiary treatment for an ADWF of 280 mgd and permitted capacity of 400 mgd. The sewershed includes the SPA; as such, assuming a remaining treatment capacity of approximately 120 mgd, the JWPCP could continue to accommodate the existing and projected wastewater flows of 2.51 mgd generated within the SPA.

It is anticipated that water conservation will lead to reductions in the amount of wastewater generated. Due to aging infrastructure, replacement of sewer lines in the area can reasonably be expected with or without the proposed Plan. As noted, payment of development fees would fund any future needed infrastructure improvements. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not cause a significantly measureable increase (2.51 mgd) in wastewater flows that would exceed existing infrastructure capacity or require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities, which would not be expected to have significant environmental impacts.

Any development resulting from the SPA would be required to provide LACSD-required upgrades to the wastewater distribution systems serving the SPA. As with the code requirements, these upgrades would be addressed for new development proposed under the SPA and implementing ordinances in conjunction with individual project approvals. The SPA is well served by existing sewer infrastructure and any developments resulting from the SPA and implementing ordinances would primarily be infill and redevelopment projects, rather than expansions into areas not already connected to the county's sewer conveyance system.

As stated above, the SPA is served by the JWPCP. The projected ADWF from the SPA at build-out is 6.52 mgd. The JWPCP is currently treating up to 280 mgd with a permitted rating of 400 mgd and could accommodate an increase of 2.51 from existing conditions within East Los Angeles to build-out of the proposed Plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Plan would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and this impact would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Past development in the unincorporated County areas could have also resulted in localized exceedance of sewer capacity or incrementally exceed the scheduled capacity of any one wastewater treatment plant. Past development has also required expansion of the wastewater treatment plants that serve the unincorporated County areas. Construction of wastewater treatment plants or plant expansion likely resulted in environmental effects; however, these effects have not led to cumulatively considerable environmental effects.

The LACSD has planned treatment plant capacity based on County General Plan build-out, which includes present and future development occurring in the thirty-five Community Plan areas in the unincorporated County areas, including the 3rd Street East Los Angeles SPA. The LACSD has determined that future cumulative development countywide as allowed under the County General Plan would not result in the need for expansion of or construction of wastewater treatment plants. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Plan and its implementing ordinances in combination with other future development that would be served by JWPCP, and based on the analysis herein, the proposed Plan's cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Stormwater Drainage

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The SPA is nearly built out with impervious surfaces throughout the SPA. In fact, vacant parcels are paved with asphalt or covered with some other impervious material, i.e., concrete. Although the Specific Plan would facilitate infill development, this would not result in substantial changes in land use cover that would, in turn, generate substantial increases in runoff. It is expected that implementation of the Specific Plan would likely result in a reduction in the amount of runoff because it would incorporate on-site features such as pervious open spaces and new landscaping to increase the attractiveness of the corridor, which would help reduce runoff volumes. However, this would be confirmed through implementation of County requirements for hydrologic and hydraulic evaluation. In addition, there is adequate capacity in the storm drain system, indicating project flows would be accommodated without increasing the risk for on- or off-site flooding. This impact would be *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development could result in significant localized stormwater drainage issues due to aging infrastructure County-wide. This is a potentially significant cumulative effect. The proposed Plan would likely result in a reduction in the amount of runoff, as noted above, and the storm drain system has adequate capacity to serve the SPA. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative effect, and the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Solid Waste

Permitted Landfill Capacity

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The solid waste expected to be generated from the proposed Plan represents less than 3.8 percent of the remaining capacity of the Sunshine Canyon

Landfill. If the entire 161.53 tons of solid waste generated by the proposed Plan were disposed of in the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, the Sunshine Canyon Landfill would still have sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate this contribution. Development under the proposed Plan would not result in the need for additional waste hauling routes, as it would be infill development in an already urbanized area and would not develop areas beyond its current service boundaries. The Commerce Refuse to Energy Facility waste-to-energy facility has a capacity of 350 tpd and the SERRF has a capacity of 1,380 tpd.

If all solid waste generated from the SPA were distributed and sent to Sunshine Canyon Landfill and these waste-to-energy processing facilities, as presented in the Solid Waste setting above, there is adequate remaining capacity at these solid waste disposal and waste-to-energy processing facilities to accommodate solid waste generated within the SPA. As a result, implementation of the Specific Plan would not be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal need and this impact is considered *less than significant*, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development in the solid waste service area could result in generation of additional solid waste. If a servicing landfill were at or near capacity, future growth could result in a significant cumulative effect, as solid waste would need to be diverted elsewhere and put additional pressure on other landfills. As part of the proposed Plan, implementing ordinances that address solid waste reduction would be incorporated into future infill and redevelopment projects to further reduce solid waste within the SPA. In addition, these same infill and redevelopment projects occurring under the proposed Plan would compliance with federal, state, and other local requirements to further reduce the contribution of solid waste generated by developments in the SPA to less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

Compliance with Solid Waste Requirements

Project Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Plan would be consistent with all State regulations as well as the Los Angeles County Code, which are presented in the Regulatory Setting. All projects in the unincorporated County undergo development review, which includes an analysis of project compliance with these programs. Therefore, future development permitted under the proposed Plan would comply with all solid waste policies and objectives; as a result of these development reviews, impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Plan would be considered *less than significant*, and no mitigation measures are required.

Cumulative Impacts

All cumulative development would comply with regulations pertaining to solid waste. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Energy

Electricity

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact. Implementation of the proposed Plan would increase the use of electricity within the SPA, to light, heat, and air condition the future development under the proposed Plan. The total annual electricity consumption by build-out of the proposed Plan is estimated to be approximately 141,661,426 kWh/yr, representing an increase of 81,165,703 kWh/yr compared to existing conditions.

SCE is making capital investments throughout Southern California. SCE has undertaken a major infrastructure expansion and replacement project system throughout its 50,000-square-mile service area. SCE's planned and ongoing systemwide improvements, coupled with CCR Title 24 requirements for installation of on-site renewable energy systems to meet net zero energy efficiencies would reduce the need for new or expanded electrical systems. As such, no new transmission or expanded distribution systems beyond those that are already planned for or being implemented as part of SCE's systemwide improvements programs would be necessary as a result of implementation of the proposed Plan. New development pursuant to the Specific Plan would be required to comply with the energy conservation measures contained in Title 24, which would reduce the amount of energy needed for the operation of any buildings constructed as a part of the Specific Plan. Therefore, potential impacts associated with electrical system deficiencies are *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

SCE has undertaken a major infrastructure expansion and replacement project system throughout its 50,000-square-mile service area, which includes the SPA. SCE will invest over \$20 billion during coming years to expand and renew the region's essential distribution and transmission grids, making the power grid greener and smarter. These upgrades and improvements will help ensure adequate power flow and voltage for millions of people while benefiting electricity customers in all eleven states of the western power grid. SCE is able to meet future projected demands and the California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan has been identified to address energy issues on a broader scale. Because substantial new infrastructure will be required to support population growth, which has been anticipated by regional and local growth projections, electricity demand generated by future development could be supplied without the need for additional construction or expansion of energy facilities beyond that which was previously planned. In addition, the Specific Plan would comply with Title 24 requirements. Because this is an incrementally small demand relative to the overall demand from cumulative growth, and because the proposed Plan will include sustainable energy features, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the impact. The cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

Natural Gas

Project Impacts

The entire SPA is within the service territory of SCGC, which operates a natural gas distribution system in the area currently, and is capable of expanding the system by providing gas service to the planned area without disruption to the existing system. Maps of the distribution systems infrastructure are proprietary information and, as such, are not available. Adequate gas supplies exist to provide service to the SPA. If new or extended natural gas lines are required to serve future development, such infrastructure would be located underground and would be constructed in accordance with SCGC's policies and extension rules on file with the CPUC at the time contractual agreements are made. Any new infrastructure would be determined on a project-by-project basis.

The total annual natural gas consumption resulting from anticipated development under the proposed Plan is estimated to be approximately 857,158,863 MMcf/yr or net increase of 424,528,122 MMcf/yr over existing uses. Future development under the proposed Plan would be required to comply with CCR Title 24 requiring building energy efficiency standards. Because the natural gas demand projected for development under the proposed Plan would not exceed natural gas in storage of 134.1 Bcf, or significantly contribute to the combined firm withdrawal capacity of 3,195 MMcfd no new or expanded transmission or distribution infrastructure would not be required to serve the SPA, other than localized connections and improvements, which as part of individual projects would not be anticipated to have significant environmental impacts. Therefore, this potential impacts associated with natural gas supplies deficiencies is *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Development in the geographic area surrounding the SPA would result in continued use of this resource. The SPA is currently served by existing infrastructure that future development projects would also use. Based on the firm injection capacity and volume of 134.1 Bcf of natural gas in storage it seems reasonable that SCGC can meet new natural gas demands generated within the SPA without jeopardizing other service commitments. As such, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 4 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant Prior to Mitigation, Where Mitigation Nonetheless Provided to Further Reduce Impacts

The following effects associated with the proposed Plan were analyzed in the EIR and found not to be significant prior to mitigation. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been incorporated to further reduce these effects.

4.1 PUBLIC SERVICES

■ Libraries

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for libraries. This is considered a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would further reduce this *less-than-significant* impact.

The County applies a library facilities mitigation fee to new residential developments in unincorporated areas. This fee is intended to mitigate the significant adverse impacts of increased residential development on the County Library system. The library facilities mitigation fee is based on the estimated cost of providing the projected library facility needs in each library planning area. Therefore, with payment of the requisite fees, the increase in resident population resulting from implementation of the proposed Plan would not require any new or physically altered library facilities to serve the proposed Plan, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts.

Cumulative Impacts

Additional development in the SPA would increase the demand for library services. However, because the Library is funded largely by property taxes which is required by all property owners, and the proposed Specific Plan would result in an increase in property tax revenues as a result of new development, future development occurring in the SPA would contribute to the funding of the Library system that would augment any increased demand on library services. As such, the incremental effect of the proposed Plan on libraries would not be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the cumulative impact of the project on library services would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

MM4.12-1 *Applicants of residential subdivisions shall comply with County Code Chapter 22.72; a Library Facilities Mitigation Fee, as required by Chapter 22.72, shall be paid by the applicant to the*

County of Los Angeles Public Library. The fee must be paid prior to the recordation of the final map and proof of payment shall be provided to the Department of Regional Planning.

CHAPTER 5 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant With Mitigation

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as discussed herewith and as set forth in the plan's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (the "MMRP" — included in a section of the Final EIR and contained in Attachment A, are incorporated by reference into these Findings. In addition, any revisions to the Plan that have occurred during the administrative process are incorporated by reference into these Findings. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA (California PRC Sections 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (CCR Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 et seq.), these Findings are hereby adopted as part of the certification of the Final EIR and adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Plan.

The Board has determined, based on the Final EIR, the mitigation measures will reduce Plan impacts to a less-than-significant level for the following environmental resource areas:

Air Quality (except implementation of the Specific Plan would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors; and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations), Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Noise (except implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project), and Transportation/Traffic (except implementation of the Specific Plan would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and would conflict with an applicable congestion management program).

5.1 AIR QUALITY

5.1.1 Potential Effect

■ Conflicts with Applicable Air Quality Plan

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment, because this growth is included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

The proposed Plan is currently planned for residential and retail/commercial land uses that would result in the development of up to an additional 5,419 dwelling units and 4,920,244 sf of commercial space. Although full build-out of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the number of dwelling units in the SPA by 17 percent, this growth is still consistent with the County's General Plan Housing Element. A program outlined in the Housing Element is to create a transit-oriented district for East Los Angeles would encourage urban infill development on vacant or underutilized sites; promote and encourage transit-oriented development along major transportation corridors; encourage mixed use development to facilitate the linkage between housing and employment opportunities; and promote increased residential density in appropriately designated areas (Housing Element Policy 1.1). The county identified in its Housing Element around 14,000 potential affordable mixed-use sites on vacant and underutilized sites throughout the unincorporated areas. Therefore, even with the increase in residential and commercial usage, the proposed Plan is consistent with the County's General Plan goals. Since the population and housing forecasts in the General Plan are used to form the basis of the AQMP, the proposed Plan would not conflict with the applicable air quality plan. In addition to consistency with the AQMP, the proposed Plan is consistent with the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan after mitigation, which furthers the goals of the AQMP by reducing mobile source emissions from what was projected.

The SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) have identified transportation reduction goals for the SCAG region. The 2020 target for per capita emissions from passenger vehicles is 8 percent below existing emissions; this was calculated to be 3.07 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) per person annually for the SCAG region (California ARB 2010). The 2035 target for per capita emissions from passenger vehicles is 13 percent below existing emissions; this was calculated to be 2.91 MT CO₂e/person annually for the SCAG region (California ARB 2010). Development under the proposed Plan results in per capita emissions of 3.36 MT CO₂e/person and 3.06 MT CO₂e/person, respectively, for 2020 and 2035 without mitigation. The proposed Plan would, therefore, exceed per capita emissions for 2020 and 2035 without mitigation.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.2-1 would reduce impacts to 2.96 MT CO₂e/person and 2.70 MT CO₂e/person respectively for 2020 and 2035. Mitigation measures MM4.2-2 and MM4.2-3 would also help reduce impacts. Therefore, the proposed Plan is determined to be consistent with the RTP/SCS. Mitigation measure MM4.2-1 would result in a reduction of VMT, which in turn would provide for a reduction in criteria pollutant emissions emitted from mobile sources. No adverse impacts associated with Air Quality (conflict with applicable air quality plan) would occur as a result of the development of the proposed Plan with incorporation of the mitigation measures described above, which have been incorporated into the proposed Plan in the County's MMRP.

Cumulative Impacts

The 2012 AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment, because this growth is included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP. Because the AQMP considers all activities within the SCAQMD's jurisdiction, project that are consistent with the

AQMP at a project level would not be cumulatively considerable while those that are not consistent with the AQMP at a project level would result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

However, cumulative development could, on a case-by-case basis, be inconsistent with the AQMP. Thus, there is a potentially significant cumulative effect.

The proposed Plan would exceed per capita emissions for 2020 and 2035 without mitigation. However, implementation of mitigation measures MM4.2-1, MM4.2-2, and MM4.2-3 would reduce impacts such that the proposed Plan is consistent with the RTP. As the proposed Plan is consistent with the County's General Plan and with the RTP after mitigation, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative effect and the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Exposure to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations (TACs)

Project Impacts

Diesel particulate matter, a carcinogen, is also a component of exhaust. However, construction of individual development projects pursuant to the proposed Plan would be short-term in nature. Estimation of the cancer risk from diesel particulate matter assumes long-term (70-year lifetime) exposure of the pollutant. Therefore, the cancer risk generated during construction is anticipated to be less than significant.

TACs of potential concern within the SPA include diesel particulate matter, a form of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emitted mostly from diesel-powered equipment during construction activities, and chemicals emitted from the industrial uses within the County. Individual types of commercial projects that could result from the implementation of the proposed Plan are unknown; therefore, pollutant sources cannot be identified, nor emissions quantified. However, as the proposed development/redevelopment in the SPA is predominantly residential with some regional retail, it is unlikely the development would result in operational emissions of diesel exhaust that would qualify the project as a TAC emitter, as these are typically associated with warehouse, industrial, and manufacturing uses). Further, the land uses that are typically considered TAC emitters (large box warehouses, industrial and manufacturing facilities, refineries, etc.) would not be allowed within a mixed-use or residential neighborhood. The only foreseen exception would be local-serving gas stations. Additionally, the SCAQMD has permitting requirements for stationary source emitters such as generators, which may be located at some of the new and redeveloped properties. The permitting requirement that generators meet a certain level of emissions compliance consistent with the district's attainment of air quality standards will result in less than significant emissions from these permitted sources.

