

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan

1 Introduction

This Findings of Fact (Findings) and the Statement of Overriding Considerations summarize the findings of environmental impacts of the *East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan Program Environmental Impact Report* (ESGVAP PEIR) – County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (SCH No. 2022040512) and presents the Statement of Overriding Considerations. This section presents an overview of the purpose of this document, summarizes the proposed Project, and presents the organization of this document.

1.1 Purpose of Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations

Section 15091 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (and Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code) require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more written findings for each such impact. According to Section 15091, “No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
- (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Additionally, CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic,

legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental effects, the significant environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.” When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects, which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. (Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21081(b); CEQA Guidelines § 15093).

1.2 Overview of the Proposed Project

The proposed East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan (ESGVAP, Area Plan, or Project), described in Chapter 3.0 of the Draft PEIR, is a community-based plan that focuses on land use and policy issues that are specific to the unique characteristics and needs of the East San Gabriel Valley (ESGV) Planning Area. The ESGVAP is intended to respond to local planning challenges, guide long-term development, enhance community spaces, promote a stable and livable environment that balances growth with preservation, and improve the quality of life in the ESGV through the creation of vibrant, thriving, safe, healthy, and pleasant communities. The ESGVAP would update and consolidate two existing community plans into the Area Plan. The Rowland Heights community standards district is being updated to better implement the objectives of the Area Plan. Boundaries of the Avocado Heights equestrian district (ED) and Trailside ED are being combined and updated to streamline and standardize horse-keeping provisions within the two existing ED areas.

Project Objectives

The overarching vision of the ESGVAP is to conserve the residential character of the ESGV communities, while at the same time, grow sustainably into a dynamic regional hub that provides diverse options for housing, shopping, entertainment, recreation, and services for its residents, workers, and visitors. The ESGVAP supports the community’s desire to preserve the historical rural and equestrian character of the ESGV.

The primary objectives of the ESGVAP are to:

- Retain the residential character of the ESGV Planning Area in harmony with its surroundings;
- Promote economic development via an active regional hub near transportation centers with diverse options for housing, shopping, entertainment, recreation, and public services;
- Develop goals, policies, and implementation programs that support smart growth, sustainable development, and thoughtful enhancement of residential neighborhoods while preserving the area’s historical rural and equestrian character;
- Establish more public spaces and create walkable communities linked by paths and greenways; and
- Encourage a diversity of housing options and affordability.

1.3 Document Organization

This Findings of Fact and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are organized as follows:

- **Section 1. Introduction:** provides background information of the purpose of Findings of Fact and the Statement of Overriding Considerations and presents the organization of this document and provides a brief overview of the proposed Project.
- **Section 2. Statement of Environmental Effects and Required Findings:** identifies the issue areas for which the proposed Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact, and presents a summary of the significant effects of the proposed Project along with the one or more written findings made by the County, as the Lead Agency, explaining how it dealt with each of the significant effects and mitigation measures.
- **Section 3. Evaluation of Alternatives:** describes the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR, and the findings and rationale for selection of the proposed Project and rejection of the alternatives, including the Environmentally Superior Alternative.
- **Section 4. Findings Regarding the Final EIR:** outlines the contents and findings of the Final PEIR
- **Section 5. Statement of Overriding Considerations:** explains in detail why the social, economic, legal, technical, or other beneficial aspects of the proposed Project outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts and why the County, as the Lead Agency, is willing to accept such impacts.

2 Statement of Environmental Effects and Required Findings

The following sections (Sections A, B, C and D) set forth the County's findings regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address the significant impacts. Although State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and PRC Section 21081 only require findings to address significant environmental effects, findings often address impacts that were found to be less than significant; therefore, these findings will account for all effects identified in the Final PEIR.

The Final PEIR addresses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of construction and operation activities associated with the proposed Project. The Final PEIR provides the environmental information necessary for the County to make a final decision on the requested discretionary actions for all phases of this Project.

