

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY METRO AREA PLAN

## CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

SEPTEMBER 2023 | STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2022020274



---

CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of  
Overriding Considerations

# Los Angeles County Metro Area Plan

---

PROJECT NO. PRJ2021-004165

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2022020274

SEPTEMBER 2023

*Prepared for:*

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**



320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

*Prepared by:*

**DUDEK**

38 North Marengo Avenue  
Pasadena, California 91101

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
i.	Introduction ..... 3
	A. Findings Of Fact ..... 3
	B. Record Of Proceedings ..... 4
	C. Custodian And Location Of Records..... 4
	D. Nature Of Findings ..... 4
	E. Independent Judgment..... 5
	F. Certification Of The Program Environmental Impact Report ..... 5
	G. Recirculation ..... 5
	H. Notice Of Determination ..... 6
	I. Mitigation Monitoring And Reporting Program ..... 6
	J. Relationship Of Findings To Peir ..... 7
	K. Severability ..... 7
	L. Environmental Review Process ..... 7
ii.	Project Summary ..... 9
	A. Project Location ..... 9
	B. Project Objectives ..... 10
	C. Project Description ..... 11
	D. Discretionary Actions ..... 13
iii.	Summary Of Environmental Impacts ..... 14
iv.	Findings Regarding Significant And Unavoidable Impacts..... 15
	A. Air Quality ..... 17
	B. Biological Resources..... 22
	C. Cultural Resources ..... 24
	D. Hazards And Hazardous Materials ..... 32
	E. Noise..... 34
	F. Population And Housing ..... 38
	G. Public Services ..... 39
	H. Recreation ..... 40
	I. Tribal Cultural Resources ..... 41
	J. Utilities And Service Systems ..... 43
v.	Findings Regarding Growth-Inducing Impacts ..... 45
vi.	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives ..... 47
	A) Alternatives Considered And Eliminated During The Planning Process ..... 48
	B) Alternatives Under Consideration ..... 50
	C) Environmentally Superior Alternative ..... 52
vii.	Statement Of Overriding Considerations ..... 52

## I. INTRODUCTION

### a. Findings of Fact

The County of Los Angeles (County), as the lead agency, has prepared the following Findings of Fact (Findings) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) for the Los Angeles County Metro Area Plan (Project or proposed Project). These Findings are made pursuant to PRC Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6, and the State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. The environmental effects of the proposed Project are addressed in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final PEIR) dated August 2023, which is incorporated by reference herein.

PRC Section 21081(a) and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) require that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report (EIR) has been completed that identifies one or more significant effects thereof, unless such public agency makes one or more of the following findings:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which 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.

CEQA also requires that the Findings made pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 be supported by substantial evidence in the record (Section 15091[b] of the State CEQA Guidelines). Under CEQA, substantial evidence means enough relevant information has been provided (and reasonable inferences from this information may be made) that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. Substantial evidence must include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts (Section 15384 of the State CEQA Guidelines).

Further, in accordance with PRC Section 21081 and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, whenever significant effects cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered “acceptable.” In that case, the decision-making agency may prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Final PEIR and all other information in the record of proceedings for the Project, the County hereby makes and adopts the following Findings.

**b. Record of Proceedings**

The Record of Proceedings for the Project includes, but is not limited to, the following documents and other evidence, which are incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these Findings:

- The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the project;
- All responses to the NOP received by the County;
- The Recirculated Draft PEIR and all technical appendices;
- The Final PEIR;
- All written comments submitted by agencies, organizations, or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Recirculated Draft PEIR;
- All responses to the written comments included in the Final PEIR;
- All written comments and oral public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the project at which such testimony was taken;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in any responses to comments in the Final PEIR;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials referenced in, or otherwise relied upon during the preparation of the Recirculated Draft PEIR and the Final PEIR;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to, federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by PRC Section 21167.6(e).

**c. Custodian and Location of Records**

The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (County Planning) is the custodian of the record of proceedings for the County's actions on the Project. The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings are located at 320 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 and on the County's website at <https://planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/>. This information is provided in compliance with the PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

**d. Nature of Findings**

Any finding made by the County shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes Findings by the County, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. The County intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these

Findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by the County with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final PEIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

**e. Independent Judgment**

The County has exercised independent judgment in accordance with PRC 21082.1(c) in retaining its own environmental consultant, directing the consultant in the preparation of the PEIR, as well as reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant. The County hereby finds that it has independently reviewed, analyzed, and revised the Final PEIR and that the Final PEIR reflects the independent judgment of the County.

**f. Certification of the Program Environmental Impact Report**

Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c) of the PRC, the County hereby certifies and finds that the Final PEIR for the Los Angeles County Metro Area Plan, State Clearinghouse No. 2022020274, has been completed in compliance with the CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Final PEIR consists of the following documents: (1) Recirculated Draft PEIR and Appendices; (2) comments and recommendations received on the Recirculated Draft PEIR, as well as responses to comments received; (3) a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Recirculated Draft PEIR; (4) minor revisions to the Recirculated Draft PEIR; and (5) MMRP. The Final PEIR describes the Project, addresses the potential significant environmental impacts of the Project, and identifies feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce, minimize, or avoid those potential impacts.

The County hereby further certifies and finds that it received, independently reviewed/analyzed, and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR as well as all hearings and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

**g. Recirculation**

The County finds that the Recirculated Draft PEIR does not require recirculation under PRC 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires recirculation of an EIR prior to certification of the Final EIR when “significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review.” As described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5:

New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

In addition, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b) provides that "recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies and amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR."

As such, the County makes the following findings:

1. None of the public comments submitted to the County regarding the Recirculated Draft PEIR or responses to comments present any significant new information that would require the PEIR to be recirculated for additional public review.
2. No new significant environmental impacts would result from new or modified mitigation measures proposed to be implemented.
3. The Recirculated Draft PEIR adequately analyzed Project alternatives and there are no feasible Project alternatives or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project.
4. The Recirculated Draft PEIR was not fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature and did not preclude meaningful public review and comment.
5. Any new information in the Final PEIR has been provided merely to clarify or amplify information in the Recirculated Draft PEIR and does not individually or collectively constitute significant new information within the meaning of PRC Section 21092.1 or the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The new information added to the Final PEIR does not involve new significant environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact.

#### **h. Notice of Determination**

A Notice of Determination will be filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk and the State Clearinghouse within five (5) working days of final Project approval.

#### **i. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

An MMRP has been prepared for the Project. Pursuant to PRC Section 21081.6, the County, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Project. The MMRP is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The County hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference, meets the requirements of PRC Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant environmental effects of the Project.

**j. Relationship of Findings to PEIR**

These Findings are based on the most current information available. Accordingly, to the extent there are any apparent conflicts or inconsistencies between the Recirculated Draft PEIR and the Final PEIR, on the one hand, and these Findings, on the other, these Findings shall control and the Recirculated Draft PEIR and Final PEIR or both, as the case may be, are hereby amended as set forth in these Findings.

**k. Severability**

If any term, provision, or portion of these Findings or the application of these Findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these Findings, or their application to other actions related to the Project, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by the County.

**l. Environmental Review Process**

**Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting.** In accordance with Section 15082(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the County circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day public review period that began on February 14, 2022, and ended on March 17, 2022. The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, public agencies, special districts, responsible and trustee agencies, and other interested parties; filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk; and published in the Our Weekly, LA Wave, East LA Tribune, Gardena Valley News, The Sentinel, and La Opinion newspapers. Printed copies of the NOP were available for public review at the Martin Luther King Jr. Library, Willowbrook Library, Florence Express Library, Huntington Park Library, East Los Angeles Library, Woodcrest Library, City Terrace Library, and East Rancho Dominguez Library. In addition, electronic copies of the NOP were made available in English and Spanish for download on the County's website at: [planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/](http://planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/). The NOP and comment letters are provided in Appendix A of the Recirculated Draft PEIR. Additionally, a virtual Scoping Meeting was held on March 2, 2022, from 5:00 PM to 6:30 PM that was made available through the County's website at: [planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/](http://planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/). Scoping Meeting comments are provided in Table 1-2, Scoping Meeting Comments Summary, of the Recirculated Draft PEIR.

**Draft Program Environmental Impact Report.** The Draft PEIR was circulated for public review from November 17, 2022, through January 16, 2023, which exceeded the 45-day minimum required by CEQA. However, the County continued to accept public comments on the Draft PEIR that were received by January 31, 2023, before 5:00 pm. After the conclusion of the public comment period for the Draft PEIR, the County elected to revise the Project to reflect County-driven revisions and to address comments received during and after the Draft PEIR public review period. The most notable change to the Project is the removal of the proposed industrial rezoning to establish the M-0.5 (Artisan Production and Custom Manufacturing) and the LSP (Life Science Park) zones along with the associated development standards that were outlined in the Draft Metro Area Plan Implementation Ordinance. Instead, the revised Project proposes Implementation Program 10, Industrial Land Use Strategy program (Industrial Program). This program requires the County to



conduct additional research and outreach to interested stakeholders; gather relevant land use and economic data; conduct additional analysis, if necessary; and adopt the M-0.5 and LSP zones on appropriate candidate parcels within five years of Project approval. The conceptual definitions for M-0.5 and LSP zones, locations of candidate parcels, and development standards are outlined in Appendix G, Industrial Land Use Strategy Program Conceptual Zones and Figure Maps, of the Metro Area Plan. The revised Project also includes updated Metro Area Plan goals and policies; mapping of the Green Zone (-GZ) Combining Zone on industrially-zoned lots; and Conditional Use Permit requirement for K-12 schools. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, the County prepared a Recirculated Draft PEIR to analyze the revised Project; add new feasible mitigation measures; and update Project goals, policies, applicable regulatory settings, and other information. The Recirculated Draft PEIR wholly replaces the Draft PEIR that was circulated in November 2022. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(1), public comments received on the Draft PEIR do not require a written response in the Final PEIR.

The Recirculated Draft PEIR was released for the required 45-day public review period that began on June 12, 2023, and ended on July 28, 2023. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Recirculated Draft PEIR were submitted to the State Clearinghouse; posted at the County Clerk's office; and published in Our Weekly, Lynwood Press Wave, East LA Tribune, Gardena Valley News, Los Angeles Sentinel, and La Opinion newspapers. Hardcopies of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, with electronic copies of all appendices, were available for public review at the main office of Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (County Planning) (320 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012) as well as the following libraries: AC Bilbrew Library, City Terrace Library, East Los Angeles Library, East Rancho Dominguez Library, Florence Library, Huntington Park Library, Woodcrest Library, and Willowbrook Library. The Recirculated Draft PEIR was also posted on County Planning website for public review at: [planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/](https://planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/).

**Final Program Environmental Impact Report.** The Final PEIR addresses the comments received during the public review period and includes minor changes to the text of the Draft PEIR in accordance with comments that necessitated revisions. This Final PEIR is made available to County decision-makers for potential certification as the environmental document for the proposed Project. All agencies who commented on the Recirculated Draft PEIR will be provided with a copy of the Final PEIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b). The Final PEIR is posted on the County's website at: [planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/](https://planning.lacounty.gov/long-range-planning/metro-area-plan/documents/).

The minor clarifications, modifications, and editorial corrections that were made to the Recirculated Draft PEIR are shown in Chapter 3, Revisions to the Recirculated Draft PEIR, of this Final PEIR. None of the revisions that have been made to the Recirculated Draft PEIR resulted in new significant impacts; none of the revisions resulted in a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact identified in the Recirculated Draft PEIR; and none of the revisions brought forth a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure that is considerably different from those set forth in the Recirculated Draft PEIR. Furthermore, the revisions do not cause the Recirculated Draft PEIR to be flawed such that it precludes meaningful public review. As none of the CEQA criteria for recirculation have been met, recirculation of the Recirculated Draft PEIR is not warranted.