The daily operation of land uses under the proposed Plan may include the implementation of land uses that would emit TACs (such as gas stations) or the siting of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of existing TAC emitters, such as gas stations or high-volume roadways/freeways. This is considered a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM4.2-4 would reduce this impact to *less than significant*, because it would ensure that new TAC sources or sensitive land uses are located an appropriate distance away from existing sensitive receptors or sources, respectively.

■ Create Objectionable Odors

Project Impacts

Based on the specific uses anticipated under the proposed Plan, the potential for land uses that emit objectionable odors is low. However, as all of the land uses are not known, there is the slight potential that new development operations could emit odors. Based on mitigation measure MM4.2-5, each individual development project under the proposed Plan would be required to evaluate the project with respect to odor impacts. By evaluating for potential odor impacts early in the development process, odor sources can be sited away from sensitive receptors or mitigated to a level where odors are not objectionable. Potential measures that could be implemented on a project level include locating potential odor sources downwind from existing sensitive receptors and potential sensitive receptors upwind from existing odor sources, maintaining an adequate buffer between potential odor sources and receptors such that emitted odors are dissipated before reaching the receptors (minimum of 500 feet depending on odor source), and designing odor-emitting source facilities such that odor emitters are located as far from potential receptors as possible and stack heights are balanced to provide the maximum dispersion of odor between the stack and the nearest sensitive receptors. In the event that an odor emitting source is developed in the SPA, appropriate measures would be considered by the County as the development projects are proposed, and appropriate mitigation will be implemented on the project level.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development could result in uses that emit objectionable odors. This could be potentially significant on a localized basis. Because of the unknown disposition of the developable land under the proposed Plan, there is the potential that new development operations will emit odors that could be objectionable or could be in close proximity to existing odor sources. Because the exact disposition of land uses is unknown, the proposed Specific Plan has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact. Based on MM4.2-5, each individual development project under the proposed Plan will be required to evaluate the project with respect to odor impacts. By evaluating for potential odor impacts early in the development process, odor sources can be sited away from sensitive receptors or mitigated to a level where odors are not objectionable. Because odors are localized impacts (typically dissipating within a couple hundred feet), the potential for numerous offensive odor sources to be located close to sensitive receptors is limited, and new odor sources or the location of new receptors near odor sources will be mitigated to the fullest extent under MM4.2-5, impacts from objectionable odors would result in a *less-than-significant cumulative* impact with mitigation.

5.1.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.2-1 *New multifamily projects or those residential portions of new mixed-use projects shall unbundle the cost of parking from the cost of living areas, either by charging a rent or lease fee, or by selling the parking space separately.*

- MM4.2-2** *During project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction equipment operating on the project site shall meet United States Environmental Protection Agency-Certified Tier 3 emissions standards or higher, according to the following:*
- *All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technologies devices certified by the California Air Resources Board. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by California Air Resources Board regulations.*
 - *All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technologies devices certified by the California Air Resources Board. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by California Air Resources Board regulations.*
 - *A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technologies documentation, and California Air Resources Board or South Coast Air Quality Management District operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.*

MM4.2-3 *Disallow wood-burning fireplaces in new residential units.*

MM4.2-4 *If, during subsequent project-level environmental review, the County determines that a project could result in toxic air contaminants (TAC) that have the potential to exceed California Air Resources Board Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (June 2005, or most current adaptation) standards, the County may require that applicants for such projects conduct a specific health risk assessment and achieve an acceptable interior risk level (less than 10 in a million, or the standards at the time of development) for sensitive receptors. All appropriate measures determined by the health risk assessment to reduce risk to sensitive receptors shall be incorporated into the individual project building design.*

MM4.2-5 *If, during project-level review, the County determines that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property lines, an odor management plan may be required. If an odor management plan is determined to be required, the County shall require the project applicant to submit the plan prior to approval to ensure compliance with the applicable Air Quality Management District's Rule 402, for nuisance odors. If applicable, the Odor Management Plan shall identify the Best Available Control Technologies for Toxicics (T-BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at the industrial facility. T-BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.*

5.1.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Air Quality as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.1.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Air Quality with respect to violation of air quality plan, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during operation, or creation of objectionable odors would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of mitigation measures MM4.2-1 and MM4.2-5.

5.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

5.2.1 Potential Effect

■ Adverse Effect on Species

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Several special-status bird species have the potential to nest and/or occur within the SPA. Project implementation could result in potentially significant impacts to nesting birds through nest abandonment or mortality to eggs and chicks. Development activities could also result in noise, dust, increased human activity, and other indirect impacts to nesting avian species within the plan area. Implementation of proposed projects within the SPA could result in the removal of roosting habitat for sensitive bat species. Bats roost in a wide variety of areas including buildings, under bridges, rock crevices, under bark, and in snags. Bat species could utilize trees and buildings in the SPA for day and/or night roosts as well as seasonally (e.g., during the spring or fall) making surveys necessary prior to construction to determine presence/absence. Should bat species inhabit the immediate area, implementation could result in accidental death from roost removal or harassment through added human presence, vibrations, and noise.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.3-1 and MM4.3-2 would require avoidance measures, including prohibition of construction during nesting season if sensitive species are identified, to protect candidate or sensitive species or their habitat.

Cumulative Impacts

Over several decades in the region, past projects, mostly urbanization and development have caused the loss of native vegetation and tree removal, and the reduction of open space. As a result, there is less habitat available for nesting resident and migratory avian species and sensitive wildlife species. As development in the County of Los Angeles and the region continues, sensitive wildlife species native to the Region and their habitat, including those species listed under state and federal ESAs and those individuals identified by state and federal resource agencies as Species of Concern, Fully Protected, or Sensitive, will be lost through conversion of existing open space to urban development. Although more mobile species might be able to survive these changes in their environment by moving to new areas, less mobile species could simply be locally extirpated. With continued conversion of natural habitat to human

use, the availability and accessibility of remaining foraging and natural habitats in this ecosystem would dwindle and those remaining natural areas may not be able to support additional plant or animal populations above their current carrying capacities. Thus, the conversion of plant and wildlife habitat on a regional level as a result of cumulative development would result in a regional significant cumulative impact on special-status species and their habitats, including nesting resident and migratory avian species.

With respect to nesting birds, the MBTA fully protects migratory avian species, including sensitive species, during the breeding season by the establishment of a federal prohibition. Unless otherwise permitted by regulations, it is unlawful to “pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture or kill, possess, offer for sale, sell, offer to purchase, purchase, deliver for shipment, ship, cause to be shipped, deliver for transportation, transport, cause to be transported, carry, or cause to be carried by any means whatever, receive for shipment, transportation or carriage, or export, at any time, or in any manner, any migratory bird, included in the terms of this Convention ... for the protection of migratory birds ... or any part, nest, or egg of any such bird” (16 U.S.C. 703). Therefore, assuming that other development complies with the law established by the MBTA, cumulative impacts to nesting migratory birds, would be considered less than significant. Further, compliance by the project proponent or developer with the MBTA, which could include mitigation measures requiring surveys for nesting MBTA species and a restriction on construction activities if nests are found during the breeding season, would ensure that the plan’s contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable and would be considered *less than significant*.

The primary effects of the proposed Plan, when considered with other projects in the Region (as defined above) would be the potential cumulative direct loss to nesting resident and migratory bird species. Specifically, present and probable future projects in the vicinity of the proposed Plan are anticipated to permanently remove vegetation and/or tree resources that could affect nesting habitat for resident and migratory avian species, and/or local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Development pursuant to the proposed Plan could contribute to a loss of regional biodiversity through the incremental conversion of habitat for plant and wildlife to human use, and thus limit the availability and accessibility of remaining natural habitats to regional wildlife. However, terrestrial plant and wildlife habitat in the SPA has been highly modified and, is of relatively low quality due to its level of disturbance and low species diversity due to the highly urbanized nature of the area.

In addition, the habitat available in the project site is small from a regional perspective and, is isolated from native natural habitat by urban development. In addition, the proposed Plan would implement mitigation measures specifically designed to avoid, reduce, or mitigate impacts to special status/sensitive species and/or their habitat. Implementation of mitigation measures from discretionary projects would require surveys for nesting resident and migratory birds and restrictions on construction activities if nests are found during the breeding season, mitigation measures will provide mechanisms to identify any sensitive species potentially occurring, prior to ground disturbance and require mitigation that would reduce impacts to species through impact avoidance. Therefore, implementation of discretionary project mitigation measures, in combination with compliance with state and federal ESAs and the *Fish and Game Code* of California would reduce the proposed Plan’s cumulative contribution to resident and migratory bird species and sensitive species to *less-than-significant* levels.

■ Adverse Effect on Wetlands

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Clean Water Act Section 404 (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Any pool, drainage, or patches of wetland vegetation within the SPA are potentially jurisdictional wetland features or waters of the US, as defined by CWA Section 404. Any potentially jurisdictional wetland or waters of the US that would be impacted by a project could require regulation by the USACE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW.

Mitigation measure 4.3-3 would require consultation with the USACE if potential wetlands on individual development sites are identified, performance of a wetland delineation, and obtaining appropriate permits pursuant to the Clean Water Act if impacts to wetlands cannot be avoided.

Cumulative Impacts

As development in the Los Angeles Basin intensifies, wetlands could continue to be adversely affected. All cumulative development would be required to comply with CWA Section 404, which would provide for no net loss of wetlands. This could include contributions to a mitigation bank or provision of replacement wetlands elsewhere. The proposed Plan includes mitigation that would avoid loss of wetlands. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

■ Conflict with Ordinances

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Los Angeles County recognizes the value of oak woodlands and has developed goals and policies for their protection and restoration. Habitat within the SPA is urban, but local recreational and residential areas could support oaks trees that, if removed, would conflict with the intent of county goals.

Mitigation measure MM4.3-4 would protect large oak trees and/or require equivalent replacement of oak trees in another location if removal cannot be avoided.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development outside the SPA could result in conflicts with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. These would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and it is anticipated that lead agencies would require mitigation measures on the project level to minimize or avoid this impact. Therefore, there is no significant cumulative effect with respect to policy conflict. The proposed Plan includes mitigation that would protect large oak trees or require replacement, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

5.2.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.3-1

Project construction-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a biological monitor acceptable to the Director of the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning surveys the project area prior to disturbance to confirm that disturbance to habitat will not result in the failure of active nests on-site or immediately adjacent to the area of disturbance. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes and/or damages vegetation or habitat, any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as noise exceeding 90 dB from equipment, or direct artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted on the subject property within 500 feet of disturbance areas no earlier than three days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If ground disturbance activities are delayed, then additional pre-disturbance surveys shall be conducted such that no more than three days will have elapsed between the survey and ground disturbance activities. The Applicant or the Project's Construction Manager shall provide the biologist with plans detailing the extent of proposed ground disturbance prior to the survey effort.

If active nests are found, clearing and construction shall be postponed or halted within a buffer area established by the biological monitor that is suitable to the particular location of the nest (typically 300 feet for most birds and 500 feet for raptors) and acceptable to the Director of the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of any further attempt at nesting. Buffer distances may be modified by the Director if a different buffer zone is shown to be suitable to the particular location. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest shall be established in the field with highly visible construction fencing, and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. Occupied nests within the buffer established by the biological monitor and adjacent to the construction site shall also be avoided to ensure nesting success. A qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. The results of the surveys, including graphics showing the locations of any active nests detected, and documentation of any avoidance measures taken, shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning and California Department of Fish and Wildlife within 14 days of completion of the pre-construction surveys to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

If any state or federally listed bird species (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher, southwestern willow flycatcher) are detected during the course of pre-construction nesting bird surveys, all construction-related activity shall be postponed, and the Applicant shall consult with appropriate agencies (California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and obtain any necessary take permits prior to the commencement of any construction-related activity. If any state or federally listed species are detected within the limits of construction during construction that were not detected during the pre-construction nesting bird surveys, construction-related activity shall cease, and the Applicant shall consult with appropriate agencies and obtain any necessary take permit before resuming any work. In addition to any take permit conditions that may be required by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, mitigation of occupied coastal California gnatcatcher habitat shall be provided at a minimum of 3:1 mitigation-to-impact ratio. Proof of habitat mitigation in keeping with the 3:1 requirement shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles before any construction-related activity can commence or resume.

MM4.3-2

Special-Status Roosting Bats. To avoid the direct loss of bats that could result from disturbance to trees or structures that may provide maternity roost habitat (e.g., in cavities or under loose bark) or structures that contain a hibernating bat colony, the following steps shall be taken:

To the extent feasible, demolition or disturbance to suitable bat roosting habitat shall be scheduled between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season.

If trees must be encroached during the maternity season (March 1 to September 30), or structures must be removed at any time of the year, a qualified bat specialist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees or structures proposed for disturbance that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat for bats.

Each tree or structure identified as potentially supporting an active maternity roost and each structure potentially supporting a hibernating colony shall be closely inspected by the bat specialist no greater than 7 days prior to tree disturbance to more precisely determine the presence or absence of roosting bats.

If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present at any time of year, it is preferable to bring down trees or structures in a controlled manner using heavy machinery. In order to ensure the optimum warning for any roosting bats that may still be present, the trees or structures shall be nudged lightly two to three times, with a pause of approximately 30 seconds between each nudge to allow bats to become active. Trees or structures may then be pushed to the ground slowly under the supervision of a bat specialist. Felled trees shall remain in place until they are inspected by a bat specialist. Trees that are known to be bat roosts shall not be sawn up or mulched immediately. A period of at least 48 hours shall elapse prior to such operations to allow bats to escape. Bats shall be allowed to escape prior to demolition of buildings. This may be accomplished by placing one way exclusionary devices into areas where bats are entering a building that allow bats to exit but not enter the building.

Maternity season lasts from March 1 to September 30. Trees or structures determined to be maternity roosts shall be left in place until the end of the maternity season. A structure containing a hibernating colony shall be left in place until a qualified biologist determines that the bats are no longer hibernating.

The bat specialist shall document all demolition monitoring activities and prepare a summary report to the County upon completion of tree disturbance or building demolition activities. If Townsend's big-eared bat is detected during pre-construction surveys, all construction-related activity shall be halted immediately and CDFW shall be notified. Work may only resume subsequent to CDFW approval.

Bat Relocation. If confirmed occupied or formerly occupied bat roosting habitat is destroyed, artificial bat roosts of comparable size and quality shall be constructed and maintained at a suitable undisturbed area. The design and location of the artificial bat roosts shall be determined by the bat specialist in consultation with CDFW.

In exceptional circumstances, such as when roosts cannot be avoided and bats cannot be evicted by non-invasive means, it may be necessary to capture and transfer the bats to appropriate natural or artificial bat roosting habitat in the surrounding area. Bats raising young or hibernating shall not be captured and relocated. Capture and relocation shall be performed by the bat specialist in coordination with CDFW, and shall be subject to approval by LACDRP and CDFW.

A monitoring plan shall be prepared for the replacement roosts, which shall include performance standards for the use of the replacement roosts by the displaced species, as well as provisions to prevent harassment, predation, and disease of relocated bats.

Annual reports detailing the success of roost replacement and bat relocation shall be prepared and submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for five years following relocation or until performance standards are met, whichever period is longer.