These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the County regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed Project, the mitigation measures included as part of the Final PEIR and adopted by the County as part of the Project, and the alternatives that have been rejected as infeasible. These findings refer to the analysis contained within the Final EIR to avoid duplication and redundancy. Because the County agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final PEIR, which includes the analysis provided in the Draft EIR, these findings will not

repeat the analysis and conclusions in the Final PEIR, but instead incorporates them by reference in these findings and relies upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

A. Findings of No Impact

The environmental effects listed below were identified as not potentially significant (refer to Section 6.5, *Effects Found Not to Be Significant*, in the Draft PEIR). The County finds that the Draft PEIR, the Final PEIR, and the record of proceedings in this matter do not identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant environmental effects of the Project with respect to the areas listed below:

1. Geology and Soils
2. Mineral Resources

As described in Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and detailed in the Draft EIR, these issues have no potential for significant impacts and required no further environmental review or analysis beyond the discussion in Chapter 6 of the Draft PEIR.

B. Findings of Less than Significant prior to Mitigation

The County finds that the following environmental effects were identified in the Draft PEIR, the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings in this matter contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project would result in less than significant effects on the environment with respect to the areas listed below:

1. Agriculture and Forestry Resources
2. Energy
3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
4. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
5. Hydrology and Water Quality
6. Land Use and Planning
7. Population and Housing
8. Public Services
9. Recreation
10. Utilities and Service Systems
11. Wildfire

B.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use (Impact AG-1).
- ii. The Project would not conflict with the existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production (Impact AG-2).
- iii. The Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (Impact AG-3).
- iv. The Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (Impact AG-4).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to agriculture and forestry resources.

B.2 Energy

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation (Impact ENG-1).
- ii. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency (Impact ENG-2).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to energy.

B.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (Impact GHG-1).
- ii. The Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs (Impact GHG-2).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to greenhouse gas emissions.

B.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not, either directly or as a result of future projects facilitated by the ESGVAP: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area; and expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires (Impact HAZ-1 through Impact HAZ-5; Impact HAZ-7).
- ii. The Project would not impair implementation of or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (Impact HAZ-6).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to hazardous materials.

B.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain; the alteration of the course of a stream or river; or through the addition of impervious surfaces; otherwise place structures in Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain areas which would require additional flood proofing and flood insurance requirements; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact

Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84); use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g., high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); and in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation (Impact HYD-1; Impact HYD-3 through Impact HYD-7).

- ii. The Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (Impact HYD-2).
- iii. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan (Impact HYD-8).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to hydrology and water quality.

B.6 Land Use and Planning

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not, either directly or as a result of future projects facilitated by the ESGVAP, physically divide an established community or conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas (Impact LU-1 and Impact LU-3).
- ii. The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (Impact LU-2).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to land use and planning.

B.7 Population and Housing

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, directly nor indirectly (Impact POP-1).
- ii. The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere (Impact POP-2).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to population and housing.

B.8 Public Services

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: (i) fire protection, (ii) police protection, (iii) schools, (iv) parks, (v) other public facilities (Impact PUB-1).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to public services.

B.9 Recreation

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not 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 (Impact REC-1).
- ii. The Project would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment (Impact REC-2).
- iii. The Project would not result interference with regional trail connectivity (Impact REC-3).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to recreation.

B.10 Utility and Service Systems

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not create new demand related to water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas power, or telecommunications utilities (Impact UTL-1).
- ii. The Project would not induce growth beyond regional SCAG projections. As a result, sufficient water supplies would be available to serve reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years consistent with local UWMP projections (Impact UTL-2).
- iii. The Project would ensure adequate treatment capacity is available in the ESGV Planning Area to service future development (Impact UTL-3).
- iv. The Project would not generate substantial solid waste or impair attainment of solid waste reduction goals (Impact UTL-4).
- v. The Project would not increase regional capacity requirements for local solid waste facilities compared to existing capacity projections. (Impact UTL-5).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to utilities and service systems.

B.11 Wildfire

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not: due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes; and expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires (Impact WF-2 through Impact WF-5).
- ii. The Project would not change regulations associated with emergency response and would not provide any goals, policies, or programs that would significantly impact emergency response and/or evacuation (Impact WF-1).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to wildfire.