**Public Hearings and Staff Report Recommendations.** A public hearing will be held before the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission (RPC) on September 13, 2023. The Notice of Public Hearing before the Regional Planning Commission was published in the Our Weekly,

Lynwood Press Wave, East LA Tribune, Gardena Valley News, Los Angeles Sentinel, and La Opinion newspapers and on the County Planning website. The hearing notice was also sent to property owners whose properties had been considered for rezoning and to interested individuals and organizations. At the conclusion of this public hearing, the RPC may certify the PEIR; adopt findings relative to the Project's environmental effects after implementation of mitigation measures; approve, deny, or modify the Project; and make a recommendation to the County Board of Supervisors regarding the Project.

To address comments from the public and correct technical errors, the Report to the Regional Planning Commission (staff report) recommends revisions to the Metro Area Plan and the Implementation Ordinance for consideration by the RPC. Revisions to Implementation Program 10 of the Metro Area Plan are recommended to remove the required adoption of two new industrial zones from the Program. The proposed revisions to Program 10 would mainly require the County to conduct a feasibility study and provide recommendations on industrial land use and zoning strategies that are supported by the feasibility analysis. Other components of Implementation Program 10 would substantively remain the same as it would still apply to the Metro Area Plan communities of East Los Angeles, Florence-Firestone, West Rancho Dominguez-Victoria and Willowbrook; require the Program to be developed within five years of Project approval; include additional public outreach, research and study; and require collaboration with the Department of Economic Opportunity to explore other non-land use and zoning tools. Eliminating the industrial zone change component from Program 10 would reduce the potential environmental impacts associated with the buildout assumptions that are analyzed in the Recirculated Draft PEIR due to the elimination of the industrial zones. No new significant environmental impacts and no substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur from these modifications. Additionally, the Recirculated Draft PEIR analyzed Alternative C – Housing Element / RHNA Only, which accounts for the no industrial buildout scenario and concluded that it would be the environmentally superior alternative. As such, the recommended revisions to Implementation Program 10 are not significant, as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5 and therefore do not require additional analysis or any changes to the conclusions of the Recirculated Draft PEIR.

Other recommended revisions to the Metro Area Plan and Implementation Ordinance merely clarify and make insignificant changes to correct minor technical errors. No new significant environmental impacts and no substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur from these modifications. These recommended revisions are also not significant, as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5 and therefore do not require additional analysis or any changes to the conclusions of the Recirculated Draft PEIR.

## **II. PROJECT SUMMARY**

### **a. Project Location**

The Metro Planning Area is one of the 11 Planning Areas of the County. The Project is only applicable to the seven unincorporated communities located within the Metro Planning Area, which include: East Los Angeles, East Rancho Dominguez, Florence-Firestone, Walnut Park, West Athens-Westmont, West Rancho Dominguez-Victoria, and Willowbrook. These unincorporated communities are collectively referred to as the "Project area" throughout this document.

**b. Project Objectives**

The Project's statement of objectives is defined below:

The Metro Area Plan aims to build off the character and existing assets of each of the seven unincorporated communities by identifying opportunities for equitable and sustainable investment while addressing issues and concerns voiced by community members. A primary goal of the proposed Project is to consolidate regulations that currently exist across multiple sections of the Zoning Code and to simplify and streamline land use and zoning regulations in the Project area. The Project would implement zoning recommendations from the recently approved General Plan Housing Element 2021-2029 (Housing Element) and considers environmental justice and equity to set forth land uses and policies that address topics such as: the need for affordable housing; strategies to reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality; economic development; reductions to industrial-related environmental hazards; identification of culturally significant landmarks and community practices; and strategies to facilitate and support community-serving green spaces in urban areas. In conjunction with the General Plan, the Metro Area Plan would serve as the primary planning document for the Project area.

In addition to the above statement, the Project Objectives are to:

1. Advance smart growth principles to create communities that are more sustainable where people of all ages can live, work, play, and run errands without the burden of car ownership.
2. Provide for a diversity of neighborhoods, residential densities, safe and sanitary housing types, healthy food options, recreation, public facilities, and shopping/commercial services to meet the needs of the communities.
3. Provide a safe, reliable, equitable, and sustainable transportation network to encourage walking, biking, transit, and other nonautomotive travel to enhance public health and safety. A decrease in vehicle miles traveled and corresponding reduction in greenhouse gas emissions would improve air quality.
4. Foster a strong and diverse local economy by providing opportunities that attract economic development, businesses, and job creation; increase competitiveness; and promote economic growth. Support design elements to improve land use compatibility between industrial and residential land uses that are in close proximity to each other.
5. Further opportunities to preserve and enhance existing cultural and historic resources that are important to the local community by documenting existing historic context and resources.
6. Incorporate the proposed land use policy changes/zoning recommendations identified in the recently adopted Housing Element to increase the diversity of housing types that are affordable at varied income levels.
7. Increase opportunities for local-serving and small commercial businesses to be located near their local customer base.

### c. Project Description

The proposed Metro Area Plan is a community-based plan that will guide regional growth and development in the Project area. The Project would facilitate development of approximately 30,968 additional dwelling units, which would generate approximately 108,390 additional Project area residents, and approximately 106 parcels with Accessory Commercial Units (ACUs), which would generate approximately 176 new jobs. The Project also proposes 10 implementation programs, including the Industrial Land Use Strategy Program (Industrial Program), which, within five years of Project approval, would adopt two new industrial zones on candidate parcels that would accommodate approximately 1,124,731 square feet of cleaner alternative industrial, such as new artisan manufacturing and life sciences facilities, which would generate approximately 3,515 new jobs within the Project area. As part of the Industrial Program, the County would conduct additional research and outreach to property owners of candidate parcels and other members of the public. Future actions would include, but are not limited to, gathering relevant land use and economic data, meetings with local stakeholders, and additional analysis, if necessary, relative to the Industrial Program components. The primary Project components are listed below.

#### General Plan Amendment

The General Plan Amendment will:

- Establish the Metro Area Plan, which will include areawide and community-specific goals and policies as well as implementation programs for the unincorporated communities of East Los Angeles, East Rancho Dominguez, Florence-Firestone, Walnut Park, West Athens-Westmont, West Rancho Dominguez- Victoria, and Willowbrook;
- Rescind the East Los Angeles Community Plan, the Walnut Park Neighborhood Plan, and the West Athens-Westmont Community Plan and:
  - Replace community-specific land use designations with “like-for-like” existing General Plan land use designations (as established in the 2015 General Plan Update);
  - Incorporate applicable components of these plans into the Metro Area Plan as areawide or community-specific goals and policies; and
  - Amend Chapter 6: Land Use Element to update Table 6.2: Land Use Designations to delete references to the East Los Angeles Community Plan, Walnut Park Neighborhood Plan, and West Athens-Westmont Community Plan in the note for the General Commercial (CG) land use designation;
- Add Guiding Principle #6 - Promote Strengths, Community Voice, and Equity Outcomes in Chapter 3: Guiding Principles.
- Update land use policy map that utilizes the General Plan Land Use Legend as proposed by the Project, including the following to:
  - Incorporate the proposed land use policy changes identified in the Housing Element; and
  - Incorporate other technical clean-ups to correct mapping errors or misalignments to reflect the correct land use designations; and

- Amend Chapter 15 to add a provision authorizing staff the ability to update the pagination format and content of the General Plan administratively to incorporate all adopted changes to the General Plan.

### Zoning Map Changes

The Project would update the zoning map to maintain consistency with the updated land use policy map; revise existing zoning map overlays to establish the Planning Area Standards District (PASD) overlay; delete the existing Willowbrook and East Rancho Dominguez Community Standards Districts (CSDs), modify the East Los Angeles, West Athens-Westmont and Walnut Park CSDs boundaries, delete or modify various CSD Area Specific Boundaries, and incorporate existing Setback Districts into the updated CSD Sub-Areas; map the Green Zone (-GZ) Combining Zone on industrially-zoned lots in the unincorporated communities of East Los Angeles, Florence-Firestone, Walnut Park, West Rancho Dominguez-Victoria to identify parcels currently subject to the Green Zone Ordinance; and incorporate all Project proposed rezoning efforts, including incorporation of proposed rezoning outside of Florence-Firestone as identified in the Housing Element to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals for Los Angeles County, rezoning certain A-1 parcels to a residential zone to better reflect existing residential uses, and other technical clean-ups to correct mapping errors and eliminate unnecessary split-zoning or spot-zoning.

### Zoning Code Amendments

The Project would amend Planning and Zoning (Title 22) of the County Code to:

- Establish ACU standards to allow for the development and operation of ACUs as an accessory use on corner lots in existing residential-only neighborhoods;
- Establish a Planning Area Standards District (PASD) with areawide regulations and include community-specific standards in CSDs on an as-needed basis under the PASD regulatory framework;
- Revise or delete six existing CSDs – East Los Angeles CSD, East Rancho Dominguez CSD, Walnut Park CSD, West Athens-Westmont CSD, West Rancho Dominguez-Victoria CSD, and Willowbrook CSD - as the result of the streamlining effort associated with the establishment of the PASD mentioned above;
- Re-categorize the City Terrace, Walnut Park, Southwest, Second Unit Eastside, and First Unit Eastside Setback Districts as CSD Sub-Areas under the PASD regulatory framework;
- Allow Shared Kitchen Complexes in certain commercial and industrial zones;
- Require CUPs for K-12 schools and establish development standards for K-12 schools;
- Require a 20% lower-income set-aside in housing developments on certain sites that are rezoned or identified in the Housing Element 2021-2029;
- Reorganize the Connect Southwest Los Angeles: A TOD Specific Plan for West Athens-Westmont and the Willowbrook TOD Specific Plan so that only regulations and development standards are codified in Title 22 and the non-regulation chapters of these

specific plans are streamlined with some technical clean-up. The Title 22 regulations would include a new provision to allow short-term rental as an accessory use to a residence in Zones CSLA CC, CSLA MXD-1 and CSLA MXD-2 for the Connect Southwest Los Angeles: A TOD Specific Plan and in Zones MU-1, MU-2, the MLK Medical Zone and the MLK Medical Overlay for the Willowbrook TOD Specific Plan;

- Amend the East Los Angeles Third Street Form-Based Code to allow ACUs and shared kitchen complexes in certain transect zones, clarify regulations on blade signs, require CUPs for K-12 schools, allow short-term rental as an accessory use in all Transect Zones where residential uses are permitted in order to maintain consistency with the pending Short-Term Rental Ordinance, and delete the definition of “school” which is inconsistent with the Countywide definition; and
- Amend Chapter 22.418 Florence-Firestone Zones & Development Standards to allow shared kitchen complexes and require CUPs for K-12 schools in the Florence-Firestone TOD Specific Plan area.

#### Implementation Programs

The Project proposes 10 implementation programs, which include schedules and tasks intended to support and address the Project’s overall policy objectives. The implementation programs also inform the budget process and would be used to set funding priorities. The Project’s proposed implementation programs consist of the following: Program 1, Freeway Cap Parks; Program 2, Focused Intensive Historic Resources Surveys; Program 3, Metro Area Plan Historic Surveys; Program 4, Interpretation Plan for Commercial Corridors; Program 5, Commercial Corridors Legacy Business Retention Program; Program 6, Community Benefits Program; Program 7, Accessory Commercial Unit Program; Program 8, Mobile Food Vending Zoning Ordinance and Implementation; Program 9, Transit Oriented District (TOD) Eastside Extension Specific Plan; and Program 10, Industrial Land Use Strategy Program.