MM4.3-3

If, during subsequent project-level review, the County determines that a project could have a potentially significant impact on wetland features or local drainage, the project applicant shall consult with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to establish which, if any, wetland features or local drainage in a particular location qualify as jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act (CWA). If necessary, the project applicant shall retain qualified personnel approved by the County to perform a wetland delineation following USACE guidelines to establish actual acreage of potential impact. If feasible, the project shall be designed to avoid all impacts to wetlands and jurisdictional waters of the US. If wetlands and jurisdictional waters of the US cannot be avoided, a 'no net loss' of wetlands policy shall be employed and the appropriate permits (i.e., CWA Sections 404 and 401 and Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement) shall be obtained prior to issuance of grading permits.

MM4.3-4

Projects within the Specific Plan (SPA) area shall be designed with the intention of preserving large (6-inch diameter or greater at breast height) oak trees. If project implementation requires removal of large oak trees, then the applicant shall coordinate with the County to replace an equivalent number of removed oaks in a suitable area undergoing restoration within the County that is also relevant to the SPA so that there is no net loss of oak trees from project implementation and local residents may enjoy the restored resource. At the discretion of the County, this may require replanting trees at a higher ratio (to be determined by the County) than what was removed and developing a mitigation monitoring plan to ensure growth in the restored area. The timeframe for completion of this measure shall be determined and approved in collaboration with County staff.

5.2.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Biological Resources as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.2.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Biological Resources with respect to sensitive or candidate species, wetlands, or tree ordinance conflicts would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures MM4.3-1 through 4.3-4.

5.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

5.3.1 Potential Effect

■ Substantial Adverse Change in Historical Resource

Project Impacts

The SPA contains numerous historical resources, including resources considered eligible for the NRHP, listed in the CRHR, and resources which may be eligible for local listing or designation. Future landscape,

sidewalk and road improvements, as well as infill development, could occur on the site of a historical resource and could result in significant impacts on historical resources within the project area, including resources eligible for listing in the NRHP, listed in the CRHR, and/or eligible for local listing or designation. Significant impacts could include the delisting or loss of eligibility of such resources. In addition, the completion of development activities has the potential to result in significant impacts on buildings, structures, and features of historic age (50 years old or older), or buildings, structures, and features which may eventually be of historic age, and which may qualify as historical resources pursuant to CEQA upon evaluation. Mitigation requires that construction activities will cease immediately upon the inadvertent discovery of any cultural resources. Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.4-1 would require the retention of a cultural resource professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History to determine if the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and develop methods for documenting and protecting the historical resource. This mitigation would reduce the potential impact on historical resources to less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Urban development that has occurred over the past several decades in the Los Angeles Basin has resulted in the demolition and alteration of historical resources, and it is reasonable to assume that present and future development activities will continue to result in impacts on historical resources. Because all historical resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. Federal, state, and local laws protect historical resources in most instances. Even so, it is not always feasible to protect historical resources, particularly when preservation in place would prevent implementation of projects. For this reason, the cumulative effects of development on historical resources in the region are considered significant. Because proposed policies and existing regulations do not explicitly prohibit demolition or inappropriate alteration of historic-period buildings or structures that are considered significant under local, state or federal regulations, it is possible that development activities resulting from the adoption and implementation of the proposed Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, if such resources are impacted or if such a resource is identified in the future. As individual projects can be cumulatively significant within the SPA, it is possible for such projects to have a contribution that would be considered cumulatively significant. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM4.4-1 would require qualified professionals to conduct site-specific historical resource investigations for future development associated with the implementation of the proposed Plan and generate recommendations for eliminating or reducing impacts on historical resources. Thus, with the application of mitigation measure MM4.4-1, and the applicable policies relating to the SPA, the proposed Plan's contribution to the cumulative effect of development in the region would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, this would be considered a *less-than-significant cumulative* impact.

■ Adverse Effect on Archaeological Resources

Project Impacts

The SCCIC records search identified several archaeological isolated finds and sites within the project area. The known sites are all historic-age archaeological sites consisting of subsurface refuse deposits.

These sites have been identified primarily through prior excavation for development in the study area. Based upon the presence of known and recorded subsurface archaeological sites within the project area, the project area is considered to have high sensitivity for potentially significant archaeological resources. Mitigation measure MM4.4-2 requires retention of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology to determine if the project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. This mitigation measure would reduce any potential impact on archaeological resources discovered during construction to less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Based upon existing studies outlining intense resource use in this region, and the documented, observable material culture (i.e. artifacts) recovered from the prehistoric era to the present, the Los Angeles Basin is known to have high archaeological sensitivity. For this reason, there is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during future construction may uncover or disturb known or previously unknown archaeological resources. Impacts to such resources would be determined on a case-by-case basis and follow CEQA guidelines. For future projects occurring under the adoption and implementation of the proposed Plan, mitigation measures have been provided to reduce potential significant impacts to archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the implementation of standard guidelines and regulations, in conjunction with mitigation measure MM4.4-2, would result in a *less-than-significant cumulative* impact on archaeological resources.

■ Adverse Effect on Paleontological Resources

Project Impacts

The project area is known to have high paleontological sensitivity in Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits exhibiting a composition conducive to the preservation of fossil resources. Thus, there is potential for the proposed Plan to result in new development or ground-disturbing activities in areas containing known or previously undetected paleontological resources. Therefore, development pursuant to the proposed Plan has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.

Mitigation measure MM4.4-3 requires retention of retention of a professional paleontologist to determine if the project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. This mitigation would reduce any potential impact on paleontological resources discovered during construction to less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Based upon the geologic history of the Los Angeles Basin, and the high paleontological sensitivity of the rock units within this region, there is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during future construction may uncover previously unknown paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features. Impacts to such resources would be determined on a case-by-case basis and follow CEQA guidelines. For future projects occurring under the adoption and implementation of the proposed Plan, mitigation measures have been provided to ensure that potential significant impacts to paleontological resources are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the implementation of standard

guidelines and regulations, in conjunction with the mitigation measure MM4.4-3, would result in a **less-than-significant cumulative** impact on paleontological resources.

5.3.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.4-1 *If, during any subsequent project-level review and prior to development, activities that would demolish or otherwise physically alter buildings, structures, or features of an officially listed historic or cultural resource; or historic buildings, structures, or features officially determined eligible for designation as a historic or cultural resource, a cultural resource professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History shall be retained by the project applicant, at the discretion of the County, to determine if the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The results of the investigation shall be documented in a technical report or memorandum that identifies and evaluates any historical resources within the improvements area and includes recommendations and methods for eliminating or reducing impacts on historical resources. Methods may include, but are not limited to, written and photographic recordation of the resource in accordance with the level of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation that is appropriate to the significance (local, state, national) of the resource.*

MM4.4-2 *In the event archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist shall record all recovered archaeological resources on the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation Site Forms to be filed with the California Historical Resources Information System—South Central Coastal Information Center, evaluate the significance of the find, and if significant, determine and implement the appropriate mitigation in accordance with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior and California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines, including but not limited to a Phase III data recovery and associated documentation. The archaeologist shall prepare a final report about the find to be filed with the Applicant, the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, and the California Historical Resources Information System—South Central Coastal Information Center, as required by the California Office of Historic Preservation. The report shall include documentation of the resources recovered, a full evaluation of the eligibility with respect to the California Register of Historical Resources, and treatment of the resources recovered. In the event of a find, archaeological and Native American monitoring shall be provided thereafter for any ground-disturbing activities within the boundary of the archaeological site.*

MM4.4-3 *Prior to any earth-disturbing activities (e.g. excavation, trenching, grading) that could encounter previously undisturbed soil, the project applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist to determine if the project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. The investigation shall include, as determined appropriate by the paleontologist and Los Angeles County, a paleontology records check and a pedestrian survey of the area proposed for development. The results of the investigation shall be documented in a technical report or memorandum that identifies the paleontological sensitivity of the development area and includes recommendations and methods for eliminating or avoiding impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features. The technical report or memorandum shall be submitted to the County for approval. As determined necessary by the County, environmental documentation (e.g., CEQA documentation) prepared for future development within the project site shall reference or incorporate the findings and recommendations of the technical report or memorandum. The project applicant shall be responsible for implementing methods for eliminating or avoiding impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features identified in the technical report or memorandum. Projects that*

would not encounter undisturbed soils and would therefore not be required to retain a paleontologist shall demonstrate nondisturbance to the County through the appropriate construction plans or geotechnical studies prior to any earth-disturbing activities.

5.3.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Cultural Resources as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.3.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Cultural Resources would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures MM4.4-1 through 4.4-3.

5.4 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

5.4.1 Potential Effect

■ Upset and Accident Conditions (Construction Effect)

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could 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. Implementation of the proposed Plan assumes that older buildings could be demolished as development occurs according to the new land uses and densities that are permitted in the Specific Plan. Construction workers as well as employees of existing or future business and/or future residents could potentially be exposed to airborne lead-based paint, dust, asbestos fibers, mold, and/or other building contaminants during demolition activities associated with future development. In addition, there is the possibility that future development may also uncover previously unidentified soil contamination.

Another potential hazard to construction workers and the public could involve construction activities on existing sites that may potentially be contaminated. Existing sites that may potentially contain hazardous materials in the project site include those identified in Table 4.7-1, which includes a range of sites with a variety of potential sources of contamination, including various forms of chemical waste, cleaners, auto-repair facilities, and gas stations. However, any new development occurring on these documented hazardous materials sites would have to be preceded by remediation and cleanup under the supervision of the DTSC before construction activities could begin, if such actions have not already occurred.

In order to address the potential for encountering previously unidentified contamination within the SPA, mitigation measures MM4.7-1 and MM4.7-2 would be implemented by requiring investigation and remediation efforts at future development sites. As such, the potential impacts associated with unknown contamination would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

Cumulative Impacts

Future hazardous materials use, storage, disposal, and transport could result in a foreseeable number of spills and accidents. Cumulative development could occur on properties listed on hazardous materials sites or that were previously used for oil production activities, and/or the demolition of existing structures, which may contain hazardous materials. Future development in the County could increase the amount of hazardous materials transported, used, and disposed. New development would be subject to hazardous materials regulations codified in CCR Titles 8, 22, and 26. Furthermore, all construction and demolition activities in the County, including projects pursuant to the proposed Plan, would be subject to Cal/OSHA, SCAQMD, and Cal/EPA regulations concerning the release of hazardous materials. Compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations during the construction and operation of new developments pursuant to the proposed Plan would ensure that cumulative impacts from the routine transportation, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials would be *less than significant*.

■ Hazardous Materials Sites

Project Impacts

Individual sites within the Specific Plan area are included on a list of hazardous materials sites and, as a result, could create a significant hazard to the public or environment. According to data from the SWRCB, eighty-two underground storage tank leaks have been reported in the SPA. Of these reports, sixty-nine sites have either been cleaned up or deemed to be of no environmental consequence. Thirteen cases are still open and are in remediation. In addition, there are no properties within the SPA and/or its immediate surroundings that have been identified on any other regulatory databases as being contaminated from the release of hazardous substances in the soil or groundwater. As discussed under Impact 4.7-2, development of the identified sites would be required to undergo remediation and cleanup before construction activities can begin. If contamination at any specific project site were to exceed regulatory action levels, the project Applicant and/or the project contractor would be required to undertake remediation procedures prior to grading and development under the supervision of appropriate regulatory oversight agencies (e.g., LACoFD, Los Angeles County Public Health/Environmental Health Department, DTSC, or LARWQCB), depending on the nature of any identified contamination. Thus, implementation of mitigation measures MM4.7-1 and MM4.7-2 would ensure that contaminated sites undergo remediation activities prior to development activities. Consequently, if future development within the SPA is located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, remediation would ensure that this impact would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative projects could result in construction and operational activities that result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. In particular, past and present projects have been regulated to ensure that any development on hazardous materials sites involves appropriate site investigation and remediation prior to issuance of building permits. Future projects in the County would be similarly regulated to ensure that either new development would not occur on hazardous materials sites, or for project sites that are listed, impacts would be required to be mitigated by appropriate remediation prior

to development. As all contaminated sites are required to be remediated prior to development, this cumulative impact would be less than significant. Development pursuant to the Specific Plan that would occur on any listed hazardous materials sites could similarly require appropriate remediation in compliance with existing regulations. This cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

5.4.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.7-1

Prior to the issuance of grading permits on any project site, the applicant(s) shall:

- *Investigate the project site to determine whether it or immediately adjacent areas have a record of hazardous material contamination via the preparation of a preliminary environmental site assessment, which shall be submitted to the County for review. If contamination is found the report shall characterize the site according to the nature and extent of contamination that is present before development activities precede at that site.*
- *If contamination is determined to be on site, the County, in accordance with appropriate regulatory agencies, such as Los Angeles County Fire Department, Los Angeles County Public Health Department, or County Division of Waste and Recycling, shall determine the need for further investigation and/or remediation of the soils conditions on the contaminated site. If further investigation or remediation is required, it shall be the responsibility of the applicant(s) to complete such investigation and/or remediation prior to construction of the project.*
- *If remediation is required as identified by the local oversight agency, it shall be accomplished in a manner that reduces risk to below applicable standards and shall be completed prior to issuance of any occupancy permits.*
- *Closure reports or other reports acceptable to the appropriate regulatory agencies, such as Los Angeles County Fire Department, Los Angeles County Public Health Department, or County Division of Waste and Recycling, that document the successful completion of required remediation activities, if any, for contaminated soils shall be submitted and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies prior to the issuance of grading permits for site development. No construction shall occur in the affected area until reports have been accepted by the County.*

MM4.7-2

If previously unidentified soil contamination is observed by sight or odor or indicated by testing by a qualified professional using a portable volatile organic compound analyzer during excavation and grading activities, excavation and grading within such an area shall be temporarily halted and redirected around the area until the appropriate evaluation and follow-up measures are implemented, as contained in the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1166, to make the area suitable for grading activities to resume. In the event contamination is found, the Applicant shall notify the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, as applicable. The contaminated soil shall be evaluated and excavated/disposed of, treated in-situ (in-place), or otherwise managed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

5.4.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects with respect to Hazards/Hazardous Materials as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.4.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Hazards/Hazardous Materials related to accident or upset conditions or development on hazardous materials sites would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures MM4.7-1 and MM4.7-2.

5.5 NOISE

5.5.1 Potential Effects

■ Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Vibration and Noise (Construction)

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. According to Caltrans, typical construction activities and equipment, such as D-8 and D-9 Caterpillars, earthmovers, and trucks do not exceed 0.10 in/sec PPV at 10 feet. Therefore, construction would have the potential to exceed the vibration threshold of 0.01 in/sec established in Noise Control Ordinance Section 12.08.560. Therefore, general construction activity in the SPA would have the potential to result in a significant impact.

Construction activities that would occur under the proposed project would have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. Vibration levels could reach as high as approximately 87 VdB within 25 feet of an active construction site. Construction activities occurring under the proposed project would have the potential to impact the nearest sensitive receptors where construction staging would occur closer to these receptors.

Construction within approximately 25 feet of existing sensitive uses would exceed the 85 VdB threshold. With attenuation due to distance, construction activities occurring 30 feet or more away from an active construction site would not exceed 85 VdB. As there is the potential for construction to occur within 25 feet of existing sensitive receptors, there is the potential for groundborne vibration impacts to be significant without mitigation. This is considered a potentially significant impact, although temporary and occurring only during approved (nonsleep) construction hours.