C. Findings of Less than Significant with Mitigation

The County finds that although the following environmental effects were identified as potentially significant in the Draft PEIR, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or lessen the potential significant environmental effects listed below to a less-than-significant level:

1. Cultural Resources
2. Tribal Cultural Resources

C.1 Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future projects facilitating land use/zoning changes and policies included in the ESGVAP could involve structural improvements, demolition/alteration of existing structures, and/or ground disturbing activities (for construction of residential, commercial and mixed-use development) that could, depending on their location, result in direct or indirect adverse changes to the significance of historical resources. Future projects would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations that protect historical resources and undergo the County's discretionary review process, where applicable, including completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review under CEQA. Such projects nonetheless could result in significant impacts to previously recorded and as-yet-unidentified archaeological and/or historic architectural resources qualifying as historical resources under CEQA. Any project that proposes the demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a building or structure more than 45 years in age or that involves ground disturbing activities could result in a significant impact to historic architectural and/or archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources under CEQA (Impact CUL-1).
- ii. Future projects facilitating land use/zoning changes and policies included in the ESGVAP could involve ground disturbing activities (for construction of residential, commercial and mixed-use development) that could, depending on their location, result in direct or indirect adverse changes to the significance of historical resources. Future projects would be required to comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations that protect unique archaeological resources and undergo the County's discretionary review process, where applicable, including completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review under CEQA. Any project that involves ground disturbing activities could result in a significant impact to a unique archaeological resource (Impact CUL-2).

- iii. Future projects facilitating land use/zoning changes and policies included in the ESGVAP could involve ground disturbing activities (for construction of residential, commercial and mixed-use development) that could, depending on their location, result in direct or indirect adverse changes to the significance of paleontological resources. Future projects would be required to comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations that protect paleontological resources and undergo the County's discretionary review process, where applicable, including completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review under CEQA. Such projects could nonetheless result in significant impacts to unique paleontological resources or sites under CEQA (Impact CUL-3).
- iv. Future projects facilitating land use/zoning changes and policies included in the ESGVAP could involve ground disturbing activities (for construction of residential, commercial and mixed-use development) that could, depending on their location, disturb human remains. Future projects would be required to comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations that protect human remains and undergo the County's discretionary review process, where applicable, including completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review under CEQA. Such projects could nonetheless result in significant impacts to human remains under CEQA, including to human remains interred outside of dedicated cemeteries (Impact CUL-4).

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance:

CR-4.5-1: Historic Resources Assessment. Prior to demolition or alteration of buildings and/or structures or the construction of aboveground infrastructure with potentially significant impacts on historic architectural resources, the project proponent shall retain an architectural historian meeting the minimum professional qualifications standards (PQS) set forth by the Secretary of the Interior (codified in 36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 61; 48 Federal Register 44738–44739) (Qualified Architectural Historian) to conduct a historic resources assessment of affected properties. The assessment shall include a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center or review of a prior record search conducted within the previous one year; a review of other pertinent archives and sources; a pedestrian field survey; recordation of all identified historic architectural resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms; evaluation of resources which may be eligible for listing in the California Register (i.e., meets the definition for historical resource in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a]), and for local listing; and preparation of a technical report documenting the methods and results of the assessment for each future project facilitated by 2045 CAP measures and actions. If a historic architectural resource is found eligible by the Qualified Architectural Historian, then the Qualified Architectural Historian shall coordinate with the project proponent and County to ensure the project is constructed in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. All reports resulting from implementation of this measure shall be filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center (including but not limited to historic resources assessments and Secretary of the Interior's Standards plan reviews).

CR-4.5-2: Archaeological Resources Assessment. Prior to conducting construction activities that would involve ground disturbance, the project proponent shall retain an archaeologist meeting the minimum PQS set forth by the Secretary of the Interior (codified in 36 CFR Part 61; 48 Federal Register 44738–44739) (Qualified Archaeologist) to conduct an archaeological resources assessment. The assessment shall include a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center or review of a prior record search conducted within the previous one year; a Sacred Lands File search at the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC); geoarchaeological review including a focused assessment of land use history and any available geotechnical data to assess the potential for subsurface archaeological resources; a pedestrian field survey in instances where ground surface is exposed; recordation of all identified archaeological resources on DPR 523 forms; evaluation of resources affected by the project for eligibility for listing in the California Register (i.e., meets the definition for historical resource in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a]), and for local listing; and preparation of a technical report documenting the methods and results of the assessment. Resources that do not qualify as historical resources shall be considered by the Qualified Archaeologist for qualification as unique archaeological resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). The technical report also shall provide recommendations as to whether additional studies are warranted to further identify or evaluate archaeological resources (i.e., Extended Phase I boundary delineation, Phase II testing and evaluation) and if archaeological monitoring and Native American monitoring of ground disturbing activities is warranted (e.g., in areas where there is a higher potential to encounter buried resources). Prior to the initiation of field work for any Extended Phase I or Phase II investigation, the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a work plan outlining the investigation’s objectives, goals, and methodology. When developing a work plan for Native American resources, the County shall consult with local Native American tribes. If archaeological/Native American monitoring is warranted, the Qualified Archaeologist shall determine the locations and duration of monitoring and reporting requirements. All reports resulting from implementation of this measure shall be filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center (including but not limited to archaeological resources assessments, Extended Phase I and Phase II reports, and monitoring reports).