#### **d. Discretionary Actions**

These Findings set forth the environmental basis for the discretionary actions to be undertaken by the County for implementation of the Project. These actions include, but are not limited to, the approval of the following for the Project:

- Certification of the Program Environmental Impact Report.
- Adoption of General Plan Amendment No. RPPL2021011925
- Adoption of Zone Change No. RPPL2021011985
- Adoption of Advance Planning Project No. RPPL2022010129
- Adoption of Advance Planning Project No. RPPL2022010131
- Adoption of Advance Planning Project No. RPPL2022010133
- Adoption of Advance Planning Project No. RPPL2022010143

- Adoption of Advance Planning Project No. RPPL2021011918

### III. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Based on the Final PEIR discussion and analysis, the following is a summary of the environmental topics considered to have no impact, a less than significant impact, and a significant and unavoidable impact.

#### No Impact

The County finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the Project will have **no impacts** and require no mitigation measures with respect to the following issues:

- Aesthetics (Impact 4.1-3)
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources (Impacts 4.2-3 and 4.2-4)
- Biological Resources (Impacts 4.4-2 and 4.4-7)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Impacts 4.10-3 [iv], 4.10-5, 4.10-6, and 4.10-7)
- Recreation (Impact 4.16-4)

#### Less Than Significant Impact

The County finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the Project will have **less than significant impacts** and require no mitigation measures with respect to the following issues:

- Aesthetics (Impacts 4.1-1, 4.1-2, 4.1-4, and 4.1-5; Cumulative Impacts)
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources (Impacts 4.2-1, 4.2-2, 4.2-5; Cumulative Impacts)
- Air Quality (Impact 4.3-4)
- Biological Resources (Impacts 4.4-3, 4.4-4, 4.4-5, and 4.4-6)
- Cultural Resources (Impact 4.5-4)
- Energy (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)
- Geology and Soils (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Impacts 4.9-1, 4.9-3, 4.9-4, 4.9-5, 4.9-6, 4.9-7[i-iii], and 4.9-8)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Impacts 4.10-1, 4.10-2, 4.10-3 [i-iii], 4.10-4, 4.10-8; Cumulative Impacts)
- Land Use and Planning (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)
- Mineral Resources (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)

- Noise (Impact 4.13-3)
- Population and Housing (Impact 4.14-2)
- Public Services (Impact 4.15-1 [i-iii and v])
- Recreation (Impact 4.16-3)
- Transportation (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)
- Utilities and Service Systems (Impacts 4.19-2, 4.19-3, 4.19-4, and 4.19-5)
- Wildfire (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)

#### **Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

The County finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the Project will have potentially **significant and unavoidable impacts, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures**, with respect to the following issues:

- Air Quality (Impacts 4.3-1, 4.3-2, and 4.3-3; Cumulative Impacts)
- Biological Resources (Impact 4.4-1; Cumulative Impacts)
- Cultural Resources (Impacts 4.5-1, 4.5-2, and 4.5-3; Cumulative Impacts)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Impact 4.9-2; Cumulative Impacts)
- Noise (Impacts 4.13-1 and 4.13-2; Cumulative Impacts)
- Population and Housing (Impact 4.14-1; Cumulative Impacts)
- Public Services (Impact 4.15-1 [iv]; Cumulative Impacts)
- Recreation (Impacts 4.16-1 and 4.16-2; Cumulative Impacts)
- Tribal Cultural Resources (All Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)
- Utilities and Service Systems (Impact 4.19-1, Cumulative Impacts)

#### **IV. FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

In accordance with PRC Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the County adopts one or more of the three possible findings for each significant impact. These findings are provided below and will be used hereinafter and referenced as identified below:

**CEQA Finding 1.** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[a][1];



**CEQA Finding 2.** Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 [a][2]); and

**CEQA Finding 3.** Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible, the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 [a][3]).

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. However, project modification or alternatives are not required where such changes are infeasible, as stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors."

For those significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects" (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15093 and 15043[b]; see also PRC Section 21081[b]).

The following significant environmental impacts of the Project are unavoidable and cannot be feasibly or effectively mitigated to a less than significant level. In accordance with Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is set forth below in Section VII to substantiate the County's decision to accept these unavoidable substantial, adverse environmental effects because of the benefits afforded by the Project.

For each Project resource category discussed below, the following sections are provided:

- **Impact:** A specific description of the significant environmental impact(s) identified in the PEIR.
- **Mitigation:** Identified feasible mitigation measures that are required as part of the Project. (If mitigation is infeasible, the reasons supporting the finding that mitigation is infeasible are discussed below under "Facts in Support of Findings.")
- **Finding:** One or more of the three specific findings set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091.
- **Facts in Support of Finding:** A summary of the reasons for the finding(s) is provided for each impact. Additional substantiation regarding the feasibility (or infeasibility) of mitigation is provided at the end of this section (which is relevant to all impacts under the given resource category).

a. Air Quality

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to air quality as follows:

- **Impact 4.3-1:** Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- **Impact 4.3-2:** Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard [including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors].
- **Impact 4.3-3:** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.3-56 – 4.3-58 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to air quality:

- **MM-4.3-1. Construction Emissions.** If during subsequent project-level environmental review, construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed SCAQMD's construction mass daily thresholds, the County shall require applicants for new projects that exceed those thresholds to incorporate appropriate measures to reduce or minimize air pollutant emissions during construction activities. New projects are required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, including but not limited to Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings), and Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities). Additional measures for projects that exceed SCAQMD's construction mass daily thresholds may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Off-Road construction equipment with engines that are 50 horsepower or greater shall be rated by the USEPA as having Tier 4 emission limits or better (whichever is the cleanest technology available at time of project development). If it can be demonstrated to County Planning that such equipment is not commercially available or feasible, alternate emissions control devices and/or techniques used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 4 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by the California Air Resources Board's regulations.
  - Use electric or alternative-fueled (i.e., non-diesel) construction equipment, if available and feasible, including but not limited to, concrete/industrial saws, pumps, aerial lifts, material hoist, air compressors, forklifts, excavator, wheel loader, and soil compactors.
  - Maintain records of all trucks associated with project construction activities to document that each truck used meets the required emission standards. The Applicant shall provide records for inspection within five business days of request by CARB, SCAQMD or County Planning.

- Provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations or appropriately sized electrical infrastructure and electrical panels. Electrical hookups should be provided for trucks to plug in any onboard auxiliary equipment.
- Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of significant construction activity to maintain smooth traffic flow, where necessary.
- Provide dedicated turn lanes for the movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site, where applicable.
- Ensure vehicle traffic inside the project site is as far away as feasible from sensitive receptors.
- Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.
- Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- Suspend use of all construction equipment that generate air pollutant emissions during first stage smog alerts.
- Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site for each trip.
- Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
- Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible to minimize dust.
- Pave roads and road shoulders, where applicable.
- Sweep streets at the end of the day with SCAQMD Rule 1186 and 1186.1 compliant sweepers if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (recommend water sweepers that utilize reclaimed water).
- Utilize only super-compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for architectural coatings (0 grams per liter to less than 10 grams per liter VOC) during construction activities. If paints and coatings with VOC content of 0 grams/liter to less than 10 grams/liter cannot be utilized, the application of architectural coatings shall be prohibited during the peak smog season: July, August, and September

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide the County with the construction contractor's inclusion of all required measures on applicable construction plans, including grading and/or building plans.

- **MM-4.3-2. Operational Emissions.** If, during subsequent project-level environmental review, operation-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed SCAQMD's operation mass daily thresholds, the County shall require applicants for

new projects that exceed those thresholds to incorporate appropriate measures to reduce or minimize air pollutant emissions during operational activities. New projects facilitated by the Metro Area Plan are required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, including but not limited to Rule 445 (Wood Burning Devices), Rule 1401 (New Source of Toxic Air Contaminants), Rule 1110.2 (Emissions from Gaseous- and Liquid-Fueled Engines), Rule 1153.1 (Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen from Commercial Food Ovens), Rule 2305 (Warehouse Indirect Source Rule), and Rule 1146 (Emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> from Small Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters). Additional measures for projects that exceed SCAQMD's operation mass daily thresholds may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Heavy-duty trucks shall, at minimum, have 2010 model year engines that meet CARB's 2010 engine emissions standards or newer model trucks with better emissions standards (whichever is the cleanest technology available at the time of project development).
- Maintain records of all trucks associated with project operation to document that each truck used meets the required emission standards. The Applicant shall provide records for inspection within five business days of request by CARB, SCAQMD or County Planning.
- The daily number of truck trips allowed during project operation shall be limited to the levels analyzed in the subsequent, project-level environmental analysis for the project.
- Provide electrical infrastructure and electrical panels in conformance with Tier 2 CalGreen code, which should be appropriately sized. Electrical hookups shall be provided for truckers to plug in any onboard auxiliary equipment.
- Truck check-in points shall be located inside the project site to help avoid trucks queuing outside the site.
- Ensure truck traffic inside the project site is as far away as feasible from sensitive receptors.
- Overnight truck parking near sensitive land uses shall be located on the project site.

Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall provide the County with appropriate documentation verifying compliance with the required measure.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.3-1:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.3-41 through 4.3-43 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project could conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook resulting from implementation of the future development projects under the Metro Area Plan due to short-term construction activities. Even with implementation of MM-4.3-1, and compliance with existing regulations, construction of future development projects under the Metro Area Plan could exceed the SCAQMD mass daily construction thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. As discussed in further detail under “Impacts 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-3” below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, implementation of the Metro Area Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to a conflict with the assumptions in the SCAQMD’s Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) due to short-term construction emissions exceedance under Consistency Criterion No. 1.
- **Operation:** As discussed on pages 4.3-41 through 4.3-43 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project could conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook resulting from implementation of the future development projects of the Metro Area Plan due to long-term operation activities. MM-4.3-2 is required to reduce air quality impacts for operational emissions. However, even with required mitigation, the operation of future development projects could exceed the SCAQMD mass daily operational thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for full operational buildout of the Project and for a combined construction and operational scenario. Therefore, implementation of the Metro Area Plan would conflict with the assumptions in the SCAQMD’s AQMP due to operational emissions exceedance under Consistency Criterion No. 1. Implementation of the Project would facilitate additional population growth, additional housing units, and an increase in density of commercial and industrial space within the Project area. Changes in growth projections beyond what was anticipated in the County’s General Plan and the applicable Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy would result in an inconsistency with the assumptions of the SCAQMD’s AQMP. As such, the Project would also conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 2 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, Impact 4.3-2 would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.3-55 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, although implementation of MM-4.3-1 and MM-4.3-2 would reduce construction-related and operational emissions (respectively) of future projects under the Metro Area Plan, these mitigation measures would not reduce impacts to less than significant, and the incremental effects of the Project, taken together with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be cumulatively considerable. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, there would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to conflicts with the assumptions of SCAQMD’s AQMP.

#### Impact 4.3-2:

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.3-43 through 4.3-44 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the construction of future development projects under the Metro Area Plan could exceed the SCAQMD mass daily thresholds for VOCs, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Implementation of MM-4.3-1 would reduce NO<sub>x</sub> and PM emissions from equipment exhaust, PM emissions associated with fugitive dust, and VOCs from paints for architectural coatings; however, due to the programmatic nature of the Project, the accuracy of the reductions that would be realized from MM-4.3-1 is not able to be accurately quantifiable. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to exceedance of SCAQMD mass daily regional thresholds during construction would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Operation:** As discussed on pages 4.3-44 through 4.3-51 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, maximum daily operational emissions from full buildout of the Metro Area Plan could exceed the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. In addition, the combined construction and operational emissions could exceed the SCAQMD's operational emissions threshold for all criteria pollutants except for SO<sub>x</sub>. MM-4.3-2 includes requirements for new projects to reduce pollutant emissions during long-term operations, including compliance with SCAQMD rules as well as adherence to engine emission standards, electrical infrastructure and panels for trucks, and avoidance of queuing and traffic near sensitive receptors. However, MM-4.3-2 does not ensure that all impacts from future development projects would be mitigated to a level of less than significant. As discussed in further detail under "Impacts 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-3," below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts regarding cumulatively considerable net increases of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.3-55 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, consistent with the finding for the Project, although implementation of MM-4.3-1 and MM-4.3-2 would reduce emissions associated with future projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan, these mitigation measures would not reduce impacts to less than significant. The incremental effects of the Project, taken together with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be cumulatively considerable. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to net increases of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in nonattainment would be significant and unavoidable.