The threshold for minor damage to fragile buildings is 100 VdB. The only construction activity that could occur at this level is pile driving, which can result in groundborne vibration up to 105 VdB.

As construction activities would be temporary and intermittent in nature, the impacts would not be expected to be significant. Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce any vibration impacts to *less than significant* by prescribing specific haul routes to avoid residential areas, revising building plans to exclude pile driving where appropriate, and locating vibration-generating construction equipment as far from sensitive receptors as feasible.

Cumulative Impacts

Construction noise and vibration impacts (except for heavy truck traffic) would be limited to the area within 115 feet of the individual project sites. There are two cumulative projects identified as occurring within the SPA that could combine with the projects proposed under the Specific Plan to generate noise and vibration in excess of established standards. The proposed Plan would not result in significant impacts to noise and vibration during construction and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to construction noise and vibration combined with any cumulative project in proximity to the project site. The *cumulative* impact during construction would be *less than significant*.

■ Temporary or Periodic Increase in Noise (Construction)

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Operation of construction equipment would have the potential to generate high noise levels for construction activities, depending on the type, duration, and location of the activity. Although noise-sensitive land uses such as existing residences could be exposed to excessive construction noise levels, the exposure would be short-term. In addition, most of the infill development proposed under the Specific Plan would not involve substantial grading activities, as it would occur on vacant and underutilized parcels. Consistent with the Noise Control Ordinance, construction activities would occur between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday. Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.10-8 would reduce this impact to less than significant through noise shielding and proper maintenance of construction equipment.

Cumulative Impacts

Construction noise impacts (except for heavy truck traffic) would be limited to the area within 115 feet of the individual project sites. There are two cumulative projects identified as occurring within the SPA that could combine with the projects proposed under the Specific Plan to generate a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise. The proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any construction noise impacts, due to the localized nature of noise impacts and the fact that all construction would not occur at the same time or at the same location. The cumulative impact related to a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise during construction would be *less than significant*.

5.5.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.10-4

Construction Vibration. *For all construction activities within the Specific Plan area, individual projects that use vibration-intensive construction activities, such as pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, near sensitive receptors shall be limited Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. No such activity shall occur on weekends or legal holidays. The County shall retain approval authority for pile-driving activities for all projects under the Specific Plan, whether discretionary or subject only to site plan review, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures during construction:*

- a. *The construction contractor shall provide written notification to all residential units and nonresidential tenants at least three weeks prior to the start of construction activities within 115 feet of the receptor informing them of the estimated start date and duration of daytime vibration-generating construction activities.*
- b. *Stationary sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from off-site receptors as possible.*
- c. *Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site.*
- d. *The project contractor shall submit a construction vibration control plan to the County for approval prior to commencement of construction activities.*
- e. *The applicant shall consider the use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques (e.g., drilled piles to eliminate use of vibration-intensive pile driver).*

MM4.10-5 *No pile-driving activities shall occur adjacent to any listed historic or cultural resource; or historic buildings, structures, or features officially determined eligible for designation as a historic or cultural resource without prior approval by the County. The County shall retain approval authority for pile-driving activities for all projects under the Specific Plan, whether discretionary or subject only to site plan review. If it is determined that pile-driving would likely cause damage to such buildings, alternative methods for building foundations shall be implemented that do not include pile driving.*

MM4.10-6 *Prior to commencement of construction, the project sponsor shall submit proposed haul routes to and from the project site, subject to approval by the County.*

MM4.10-8 *Construction Noise Plan. Power construction equipment shall be equipped with noise shielding and muffling devices. All equipment shall be properly maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts is generated.*

5.5.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects with respect to Noise as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.5.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Noise (temporary or periodic increase in noise levels during construction) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of mitigation measure MM4.10-8.

5.6 RECREATION

5.6.1 Potential Effect

■ Deterioration of Recreational Facilities/Capacity

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would 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 and would create capacity or service level problems. The Regional Park and Open Space District collects assessments against parcels of land in the County of Los Angeles and disburses funds for grants and other programs. The District works with the County Assessor, Auditor-Controller, and Treasurer-Tax Collector to collect the District's assessments. Assessment review is available on any parcel. In addition to the levied assessment on property in East Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles has adopted park dedication requirements for new projects (Quimby Ordinance) that are applicable to the proposed Plan. On a project level, given that there are mechanisms for collection of in-lieu fees and parcel assessments to help fund development and improvements to parks in the County, with payment of these fees and assessments per mitigation measure MM4.13-1, the impact is *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

The existing parkland ratio of parks to population in the MPA is 0.3 acre per 1,000 persons. This ratio falls below the standard established in the Public Recreation Plan. As described previously, the County's Public Recreation Plan recommends a parkland standard of 4 acres per 1,000 residents for neighborhood and community parks, and 6 acres per 1,000 residents for regional parks. Since there is a current deficit of parkland, future cumulative development in this geographic context would exacerbate the already significant impact. Implementation of the proposed Plan would increase the use and physical deterioration of existing park resources. It is reasonably expected that at full plan capacity, the SPA could have a resident population of approximately 54,271 and an increase of 22,164 residents, and would contribute to the need for parkland. The population increase that could result from implementation of the plan and implementing ordinances would be incrementally small, representing only 1.5 percent of the expected 2035 population in the projected unincorporated area as a whole. Payment of fees pursuant to mitigation measure MM4.13-1 would reduce the impact of the proposed Plan on parks and recreational facilities to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact, and the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Construction of Recreational Facilities

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. With respect to physical impacts from construction of recreational facilities, construction impacts have been

analyzed in the EIR and appropriate mitigation provided where feasible. No additional impacts would occur that have not been previously identified.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts related to construction have been addressed in the individual technical sections of the EIR.

5.6.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.13-1 *Applicants of residential subdivisions shall comply with the County's Quimby Ordinance through a combination of new park development and/or in-lieu fee payment to offset the demand for park services generated by the project. The fee must be paid prior to the recordation of the final map and proof of payment shall be provided to the Department of Regional Planning.*

All mitigation measures identified in the EIR related to construction.

5.6.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Recreation as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.6.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Recreation would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of mitigation measure MM4.13-1 and all mitigation measures for other topics for construction impacts.

5.7 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

5.7.1 Potential Effect

■ Construction Effects on Congestion Management Facilities

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan could conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. With regard to impacts during construction, future construction details are unknown. Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.14-1, which requires project-level traffic impact analyses and coordination with Caltrans, would reduce construction impacts on CMP facilities to *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Construction of the cumulative projects could result in adverse effects on CMP facilities which, combined with the impacts of the proposed Plan, could result in a significant cumulative effect. With implementation of mitigation measure MM4.14-1, the impact of the proposed Plan would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative effect, and the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

■ Conflicts with Circulation System

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. While traffic during construction and operation of individual projects pursuant to the proposed Plan cannot be quantified, as there are no details at this time concerning the projects that would be constructed, each project would be subject to mitigation measure MM4.14-1, which requires project applicants to perform a traffic impact study and coordinate with Caltrans under certain conditions. Compliance with this mitigation would reduce any potentially significant impact from construction of individual projects to *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of cumulative projects would, in combination with projects under the proposed Plan, result in an increase in traffic during construction and operation and add to the significant cumulative effect of traffic. All cumulative development would be subject to mitigation measure MM4.14-1. Therefore, the proposed Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative effect, and the *cumulative* impact would be *less than significant*.

5.7.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.14-1

The County shall require traffic engineering firms, which are retained to prepare traffic impact studies for future development projects, to consult with Caltrans when a development proposal meets the requirements of statewide, regional, or areawide significance per CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b). Proposed developments meeting the criteria of statewide, regional, or areawide include:

- *Proposed residential developments of more than 500 dwelling units*
- *Proposed shopping centers or business establishments employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 500,000 gross square feet of floor space*
- *Proposed commercial office buildings employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 250,000 gross square feet of floor space*
- *Proposed hotel/motel developments of more than 500 rooms*

When the CEQA criteria or regional significance are not met, the County shall require transportation engineers and/or Lead Agency representatives consult with Caltrans when proposed developments include the following characteristics:

- *Proposed developments that have the potential to cause a significant impact to state highway facilities (rights-of-way, intersections, interchanges, etc.) and when required mitigation improvements are proposed in the Initial Study*
- *Proposed developments that assign 50 or more trips (passenger-car-equivalent trips) during peak hours to a state highway/freeway*
- *Proposed developments that assign 10 or more trips (passenger-car-equivalent trips) during peak hours to a state highway/freeway off-ramp*
- *Proposed developments that are located adjacent to a state highway facility and that require a Caltrans encroachment permit (exceptions: additions to single-family homes, 10 residential units or less)*

5.7.3 Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on traffic as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less-than-significant levels (**Finding 1**).

5.7.4 Facts Supporting Finding

No adverse impacts associated with Transportation/Traffic would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of mitigation measure MM4.14-1.

CHAPTER 6 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Significant and Unavoidable after Mitigation

The Board has determined, based on the Final EIR, that after implementation of Plan policies and mitigation measures, the proposed Plan will have a significant and unavoidable impact on the following environmental resource areas: air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation/traffic, and utilities/service systems. The Findings for each of these environmental resource areas is presented below.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (see Chapter 16) has been prepared to substantiate the County's decision to accept these significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts because of the benefits afforded by the proposed Plan.

6.1 AIR QUALITY

6.1.1 Potential Effect

■ Violation of Air Quality Standard

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Due to the unknown level of construction activity that would occur on any given day during the proposed Plan build-out, construction emission impacts are considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of SCAQMD regulatory requirements and compliance with County codes in effect at the time of construction and designed to reduce pollutant emissions; along with the implementation of mitigation measure MM4.2-2 would reduce this impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. Individual development projects could, even with implementation of mitigation, result in an air quality violation or a substantial contribution to an existing air quality violation. Construction emissions would be anticipated to be lower during years where the SPA is experiencing an economic slowdown and higher during years where the economic situation is at peak. It is anticipated that the daily average emissions during development/redevelopment activities could exceed the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds for construction emissions. Therefore, construction impacts would be a *significant and unavoidable* impact with regard to violation of air quality standards on a program level.

Operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities within the SPA. Stationary area source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices, the operation of landscape maintenance equipment, the use of consumer products, and the application of architectural coatings. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to, within, and from the SPA.

Operational emissions, without any mitigation incorporated, would result in significant impacts for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Implementation of the proposed Plan would reduce ROG, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions by implementing green building policies and reducing VMT generated by projected growth. For example, Mobility Goal 2, (Safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to transit, jobs, services, school and parks in character with East Los Angeles) would provide for increased connectivity within the SPA. In addition, Land Use Goal 2 (Transit-supportive residential densities are accommodated in a manner that protects and preserve the character of the existing residential neighborhoods) would increase density by developing a greater number of residential uses within 0.25 mile of transit facilities and thereby increasing accessibility to transit stops within the SPA. Mitigation measure MM4.2-3 would reduce the burning of wood or fossil fuels which emit high levels of criteria pollutants. These mitigation measures would reduce the amount of criteria pollutants that would be generated and emitted through the day to day operation of the project.

While the implementation of mitigation measure MM4.2-3 will reduce air quality operational emission impacts, build-out of the proposed Plan would still result in vehicle and area emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD's daily thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, impacts from operational emissions would be *significant and unavoidable*.

Cumulative Impact

Cumulative development could also exceed SCAQMD standards during construction, which could combine with the proposed Plan's impacts. At this time, it is not possible to quantify these emissions due to the variables in construction lengths, number of projects being built at the same time, etc. Since the Basin is in nonattainment for these pollutants, any contribution to pollutant emissions would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the violation of air quality standards, even with implementation of mitigation measures, and the cumulative impact during construction would be *significant and unavoidable*.

Since the Basin is in nonattainment for criteria pollutants, as noted, any increase in vehicular traffic or other sources of pollutant emissions would add to the already significant cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative development, combined with the impact of the proposed Plan, would be cumulatively significant. Despite implementation of mitigation, the proposed Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the impact during operation, and the cumulative impact during operation would be *significant and unavoidable*.

■ Exposure to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) have been developed by the SCAQMD to determine maximum allowable concentrations of criteria air pollutants for projects. Construction emissions are dependent on the number of construction equipment and delivery vehicles operating, the length of time in operation, and the amount of soil that is disturbed on a daily basis. Without a known schedule or an anticipated annual or daily level of construction, construction emissions cannot be accurately estimated.

Due to the unknown level of construction activity that would occur on any given day during proposed Plan build-out, and the location of construction with respect to sensitive receptors, this is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of SCAQMD standard code requirements, best available control measures (BSCMs) and standard SCAQMD mitigation measures that are in use at the time of development would reduce construction impacts. Impacts from construction are greater the closer construction activities are to sensitive receptors. Since the SPA is predominantly residential, new development would occur relatively close to existing sensitive receptors. Individual projects, even with implementation of mitigation measure MM4.2-2, could exceed LST thresholds when construction activities are in close proximity to sensitive receptors. Therefore, localized construction impacts would be a *significant and unavoidable* impact for construction activities.

Cumulative Impact

Construction activities have the potential to impact local sensitive receptors due to close proximity of the construction emissions with sensitive receptors. Because construction activities are of limited duration and in a limited area it is unlikely that construction being undertaken now would overlap with construction under the proposed Plan. However, without a known schedule or an anticipated annual or daily level of construction for development under the proposed Plan, timing and emission levels cannot be accurately estimated. Therefore, construction for the proposed Plan is considered a potentially significant impact on the project level. Implementation of the SCAQMD standard code requirements, best available control measures (BSCMs) (current are included in Appendix C), and standard SCAQMD mitigation measures that are in use at the time of development in addition to measure MM4.2-2 would reduce this impact by requiring the use of equipment and construction materials that emits or generate reduced levels of criteria pollutants. However, the mitigation will not necessarily reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Because the timing and extent of current construction's overlap with nearby construction under the proposed Plan is unknown, construction activities would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the project's cumulative impact. Because the SCAQMD indicates that projects that are significant at a project level must also be determined to be significant at a cumulative level, localized construction impacts would result in a *significant and unavoidable cumulative* impact.

■ Cumulatively Considerable Increase in Criteria Pollutants

Project/Cumulative Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). The Basin is designated as a federal-level severe nonattainment area for ozone, meaning that federal ambient air quality standards are not expected to be met for more than 18 years, and as nonattainment areas for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and lead. The Basin is a state-level extreme nonattainment area for ozone, and is a state-level nonattainment area for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ (California ARB 2013b). Emissions from operational activities are anticipated to exceed the SCAQMD operational threshold before and after mitigation. Because emissions from the SPA would be significant on a project level, and the Basin is in nonattainment for ozone, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, this is considered to be a potentially significant cumulative impact. Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.2-2 and MM4.2-3 would reduce impacts from the

projects generation of criteria pollutants from construction and the operation of the project, but not to below regulatory thresholds. Because the project exceeds the thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} directly, and the thresholds for NO_x and ROG (precursors for Ozone), criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment, the project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution. Additionally, construction emissions cannot be quantified and are therefore assumed to be significant and unavoidable at a project level. Because all exceedances of project-level thresholds inhibit the Basin's ability to reach attainment, any exceedance is considered a *significant and unavoidable cumulative* impact.

■ Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Project Impact

Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) have been developed by the SCAQMD to determine maximum allowable concentrations of criteria air pollutants for projects. Construction emissions are dependent on the number of construction equipment and delivery vehicles operating, the length of time in operation, and the amount of soil that is disturbed on a daily basis. Without a known schedule or an anticipated annual or daily level of construction, construction emissions cannot be accurately estimated.