CR-4.5-3: Construction Worker Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training. For projects with ground disturbing activities that may encounter potentially significant archaeological resources, the Qualified Archaeologist shall implement a cultural resources sensitivity training program. The Qualified Archaeologist, or its designee, shall instruct all construction personnel of the types of archaeological resources that may be encountered, the proper procedures to be enacted in the event of an inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources or human remains, applicable laws protecting archaeological resources, and confidentiality of discoveries. Native American monitor(s) shall be invited to participate in presenting tribal perspectives as part of the training curriculum. In the event that construction crews are phased, additional trainings shall be conducted for new construction personnel. The project proponent or its contractors shall ensure construction personnel are made available for and attend the training. The project proponent shall retain documentation demonstrating attendance and provide it to the County.

CR-4.5-4: Archaeological Resources Discoveries. In the event archaeological resources are encountered during construction of a project, the project proponent shall cease all activity within 50 feet of the find shall cease. The discovery shall be evaluated for significance by the Qualified Archaeologist. When assessing significance and developing treatment for resources that are Native American in origin, the County shall consult with local Native American tribes. If the Qualified Archaeologist determines that the resource is significant (i.e., meets the definition for historical resource in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a] or for unique archaeological resource in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2[g]), the Qualified Archaeologist shall provide a method for avoidance and preservation in place, which shall be the preferred manner of mitigating impacts. If avoidance is infeasible, the Qualified Archaeologist shall develop a Phase III Archaeological Resources Data Recovery and Treatment Plan consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.5-5. The Qualified Archaeologist also shall determine, based on the initial assessment of the discovery, whether the 50-foot buffer may be reduced. All reports resulting from implementation of this measure shall be filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center (including but not limited to Extended Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III reports).

CR-4.5-5: Treatment of Archaeological Resources. If the assessment conducted under Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 or Mitigation Measure 4.5-4 identifies significant archaeological resources (i.e., meets the definition for historical resource in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a] or for unique archaeological resource in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2[g]), then avoidance and preservation in place shall be the preferred manner of mitigating impacts. Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, avoidance, incorporating the resource into open space, capping, or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance and preservation in place of significant archaeological resources is determined by the County to be infeasible, then the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare 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. When developing treatment for resources that are Native American in origin, the County shall consult with local Native American tribes. All Phase III reports resulting from implementation of this measure shall be filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center.

CR-4.5-6: Curation and Disposition of Cultural Materials. Disposition of Native American archaeological materials shall be determined by the County in coordination with local California Native American tribes. Disposition of materials 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 County shall consider tribal preferences when making a determination of disposition of Native American archaeological materials. Disposition of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects or grave goods (i.e. artifacts associated with human remains) shall be determined by the landowner in consultation with the County and the MLD. The project

proponent shall curate all significant historic-period archaeological material, or portions thereof at the discretion of the Qualified Archaeologist, 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 proponent 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 proponent 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.