#### Impact 4.3-3:

- **Construction:** As discussed on page 4.3-52 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the construction of future development projects of the Metro Area Plan could result in toxic air contaminants (TAC) exposure, particularly diesel particulate matter (DPM), to existing or future sensitive land uses. Implementation of MM-4.3-1 would reduce construction emissions associated with future projects; however, due to the programmatic level of review for the Project (e.g., the exact location, orientation, number and timing of individual development projects and/or infrastructure improvements) the level of potential emissions in relation to the location of sensitive receptors cannot be estimated with a level of accuracy. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant.

Therefore, the potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

- **Operation:** As discussed on page 4.3-53 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project would facilitate additional housing, neighborhood-commercial uses, and potential industrial land uses, such as artisan manufacturing and research/life sciences use, which could include various sources of TACs. MM-4.3-2 includes requirements for new projects to reduce pollutant emissions during long-term operations, including compliance with SCAQMD rules as well as adherence to engine emission standards, electrical infrastructure and panels for trucks, and avoidance of queuing and traffic near sensitive receptors. However, MM-4.3-2 does not ensure that all impacts from future development projects would be mitigated to a level of less than significant. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to TAC emission would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on pages 4.3-49 through 4.3-50 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the impact of the proposed Project in addition to growth associated with regional plans could further increase the exposure of air quality pollutants to sensitive receptors. Due to the uncertainty of future sensitive receptor locations, it is not possible to accurately measure the effectiveness of MM-4.3-1 and MM-4.3-2. No additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Thus, consistent with the significance finding for the Project, there would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from TACs.

**Impacts 4.3-1, 4.3-2, and 4.3-3:** Impacts of a future development project depend on its specific characteristics such as site location, size, type of development, and nature of the construction or operational activities. Although MM-4.3-1 and MM-4.3-2 would apply to future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Furthermore, although future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to applicable federal, state and local regulations, they would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.3-1 and MM-4.3-2, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

b. **Biological Resources**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to biological resources as follows:

- **Impact 4.4-1:** 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 (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

**MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.4-34 through 4.4-35 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation measure was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to biological resources:

- **MM-4.4-1. Special-Status Plant Species.** During subsequent project-level environmental review, the County biologist, as appropriate, shall consider all relevant information available for the property (e.g., applicable database search, site visit, and/or existing biological report) to determine potential project impacts to special-status plant species. If there is potential for special-status plants to be impacted by proposed project activities, the County biologist shall require applicants for new projects to submit a survey report for special-status plant species to County Planning for review and approval. The assessment shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and must include all required information specified by the County biologist at the time of the request. If the survey determines that plant will be impacted by proposed project activities, the County shall require applicants to incorporate appropriate measures to avoid or minimize those impacts. Additional measures may include, but are not limited to, on or off-site preservation of the species within protected occupied habitat, or habitat restoration and enhancement activities in order to promote the continued existence of the species within the County.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.4-1:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.4-12 through 4.4-20 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project could result in adverse effects on a plant species that is identified as a sensitive or special status species from implementation of the future development projects. During subsequent project-level review, MM-4.4-1 mandates that future projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan must assess potential impacts on the southern tarplant and lucky morning glory species. However, future non-discretionary projects that would be implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to the federal, state and local regulations mentioned above; however, these non-discretionary projects would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.4-1, impacts to protected plant species would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.4-33 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, MM-4.4-1 would reduce potential impacts to special status plant species for future development under the Project requiring discretionary review. Although non-discretionary projects throughout the cumulative area would be subject to these regulations, their compliance would be difficult to enforce since they would not be subject to CEQA and no site-specific environmental assessments would be required. Further, planned future development within the County is anticipated to result in significant impacts to special status species. As such, there is a potential for the Project to contribute to cumulative impacts to protected plant species



identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, and the Project's contribution is anticipated to be cumulatively considerable..

Impacts of a future development project depend on its specific characteristics such as site location, size, type of development, and nature of the construction or operational activities. Although MM-4.4-1 would apply to future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Furthermore, although future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to applicable federal, state and local regulations, they would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.4-1, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level..

**c. Cultural Resources**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to cultural resources as follows:

- **Impact 4.5-1:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5).
- **Impact 4.5-2:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
- **Impact 4.5-3:** Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

**MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.5-50 through 4.5-55 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to cultural resources:

- **MM-4.5-1. Historic Architectural Resources.** During subsequent project-level environmental review, the County shall determine if any potential historical building, structure, or district is present; conduct records search from applicable data repositories; check GIS "Historical Resource" layer to identify properties listed in/eligible for listing in the National, California and/or County Registers; conduct site inspections, as appropriate; and consider all relevant information available for the property to determine its historical significance.

If necessary, the County shall require applicants of new projects to submit a Phase I and/or Phase II Historic Resources Assessment (HRA) report to evaluate the significance of resources greater than 45 years of age. The report shall be prepared by an architectural historian meeting the Professional Qualification Standards of the Secretary of the Interior (SOI), in accordance with SOI standards and guidelines. The HRA shall include background, archival and historic research; site surveys; detailed physical description of identified resources; photographs; a historical significance evaluation in consideration of County,

California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) designation criteria and integrity requirements; an assessment of project impacts to historical resources; recommendations of mitigative treatment; and the preparation/recordation of the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, as applicable.

If project impacts to historic architectural resources are potentially significant, the County shall require the project to incorporate appropriate measures to avoid or minimize those impacts. Additional measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- If a future project involves alterations or modifications to historic architectural resources, the project design and proposed work shall conform to SOI standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to reduce or avoid impacts to historic resources. The project applicant shall retain a qualified architectural historian to advise on the final project design, recommend mitigative actions, specify performance standards, and oversee the construction activities related to the historical resources to ensure the project is constructed in compliance with specified mitigation performance standards and SOI standards.
- If a future project involves the demolition or material impairment of an historical resource that cannot be mitigated through SOI Standards compliance, the project applicant shall submit an archival Historic American Building Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), or Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) documentation, as appropriate, to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of any grading permit. The HABS/HAER/HALS documentation shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian and may include an architectural and historical narrative; archival drawings and/or measured drawings; and large-format photography. All reports resulting from implementation of this mitigation measure shall be submitted to County Planning and filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).
- **MM-4.5-2. Archaeological Resources.** During subsequent project-level environmental review, the County shall consider all relevant information available for the property to determine potential project impacts to archaeological resources. If necessary, the County shall require applicants for new projects to submit a Phase I Archaeological Report to identify and evaluate archaeological resources that may be impacted by the project. The report must be prepared by a qualified archaeologist meeting Professional Qualification Standards of the Secretary of the Interior (SOI), in accordance with SOI standards and guidelines. The report shall include archival search of historic records; records search of applicable data repositories, including CHRIS database; pedestrian surveys; identification of archaeological resources within or near the project site; assessment of potential project impacts to archaeological resources; recommendations for archaeological monitoring, if appropriate; and completion/recordation of the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms for all identified archaeological resources, as applicable. A Phase II Archaeological Report for testing and evaluation may be required based on the results and recommendations of the Phase I Report.

If project impacts to archaeological resources are determined to be potentially significant, the County shall require the project to incorporate appropriate measures to avoid or

minimize impacts to archaeological resources. Additional measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Archaeological Resources Work Plan. Prior to issuance of grading permit, project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist meeting SOI's Professional Qualification Standards to prepare and submit an Archaeological Resources Work Plan (ARWP) to the County for review and approval. The purpose of this plan is to document the actions and procedures to be followed by the project to avoid or minimize impacts to archaeological resources. If potential impacts to tribal cultural resources are identified during project level review (e.g. records search, archaeological reports, AB 52 consultation), the ARWP shall also address tribal cultural resources, in consultation with local Native American tribes. The ARWP shall include, but is not limited to, the following elements:

- A description of the roles and responsibilities of the archaeologist, the reporting relationships between construction managers and the archaeologist, and the notification procedures.
- Maps identifying locations where archaeological and/or Native American monitoring is required; duration of monitoring; and documentation of monitoring activities, including daily log of monitoring activities, location and results.
- Detailed procedures to follow if cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, including stop-work requirement within a 50-foot radius of the find; documentation of all recovered resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms; and inspection and evaluation of the resource for listing in the national, state, and local register.
- Detailed plan for the collection of archaeological data, including sampling techniques and data management protocols.
- Methodology for testing and evaluation of archaeological resources encountered.
- Detailed treatment plan to avoid or minimize impacts to significant archaeological resources, including preservation and/or data recovery to the satisfaction of County Planning.
- Detailed plan for reporting recovered resources and treatment results, including submission of reports to applicable agencies.

Construction Worker Archaeological Resources Sensitivity Training. Prior to the commencement of project ground-disturbing activities, a qualified archaeologist shall present an archaeological resources sensitivity training to project construction personnel. A minimum of two weeks before the training session, the archaeologist shall invite interested Tribes to participate in and present Native American perspectives during the training sessions. The archaeologist shall inform construction personnel about the types of cultural resources that could be encountered; the proper procedures to follow in the event of an archaeological discovery; potential penalties for failing to adhere to applicable laws and regulations; and confidentiality of discoveries. Project applicant shall provide the training agenda, materials and attendance records to the County within five business days of request.

Archaeological Resources Monitoring. During grading and excavation activities, a qualified Archaeological Monitor shall be present to monitor ground-disturbing activities in accordance with the ARWP. Should archaeological resources be encountered, the Archaeological Monitor shall have the authority to halt ground-disturbing activities and immediately notify the Archaeologist of the find. The Archaeologist shall implement the evaluation and mitigation protocols described in the ARWP.

In the event Native American archaeological resources are encountered during construction, Native American monitoring shall be provided thereafter for any ground-disturbing activities. However, if impacts to tribal cultural resources are determined potentially significant during project level review, a Native American Monitor shall be required at the outset to monitor all ground-disturbing activities. The Archaeologist and/or Native American Monitor shall prepare a final report documenting all recovered archaeological resources, the significance of the resources, and the treatment of the recovered resources to the County, SCCIC, and NAHC (if applicable).

Archaeological Resources Discoveries. If archaeological resources are encountered during construction, all ground-disturbing activities shall cease within 50 feet of the find. The Archaeologist can determine, based on the initial assessment of the discovery, whether the 50-foot buffer may be reduced. The Archaeologist shall evaluate the recovered archaeological resources for significance. If the resource is found significant pursuant to CEQA, avoidance and preservation in place shall be the preferred manner of mitigating impacts. If avoidance is infeasible, the Archaeologist shall develop and oversee the execution of a Phase III Archaeological Resources Data Recovery and Treatment Plan. The plan shall include: a detailed research design; justification for data recovery or other treatment methods depending on the nature of the resource's eligibility; excavation methodology; and, reporting and curation requirements. The archaeologist shall prepare a final report that includes documentation of all recovered resources, a full evaluation of their significance, and treatment of the recovered resources.

When assessing significance and developing treatment for recovered resources that are Native American in origin, the County shall consult and coordinate with local Native American tribes. The County shall consider tribal preferences when making a determination on the disposition of Native American archaeological resources, which may include curation at an accredited or nonaccredited repository; onsite or offsite reburial; and/or donation to a local tribe or public, nonprofit institution with a research interest in the materials, or local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

The project applicant shall curate all significant historic- period archaeological material, or portions thereof at the recommendation of the Archaeologist and approval by the County, at a repository accredited by the American Association of Museums that meets the standards outlined in 36 CFR Section 79.9. If no accredited repository accepts the collection, then the project applicant may curate it at a nonaccredited repository as long as it meets the minimum standards set forth in 36 CFR Section 79.9. If neither an accredited nor a nonaccredited repository accepts the collection, then the project applicant may offer the collection to a public, nonprofit institution with a research interest in the materials, or to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

All reports resulting from implementation of this measure shall be completed and submitted to County Planning for review and approval and filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).