Construction activities for each development project under the proposed Plan will be required to conduct an LST analysis with respect to CO, NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions, as a condition of approval. Due to the unknown level of construction activity that would occur on any given day during proposed Plan build-out, and the location of construction with respect to sensitive receptors, this is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the SCAQMD standard code requirements, best available control measures (BSCMs) (current are included in Appendix C), and standard SCAQMD mitigation measures that are in use at the time of development would reduce construction impacts. Impacts from construction are greater the closer construction activities are to sensitive receptors. Since the SPA is predominantly residential, new development would occur relatively close to existing sensitive receptors. Individual projects, even with implementation of mitigation measure MM4.2-2, could exceed LST thresholds when construction activities are in close proximity to sensitive receptors. Therefore, localized construction impacts would be a *significant and unavoidable* impact for construction activities.

Cumulative Impact

Construction activities have the potential to impact local sensitive receptors due to close proximity of the construction emissions with sensitive receptors. Because construction activities are of limited duration and in a limited area it is unlikely that construction being undertaken now would overlap with construction under the proposed Plan. However, without a known schedule or an anticipated annual or daily level of construction for development under the proposed Plan, timing and emission levels cannot be accurately estimated. Therefore, construction for the proposed Plan is considered a potentially significant impact on the project level. Implementation of the SCAQMD standard code requirements, best available control measures (BSCMs) (current are included in Appendix C), and standard SCAQMD mitigation measures that are in use at the time of development in addition to measure MM4.2-2 would reduce this impact by requiring the use of equipment and construction materials that emits or generate

reduced levels of criteria pollutants. However, the mitigation will not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. Because the timing and extent of current construction's overlap with nearby construction under the proposed Plan is unknown, construction activities would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the project's cumulative impact. Because the SCAQMD indicates that projects that are significant at a project level must also be determined to be significant at a cumulative level, localized construction impacts would result in a *significant and unavoidable cumulative* impact.

6.1.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.2-2 *During project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction equipment operating on the project site shall meet United States Environmental Protection Agency-Certified Tier 3 emissions standards or higher, according to the following:*

- *All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technologies devices certified by the California Air Resources Board. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by California Air Resources Board regulations.*
- *All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technologies devices certified by the California Air Resources Board. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by California Air Resources Board regulations.*
- *A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technologies documentation, and California Air Resources Board or South Coast Air Quality Management District operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.*

MM4.2-3 *Disallow wood-burning fireplaces in new residential units.*

6.1.3 Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR (**Finding 3**).

6.1.4 Facts Supporting Finding

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including those previously adopted by the County, would reduce impacts, the Project's impacts on air quality (violation of air quality standards, cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations) would remain significant and unavoidable. If any of the mitigation measures is determined to be infeasible or necessary permits/approvals to implement the mitigation measures cannot be obtained, then a significant impact (or impacts) may remain. Furthermore, if implementation of any measure is delayed, a significant impact would occur until the implementation of the measure.

6.2 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

6.2.1 Potential Effect

■ Direct or Indirect Greenhouse Gas Emissions Generation

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Implementation of the proposed Plan would generate greenhouse gases through the construction and operation of new residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Greenhouse gas emissions from development under the proposed Plan would specifically arise from direct sources such as motor vehicles, natural gas consumption, solid waste handling/treatment, and indirect sources such as electricity generation.

Following the SCAQMD recommendations, construction emissions would be amortized over an anticipated 30-year structure lifetime and added to the operational emissions to provide a complete average annual emissions estimate. The predominant land uses that would be constructed under the proposed Plan would be residential and retail/commercial, with development of approximately 5,419 new residential uses and 4,920,244 sf of new nonresidential land use. While the amount of development is known, the development will be spread out over 20 years and the phasing of individual construction projects would be determined by market need. Therefore, the construction details would be difficult, if not impossible to quantify due to the variables associated with daily construction activity (e.g., construction schedule, number and types of equipment, etc.). GHG emissions would be anticipated to be lower during years where the area is experiencing an economic slowdown and higher during years where the economic situation is at peak. It should be noted that development pursuant to the proposed Plan would occur on vacant or underutilized parcels and would represent infill development that would not involve large-scale rough grading that would generate significant amounts of diesel equipment emissions. It is anticipated that the daily average emissions (between existing and 2035) could exceed the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds for construction emissions, although individual years (and months and days) would vary substantially over the planning horizon.

The proposed Plan would generate operational-related GHG emissions from vehicle usage, energy consumption, water use and waste generation associated with operation of residential and commercial development. Mobile and stationary source emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod model assuming project build-out would be completed by 2035. Detailed assumptions and inputs used with the CalEEMod model are included in Appendix D of this Draft EIR. The 2020 emissions assume a worst case in that the entire proposed Plan is built out by 2020, this would increase mobile source emissions as opposed to a 2035 build-out because under current regulations there will continue to be a reduction in passenger vehicle emissions between 2020 and 2035. Without incorporation of annual construction emissions, the operation of the proposed Plan is not anticipated to exceed the 4.1 MT CO₂e/SP annual threshold for 2035 or the 6.6 MT CO₂e/SP annual threshold for 2020. As SCAQMD methodology requires annual construction emissions to be taken into account and, as discussed, calculation of annual

construction emissions cannot be accurately accounted for, unmitigated emissions would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation measures MM4.2-1 through MM4.2-4 would reduce GHG emissions within the SPA. Mitigation measure MM4.2-1 reduces VMT and, therefore, would reduce GHG emissions associated with the combustion of fuels. Mitigation measure MM4.2-2 includes the use of more efficient construction equipment, which would reduce the combustion of fuels associated with construction. Mitigation measure MM4.2-3 would reduce the burning of wood or fossil fuels, which emit GHGs in greater quantities than natural gas. All of these mitigation measures reduce the amount of GHG's that would be generated and emitted through the construction and day to day operation of the project. In addition, mitigation measure MM4.6-1 would address the individual development's potential to impact climate change, by ensuring that individual projects meet the required reduction thresholds. The operational GHG emissions for both 2020 and 2035 are below the performance standard thresholds. However, due to the unknown level of contribution from construction activities, this would be a *significant and unavoidable* impact.

Cumulative Impact

As the impacts of GHG emissions are cumulative, no additional cumulative analysis is required.

■ Conflict with GHG Reduction Plans

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan could conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The SCAQMD developed performance standards to demonstrate a project's compliance with the AB 32 reduction goals. Operational GHG emissions of the proposed Plan would meet the performance standard thresholds prior to the incorporation of mitigation and would further be reduced with the incorporation of mitigation measures MM4.2-1 through MM4.2-4 and MM4.6-1. Therefore, from an operational standpoint, the proposed Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to the established AB 32 reduction goal. The Specific Plan includes sustainable strategies to promote reduced auto dependency by improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and concentrating future development adjacent to transit facilities. However, because the GHG emissions must include emissions generated during construction, the total impact on climate change from the proposed Plan cannot be quantified. This is considered a potentially significant impact, as compliance with the AB 32 scoping plan cannot be insured.

The proposed Plan extends beyond the year 2020, the next AB 32 reduction goal year. AB 32 details policies and programs for California to reach the 2020 target of a return to 1990 emissions levels. The State has not developed a plan to reduce emissions beyond the 2020 target, so the consistency with such a plan cannot be evaluated at this time.

In accordance with SB 375, the California ARB and SCAG have collaboratively established a reduction target for passenger car emissions. This target consists of two goals: a reduction of 8 percent per capita reduction for the year 2020, and a conditional target of 13 percent for the year 2035. SCAG is currently in the process of updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and including the Sustainable

Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the update. Because the RTP and SCS are not yet complete, consistency with the forthcoming plan is analyzed based on the County's consistency with the reduction goals for the SCAG region. The 2020 target for per capita emissions from passenger vehicles is 8 percent below existing emissions; this was calculated to be 3.07 MT CO₂e/person annually for the SCAG region (California ARB 2010). The 2035 target for per capita emissions from passenger vehicles is 13 percent below existing emissions; this was calculated to be 2.91 MT CO₂e/person annually for the SCAG region (California ARB 2010). Even with the incorporation of the mitigation measures described above, the growth-related SPA's per capita emissions from passenger vehicles would be 3.36 MT CO₂e/person in 2020 and 3.06 MT CO₂e/person in 2035, exceeding the SCAG targets. However, the SCAG targets are designed for planning areas and not individual projects or parts of planning areas. When the emissions from the existing passenger vehicles within the plan area and existing population are taken into account, the mitigated per capita emissions are 2.96 MT CO₂e/person and 2.70 MT CO₂e/person respectively for 2020 and 2035 and are below the SB 375 target. Therefore, the proposed Plan would have a less-than-significant impact on the implementation of SB 375.

The overall potential of the project to conflict with adopted plans, policies and regulations designed to reduce GHG emissions is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.2-1 through MM4.2-4 would reduce this impact from GHG emissions. Passenger vehicle emissions meet the established threshold, as well as the operational portion of the proposed Plan Emissions. However, because total proposed Plan emissions must include emissions generated during construction, the total impact on climate change from the proposed Plan cannot be determined. Therefore, this impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.

Cumulative Impact

As the impacts of GHG emissions are cumulative, no additional cumulative analysis is required.

6.2.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.6-1 *If, during project-level review, the County determines that a project has the potential to exceed SCAQMD 2035 thresholds for GHG emissions, the applicant shall submit a GHG emissions analysis report of the proposed project to the County. The analysis shall ensure that the per service population emissions for the individual project, with the incorporation of amortized construction emissions, meets the SCAQMD thresholds for 2035.*

MM4.2-1 through MM4.2-4 would also apply.

6.2.3 Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR (**Finding 3**).

6.2.4 Facts Supporting Finding

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including those previously adopted by the County, would reduce impacts, the Project's impacts on GHG emissions would still remain significant

and unavoidable. Furthermore, if implementation of the mitigation measure is delayed, a significant impact would occur until the implementation of the measure.

6.3 NOISE

6.3.1 Potential Effects

■ Exceedance of Noise Standards

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in the 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. The results of the short-term noise level measurements taken to assess existing conditions show that the existing noise levels are higher than the recommended levels for sensitive receptors by the County. The dominant noise source in the project area is vehicular traffic. Traffic noise levels on surface roads in the SPA in Year 2035 with proposed Plan implementation would typically range from 67 to 71 dBA CNEL. Freeway noise levels would have the potential to exceed 60 dBA CNEL within 0.6 mile of a freeway, 65 dBA CNEL within 0.3 mile, and 70 dBA CNEL within 0.1 mile, in excess of established standards. The proposed project would increase noise temporarily in the SPA, primarily along the corridors, during construction. Noise during construction would primarily be generated from construction equipment.

Approximate noise levels anticipated to be experienced by nearby sensitive uses due to construction activities occurring at the project site were estimated. If pile driving is involved in the construction, noise at a high of 105 dBA could occur,² although this activity would likely be of limited duration.

Noise levels generated by construction equipment (or by any point source) decrease at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source. Therefore, if a particular construction activity generated average noise levels of 89 dBA at 50 feet, the L_{eq} would be 83 dBA at 100 feet, 77 dBA at 200 feet, 71 dBA at 400 feet, and so on. Intervening structures that block the line of sight, such as buildings, further decrease the resultant noise level by a minimum of 5 dBA. The reduction in noise from construction activities is reduced by 1.0 dBA for every 1,000 feet from the source. Although the increases in noise levels during construction could be substantial, the increases would be intermittent and temporary during daytime hours as permitted by the County's Noise Ordinance. Therefore, it is unlikely that significant impacts on noise-sensitive uses or activities would occur. Although a less-than-significant impact would occur, noise control measures are recommended during construction to reduce the noise levels to the extent practicable in order to minimize the impact on nearby sensitive receptors.

The noise control measures would help in reducing the annoyance of high noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses to the extent practicable during construction. While intermittent, because the specific development projects and length of construction are not known, this impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.

² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1971).

Operational noise sources would be similar to existing conditions with implementation of the Specific Plan because land uses would be similar; however, development intensity would increase with Plan implementation. Implementation of the Specific Plan would accommodate a total of 5,419 new dwelling units and 4.9 million additional square feet of nonresidential use compared to existing conditions, particularly as new mixed-use development. Therefore, noise levels would have the potential to increase in the SPA from increase in activity and motor vehicular traffic.

The Specific Plan proposes intensified commercial, residential and mixed-use development along area roadways. Mixed-use development would be concentrated along 3rd Street. New development would place new single- and multifamily residential development and commercial development along major roadways, which would expose residents to noise levels in excess of the California Department of Health normally acceptable compatibility standards. Similarly, due to the increase in vehicular traffic as a result of build-out of the Specific Plan, existing noise-sensitive receptors could be exposed to noise levels in excess of acceptable compatibility standards. This would result in a potentially significant impact associated with exposure to traffic noise.

The Gold Line light-rail line traverses the SPA along 3rd Street. Four stations are located in the SPA on 3rd Street at the intersections with Indiana Street, Maravilla Street, La Verne Avenue, and South Atlantic Avenue. The noise and vibration assessment for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor Final SEIS/SEIR determined that noise levels from operation of the Gold Line are as high as 76 dBA CNEL at 25 feet for the rail line. Single-family residential development within 160 feet of the rail line; multifamily residential development within 90 feet of the rail line; commercial, office, and civic development planned within approximately 50 feet of the rail line; and industrial development planned within 30 feet from the track centerline would be exposed to noise levels that exceed the normally acceptable ambient noise standards established by the California Department of Health. Therefore, development proposed within a noise contour which exceeds the limits established by the California Department of Health would result in a potentially significant impact. It should be noted that future build-out of multistory buildings located adjacent to primary noise sources, such as the Gold Line, would provide shielding and would attenuate noise levels for land uses located further from the sources. However, exterior noise levels would likely still exceed acceptable threshold for those projects in proximity to the rail line.

Audible warnings at railroad crossing would continue to be a source of intermittent noise in the SPA. Implementation of the Specific Plan would increase exposure to these events by increasing development density. Railroad crossing events would occur intermittently throughout the day and night and would be short in duration. Additionally, Noise Control Ordinance Part 5 exempts warning devices and train horns from the County's exterior noise level limits. However, Gold Line operations during nighttime hours may result in sleep disturbance to new residents along the Gold Line. New residential development along the Gold Line would have the potential to expose multifamily residences to noise levels in excess of the County's interior noise level limits from train crossing noise. A potentially significant impact would occur. As noted, attenuation measures would be required for all development where interior noise would exceed the standard so as to comply with the Noise Ordinance. In addition, the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor Final SEIR/SEIS identified mitigation measures that would be provided for sensitive uses adversely affected.

There are two sources of transportation noise that could impact residential development adjacent to 3rd Street and the Gold Line. Traffic noise attributable to 3rd Street in Year 2035 would be up to 71 dBA CNEL at 50 feet from the roadway centerline. Railroad noise levels for the Gold Line would exceed 73 dBA up to 50 feet from the rail line. Combining 3rd Street traffic noise and Gold Line light-rail noise would result in a noise level of 75 dBA CNEL at 50 feet. Provided that new or redevelopment residential or commercial development under the Specific Plan may be located within 50 feet of both noise sources, compatible exterior noise levels may not be achieved. As noted, attenuation measures would be required for all development where interior noise would exceed the standard so as to comply with the Noise Ordinance. In addition, the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor Final SEIR/SEIS identified mitigation measures that would be provided for sensitive uses adversely affected.