CR-4.5-7: Paleontological Resources Assessment and Monitoring. For projects facilitated by the ESGVAP that involve ground disturbance, the project proponent shall retain a paleontologist who meets the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's (SVP 2010) definition for qualified professional paleontologist (Qualified Paleontologist) to prepare a paleontological resources assessment report prior to the start of construction activities. The report shall include methods and results of the paleontological resources assessment, monitoring requirements (including depths, frequency, and reporting), and maps that outline where monitoring is required. Monitoring shall follow SVP Guidelines: no monitoring of ground-disturbing activities within units of Low Sensitivity or No Potential; monitoring of all ground-disturbing activities (with depths specified) in units of Low to High Significance; and at all depths within units of High Significance unless the Qualified Paleontologist's report identifies previous disturbances or the use of construction methods which do not warrant monitoring; and monitoring at the initiation of excavation in units of Undetermined Significance. The report also shall stipulate whether screen washing is necessary to recover small specimens following SVP Guidelines and determine whether unique geologic features are present onsite. If monitoring is conducted, then the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a final report summarizing monitoring results and submit it to the project proponent and the County.

CR-4.5-8: Paleontological Resources Sensitivity Training. Prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities for projects facilitated by the ESGVAP with potentially significant impacts on paleontological resources, the Qualified Paleontologist or its designee shall conduct construction worker paleontological resources sensitivity training (or may be provided via digital recording) for all construction workers. Construction workers shall be informed on how to identify the types of paleontological resources that may be encountered, the proper procedures to be enacted in the event of an inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources, and safety precautions to be taken when working with paleontological monitors. The project proponent shall ensure that construction workers are made available for and attend the training. The project proponent shall retain documentation demonstrating attendance and provide it to the County.

CR-4.5-9: Paleontological Discoveries. If a potential fossil is found, the paleontological monitor shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading and excavation activities in the area of the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation of the discovery. An appropriate buffer area determined by the paleontological monitor shall be established around the find

where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. At the monitor's discretion, and to reduce any construction delay, the grading/excavation contractor shall assist, where feasible, in removing rock/sediment samples for initial processing and evaluation. If a fossil is determined to be significant, the Qualified Paleontologist shall implement a paleontological salvage program to remove the resources from their location, following the guidelines of the SVP (2010). 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.

If construction workers discover any potential fossils during construction while the paleontological monitor is not present, regardless of the depth of work or location, work at the discovery location shall cease in a 50-foot radius of the discovery until the Qualified Paleontologist has assessed the discovery and recommended and implemented appropriate treatment as described earlier in this measure.

Any salvage reports resulting from implementation of this measure shall be filed with the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

CR- 4.5-10: Human Remains Discoveries. If human remains are encountered, then the project proponent or its contractor shall immediately halt work within 50 feet of the discovery and contact the Los Angeles County Coroner in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, which require that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the remains' origin and disposition. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, then the County Coroner will notify the NAHC within 24 hours in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(c), and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The NAHC shall then identify the person(s) thought to be the MLD. The MLD may, with the permission of the land owner, or their authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access by the landowner to inspect the discovery. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. The reasonable options regarding the MLD's preferences for treatment.

Until the project proponent, County, and landowner have conferred with the MLD, the contractor shall ensure that the immediate vicinity where the discovery occurred is not disturbed by further activity and is adequately protected according to generally accepted

cultural or archaeological standards or practices (e.g., the NAHC's A Professional Guide for the Preservation and Protection of Native American Human Remains and Associated Grave Goods [NAHC 2022], which reiterates statutory requirements), and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials.

If the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner rejects the recommendation of the MLD and the mediation provided for in Public Resources Code Section 5097.94(k), if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall inter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.

Finding: The County finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that lessen significant impacts to cultural resources, as identified in the Final PEIR. The County finds that based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

C.2 Tribal Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future projects facilitating land use/zoning changes and policies included in the ESGVAP could involve ground disturbing activities (for construction of residential, commercial and mixed-use development) that could, depending on their location, result in direct or indirect substantial adverse changes to the significance of tribal cultural resources. Future projects facilitated by the ESGVAP would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations and, as appropriate, to undergo the County's discretionary review process, including completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review under CEQA. These projects would similarly require compliance with AB 52 to ensure that tribal cultural resources are properly identified. Such projects could nonetheless result in significant impacts to sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe qualifying as tribal cultural resources (Impact TCR-1).

Mitigation: Implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-2 through CR-4.5-6 would reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources, including archaeological resources that could also meet the definition of tribal cultural resource, less than significant levels.