- **MM-4.5-3. Paleontological Resources.** During subsequent project-level environmental review, the County shall require applicants for new projects to retain a Qualified Paleontologist to conduct a Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLA) records search to determine the potential for project impacts to paleontological resources. If necessary, the County shall require applicants for new projects to submit a Paleontological Resources Assessment Report that is prepared by a Qualified Paleontologist meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP 2010) standards. The report shall include methods and results of the paleontological resources assessment, including review of geological map and paleontological literature; records search through appropriate fossil repositories, including the NHMLA; pedestrian surveys if exposed ground exists within the project site that is underlain by a geologic unit with High or Undetermined Paleontological Resources Sensitivity or Potential or as required by the Qualified Paleontologist; and, if necessary, recommendation for monitoring requirements (including depths, frequency, and reporting) with maps that outline where monitoring is required within the project site. Monitoring shall follow SVP (2010) Guidelines: no monitoring of ground-disturbing activities within units of Low or No Paleontological Resources Sensitivity or Potential and monitoring of all ground-disturbing activities (with depths specified) within units of High Paleontological Resources Sensitivity or Potential, unless the Qualified Paleontologist's report identifies previous disturbances or the use of construction methods which do not warrant monitoring. For project sites underlain by geological units with Undetermined Paleontological Resources Sensitivity or Potential, monitoring shall occur at the initiation of excavation if the qualified paleontologist deems it necessary based on preconstruction surveys and literature review. The report also shall stipulate whether screen washing is necessary to recover small specimens following SVP (2010) Guidelines and determine whether unique geologic features are present onsite.

If project impacts to paleontological resources are determined to be potentially significant, the County shall require the project to incorporate appropriate measures to avoid or minimize impacts to paleontological resources. Additional measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Paleontological Resources Recovery Plan. If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, a Qualified Paleontologist meeting Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP 2010) standards shall prepare and submit a Paleontological Resources Recovery Plan (PRRP) to the County for review and approval. The recovery plan shall include, but is not limited to, sampling and fossil recovery procedures, museum curation for any scientifically significant specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan as approved by the County shall be implemented before construction activities can resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered.

All reports and plans resulting from implementation of this measure shall be submitted to County Planning and filed with the NHMLA.

Construction Worker Paleontological Resources Sensitivity Training. Prior to the commencement of project ground-disturbing activities, a Qualified Paleontologist shall present a paleontological resources sensitivity training (or may be provided via digital recording) to project construction personnel. The paleontologist shall inform construction personnel about the laws protecting paleontological resources; the types of paleontological resources that could be encountered; the proper procedures to follow in the event of a paleontological discovery; and safety precautions to be taken when working with paleontological monitors. The project applicant shall provide the training agenda, materials, and attendance records to the County within 5 business days of request.

Paleontological Monitoring. During grading and excavation activities, a qualified Paleontological Monitor shall be present to monitor the earth-moving activities in accordance with the project paleontological assessment report or the PRRP. Should paleontological resources be encountered, the Paleontological Monitor shall have the authority to halt ground-disturbing activities; and immediately notify the Paleontologist of the find; and inspect, document, and salvage the find as necessary. The Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare and submit a final report summarizing monitoring results to the County and NHMLA.

Paleontological Resources Discoveries Protocols. If fossils are discovered during earthmoving activities, the Paleontological Monitor shall be authorized to halt the ground-disturbing activities within an appropriate buffer area determined by the Paleontological Monitor. The paleontologist shall implement the PRRP and oversee the collection of sediment samples and exposed fossils for processing and evaluation. Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification, catalogued, and curated at a public, nonprofit institution with a research interest in the material and with retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, if such an institution agrees to accept the fossils. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository. If no institution accepts the fossil collection, it may be donated to a local school or other interested organization in the area for educational purposes. The paleontologist shall prepare a final report on the collected fossils. The report shall contain an appropriate description of the fossils, treatment, and curation. A copy of the report shall be filed with the County and NHMLA along with field notes and any other supporting documentation.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.5-1:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.5-36 through 4.5-37 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project could indirectly impact historical resources through the reasonably foreseeable future property demolition, alteration, and/or expansion that may occur on existing buildings and properties in the Project area. As such, MM-4.5-1 is required, which stipulates that future projects involving the demolition or alteration of buildings/structures over 45 years old must assess their historical significance. This may involve a Phase I or II

Historic Resources Assessment report in line with CEQA Guidelines. This measure would substantially lessen impacts to historical resources for select future project requiring discretionary permits. However, future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to the MMRP or any additional project-specific mitigations measures. As discussed in further detail below under “Impacts 4.5-1, 4.5-2, and 4.5-3,” no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. As such, impacts relative to historic resources would be significant and unavoidable.

- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.5-49 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, it is reasonable to expect that future development throughout the County has the potential to remove or alter historical resources on a project-specific basis. Although MM-4.5-1 would substantially lessen adverse effects associated future projects subject to discretionary review, future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to the MMRP or any additional project-level mitigation under CEQA. Therefore, the Project’s incremental effects would be cumulatively considerable. As no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level, cumulative impacts related to archeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.

#### Impact 4.5-2:

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.5-43 through 4.5-44 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of both known and unknown archaeological resources through the reasonably foreseeable future property development that may occur on existing properties in the Project area. As such, MM-4.5-2 would be required, which mandates the consideration of known archaeological resources prior to any project-specific activities. If such resources are identified or unexpectedly discovered during construction, they must be evaluated and treated appropriately. This measure would substantially lessen adverse effects associated with select future discretionary projects. However, MM-4.5-2 does not ensure that all impacts from future development projects would be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Future non-discretionary projects that would be implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to the MMRP or any additional project-specific mitigation measures. As discussed in further detail below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. As such, impacts relative to archaeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.5-49 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, future development projects that demolish or alter certain archaeological resources have the potential to erode a general cultural landscape to which the archaeological resources belong. Although MM-4.5-2 would substantially lessen adverse effects associated with select future discretionary projects, future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to the MMRP or any additional project-level mitigation under CEQA. Therefore, the Project’s incremental effects would be cumulatively considerable. As discussed in further detail below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, implementation of future development projects under the Metro Area Plan area in combination with additional development anticipated through other County plans would combine to result in a cumulatively significant and unavoidable effect on archaeological resources.

### Impact 4.5-3:

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.5-45 through 4.5-46 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of both known and unknown paleontological resources through the reasonably foreseeable future property development that may occur on existing properties in the Project area. As required under MM-4.5-3, future project applicants would be required to retain a qualified paleontologist to conduct a Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLA) records search to determine the potential for project impacts to paleontological resources. Although MM-4.5-3 would substantially lessen adverse effects associated with select future discretionary projects, this measure does not ensure that all impacts from future development projects would be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Future non-discretionary projects that would be implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to the MMRP or any additional project-specific mitigation measures. As discussed in further detail below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on pages 4.5-49 and 4.5-50 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects could result in cumulatively significant impacts to paleontological resources. Although MM-4.5-3 would substantially lessen adverse effects associated with select future projects subject to discretionary review, future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to the MMRP or any additional project-level mitigation under CEQA. Therefore, the Project's incremental effects would be cumulatively considerable. As discussed in further detail below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impacts 4.5-1, 4.5-2, and 4.5-3:** Impacts of a future development project depend on its specific characteristics such as site location, size, type of development, and nature of the construction or operational activities. Although MM-4.5-1, 4.5-2 and 4.5-3 would apply to future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the environmental baselines and details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Future non-discretionary projects that would be implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to the federal, state and local regulations mentioned above; however, these non-discretionary projects would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.5-1, 4.5-2 and 4.5-3, potential impacts relative to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level.



**d. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

- **Impact 4.9-2:** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment.

**MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.9-59 through 4.9-60 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials:

- **MM-4.9-1. Environmental Site Assessment (ESA).** During subsequent project-level environmental review, the County shall consider all relevant information available for the property (e.g., applicable database search, site visit, past and present land uses on the property, and/or existing site investigations) to determine potential project impacts related to hazards. If review of relevant information, including past and present land use on the property, identifies potential impacts related to hazards, the County shall require project applicants to retain a qualified hazardous materials specialist to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in accordance with American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) Standard E-1527-21. Any and all recognized environmental conditions (RECs) identified in the Phase I ESA shall be investigated through completion of a Phase II ESA in accordance with ASTM Standard 1903-19. The Phase II ESA shall compare sampling results to regulatory screening levels for applicable contaminants. If concentrations exceed current screening levels, the Applicant shall consult with the applicable environmental agency(ies) (e.g., CalEPA, DTSC, RWQCB, County Fire Department) to determine any requirements for additional investigations and/or restrictions on site development based on the Applicant's development proposal.

If remediation activities are required, all remediation shall be conducted to the satisfaction of the overseeing environmental agency(ies) in compliance with all applicable state and local regulations. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the Applicant shall provide the County Department of Public Works, Building and Safety and County Planning with written documentation from the overseeing environmental agency that states the proposed site development is safe and would not significantly impact the health and safety of construction workers, adjacent sensitive receptors, or future occupants on the site.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.9-2:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.9-48 through 4.9-50 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project would result in the implementation of future development projects which may encounter unknown soil contamination and could pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. MM-4.9-1 requires that the County consider all potential impacts related to hazardous conditions at a future project site and if necessary, require preparation of a Phase I ESA and potentially additional site investigations to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of a permit. However, future non-discretionary projects that would be implemented under the Metro Area Plan would not be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As discussed in further detail below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. As a result, the Project impacts at the program level would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on pages 4.9-55 and 4.9-56 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the potential to encounter unknown soil contamination could pose a hazard to construction workers or other nearby sensitive uses if construction activities were to expose contaminated conditions for related projects. Because redevelopment of industrial land uses is expected to occur in the Project area, the potential for encountering unknown soil contamination and/or soil vapor conditions during construction activities may occur and could result in significant hazards to the public or the environment. MM-4.9-1 would substantially lessen the adverse effects of future discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan. However, future development under the Project and buildout of related local and regional plans would include non-discretionary projects that would not be subject to CEQA or additional project-specific mitigation. The Project's incremental effects would be cumulatively considerable. As discussed below, no additional mitigation is feasible that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. As a result, cumulative impacts related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to hazards associated with contaminated sites would be significant and unavoidable.

Impacts of a future development project depend on its specific characteristics such as site location, size, type of development, and nature of the construction or operational activities. Although MM-4.9-1 would apply to future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Furthermore, although future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to applicable federal, state and local regulations, they would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.9-1, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

e. **Noise**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to noise as follows:

- **Impact 4.13-1:** Result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies.
- **Impact 4.13-2:** Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

**MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.13-38 – 4.13-40 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to noise:

- **MM 4.13-1. Commercial/Industrial/Mixed-Use/Accessory Commercial Units (ACUs) Operational Noise.** Prior to issuance of a building permit for any future commercial, industrial, mixed-use, or ACU development projects that are located within 500 feet of sensitive receptors, project applicants shall submit a noise mitigation plan to Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (DPH) for review and approval. The noise mitigation plan shall be prepared by a sound engineer and be sufficient for DPH to make a determination of whether the project will be in compliance with all applicable County Noise standards and regulations. At minimum, the noise mitigation plan shall include the following information: a list of all electro-mechanical equipment (HVAC, refrigeration systems, generators, etc.) that will be installed at the project site; sound level that would be produced by each equipment; noise-reduction measures, as necessary; and sufficient predictive analysis of project operational noise impact. All noise-reduction measures approved by DPH shall be incorporated into the project building plans and be implemented during project construction. Potential noise-reduction measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Install permanent noise-occluding shrouds or screens on operating equipment
  - Maintain all equipment and noise control features in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications
  - Orient equipment vents and other sources of sound emissions away from noise-sensitive receptors and/or behind structures, containers, or natural features
  - Increase distance between the operating equipment and the noise-sensitive receptor(s) of concern, to the maximum extent feasible
  - Install portable sound-occluding barriers to attenuate noise between the source(s) and the noise-sensitive receptor(s)

This mitigation measure shall be superseded once a Countywide noise ordinance goes into effect that establishes operational noise standards for noise-reduction measures that ensures project operational noise compliance with the County of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance standards (i.e., LACC 12.08.440) for development projects within the Metro Area Plan.