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, in addition to the mitigation measures identified in the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor Final SEIR/SEIS, interior noise would be below the standard of 45 dBA, but exterior noise could still exceed established thresholds. Given the design of the Metro Gold Line tracks, which runs in the street in the SPA, attenuation measures such as trackside landscaping or sound walls would not be feasible. Thus, this impact would be *significant and unavoidable*, as there are no further feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this impact.

Cumulative Impact

Noise attenuates with distance. Therefore, impacts related to noise are generally limited to the area in proximity to the noise source. As such, for construction, the geographic context for cumulative impacts related to noise is limited to the SPA. For operational noise, the geographic context is larger, as traffic generated by the proposed Plan would travel on streets and freeways outside the SPA. Traffic would disperse as it leaves the SPA and would not, at some distance, be concentrated in any particularly area. Therefore, the geographic context for evaluation of cumulative impacts during operation would reasonably encompass an area within a 5-mile radius of the SPA boundaries.

Existing daytime noise levels in the SPA range from 55 and 87 dBA. Existing noise levels in the SPA currently exceed normally acceptable noise compatibility guidelines for residences and commercial development. Therefore, there is an existing significant cumulative impact.

■ Exposure to Excessive Groundborne Noise and Vibration

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Potential vibration-sensitive uses in the proposed Specific Plan may include machinery in industrial uses, or medical laboratory equipment. These land uses are located throughout the SPA, with medical uses concentrated on 1st Street. The primary sources of vibration within the proposed Plan vicinity would be from Gold Line operation, increase in heavy truck traffic, and construction activities.

The FTA provides thresholds for land use categories that may be subject to vibration impacts from a commuter railroad (FTA 2006). For Category 1 uses (vibration-sensitive equipment), the disturbance criteria for frequent events is 65 VdB. For Category 2 land uses (residences and buildings where people

normally sleep), the disturbance criteria is 72 VdB. The screening distance for Category 3 land uses (institutional land uses) is 75 VdB. The proposed Plan would potentially accommodate Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3 land uses throughout the SPA, including concentrated Category 2 land uses along the Gold Line.

According to the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor Final SEIS/SEIR (LA Metro 2002), the Gold Line generates groundborne up to 85 VdB at 25 feet from the rail line. The Gold Line would have the potential to exceed the FTA disturbance criteria for Category 1 uses up to 115 feet from the rail line, up to 70 feet for Category 2 uses, and up to 55 feet for Category 3 uses. Mixed-use development is proposed to be concentrated along 3rd Street and the Gold Line, which could include Category 1, 2, or 3 land uses. Therefore, the Specific Plan has the potential to locate new land uses within the applicable screening distance of the Gold Line light-rail line. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Los Angeles Eastside Corridor Final SEIR/SEIS identified mitigation measures through track design that would be applied to reduce the impact of train vibration on sensitive uses. In combination with these Metro mitigation measures, project mitigation measure MM4.10-7 would reduce this impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. The impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.

Cumulative Impact

Construction noise and vibration impacts (except for heavy truck traffic) would be limited to the area within 115 feet of the individual project sites. There are two cumulative projects identified as occurring within the SPA that could combine with the projects proposed under the Specific Plan to generate noise and vibration in excess of established standards. The proposed Plan would result in significant impacts to noise and vibration during construction and would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to construction noise and vibration combined with any cumulative project in proximity to the project site. The *cumulative* impact during construction would be *significant and unavoidable*.

■ Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise

Project Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The primary way in which implementation of the Specific Plan would change noise within the SPA and in the surrounding vicinity is by increasing traffic. Acoustical calculations were performed for future (2035) traffic volumes along roadway segments most affected by the proposed Plan using standard noise modeling equations adapted from the FHWA noise prediction model (FHWA-RD-77-108). Most affected segments include those where implementation of the proposed Plan would result in a net increase of more than 1,000 peak hour trips. The Year 2035 scenario represents full build-out of the development accommodated by the Specific Plan and cumulative growth through Year 2035. The modeling calculations considered the posted vehicle speed, average daily traffic volume, and the estimated vehicle mix.

Future 2035 noise levels (without the Specific Plan) would range from 65 to 68 dBA CNEL at a distance of 50 feet from the roadway centerline. Noise levels would exceed the California Department of Health normally acceptable compatibility standards of 60 dBA CNEL for single-family residences and 65 dBA CNEL for multifamily residential uses. An increase in traffic noise of 3 dBA CNEL or more is

considered significant because a 3 dBA change is the smallest increment that is perceivable by most receivers. When proposed Plan build-out traffic is added, the increase in the resulting noise level along 1st Street would be 2 dBA. A 2 dBA noise increase is not considered excessive, although proposed Plan traffic would incrementally contribute to an already noisy environment. However, the proposed Plan would result in a 3 dBA increase on three segments of Cesar Chavez Avenue, and a 4 to 5 dBA increase on all segments of 3rd Street. Therefore, proposed Plan-related impacts associated with increases in traffic noise are considered potentially significant.

Typical sound mitigation for traffic noise consists of walls or other barriers that would attenuate noise to the sensitive receptors behind the barrier. However, the feasibility of noise walls is restricted by access requirements for driveways, presences of local cross streets, underground utilities, other noise sources in the area, and safety considerations. The SPA is currently developed and numerous driveways and cross-streets currently exist along Cesar Chavez Avenue and 3rd Street. A noise wall would be ineffective on the impacted segments in the SPA due to breaks in the wall that would be required. Additionally, noise barriers on surface streets would inhibit the creation of a pedestrian friendly streetscape by walling off businesses and public spaces from the public view. Therefore, installation of noise wall along impacted segments would not be feasible. No other mitigation measures are available that would not regulate the vehicle trips of individual consumers. As noted above, however, the proposed Plan would be consistent with the East Los Angeles Community Plan, which includes a policy to reduce the overall noise level in the community. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, this would remain *significant and unavoidable* with respect to a permanent increase in ambient noise.

Cumulative Impact

The proposed Plan would result in an increase in the ambient noise level from new operational noise sources and increased human activity throughout the SPA, including increased traffic noise within a five-mile radius of the SPA boundaries. Cumulative noise levels along surface roadways in the SPA would exceed the normally acceptable noise compatibility standards. Therefore, a cumulative impact would occur. Operation of the Gold Line and the SR-60 and I-710 freeways would also contribute to exposure to excessive noise levels and permanent increase in ambient noise. Despite implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact. Combined with reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects in the defined cumulative context, there would be a *significant and unavoidable cumulative* impact.

6.3.2 Improvement Measures

N-1 To the extent applicable, practicable, and feasible, all noise-producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc welders, air compressors) may be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.

N-2 To the extent applicable, practicable, and feasible, electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment.

N-3 *The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.*

N-4 *No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.*

6.3.3 Mitigation Measures

MM4.10-1 HVAC Mechanical Equipment Shielding. *Prior to the approval of a new nonresidential development project, the applicant shall consult with LACDPH and may be required to submit an acoustical analysis demonstrating that the noise level from operation of mechanical equipment will not exceed the exterior noise level limits for a designated receiving land use category as specified in Noise Control Ordinance Section 12.08.390. Noise control measures may include, but are not limited to, the selection of quiet equipment, equipment setbacks, silencers, and/or acoustical louvers*

MM4.10-2 Site-Specific Acoustic Analysis—Nonresidential Development. *Prior to the approval of a new nonresidential project, the applicant shall consult with LACDPH and may be required to submit an acoustical analysis to the County to determine the existing noise level. If the noise level exceeds 70 dBA CNEL (unless a higher noise compatibility threshold (up to 75 dBA CNEL) has been determined appropriate by Los Angeles County), the analysis shall detail the measures that will be implemented to ensure exterior noise levels are compatible with the operation of the proposed use. LACDPH may require, on a case-by-case basis, and an acoustical study may still be required even if the area falls below 70 dBA CNEL. Measures that may be implemented to ensure appropriate noise levels include, but are not limited to, setbacks to separate the proposed habitable structure from the adjacent roadway, or construction of noise barriers on site.*

MM4.10-3 Site-Specific Acoustic Analysis—Multifamily Residences. *Prior to the approval of a new multifamily project, the applicant shall consult with LACDPH and may be required to submit to the County an acoustical analysis to ensure that interior noise levels due to exterior noise sources are below 45 dBA CNEL:*

- *Multifamily residential units where the first and/or upper floor exterior noise levels exceed 60 dBA CNEL*
- *Multifamily outdoor usable areas (patios or balconies) where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA CNEL*
- *Multifamily residential units that are located within the same building as commercial development*
- *Multifamily residential units located near a structure requiring an exterior HVAC system*

Prior to approval of building plans, noise attenuation for habitable rooms shall be approved by the County. Building plans shall be available during design review and shall demonstrate the accurate calculation of noise attenuation for habitable rooms. Consequently, based on the results of the interior acoustical analysis, the design for buildings in these areas may need to include a ventilation or air conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment with the windows closed. Residential air conditioning systems shall comply with Noise Control Ordinance Section 12.08.530.

MM4.10-4 Construction Vibration. *For all construction activities within the Specific Plan area, individual projects that use vibration-intensive construction activities, such as pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, near sensitive receptors shall be limited Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. No such activity shall occur on weekends or legal holidays. The County shall retain*

approval authority for pile-driving activities for all projects under the Specific Plan, whether discretionary or subject only to site plan review, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures during construction:

- a. The construction contractor shall provide written notification to all residential units and nonresidential tenants at least three weeks prior to the start of construction activities within 115 feet of the receptor informing them of the estimated start date and duration of daytime vibration-generating construction activities.*
- b. Stationary sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from off-site receptors as possible.*
- c. Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site.*
- d. The project contractor shall submit a construction vibration control plan to the County for approval prior to commencement of construction activities.*
- e. The applicant shall consider the use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques (e.g., drilled piles to eliminate use of vibration-intensive pile driver).*

MM4.10-5

No pile-driving activities shall occur adjacent to any listed historic or cultural resource; or historic buildings, structures, or features officially determined eligible for designation as a historic or cultural resource without prior approval by the County. The County shall retain approval authority for pile-driving activities for all projects under the Specific Plan, whether discretionary or subject only to site plan review. If it is determined that pile-driving would likely cause damage to such buildings, alternative methods for building foundations shall be implemented that do not include pile driving.

MM4.10-6

Prior to commencement of construction project that requires an approved haul route, the applicant shall submit proposed haul routes to and from the project site, subject to approval by the County.

MM4.10-7

Gold Line Groundborne Vibration. For each new development project within 115 feet of the Gold Line pursuant to the Specific Plan, the applicant shall implement the FTA and Federal Railroad Administration guidelines, where appropriate, to limit the extent of exposure that sensitive uses may have to groundborne vibration from trains. Specifically, Category 1 uses (vibration-sensitive equipment) within 115 feet from the Gold Line, Category 2 uses (residences and buildings where people normally sleep) within 70 feet, and Category 3 uses (institutional land uses) within 55 feet shall require a site-specific groundborne vibration analysis conducted by a qualified groundborne vibration specialist in accordance with FTA and FRA guidelines. The groundborne vibration analysis, including identification of feasible vibration control measure, shall be submitted to and approved by the County prior to commencement of construction activities. All feasible vibration control measures deemed appropriate by the County shall be incorporated into site design.

6.3.4 MM4.10-8 Construction Noise Plan. Power construction equipment shall be equipped with noise shielding and muffling devices. All equipment shall be properly maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts is generated. Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR (**Finding 3**).

6.3.5 Facts Supporting Finding

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including those previously adopted by the County, would reduce impacts, the Project's impacts on noise (exceedances of noise standards, exposure to excessive groundborne noise and vibration, and substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels) would remain significant and unavoidable. If any of the mitigation measures is determined to be infeasible or necessary permits/approvals to implement the mitigation measures cannot be obtained, then a significant impact (or impacts) may remain. Furthermore, if implementation of any measure is delayed, a significant impact would occur until the implementation of the measure.

6.4 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

6.4.1 Potential Effect

■ Congestion Management Program

Project Impact

The CMP roadways in the SPA are SR-60, I-710, and Whittier Boulevard. The CMP indicates that SR-60 and I-710 currently operate at a LOS E or LOS F in the SPA, and Whittier Boulevard operates at an LOS D or better.

The proposed Plan is intended to support and encourage the use of transit, which would in turn reduce congestion, consistent with the goals of the CMP. Additionally, future nonresidential development under the Specific Plan would be required to comply with the project-specific Transportation Demand Management (TDM) development standards outlined in the CMP. However, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant increases in congestion throughout the SPA, including significant impacts to the intersection of 3rd Street with the SR-60 westbound off-ramp and the intersections of Whittier Boulevard with Downey Road, Eastern Avenue, and Arizona Avenue. Therefore, the proposed Plan would have the potential to increase congestion on the CMP roadway network.

Traffic operations at the following study intersections at freeway ramps could deteriorate to LOS E or F with implementation of maximum-density development permitted under the proposed Land Use Plan:

- **Gage Avenue/3rd Street**—Would deteriorate from LOS C to E in the a.m. peak hour and from LOS B to F in the PM peak hour
- **SR-60 Westbound On/Off Ramps/3rd Street**—Would deteriorate from LOS C to F in the p.m. peak hour
- **Downey Road/SR-60 Eastbound Off-Ramp**—Would deteriorate from LOS E to F in the PM peak hour

This would be considered a potentially significant impact. Identified significant impacts at the intersection of Downey Road/SR-60 Eastbound Off-Ramp, per County guidelines, would be mitigated to a level of insignificance. Future signal synchronization projects and other traffic signal upgrades in the future within the 3rd Street corridor could mitigate the identified LOS degradations at these locations.

Additional mitigation measures will likely be necessary during the course of development under the proposed Plan.

Pursuant to mitigation measure MM4.14-1, all projects pursuant to the Specific Plan that meet a certain size threshold as specified in that mitigation would be required to consult with Caltrans prior to preparing a traffic impact study. This consultation requirement would help project developers identify potential mitigation measures for increased traffic on area freeways that would meet Caltrans' requirements.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.14-1 would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would be ***significant and unavoidable***.

Cumulative Impact

As discussed above, the proposed Plan and cumulative growth through the year 2035 would cause intersections throughout the SPA to operate at a deficient LOS. The increase in congestion would have the potential to decrease LOS on CMP Roadways, including SR-60, I-710, and Whittier Boulevard. Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.14-1 would reduce the proposed Plan impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the proposed Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution and the cumulative impact would be ***significant and unavoidable***.

6.4.2 Mitigation Measures

MM4.14-1

The County shall require traffic engineering firms, which are retained to prepare traffic impact studies for future development projects, to consult with Caltrans when a development proposal meets the requirements of statewide, regional, or areawide significance per CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b). Proposed developments meeting the criteria of statewide, regional, or areawide include:

- *Proposed residential developments of more than 500 dwelling units*
- *Proposed shopping centers or business establishments employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 500,000 gross square feet of floor space*
- *Proposed commercial office buildings employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 250,000 gross square feet of floor space*
- *Proposed hotel/motel developments of more than 500 rooms*

When the CEQA criteria or regional significance are not met, the County shall require transportation engineers and/or Lead Agency representatives consult with Caltrans when proposed developments include the following characteristics:

- *Proposed developments that have the potential to cause a significant impact to state highway facilities (rights-of-way, intersections, interchanges, etc.) and when required mitigation improvements are proposed in the Initial Study*
- *Proposed developments that assign 50 or more trips (passenger-car-equivalent trips) during peak hours to a state highway/freeway*
- *Proposed developments that assign 10 or more trips (passenger-car-equivalent trips) during peak hours to a state highway/freeway off-ramp*

- *Proposed developments that are located adjacent to a state highway facility and that require a Caltrans encroachment permit (exceptions: additions to single-family homes, 10 residential units or less)*

6.4.3 Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR (**Finding 3**).