Finding: The County finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that lessen significant impacts to tribal cultural resources, as identified in the Final PEIR. The County finds that based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

D. Impacts Found to Be Significant after Mitigation (Significant and Unavoidable)

The County finds that the following environmental effects were identified as potentially significant and that even with the implementation of mitigation measures, the PEIR and the record of proceedings in this matter identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant and unavoidable environmental effects as listed below:

1. Aesthetics
2. Air Quality
3. Biological Resources
4. Noise
5. Transportation

D.1 Aesthetics

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to having a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas and visual resources (Impact AES-1).
- ii. The Project would not have an adverse impact to existing views of the ESGVAP area from elevated vantage points, as are available from regional riding, hiking, and multi-use trails (Impact AES-2).
- iii. The Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway (Impact AES-3).
- iv. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to substantially degrading the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features and/or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality (Impact AES-4).
- v. The Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. The impact would be less than significant (Impact AES-5).

Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact of Impact AES-1 and Impact AES-4.

Finding: The County has determined that there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to adverse effects on scenic vistas and degradation of the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings with implementation of the Project. Based

on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to aesthetics.

D.2 Air Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (Impact AQ-1).
- ii. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (Impact AQ-2).
- iii. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operations due to future development projects facilitated by adoption of the ESGVAP generating substantial emissions in proximity to sensitive receptors (Impact AQ-3).
- iv. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to other emissions (such as those leading to odors) during construction or operation (Impact AQ-4).

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact of Impact AQ-2, Impact AQ-3 and Impact AQ-4.

Finding: The County has determined that there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to net increases of criteria pollutants, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and other emissions (such as those leading to odors) during construction or operation. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality.

D.3 Biological Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact relating to the loss of special-status species through direct mortality or via indirect effects such as habitat loss and edge effects at the urban-wildland interface. Buildout of the ESGVAP could have significant adverse impacts on special-status species and/or their habitats (Impact BIO-1).
- ii. The Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts relating to sensitive natural communities (Impact BIO-2).

- iii. The Project could result in impacts to aquatic habitats, particularly those located in proximity to water bodies. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4.4-1 would require identification of state and federally protected wetlands and waters, implementation of avoidance and minimization measures, obtaining necessary permits, and compensatory mitigation for projects that would result in the direct removal, filling, or other alteration of protected aquatic resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation (Impact BIO-3).
- iv. The Project would have no impact to oak woodlands or other unique native woodlands (Impact BIO-4).
- v. Future construction associated with the Project could result in impacts to nesting resident and migratory birds. Potential impacts could include disruption of nesting activity due to construction-related noise and direct removal of active nests associated with construction or vegetation removal/disturbance. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4.4-2 would avoid and/or minimize impacts to nesting avian species and active nests. Potential impacts would be less than significant with mitigation (Impact BIO-5).
- vi. The Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (Impact BIO-6).
- vii. The Project would not conflict with adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect in the East San Gabriel Valley (Impact BIO-7).

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact of Impact BIO-1 and Impact BIO-2. The following mitigation measures are required to reduce Impact BIO-3 and Impact BIO-5 below a level of significance:

BIO-4.4-1: Projects subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE, Los Angeles RWQCB, and/or CDFW shall provide an aquatic resources delineation of wetlands and water courses prior to disturbance of any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat. Findings shall be included in an aquatic resources delineation report suitable for submittal to these agencies for obtaining a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit (CWA), Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC), Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), and/or streambed alteration agreement (SAA).

Based on the findings of the aquatic resources delineation report and agency verification of the extent of state/federally protected wetlands and waters resources, riparian vegetation, wetlands, and waters shall be avoided to the extent feasible, and appropriate 100-foot setbacks shall be marked from the edge of jurisdictional waters or riparian vegetation (whichever is wider) to maintain riparian and aquatic functions and values wherever feasible. In areas where avoidance of stream channels or riparian vegetation is infeasible, impacts shall be minimized and the site slopes and hydrology of remediated areas shall be

restored to pre-construction conditions to the extent possible. If impacts to wetlands are unavoidable, compensatory mitigation shall ensure no net loss of wetlands.

A compensatory mitigation plan addressing temporary and permanent impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and waters shall be prepared prior to disturbance. The plan shall be developed in consultation with the USACE, Los Angeles RWQCB, and/or CDFW. All restored/established/enhanced habitats shall be protected in perpetuity, subject to regular maintenance activities, if necessary, and appropriate to permitting agencies. Alternately, compensatory mitigation can be achieved through purchasing credits at a USACE- or CDFW-approved mitigation bank.