- **MM-4.13-2 Construction Noise.** Applicants for future development projects that are within 500 feet of sensitive receptors (e.g., residences, hospitals, schools) shall submit a noise study to DPH for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. The study shall include noise-reduction measures, if necessary, to ensure project construction noise will be in compliance with the County of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance standards (i.e., LACC 12.08.440). All noise-reduction measures approved by DPH shall be incorporated into appropriate construction-related plans (e.g., demolition plans, grading plans and building plans) and implemented during construction activities. Potential noise-reduction measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Install temporary sound barriers for construction activities that occur adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive receptors
  - Equip construction equipment with effective mufflers, sound-insulating hoods or enclosures, vibration dampers, and other Best Available Control Technology (BACT)
  - Limit non-essential idling of construction equipment to no more than five minutes per hour

This mitigation measure shall be superseded once a Countywide noise ordinance goes into effect that establishes construction noise standards for noise-reduction measures that ensures project construction noise compliance with the County of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance standards (i.e., LACC 12.08.440) for development projects within the Metro Area Plan.

- **MM-4.13-3 Construction Vibration.** For future development projects that utilize vibration-intensive construction equipment (e.g., pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers) within 500 feet of sensitive receptors, project applicant shall submit a vibration impact evaluation to DPH for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. The evaluation shall include a list of project construction equipment and the associated vibration levels and a predictive analysis of potential project vibration impacts. If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses (i.e., exceed the County's standard of 0.01 inches per second RMS vibration velocity [within the range of 1 to 100 Hz frequency]), project-specific measures shall be required to ensure project compliance with vibration standards. All project-specific measures approved by DPH shall be incorporated into appropriate construction-related plans (e.g. demolition plans, grading plans and building plans) and implemented during project construction.

Examples of equipment vibration source-to-receptor distances within which impact evaluation should occur vary with equipment type (based on FTA reference vibration information) and are as follows:

- Jackhammer – 23 feet

- Dozer, hoe-ram, drill rig, front-end loader, tractor, or backhoe – 43 feet
- Roller (for site ground compaction or paving) – 75 feet
- Impact pile-driving – 280 feet

This mitigation measure shall be superseded once a Countywide groundborne vibration ordinance goes into effect that establishes construction groundborne vibration standards for vibration-reduction measures that ensures project construction groundborne vibration compliance with the County of Los Angeles standard of 0.01 inches per second RMS vibration velocity (within the range of 1 to 100 Hz frequency) for development projects within the Metro Area Plan.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.13-1:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.13-31 through 4.13-33 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project would result in future development projects with associated construction activities, which, depending on the type of residential receptor and relevant screening distance, and assuming daytime construction only, could result in significant impacts relative to an exceedance of the County construction noise threshold to off-site sensitive receptors. MM-4.13-2 would require all future discretionary projects near sensitive receptors to prepare a noise study that would ensure compliance with County noise standards, to the extent feasible. Nonetheless, there is the potential for an off-site residence to be so close to a construction site that the resulting noise impact—even with incorporation of practical, feasible, and reasonable mitigation measures—could still be unavoidable. Therefore, potential construction noise impacts of the Project would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Operation:** As discussed on page 4.13-25 through 4.13-31 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project could result in future development projects, including higher density development of housing sites mechanical ventilation and air-conditioning assumed to include corresponding noise emission from compressors and ventilation fans. As a result, aggregate stationary source noise emission from a site-specific development implemented under the Project could exceed noise standards; therefore, Project noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable. In addition, each ACU/new industrial facility would need outdoor-exposed HVAC equipment that would emit noise to the surrounding community. Operation of an ACU/new industrial facility would likely indicate an exceedance with respect to the County noise ordinance at certain distances and thus necessitate some form of operational noise mitigation. Implementation of MM-4.13-1 would require all future discretionary mixed-use and industrial projects near sensitive receptors to prepare a noise mitigation plan that would ensure compliance with County noise standards. However, even with implementation of MM-4.13-1, localized conditions may make it difficult to comply with the County standards or limit outdoor ambient noise level increases to those that

would avoid neighborhood complaints. For these reasons, the Project could result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of applicable County standards and even with implementation of MM-4.13-1, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.13-36 through 4.13-38 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, cumulative impacts due to cumulative construction noise could be considered significant under certain conditions of multiple project proximity to a common noise-sensitive receiving land use. Mitigation of such cumulative construction noise impact would require each individual project to comply with the County's construction noise standard and involve measures as appearing in MM-4.13-2. Nevertheless, because the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts even with implementation of MM-4.13-2, the Project would contribute to potentially significant cumulative impacts related to construction noise. In addition, given that the implementation of ACUs would result in significant unavoidable impacts, cumulative impacts to outdoor ambient noise levels resulting from proposed Project stationary sources combining with another unrelated project could result in a cumulatively considerable change greater than 3 dBA.

#### **Impact 4.13-2:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on page 4.13-32 through 4.13-34 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, potential impacts from construction vibration are considered significant because ensuring adequate distances to receptors may not be feasible for one or more site-specific construction projects implemented under the Project. Implementation of MM-4.13-3 would reduce vibration impacts associated with construction activities to the extent feasible. However, due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses and potential longevity of construction activities, their potential would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.13-37 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, cumulative impacts due to cumulative construction vibration could be considered significant under certain conditions of multiple project proximity to a common noise-sensitive receiving land use.

**Impacts 4.13-1 and 4.13-2:** Impacts of a future development project depend on its specific characteristics such as site location, size, type of development, and nature of the construction or operational activities. Although MMs-4.13-1, 4.13-2, and 4.13-3 would apply to future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Furthermore, although future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to applicable federal, state and local regulations, they would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MMs-4.13-1, 4.13-2, and 4.13-3, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

f. **Population and Housing**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to population and housing as follows:

- **Impact 4.14-1:** Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

**MITIGATION:**

No feasible mitigation measure is available.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Finding 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.14-1:**

- **Operation:** As discussed on pages 4.14-21 through 4.14-23 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project's anticipated population and housing buildout would represent substantial unplanned population growth for the Project area. Specifically, the Project's anticipated population and housing buildout would represent substantial unplanned population growth for the Project area by facilitating the development of new future housing in accordance with the residential upzoning proposed through the Metro Area Plan. No mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Thus, the unplanned growth in the Project area occurring as a result of Project implementation would be considered significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.14-25 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the buildout of the Metro Area Plan in 2035 would exceed the buildout projections for the Metro Planning Area in the County's General Plan. Furthermore, buildout of related local and regional plans include additional housing (and associated population growth) beyond the Project area's RHNA requirements, which further adds to the exceedance of buildout projections for the Metro Planning Area beyond what was anticipated through the General Plan. The projected population growth for the Project area and unincorporated Los Angeles County, as anticipated through the County's General Plan, as well as regional growth anticipated through SCAG's Connect SoCal, would result in substantial unplanned population growth. No mitigation is feasible that would reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

The County has an obligation to meet RHNA obligations in accordance with State Housing Element law. Given that the proposed land use and zone changes are required to accommodate the state-mandated RHNA, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the substantial population growth. As such, Impact 4.14-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

**g. Public Services**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to public services as follows:

- **Impact 4.15-1(iv):** Create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks).

**MITIGATION:**

No feasible mitigation measure is available.

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Finding 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.15-1(iv):**

- **Operation:** As further discussed in Section 4.16, Recreation, of the Recirculated Draft PEIR (pages 4.16-19 – 4.16-21), impacts regarding park services would be significant and unavoidable. As discussed below, there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this anticipated impact.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed further in Section 4.16 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR (page 4.16-25), without the payment of park mitigation fees or the dedication of land for future parks, the Project's incremental effects, in combination with cumulative growth related to local and regional plans would be cumulatively considerable. As discussed below, no mitigation is feasible to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Thus, cumulative impacts to park services would be significant and unavoidable.

Select future development projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to discretionary permits and future environmental review pursuant to CEQA that would evaluate environmental impacts and determine appropriate mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. The extent to which the County can implement parks, trails, and other recreational facilities is related to the availability of funding for land acquisition, construction, operations, maintenance, and programming. Despite the application of future project-level mitigation measures (including payment of in-lieu fees) for those discretionary projects that are determined to require mitigation, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to levels less than significant because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Although the Metro Area Plan encourages the inclusion of more neighborhood and pocket parks and the study of future parkland development over existing freeways, the Metro Area Plan does not have



the mechanism to ensure that new recreational facilities are constructed. Additionally, the Project area is highly built-out and urbanized, and there is a lack of available space to develop new parks to serve the anticipated population growth in the Metro Area Plan. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. For the reasons discussed above, impacts to park services would remain significant and unavoidable..

#### **h. Recreation**

##### **IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to recreation as follows:

- **Impact 4.16-1:** Create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks).
- **Impact 4.16-2:** 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.

##### **MITIGATION:**

No feasible mitigation measure is available.

##### **FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Finding 3.

##### **FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

##### **Impact 4.16-1:**

- **Operation:** As discussed on pages 4.16-19 through 4.16-21 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, each community's existing conditions are currently below the General Plan goal for parkland per 1,000 residents. The Project would result in 108,390 additional Project area residents, which would increase the parkland deficit to over 1,300 acres of new parkland required to meet the County's goal and limit the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation's ability to maintain acceptable service ratios. Even with the support of Metro Area Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs, without the payment of park mitigation fees or the dedication of land for future parks, the Project would result in a significant impact to park services. As discussed in further detail below ("Impacts 4.16-1 and 4.16-2") no mitigation is feasible to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact to park services.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.16-25 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the proposed Project in combination with cumulative growth related to local and regional plans would

result in a cumulatively significant impacts to park services. No mitigation is feasible to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. As such, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impact 4.16-2:**

- **Operation:** As discussed on pages 4.16-17 through 4.16-19 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, each community's existing conditions are currently below both the countywide average and General Plan goal for parkland per resident with the exception of Willowbrook. However, the County notes that Willowbrook, despite the 3.6 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, lacks a variety of park amenities and is still below the General Plan's goal. As such, the proposed Project would increase demand on parks to maintain acceptable service ratios. Therefore, the proposed Project would be expected to substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and associated recreational facilities. As discussed below, no mitigation is feasible to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Given this, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur related to recreation.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on pages 4.16-25 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, in the absence of new parks to alleviate the existing demands for park facilities currently in the Project area and unincorporated County areas, the impact of the proposed Project in addition to Countywide growth anticipated through the local and regional plans, would constitute a significant cumulative impact related to park deterioration. As discussed below, no mitigation is feasible, and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impacts 4.16-1 and 4.16-2: Select future development projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to discretionary permits and future environmental review pursuant to CEQA that would evaluate environmental impacts and determine appropriate mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis. The extent to which the County can implement parks, trails, and other recreational facilities is related to the availability of funding for land acquisition, construction, operations, maintenance, and programming. Despite the application of future project-level mitigation measures (including payment of in-lieu fees) for those discretionary projects that are determined to require mitigation, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to levels less than significant because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Although the Metro Area Plan encourages the inclusion of more neighborhood and pocket parks and the study of future parkland development over existing freeways, the Metro Area Plan does not have the mechanism to ensure that new recreational facilities are constructed. Additionally, the Project area is highly built-out and urbanized, and there is a lack of available space to develop new parks to serve the anticipated population growth in the Metro Area Plan. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. For the reasons discussed above, impacts to recreation would remain significant and unavoidable.