6.4.4 Facts Supporting Finding

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including those previously adopted by the County, would reduce impacts, the Project's impacts on CMP facilities would remain significant and unavoidable. If any of the mitigation measures is determined to be infeasible or necessary permits/approvals to implement the mitigation measures cannot be obtained, then a significant impact (or impacts) may remain. Furthermore, if implementation of any measure is delayed, a significant impact would occur until the implementation of the measure.

6.5 UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS

6.5.1 Potential Effect

■ Water Supply

Project Impact

The proposed Plan could result in the redevelopment of existing land uses or the development of underutilized, undeveloped/vacant land within the SPA. Additionally, reasonably anticipated development would result, as shown in Table 4.11-2 (Summary of Potential Dwelling Units and Population in the Specific Plan Area) in Section 4.11 (Population/Housing), in an increase of residents in the SPA, through new redevelopment of low- and medium-density residential uses and nonresidential (employment) uses through 2030. As shown in Table 4.15-3, water demand is calculated to be 7.25 mgd or 8,119 afy.

As shown in Table 4.15-3, projected water demand for the SPA in 2030 under reasonably expected development levels would be approximately 7.25.³ The forecasted 2030 water demand with implementation of the proposed Plan would increase by 2.16 mgd over existing conditions. Demand within Cal Water's East Los Angeles District in 2010 was 14.80 mgd, and is anticipated to increase to 16.14 mgd by 2030, which is consistent with the new change in demand within the SPA between 2010 and 2030. Upon implementation of the proposed Plan, water demand by 2030 would represent less than 1 percent of the total demand in the MWD's service area in 2030. Implementation of the proposed Plan incrementally contributes to overall demand within MWD's service area, which is projected to grow proportionally as population and employment increases over the long-term planning horizon.

³ These water consumption estimates are based on historic water use rates that are anticipated to reduce with increased water conservation as well as recycling.

Future development occurring in the SPA would be subject to provisions of Cal Water's water conservation best management practices presented in its 2010 UWMP. Ongoing basin conservation efforts and MWD policies designed to reduce water usage would help reduce potential impacts to water supplies. While the increased demand for water as a result of implementation of the proposed Plan is minimal compared to basinwide water demand, the proposed Plan could have a potentially significant impact on existing entitlements and water resources. The program level environmental clearance for the proposed Plan does not eliminate future environmental review for any specific development projects. Future development requiring discretionary action will be evaluated under project-level environmental clearance. With compliance with existing regulations, impacts would be reduced, but not necessarily to less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be considered *significant and unavoidable*.

Cumulative Impact

Historical climate conditions identify short- and long-term droughts in California and throughout the southwestern United States. Ongoing statewide developments, environmental restrictions in the Bay-Delta system, population growth and substantial rainfall shortages in multiple years have led to a recognized drought conditions. In mid-January 2014, the governor declared a statewide drought. Currently, SWP deliveries are estimated to be less than 5 percent for 2014. All present and future development is required to meet water conservation goals including a 20 percent reduction in per capita demand statewide by 2020. While ongoing conservation efforts are designed to reduce water usage would help reduce potential impacts to water supplies, the proposed Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the State's water shortage, and the proposed Plan's cumulative impact would be *significant and unavoidable* with regard to water resources.

6.5.2 Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR (**Finding 3**).

6.5.3 Facts Supporting Finding

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including those previously adopted by the County, would reduce impacts, the Project's impacts on water supply would remain significant and unavoidable. If any of the mitigation measures is determined to be infeasible or necessary permits/approvals to implement the mitigation measures cannot be obtained, then a significant impact (or impacts) may remain. Furthermore, if implementation of any measure is delayed, a significant impact would occur until the implementation of the measure.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 7 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based upon the following analysis, the County finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(g)(2), that no alternative (other than Alternative 1, which was adopted by the Lead Agency as the Project and is now being adopted by the County as a Responsible Agency) or feasible mitigation measure within its powers would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the Project would have on the environment. The following findings of fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with CEQA Section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. Alternatives to the proposed Plan described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.

7.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

An important consideration in the analysis of alternatives to the originally proposed project is the degree to which such alternatives would achieve the objectives of the originally proposed project. To facilitate this comparison, the objectives of the originally proposed project were compared to the alternatives.

The Specific Plan was developed in response to the extension of the Metro Gold Line into East Los Angeles, with the expectation of new economic opportunities, transformative development, and jobs that would be facilitated by the extension. The following objectives have been identified for the proposed project:

- Transform 3rd Street through infill of vacant properties and reuse of underutilized buildings, and transform the areas around the Gold line stations into vibrant, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use centers
- Enhance the image of the community through visually attractive and high-quality development that is in scale with the adjoining neighborhoods
- Protect and enhance the character of residential neighborhoods through streetscape improvements, more open space, and improved property maintenance
- Cultivate new job creation and economic development
- Address parking through development regulations and strategies to ensure that adequate parking is provided for new uses and reasonable parking regulations for infill development and new businesses
- Achieve a balanced mobility system through improvement of pedestrian and bicycle connections to public transit and enhancement of the built environment
- Increase access to open space and recreation opportunities
- Protect and promote local history and culture, including protection of existing cultural and historical resources and opportunities for public art

7.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration is the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that have been considered and rejected are discussed below.

7.3.1 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

■ Alternative Site

An alternate site for the proposed Plan was rejected because the Specific Plan is tailored expressly to maximize transit-oriented development around the Metro Gold Line stations that traverse the SPA. There is no alternative site in the community of East Los Angeles that would achieve the project objectives.

■ Reduced Development Alternative A

This alternative would reduce the maximum number of stories from two to one story in the Atlantic Boulevard (AB) zone and from two and a half to two stories in the Neighborhood Center (NC) zone and reduce the maximum dwelling units per acre (du/acre) from 32 to 28 du/acre in the AB and NC zones. Under Reduced Development Alternative A, there would be a net increase of approximately 5,208 residential units and 4,481,058 sf of commercial area over existing conditions.

This alternative does not assume that development would be permitted on fewer sites or at less intensity on individual sites as compared to the proposed Plan, but that the cumulative development totals, or caps, for each land use type would be lower. Therefore, potential overall traffic generation, associated air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts, and overall wastewater, water and other municipal service needs would be lower. However, potential site-specific impacts associated with future individual developments (e.g., potential loss of biological resources, potential historic resource impacts, potential geotechnical impacts) would not necessarily be reduced, under the "reduced development alternative" because the basic site grading, disturbance, or coverage resulting from individual development projects would not necessarily be reduced. In such cases, similar impacts would result from, and similar mitigations would be applied to, each future site-specific development regardless of the overall cap placed on total SPA development.

Further, this alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts identified in this EIR because the properties proposed for reduced development are subject to existing General Plan policies and zoning regulations. Development under the existing General Plan, East Los Angeles Community Plan, and zoning would result in increases in air emissions, noise, and vehicular traffic, which would likely be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed Plan.

■ Reduced Development Alternative B

This alternative would reduce the maximum number of stories from three to two in the Cesar Chavez (CC) zone and reduce the maximum dwelling units per acre from 32 to 28 du/acre in this zone. Under Reduced Development Alternative B, the Plan would increase development by approximately 5,235 additional net residential units and increase the square footage of commercial floor area by 4,320,428 over existing conditions.

This alternative does not assume that development would be permitted on fewer sites or at less intensity on individual sites as compared to the Plan, but that the cumulative development totals, or caps, for each land use type would be lower. Therefore, potential overall traffic generation, associated air quality, climate change, and noise impacts, and overall wastewater, water and other municipal service needs would be lower. However, potential site-specific impacts associated with future individual developments (e.g., potential loss of biological resources, potential historic resource impacts, potential geotechnical impacts) would not necessarily be reduced, under the “reduced development alternative” because the basic site grading, disturbance, or coverage resulting from individual development projects would not necessarily be reduced. In such cases, similar impacts would result from, and similar mitigations would be applied to, each future site-specific development regardless of the overall cap placed on total SPA development.

Further, this alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts identified in this EIR because the properties proposed for reduced development are subject to existing General Plan policies and zoning regulations. Development under the existing General Plan, East Los Angeles Community Plan, and zoning would result in increases in air emissions, noise, and vehicular traffic, which would likely be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed Plan.

■ Reduced Development Alternative C

Alternative C would reduce the maximum dwelling units per acre from 32 to 28 du/acre in the AB, CC, FS, NC, and TOD zones. Under Reduced Development Alternative C, the Plan would increase development by approximately 4,713 additional net residential units and increase the square footage of commercial floor area by 4,920,244 over existing conditions.

This alternative does not assume that development would be permitted on fewer sites or at less intensity on individual sites as compared to the Plan, but that the cumulative development totals, or caps, for each land use type would be lower. Therefore, potential overall traffic generation, associated air quality, climate change, and noise impacts, and overall wastewater, water and other municipal service needs would be lower. However, potential site-specific impacts associated with future individual developments (e.g., potential loss of biological resources, potential historic resource impacts, potential geotechnical impacts) would not necessarily be reduced, under the “reduced development alternative” because the basic site grading, disturbance, or coverage resulting from individual development projects would not necessarily be reduced. In such cases, similar impacts would result from, and similar mitigations would be applied to, each future site-specific development regardless of the overall cap placed on total SPA development.

Further, this alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts identified in this EIR because the properties proposed for reduced development are subject to existing General Plan policies and zoning regulations. Development under the existing General Plan, East Los Angeles Community Plan, and zoning would result in increases in air emissions, noise, and vehicular traffic, which would likely be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed Plan.

7.3.2 Alternative 1: No Project/Continuation of Existing Community Plan and Zoning

■ Description of Alternative 1

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) states that when the project is the revision of an existing land use plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the No Project alternative is the continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future. Land use decisions in the SPA are currently governed by the East Los Angeles Community Plan and the Los Angeles County General Plan. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would represent the continuation of the existing Community Plan, the County General Plan, the East Los Angeles Community Standards District, and the Zoning Ordinance, where not superseded to guide future growth and development within the project site.

■ Impact Summary of Alternative 1

The Community Plan does not contain maximum development data, and the County General Plan does not segregate allowable growth by community but, rather, looks at the County overall. Therefore, it is not possible to quantify and compare the allowable build-out of the proposed Plan to the Community Plan or the General Plan to determine whether impacts would be greater or less compared to the proposed Plan. Therefore, this analysis assumes that continuation of the existing plans would result in less cohesive, non-transit-oriented development, as well as potentially greater levels of development, with likely greater air quality, noise, and traffic impacts. In other words, the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Plan to air quality, noise, and traffic would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level under this Alternative.

With regard to other resources where the proposed Plan would result in no impact or less-than-significant impacts, with or without mitigation, General Plan and Community Plan policies that address these resources would continue to be applied. However, the design standards in the proposed Plan are more detailed and tailored to the planned TOD, which will result in a more pedestrian-friendly, integrated commercial neighborhood as well as improving existing residential neighborhoods. Thus, continuation of the existing plans would likely result in greater impacts to aesthetics and visual quality, as this Alternative would not provide the benefit of an integrated approach to future development in the SPA that takes advantage of its proximity to the Metro Gold Line. Alternative 1 would result in greater greenhouse gas emissions, as it would not reduce vehicle trips to the same extent as the proposed Plan (because of the plan's TOD focus), despite policies with regard to improving air quality and reducing energy consumption.

Currently, the SPA contains approximately 1,842,178 sf of nonresidential/commercial development, 2,008 single-family residential units and 5,842 multi-family residential units (Los Angeles 2012). The

General Plan and the East Los Angeles Community Plan do not have caps for future growth in the SPA, as noted. Therefore, if growth in the SPA exceeds that of the proposed Plan, all population-related impacts would also be greater, and potentially significant. This would include population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. It would be expected that impacts related to geology and soils, hazards, hydrology, and land use would be similar to the impacts of the proposed Plan.

In summary, the greater level of growth in the SPA that would likely occur under Alternative 1 would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Plan.

■ Finding

Overall, Alternative 1 would reduce adverse environmental impacts when compared with the development under the proposed Plan. Therefore, this Alternative would be an environmentally superior alternative to the Proposed Plan. However, Alternative 1 would not address any of the project objectives. It is found pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Chapter 9 (Statement of Overriding Considerations) of these Findings, make infeasible the No Project Alternative described in the EIR.

■ Facts Supporting Finding

Alternative 1 would not meet most of the project objectives, as it would not provide the complementary mix of uses as under the proposed Plan. It would not: provide for the community's transition from its predominately low-medium density to medium density residential and fragmented development pattern into an attractive and desirable transit and pedestrian-oriented urban community containing distinct and quality mixed-use neighborhoods and districts with housing, office, retail, restaurants, personal services, hotels, community facilities, and parks; develop a mix and choices of use to enable residents and workers to meet their basic needs within the East Los Angeles community; develop land uses and densities that maximize ridership and support public investment in transit facilities, while reducing regional traffic congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions; develop housing in the East Los Angeles community area for a variety of persons and households who choose to live in an active, urban environment; match new housing opportunities with jobs in the East Los Angeles community area, enabling residents to live close to where they work; allow for flexibility in the mix of land uses that responds to market conditions as they evolve over the next 20 years and beyond; provide opportunities for the development of uses that complement one another, such as locating retail, restaurants, hotels, and financial services near offices and residences; locate buildings to create an intimate "village" environment that encourages walking; establish zoning and design guidelines for ground floor uses and facades, streets, sidewalks, landscaping, lighting, and signage that facilitate pedestrian use; promote and support the completion of multi-use trails, sidewalks, and pathways to provide connectivity within the community area and maximize the use of transit by residents and workers through the placement and density of land uses, and the creation of safe and attractive pedestrian and bike routes to the Gold-Line light-rail station; break up internal "superblocks" into a smaller grid of streets that promotes pedestrian activity; develop an area-wide greenways network and parklands to unify and provide recreational amenities for residents and workers in the community area; promote the development of small, urban-scaled parklands, plazas, and public spaces providing recreational opportunities for residents and workers. It would meet some of

the project objectives related to improving the aesthetics and architectural appearance of the community area, providing a symbolic and functional entry to the community, increasing revenues and jobs, and improving roadway infrastructure.

The proposed Specific Plan contains numerous and specific goals intended to improve both the appearance and functionality of the East Los Angeles community, and, importantly, provide for transit-oriented development in a pattern that promotes walkability and bicycle use, as well as direct access to the Gold-Line light-rail station. Additionally, the proposed Plan includes a transit overlay zone to allow for transit-oriented uses, and also includes new residential development, which use is necessary to realize the full benefit of transit-oriented development. Alternative 1 would not achieve these goals, and would not achieve the realization of various community goals in the proposed Plan.

7.3.3 Alternative 2: Reduced Plan Map Area

■ Description of Alternative

This alternative would alter the SPA's northern and southern boundary to include only the 3rd and 1st Street corridors, reducing the SPA from 1,128.6 acres to 232 acres. The remaining redevelopment as outlined by the proposed Plan would not occur. The four Metro station areas located along 3rd Street would be transformed into transit centers, the same as under the proposed Plan, with a mix of commercial and residential uses. Mixed-use buildings would incorporate amenities such as public plazas, outdoor dining, and public art as provided by the proposed development in Specific Plan Chapter 5 (Appendix B). The transit centers would serve residents, visitors, and employees. An increase in the variety and quality of goods and services would be expected. The SPA's corridors would experience moderate change, with context-sensitive infill development, an improved streetscape, and an increase in the variety and quality of goods and services. Minor changes would be expected in the residential neighborhoods, consisting of improvements in streetscape, improvement in private property maintenance, and an increase in open space and green elements, such as street trees and landscaping. This alternative would not redevelop the corridors of Cesar Chavez Boulevard or Atlantic Boulevard as under the proposed Plan. This alternative would result in no additional single-family residential units, 7,453 fewer multifamily dwellings, and 2,438,747 less commercial square footage compared to the proposed Plan. Compared to existing conditions, Alternative 2 would result in an increase of 3,529 multifamily residential units and 4,323,675 sf of commercial uses.

■ Impact Summary of Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would not improve the visual quality of the Cesar Chavez or Atlantic Boulevard corridors or provide the same level of goods and services as the proposed Plan. This alternative would also result in similar impacts with regard to light, glare, and shadows. Impacts on air quality would be substantially similar to the impacts of the proposed Plan, with retention of a greater number of energy-inefficient structures would be offset by reduced development levels overall. Impacts to biological resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, would be substantially similar to the proposed Plan. Impacts related to cultural resources, population/housing, public services, and recreation would be less compared to the proposed Plan.

Impacts related to noise would remain significant and unavoidable, although reduced compared to the proposed Plan. Intersection impacts would remain significant under Alternative 2. Significant and unavoidable impacts would remain after implementation of those mitigation measures. Therefore, even though the growth accommodated by Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan, and would still include TOD, Alternative 2 would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Plan.

■ Finding

Overall, Alternative 2 would reduce adverse environmental impacts when compared with the development under the proposed Plan. However, Alternative 2 would not address many of the project objectives. It is found pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Chapter 9 (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 2 described in the EIR.

■ Facts Supporting Finding

Alternative 2 would minimally meet some of the project objectives, as it would not include the full extent of TOD development as under the proposed Plan. It would not: provide for the full extent of the community's transition from its predominately low-medium density to medium density and limited development pattern into a fully utilized transit and pedestrian-oriented urban community containing distinct and quality mixed-use neighborhoods and districts with housing, office, retail, restaurants, personal services, hotels, community facilities, and parks. As mentioned previously, an increase in the variety and quality of goods and services would be expected. However, this alternative would result in no additional single-family residential units, 7,453 fewer multifamily dwellings, and 2,438,747 less commercial square footage compared to the proposed Plan.

The proposed Plan and Alternative 2 both contain specific goals intended to improve both the appearance and functionality of the East Los Angeles community, and, importantly, provide for transit-oriented development in a pattern that promotes walkability and bicycle use, as well as direct access to the Gold-Line light-rail station. However, the proposed Plan would implement such improvements on a higher scale, which would adhere to the project objectives more closely. Additionally, this alternative would result in no additional single-family residential units, 7,453 fewer multifamily dwellings, and 2,438,747 less commercial square footage compared to the proposed Plan. New residential development is necessary to realize the full benefit of transit-oriented development. As such Alternative 2 would not achieve these goals, and would not achieve the realization of various community goals in the proposed Plan.

7.3.4 Alternative 3: Reduced Development

■ Description of Alternative

Alternative 3 represents a 50 percent reduction in overall development in all proposed zones of the proposed Plan. Compared to the proposed Plan, Alternative 3 would increase single-family residential units by 1,144, multifamily residential by 5,491 units, and commercial square footage by 3,381,211 sf.

Some or all building heights would be lower than under the proposed Plan to accommodate the reduced development.

■ Impact Summary of Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would have substantially similar impacts related to biological impacts, cultural resources, geology, minerals and soils, hydrology and water quality, and land use planning compared to the proposed Plan. It would help to reduce potential impact areas to a lesser extent in the impact areas of aesthetics, hazards and hazardous materials, population/housing and employment, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems due to a minimized development scenario reducing the overall potential for such impacts. While the significant impacts of the proposed Plan related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, traffic, and water supply would be reduced compared to the proposed Plan, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

■ Finding

Overall, Alternative 2 would reduce adverse environmental impacts when compared with the development under the proposed Plan. However, Alternative 2 would not address many of the project objectives. It is found pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Chapter 9 (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 2 described in the EIR.

7.3.5 Facts Supporting Finding

Alternative 3 would minimally meet some of the project objectives, as it would reduce overall development by 50 percent of the full extent of TOD development as under the proposed Plan. It would not: provide for the full extent of the community's transition from its predominately low-medium density to medium density and limited development pattern into a fully utilized transit and pedestrian-oriented urban community containing distinct and quality mixed-use neighborhoods and districts with housing, office, retail, restaurants, personal services, hotels, community facilities, and parks. However, this alternative would result in an increase in single-family residential units by 1,444 units, 5,491 more multifamily units, and an additional 3,381,211 commercial square footage compared to the proposed Plan. As such, the proposed Plan and Alternative 3 both contain specific goals intended to improve both the appearance and functionality of the East Los Angeles community, and, importantly, provide for transit-oriented development in a pattern that promotes walkability and bicycle use, as well as direct access to the Gold-Line light-rail station. However, the proposed Plan would implement such improvements on a higher scale, which would adhere to the project objectives more closely. Additionally, this alternative would result in a reduction of commercial use square footage as compared to the proposed Plan. New commercial development is necessary to realize the full benefit of transit-oriented development. As such Alternative 3 would not achieve these goals, and would not achieve the realization of various community goals in the proposed Plan.

7.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that an analysis of alternatives to an originally proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that: “If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘No Project’ Alternative, then the EIR shall identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

The selection of an environmentally superior alternative is based on an evaluation of the extent to which the alternatives reduce or eliminate the significant impacts associated with the Project, and on a comparison of the remaining environmental impacts of each alternative.

Neither of the build alternatives would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Plan to less than significant, although impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, and traffic would likely be reduced in degree under both alternatives. Alternative 3 would reduce the proposed Plan’s significant impacts to a greater extent because it represents the least amount of development spread over a larger area than Alternative 2. Based on the information provided, Alternative 3 is environmentally superior. The proposed Specific Plan is designed to optimize the benefits of TOD along existing corridors and to maximize revitalization of the SPA in view of the Metro Gold Line completion. Alternative 3 would not achieve most of the project’s objectives.

However, Alternative 3 would not achieve all of the project objectives. It would not help to cultivate new job creation through the development of commercial land use and address parking through development regulations for infill development and new businesses. The Environmentally Superior alternative is Alternative 3.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 8 Findings Regarding General Impact Categories

8.1 POTENTIAL SECONDARY EFFECTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) requires mitigation measures to be discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project if the mitigation measure(s) cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the proposed project. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, proposed mitigation measures that could cause potential impacts were evaluated. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary environmental effects that could occur as a result of implementing mitigation measures.

Implementation of the Project's traffic mitigation measures and improvements/upgrades to the area's water and electrical infrastructure have the potential to result in significant impacts, after the incorporation of project mitigation measures, that are beyond those identified in the above sections. Specifically, implementation of the Project's traffic mitigation measures have the potential to contribute to significant regional construction air quality impacts during periods when multiple off-site roadway improvements are under construction at the same time and/or construction of a single off-site roadway improvement occurs concurrently with average or peak levels of on-site construction. Potential significant construction noise impacts could also occur for limited durations when mechanical construction equipment would be used within 200 to 300 feet of noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residences, outdoor patios/plazas) given the incremental difference between construction noise levels and ambient noise levels in the area.

With regard to off-site improvements to the area's water and electrical infrastructure, significant short-term construction noise and construction regional air quality impacts similar to those described above could also occur given the incremental difference between construction noise levels and ambient noise levels in the area and if the off-site water and electrical improvements occur concurrently with average or peak levels of on-site construction.

8.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This includes ways in which a project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) states:

Discuss the 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. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the

environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The Project represents infill development within an urbanized area of SPA on under-utilized parcels. The Specific Plan would result in increased housing and population growth, but would be within the forecasts for such growth as outlined in the County General Plan. The associated utility and public service improvements described above would be growth-accommodating rather than growth inducing. Therefore, the Project's growth inducing impacts would be less than significant.

8.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates that:

Uses 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.

Construction of development pursuant to the Specific Plan would require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or that may renew slowly enough to be considered nonrenewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel, and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper, and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics), and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

Operation of development pursuant to the Specific Plan would involve ongoing consumption of nonrenewable resources such as natural gas, and crude oil. Petroleum products (diesel fuel, fuel oil, gasoline, and petrochemical synthetics) would be consumed directly and indirectly by proposed Project activities in terms of electricity generation, and as fuels used by vehicles bringing visitors and employees to the SPA. To the extent that fossil fuels remain a principal source of energy within the economy, the proposed Plan represents a long-term commitment of these resources. Development would irreversibly increase the commitment of public services, such as providing police and fire services. Operation of the Project would also result in an increased commitment of public maintenance services such as waste disposal and treatment, as well as an increased commitment of the infrastructure that serves the Project Site. The use of potentially hazardous materials would occur in the SPA. Such materials would be used, handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable government regulations and standards, which would protect against a significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from an accidental release of hazardous materials.

The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development would limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during the operation of development pursuant to the proposed Plan. However, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the County of Los Angeles and the Southern California region as a whole. Further, use of such resources would be of a relatively small scale in relation to the proposed Plan's

fulfillment of regional and local urban design and development goals for the area. These goals are intended to promote smart growth that would reduce resource consumption by promoting TOD, reducing vehicle trips, and incorporating sustainable design features. Therefore, the use of such resources for development pursuant to the proposed Plan would be reduced as compared to development in other locations that would not fulfill such goals as fully. As such, the use of such resources would not be considered significant.

8.4 ADDITIONAL LEAD AGENCY CONSIDERATIONS UNDER CEQA

1. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the County has reviewed and considered the information found in the EIR and has reached its own conclusions on whether and how to approve the Project and make these findings.
2. Pursuant to PRC Section 21002.1(d) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the County, acting as a lead agency under CEQA, has determined that the EIR complies with the mandates of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and fully discloses and analyzes the effects of those activities involved in the Project which the County is required by law to carry out or approve.
3. The County finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period.
4. The mitigation measures identified for the proposed Plan were included in the Draft and Final EIR. With the County's approval of the proposed Plan, those mitigation measures were revised and finalized in the County's MMRP. The County's MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures also adopted by the County in connection with the approval of the Project that address the direct or indirect environmental effects of those parts of the Project that are subject to the County's jurisdiction. The County finds that the impacts of the Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the County's MMRP and those mitigation measures previously incorporated into the Project by the County through its adoption of the County's MMRP.
5. In accordance with CEQA, the County's MMRP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of PRC Section 21081.6, the County hereby adopts the County's MMRP. Similarly, the County hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth in the County's MMRP as conditions of approval for the Project.
6. The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012.
7. The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.
9. In accordance with CEQA, the County's MMRP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of PRC Section 21081.6, the County hereby adopts the County's MMRP. Similarly, the County hereby adopts each of the

mitigation measures expressly set forth in the County's MMRP as conditions of approval for the Project.

10. The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012.
11. The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

CHAPTER 9 Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Final EIR has identified and discussed significant environmental effects that will occur as a result of implementation of the proposed East Los Angeles 3rd Street Specific Plan. With implementation of the mitigation measures and project design features, discussed in the Final EIR, these effects can be mitigated to levels considered less than significant except for significant, unavoidable adverse project-specific and/or cumulative impacts in the areas of air quality and noise, as described above in Chapter 5 (Environmental Impacts Found to Be Significant and Unavoidable after Mitigation). Specifically, implementation of the proposed Plan would result in the following significant impacts even after imposition of all feasible mitigation measures and would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations:

■ Air Quality

- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).
- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

■ Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- > Implementation of the Specific Plan could conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

■ Noise

- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- > Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

■ Transportation/Traffic

- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

■ **Utilities/Service Systems**

- > Implementation of the Specific Plan would require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

CEQA Section 21081 provides that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project were carried out unless the agency makes specific findings with respect to those significant environmental effects. Where a public agency finds that economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, makes infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR, and thereby leave significant unavoidable effects, the public agency must also find that “specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.”

In making this determination, the Lead Agency is guided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, which provides as follows:

- (a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”
- (b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to [CEQA] Section 15091.

Having considered the unavoidable adverse significant impacts of the proposed Plan, the Board hereby determines that all feasible mitigation measures have been adopted to minimize, substantially reduce, or avoid the significant impacts identified in the Final EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts. Further, the Board finds that economic, social, and other considerations of proposed Plan outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts described above, and it adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. In making this Finding, the Board has balanced the benefits of the proposed Plan against its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and has indicated its willingness to accept those risks.

The following statements are in support of the Board's action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The benefits from approving the proposed Plan include those related to the development of the area as a vital economic component of the County's fiscal well being. The Project Objectives identify the benefits of Project implementation.

- Transform 3rd Street through infill of vacant properties and reuse of underutilized buildings, and transform the areas around the Gold line stations into vibrant, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use centers
- Enhance the image of the community through visually attractive and high-quality development that is in scale with the adjoining neighborhoods
- Protect and enhance the character of residential neighborhoods through streetscape improvements, more open space, and improved property maintenance
- Cultivate new job creation and economic development
- Address parking through development regulations and strategies to ensure that adequate parking is provided for new uses and reasonable parking regulations for infill development and new businesses
- Achieve a balanced mobility system through improvement of pedestrian and bicycle connections to public transit and enhancement of the built environment
- Increase access to open space and recreation opportunities
- Protect and promote local history and culture, including protection of existing cultural and historical resources and opportunities for public art

The Board finds the proposed Plan's objectives would include benefits to the County. In addition to these objectives, the following benefits constitute an overriding consideration warranting approval of the proposed Plan despite the significant and unavoidable environmental effects:

1. The Project will enhance the future economic vitality of the County of Los Angeles by providing commercial and residential growth. Such growth will be located in proximity to the Metro Gold Line stations in East Los Angeles and in proximity to regional freeways and other transit, and will enhance the East Los Angeles area as a high activity regional center destination, which may attract more business to the area and encourage local job creation.
2. The Project would place jobs and housing within walking distance of transit facilities and uses that meet residents and employees basic needs, reducing the number of vehicle miles traveled in the East Los Angeles area, and therefore reducing regional traffic congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions.
3. The Project would allow for the revitalization and redevelopment of underutilized areas of the Specific Plan area.
4. The Project would improve the visual appearance of the Specific Plan area.
5. The Project would allow for development of property and uses that would contribute additional tax revenues for needed capital improvements and on-going public services for residents and workers in the East Los Angeles area.

In light of the foregoing, and the information contained within the Final EIR and other portions of the Project record, the Board concludes that implementation of the proposed East Los Angeles 3rd Street Specific Plan will result in the development of beneficial transit-oriented, mixed uses as outlined above. The Board further concludes that these benefits outweigh the significant, unavoidable environmental impacts associated with development of the proposed Plan and, accordingly, adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations. Substantial evidence in the record supports this conclusion, and can be found in the Final EIR, record of proceedings, and public hearings for the proposed Plan.