**i. Tribal Cultural Resources**

**IMPACT**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to tribal cultural resources as follows:

- **Impact 4.18-1(i):** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape

that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k).

- **Impact 4.18-1(ii):** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

#### **MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.18-21 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to tribal cultural resources:

- **MM-4.18-1. Tribal Cultural Resources.** During subsequent project-level environmental review, the County shall obtain a Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Land Files Search, as appropriate, and comply with all applicable requirements of AB 52. Pursuant to AB 52, the County shall provide formal notification of the project to designated contact of each traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribe that has requested notice. The County shall begin the consultation process within 30 days after receiving a tribe's request for consultation. The County shall consider all relevant information available for the property to identify potential tribal cultural resources in the project area, evaluate the project's potential impacts to tribal cultural resources, and mitigate those potential impacts.

If project impacts to tribal cultural resources are determined to be potentially significant, the County shall require the project to incorporate appropriate measures to avoid or minimize impacts to tribal cultural resources, including but not limited to, the measures recommended in Public Resources Code Section 21084.3, tribal monitoring, or other alternative measures identified in consultation with the California Native American tribe.

If an archaeological resource that is Native American in origin is identified in the preparation of a Phase I Archaeological Report (see MM-4.5-2) or Native American archaeological resources are encountered during construction, the County shall consult and coordinate with the California Native American Tribal representatives who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the development project to evaluate and mitigate impacts in accordance with the requirements set forth in MM-4.5-2.

- **MM-4.5-2. Archaeological Resources.** (See Section IV.c, Cultural Resources, above.)

#### **FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.18-1(i) and Impact 4.18-1(ii):**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.18-18 – through 4.18-20 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the construction of future development projects would involve earthwork to demolish, renovate, and build structures on properties within the Project area. Thus, there is a potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of both known and unknown tribal cultural resources. MM-4.18-1 would require the County to obtain appropriate records search and comply with all applicable requirements of AB 52 during subsequent project-level environmental review. In addition, MM-4.5-2 would require all ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find to cease if tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction. However, these measures do not assure that all impacts would be mitigated to a level of less than significant for those tribal cultural resources not yet identified. As discussed below, no additional mitigation is feasible. Therefore, the Project impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Cumulative:** As discussed on page 4.18-20 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, future development projects constructed from Project implementation would have a significant impact. In addition, the Project, in combination with additional growth anticipated through other local and regional plans would combine to constitute a significant cumulative impact related to tribal cultural resources. As discussed below, no additional mitigation is feasible. Therefore, the cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Impact 4.18-1(i) and Impact 4.18-1(ii):** Although MM-4.18-1 and MM-4.5-2 would substantially reduce or eliminate potential impacts for future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Furthermore, although future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to applicable federal, state and local regulations, they would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.18-1, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level

**j. Utilities and Service Systems**

**IMPACT:**

The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to utilities and service systems as follows:

- **Impact 4.19-1:** Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects).
- **Threshold 4.19-2:** Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

**MITIGATION:**

As shown on pages 4.19-44 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the following mitigation was incorporated to reduce significant impacts related to utilities and service systems:

- **MM-4.3-1. Construction Emissions.** (See Section IV.a, Air Quality, above.)
- **MM-4.4-1. Special-Status Plant Species.** (See Section IV.b, Biological Resources, above.)
- **MM-4.5-1. Historic Architectural Resources.** (See Section IV.c, above.)
- **MM-4.5-2. Archaeological Resources.** (See Section IV.c, above.)
- **MM-4.5-3. Human Remains Discoveries.** (See Section IV.c, above.)
- **MM-4.5-4. Paleontological Resources.** (See Section IV.c, above.)
- **MM-4.9-1. Environmental Site Assessment.** (See Section IV.d, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, above.)
- **MM-4.13-2. Construction Noise.** (See Section IV.e, Noise, above.)
- **MM-4.13-3. Construction Vibration.** (See Section IV.e, above.)
- **MM-4.18-1. Tribal Cultural Resources.** (See Section IV.i, Tribal Cultural Resources, above.)

**FINDING:**

The County hereby adopts CEQA Findings 1 and 3.

**FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING:**

**Impact 4.19-1:**

- **Construction:** As discussed on pages 4.19-26 – 4.19-31 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, future development projects associated with the Metro Area Plan could result in increased sewage generation that would result in significant impacts related to sanitary sewer collection. In addition, significant impacts related to increased water demand could occur due to increases in land use development as a result of Project build-out. Similarly, significant impacts would occur due to the physical impacts associated with the construction of electric utilities, telecommunications, and natural gas infrastructure. The incorporation of Project mitigation measures applicable to construction activities would help reduce construction-related impacts, including MM-4.3-1, MM-4.4-1, MM-4.5-1, MM-4.5-2, MM-4.5-3, MM-4.5-4, MM-4.9-1, MM-4.13-2, MM-4.13-3, and MM-4.18-1 (discussed above). However, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures, no other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. As such, Project impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Cumulative:** As discussed on pages 4.19-38 – 4.19-40 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, future development projects constructed from Project implementation would have a significant impact. In addition, the Project, in combination with additional growth anticipated through other County plans would combine to constitute a significant cumulative impact related to utilities and service systems. Although MM-4.3-1, MM-4.4-1, MM-4.5-1, MM-4.5-2, MM-4.5-3, MM-4.5-4, MM-4.9-1, MM-4.13-2, MM-4.13-3, and MM-4.18-1 would reduce construction-related impacts for future discretionary projects, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures available that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **Impact 4.19-2:**

- **Cumulative:** As discussed on pages 4.19-42 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, cumulative project development reliant predominantly on surface water (i.e., State Water Project and Colorado River water) could potentially result in cumulatively considerable water supply impacts. The County cannot enforce mitigation outside of its jurisdiction or (as discussed in further detail below) for non-discretionary or otherwise “exempt” projects under CEQA. As such, there would be no feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts to water supply; therefore, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impacts 4.19-1 and 4.19-2:** Impacts of a future development project depend on its specific characteristics such as site location, size, type of development, and nature of the construction or operational activities. Although MM-4.3-1, MM-4.4-1, MM-4.5-1, MM-4.5-2, MM-4.5-3, MM-4.5-4, MM-4.9-1, MM-4.13-2, MM-4.13-3, and MM-4.18-1 would apply to future discretionary projects within the Metro Planning Area, it cannot be known for certain that the mitigation will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels because the details of future development projects are unknown at this time. Furthermore, although future non-discretionary projects implemented under the Metro Area Plan would be subject to applicable federal, state and local regulations, they would not necessarily be subject to CEQA review, additional environmental assessments, or mitigation measures. As such, even with implementation of existing regulations, applicable Metro Area Plan goals and policies, and MM-4.3-1, MM-4.4-1, MM-4.5-1, MM-4.5-2, MM-4.5-3, MM-4.5-4, MM-4.9-1, MM-4.13-2, MM-4.13-3, and MM-4.18-1, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

## **V. FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS**

As required by section 15126.2(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must discuss ways in which a project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Also, the EIR must discuss the characteristics of the project that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Growth can be induced in a number of ways, such as through the elimination of obstacles to growth, the stimulation of economic activity within the region, or the establishment of policies or other precedents that directly or indirectly encourage additional growth. Under CEQA, this growth is not to be considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of significant consequence. Induced growth would be considered a significant impact if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth, directly or indirectly, significantly affects the environment.

In general, a project could foster spatial, economic, or population growth in a geographic area if the project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, the provision of new access to an area, or a change in zoning or General Plan amendment approval), or economic expansion or growth occurs in an area in response to the project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion). These circumstances are further described below.

**Elimination of Obstacles to Growth:** As discussed on pages 5-8 through 5-10 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, direct growth-inducing impacts are commonly associated with the extension of new public services, utilities, and roads into areas that have previously been undeveloped. The extension of such infrastructure into a non-serviced area can represent the elimination of a growth-limiting factor, thereby inducing growth. Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities and ultimately resulting in an increase in the pace of development or the density of the existing surrounding development. Indirect growth-inducing impacts include an increased demand for housing, commodities, and services that new development causes or attracts by increasing the population or job growth in an area.

The purpose of the Project is to guide land use and development/redevelopment in the unincorporated areas of the Metro Planning Area. The Project is anticipated to indirectly induce growth through the removal of obstacle to additional growth and development, such as allowing increased density to occur through proposed land use and zone changes. However, the Project does not propose any specific infrastructure improvements that would result in growth. The Project does not approve the construction of specific development projects and would largely accommodate growth based on market conditions. However, it would allow increased development intensity and/or a more inclusive mix of land uses compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the Project removes regulatory obstacles to growth, and is considered to be growth-inducing.

**Establishment of Policies that Encourage Additional Growth.** Implementation of the Project would increase the number of dwelling units that could occur under buildout conditions and accommodate a greater population than was envisioned under the General Plan. Additionally, it would increase commercial activity and create new jobs in the Project area through ACU development and potential future development/redevelopment under the Industrial Program. These new jobs could potentially lead to future employees moving into the Project area to be proximate to their jobs, therefore increasing the population. Therefore, the Metro Area Plan would have indirect growth-inducing effects, as analyzed throughout the PEIR.

As the Project area continues to develop, it would require further commitment of public services that could include fire protection, law enforcement, public schools, public recreation, and other services as appropriate. Future development in the Project area would require an increased commitment to public services that would be considered a long-term commitment in order to maintain a desired level of service. This is considered a growth-inducing impact.

As the population grows and occupies new dwelling units, these residents would seek shopping, entertainment, employment, home improvement, vehicle maintenance, and other economic opportunities in the surrounding area. This would facilitate the purchase of economic goods and services and could, therefore, encourage the creation of new businesses and/or the expansion of existing businesses. This need for goods and services would partially be met by the proposed ACU and potential clean industrial development, but not fully. This is considered a growth-inducing impact.

**Establishment of Other Precedents that Encourage Additional Growth.** Approval of the Project would not set a precedent that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment. Cities and counties in California periodically update their general plans pursuant to California Government Code Sections 65300 et seq. The Project is intended to guide regional level growth and development within the unincorporated communities of the Metro Planning Area. The Project would consolidate regulations that currently exist across multiple plans to simplify and streamline land use and zoning regulations. While no direct development is proposed as part of the Project, the implementation of Metro Area Plan land use changes, programs, and policies would accommodate future development (and redevelopment of previously developed areas).

**Stimulation of Economic Activity within the Region.** Pressures to develop in the surrounding cities may derive from regional economic conditions and market demands for housing, commercial, office and industrial land uses that may be directly or indirectly influenced by the Project. Although the Project does not include approval of physical development, it creates additional development capacity in the Project area compared to existing conditions. Much of this development capacity is either available under existing conditions or is limited to targeted areas. Furthermore, development projects would be induced more by market demands than by new development capacity created by land use changes included in the rezoning program. However, because approval of the Project would ultimately result in subsequent projects that would have their own environmental impacts—including potentially significant impacts—the Project is a growth-inducing action (Recirculated Draft PEIR pages 5-8 through 5-10).

**Impacts of Induced Growth.** The growth induced directly and indirectly by the Project are anticipated to contribute to the environmental impacts. The environmental impacts were analyzed throughout the PEIR, including environmental impacts that would be significant and unavoidable, as summarized in Section V above.

## VI. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must contain a discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, or the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Section 15126.6(f) further states that “the range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by the ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” Thus, the following discussion focuses on project alternatives that are capable of eliminating significant environmental impacts or substantially reducing them as compared to the proposed Project, even if the alternative would impede the attainment of some project objectives, or would be more costly. In accordance with Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the Guidelines, among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are: (1) site suitability; (2) economic viability; (3) availability of infrastructure; (4) general plan consistency; (5) other plans or regulatory limitations; (6) jurisdictional boundaries; and (7) whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site.

As required in Section 15126.6(a), in developing the alternatives to be addressed in this section, consideration was given to an alternative’s ability to meet most of the basic objectives of the Project. Because the proposed Project will cause potentially significant environmental effects, the County must consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternatives to the Project, evaluating whether these alternatives could avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant environmental effects while achieving most of the objectives of the Project.



The County, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the Record of Proceedings, and pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), makes the following findings with respect to the alternatives identified in the Final PEIR (SCH No. 2022020274):

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make the alternatives identified in the Final PEIR (SCH No. 2022020274) infeasible as described below:

*“Feasible” is defined in Section 15364 of the State CEQA Guidelines to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.”*

Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15019(a)(3) also provide that “other” considerations may form the basis for a finding of infeasibility. Judicial decisions<sup>1</sup> have made clear that feasibility includes the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project, and that an alternative may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives. A lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that purpose. Additionally, the agency may reasonably balance the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors and may reject an alternative that is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint.

**a) Alternatives Considered and Eliminated During the Planning Process**

Three alternatives for the Project were considered, but ultimately rejected from further analysis, consistent with Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

**1. Accessory Commercial Units Within All Residential Zones**

A preliminary consideration was that ACUs should become permitted across any residential neighborhood in the Metro Planning Area, and depending on location, each residential property would fall under one of three potential tiers.

- Tier 1: Any residential lot. Because of their immediate adjacency to homes, these lots would be restrained by the greatest limits to commercial development (via hours of operation, footprint of ACU, and number of employees. Restaurants and food preparation would not be permitted).
- Tier 2: At corner lots. Because of their visibility at centralized locations within neighborhoods, these lots are opportune for neighborhood-serving commercial uses but can offer more flexibility to commercial development than the category above. Compared to Tier 1, Tier 2 parcels could allow food preparation and restaurants/cafes via a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego (1982) 133 Ca1.App.3d 410, 417; Sierra Club v. County of Napa (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509; California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009)177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009), Section 17.39, p. 825; San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.

- Tier 3: Lots within 500 feet of existing commercial uses. Because of their natural proximity to existing commercial uses, these lots should have the most flexibility for commercial development. Alcohol sales could be considered via a CUP. Tier 3 parcels would also have the longest hours of operation, largest allowed footprint, and increased number of employees.

The currently proposed Metro Area Plan does not allow for ACUs on every residential property because it was determined that would be too disruptive to the current character of the established residential communities. Therefore, this initially considered proposal was not carried forward into the Metro Area Plan. Further, it was not considered to be an alternative considered in this PEIR because it would result in more significant environmental impacts related to reasonably foreseeable construction activities in residential areas, as well as reasonably foreseeable long-term operational noise impacts.

## **2. Reduced Housing Development (Not Feasible)**

This PEIR concludes that several significant and unavoidable impacts would result from the reasonably foreseeable development that would occur from implementation of the Metro Area Plan and its associated land use, policy and program changes. The majority of the growth associated with the Metro Area Plan would be generated by the implementation of the recently adopted Housing Element.

Because Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines mandates that “the range of potential alternatives to the proposed Project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects,” the reduction of the number of dwelling units that would be facilitated by the Metro Area Plan would be an appropriate means of reducing significant impacts. All significant and unavoidable impacts of the Metro Area Plan, with the exception of Impact 4.13-2 related to long-term operational noise associated with ACUs in residentially zoned areas, would be incrementally reduced in accordance with corresponding reductions in dwelling units and associated population growth.

However, this potential alternative would be infeasible because implementation of the Housing Element and RHNA requirements is mandated by the State of California and must be implemented. Therefore, the amount of housing anticipated through the implementation of the Metro Area Plan would satisfy the requirements of the Housing Element/RHNA and cannot be feasibly reduced, even if such reductions would reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts.

## **3. Alternative Locations for Housing (Not Feasible)**

The PEIR analyzes the environmental impacts of the implementation of the Metro Area Plan, which is mandated by the County’s General Plan and is specific to the Metro Planning Area. As discussed above, the Project would implement land use and zone changes within the unincorporated communities within the Metro Planning Area to accommodate the state-mandated RHNA allocation for the County, as identified by the Housing Element. Sites selected for rezoning/redesignation in the Project area were previously identified by the Housing Element’s adequate sites analysis. As the County is required to implement the Housing Element pursuant to state law, including the adequate sites program. As such, consideration of alternative locations for the implementation of the Metro Area Plan is not feasible.

## **b) Alternatives Under Consideration**

As discussed on pages 6-7 through 6-39 of the Recirculated Draft PEIR, the Project alternatives are summarized below along with the findings relevant to each alternative.

### **1. Alternative A: No Project/ Buildout According to Adopted Plans**

State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e), requires that an EIR evaluate a “no project” alternative along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow a lead agency to compare the impacts of approving the project to the impacts of not approving it. As specified in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), when a project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan or policy or an ongoing operation, the no project alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the no project alternative, as required by the State CEQA Guidelines, would analyze the effects of development consistent with implementation of the General Plan and existing land use/zoning.

#### Potentially Significant Effects:

The No Project Alternative would result in the continuation of existing conditions and planned development of the County. This alternative would not implement new zoning and development standards, which could contribute to the quality and character of future development in these zones. Furthermore, Alternative A would conflict with State Housing Law and the recently adopted Housing Element for Los Angeles County by not allocating the RHNA goals required for the 6th Cycle. As such, impacts under Alternative A related to aesthetics and land use and planning would be more than the proposed Project. For all other resource areas, no new significant environmental impacts or an increased severity of environmental impacts identified in the General Plan EIR would occur under this alternative because it would retain the current General Plan land use designations and policy provisions. The No Project Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts to most environmental topics (i.e., all topics except aesthetics, agriculture/forestry resources, land use/planning, and mineral resources) and eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and utilities and service systems. Because the No Project Alternative would not change parcels identified in the proposed Project, this alternative would not generate new construction in the same manner as the proposed Project and associated future development projects would occur as analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

#### Facts in Support of Finding:

The County finds that this alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable environmental impacts for the following: air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and utilities and service systems. Alternative A would reduce most other significant and unavoidable environmental impacts associated with the Project (i.e., all except for aesthetics, agriculture/forestry resources, land use/planning, and mineral resources). However, this alternative substantially reduces the ability to meet all of the project objectives.

## **2. Alternative B: Elimination of Accessory Commercial Units**

By eliminating the proposed ACU amendments and Program 7 (Accessory Commercial Unit Program), Alternative B would eliminate the potential for 106 new ACUs on corner lots in Project area's residential-only zones and reduce the employment potential of approximately 176 new jobs when compared to the proposed Project. As such, Alternative B would indirectly result in the same buildout of additional housing units and employees associated with future development/redevelopment under the Industrial Program as the proposed Project. The locations anticipated to support future residential or industrial growth under Alternative B are the same as the proposed Project.

### Potentially Significant Effects:

Alternative B would have similar impacts compared to the proposed Project and would not eliminate any significant and unavoidable impacts identified under the proposed Project. As such, significant impacts related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems would remain significant and unavoidable.

### Facts in Support of Finding:

The County finds that this alternative would not reduce potentially significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Moreover, under Alternative B, only two of the seven project objectives would be met: (5) Further opportunities to preserve and enhance existing cultural and historic resources that are important to the local community by documenting existing historic context and resources; and (6) Incorporate the proposed land-use policy changes/zoning recommendations identified in the recently adopted Housing Element to increase the diversity of housing types that are affordable at varied income levels. Alternative B would reduce the ability to meet all other project objectives and substantially reduce the ability to meet the following project objective: (7) Increase opportunities for local-serving and small commercial businesses to be located near their customer base.

## **3. Alternative C: Housing Element/RHNA Only**

Under Alternative C, only the implementation of the land use and zoning recommendations from the recently adopted Housing Element would occur. Thus, buildout of the Alternative C would include a targeted redesignation/rezoning program to accommodate development of additional dwelling units, which would generate a new population of additional residents. As a result of Alternative C, new jobs and development standards associated with ACUs and the Industrial Program would not occur when compared to the proposed Project. Alternative C would also not include the proposed administrative "cleanup" of land use and zoning data applicable to the Project area, and would not introduce new or revise and streamline existing development standards under the Metro Planning Area Standards District.

### Potentially Significant Effects:

Alternative C would result in greater impacts when compared with the Project for aesthetics; similar impacts for agriculture and forestry, biological resources, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and recreation; and reduced

impacts for cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. Alternative C would also eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and hazards and hazardous materials compared to the proposed Project. Under this alternative, significant and unavoidable impacts would still occur related to biological resources, cultural resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems.

Facts in Support of Finding:

The County finds that this alternative would eliminate potentially significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and hazards and hazardous materials. In addition, Alternative C would reduce significant and unavoidable impacts related to cultural resources, noise, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems compared to the proposed Project. All other significant unavoidable impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. However, other considerations, such as not fully meeting most of the project objectives, including substantially reducing the ability to meet the following objectives: (1) Advance smart growth principles to create communities that are more sustainable where people of all ages can live, work, play, and run errands without the burden of car ownership; (4) Foster a strong and diverse local economy by providing opportunities that attract economic development, businesses, and job creation; increase competitiveness; and promote economic growth. Support design elements to improve land use compatibility between industrial and residential land uses that are in close proximity to each other; (5) Further opportunities to preserve and enhance existing cultural and historic resources that are important to the local community by documenting existing historic context and resources; and (7) Increase opportunities for local-serving and small commercial businesses to be located near their local customer base.

**c) Environmentally Superior Alternative**

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative; and, where the no project alternative is environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify an alternative from among the others evaluated as environmentally superior (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]). Alternative A would result in reduced environmental impacts to more environmental topics as compared to Alternatives B and C. As required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Alternative C would be the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative C would (1) eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts and (2) further reduce Project impacts which were found to be significant and unavoidable or less than significant under the proposed Project.

**VII. Statement of Overriding Considerations**

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081(b) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15093(a) and (b), the County is required to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. The lead or responsible agency may then approve the project and adopt a “Statement of Overriding Considerations,” which states in writing the specific reasons to support the lead or responsible agency’s action based on the FEIR and other information in the record (CEQA Guidelines section 15093 and

15096(h)). These Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the Final PEIR, public testimony, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings.

The County finds and determines that (1) all significant environmental effects of the Project have been substantially lessened where feasible; (2) the Project will result in certain significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level even with incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures; and (3) there are no other feasible mitigation measures or feasible Project alternatives that will further mitigate, avoid, or reduce the remaining significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.

The County finds that the adoption and implementation of the Metro Area Plan will have the following economic, social, legal, and other considerable benefits:

1. The Project would advance smart growth principles to create communities that are more sustainable where people of all ages can live, work, play, and run errands without the burden of car ownership.
2. The Project would provide for a diversity of neighborhoods, residential densities, safe and sanitary housing types, healthy food options, recreation, public facilities, and shopping/commercial services to meet the needs of the communities.
3. The Project would provide a safe, reliable, equitable, and sustainable transportation network to encourage walking, biking, transit, and other nonautomotive travel to enhance public health and safety. In addition, a decrease in vehicle miles traveled and corresponding reduction in greenhouse gas emissions would improve air quality.
4. The Project would foster a strong and diverse local economy by providing opportunities that attract economic development, businesses, and job creation; increase competitiveness; and promote economic growth. The Project would support design elements to improve land use compatibility between industrial and residential land uses that are in close proximity to each other.
5. The Project would further opportunities to preserve and enhance existing cultural and historic resources that are important to the local community by documenting existing historic context and resources.
6. The Project would incorporate the proposed land use policy changes/zoning recommendations identified in the recently adopted Housing Element to increase the diversity of housing types that are affordable at varied income levels.
7. The Project would increase opportunities for local-serving and small commercial businesses to be located near their local customer base.

After balancing the specific economic, social, legal, and other considerable benefits of the Project, the County finds that the remaining significant and unavoidable environmental effects are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations above.