BIO-4.4-2: Construction, ground-disturbing activities, and vegetation removal shall avoid the general avian nesting season of February 15 through September 15. If construction of future projects that contain or are immediately adjacent to suitable nesting habitat must occur during the general avian nesting season, a pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted within 7 days prior to the start of construction activities to determine if any active nests or nesting activity is occurring on or within 500 feet of the project. If no sign of nesting activity is observed, construction may proceed without potential impacts to nesting birds. If an active nest is observed during the preconstruction clearance survey, an adequate buffer shall be established around the active nest depending on sensitivity of the species and proximity to project impact areas. Typical buffer distances include up to 300-feet for passerines and up to 500-feet for raptors, but can be reduced as deemed appropriate by a monitoring biologist. On site construction monitoring may also be required to ensure that no direct or indirect impacts occur to the active nest. Project activities may encroach into the buffer only at the discretion of the monitoring biologist. The buffer shall remain in place until the nest is no longer active as determined by the monitoring biologist.

Finding: The County has determined that there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to candidate, sensitive, or special status species, or their habitats, including those in SEAs, and sensitive natural communities with implementation of the Project. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to biological resources.

D.4 Noise

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact relating to construction noise levels in excess of standards. Despite implementation of mitigation measures NOI-4.11-1 and NOI-4.11-2, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable (Impact NOI-1).
- ii. Construction activities for future projects facilitated by adoption of the ESGVAP could result in significant construction groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels in excess of standards and result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Despite

implementation of mitigation measure NOI-4.11-3, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable during construction (Impact NOI-2).

- iii. Implementation of the proposed ESGVAP would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels, and thus this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required (Impact NOI-3).

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact of Impact NOI-1 and Impact NOI-2. The following mitigation measures are required to reduce the severity of Impact NOI-1 and Impact NOI-2, but they would remain significant and unavoidable:

NOI-4.11-1: Commercial/Industrial/Accessory Commercial Unit (ACU) Operational Noise. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any future commercial, industrial, mixed-use, or ACU development projects within the East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan that are located within 500 feet of sensitive receptors, project applicant shall submit a noise mitigation plan to 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, one or more of the following, as applicable to the project:

- 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 not apply and is superseded once a Countywide noise ordinance goes into effect that establishes operational noise standards for commercial, industrial, mixed-use, or ACU development projects within the East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan.

NOI-4.11-2: Construction Noise. Applicants for future development projects pursuant to implementation of the East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan 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, one or more of the following, as applicable to the project:

- 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 not apply and is 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 East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan.

NOI-4.11-3: Construction Vibration. For future development projects that utilize vibration-intensive construction equipment (e.g., pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers) within 300 feet of sensitive receptors within the East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan, 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 at 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 not apply and is 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 East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan.

Finding: The County has determined that there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to noise and vibration with implementation of the Project. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise and vibration.

D.5 Transportation

Facts/Effects:

- The Project would be consistent with all applicable plans and programs related to transportation (Impact TR-1).
- The Project would result in a potentially significant VMT impact. Although VMT per capita would be reduced as a result of the Project, with mitigation measures TR-4.15-1 and TR-4.15-2, the impact related to VMT per service population will remain significant and unavoidable (Impact TR-2).
- The Project would not result in hazards due to design features or incompatible uses (Impact TR-3).
- The Project would facilitate the consideration of the needs for emergency access in transportation planning during buildout (Impact TR-4).

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact of Impact TR-2. The following mitigation measures are required to reduce the severity of Impact TR-2, but the impact would remain significant and unavoidable:

TR-4.15-1: VMT Reduction Projects. The County will work with State, regional, and local agencies to reduce regional VMT. Land use policies in the ESGVAP to improve and/or expand transit service, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and transportation projects will help the region to achieve the projected decreases in regional VMT. The County will also collaborate with State and other agencies to explore the feasibility of new programs for reducing VMT, such as VMT fees.

TR-4.15-2: TDM Strategies. Implementation of TDM strategies, where feasible and necessary based on project- and site-specific considerations, may include but are not limited to those identified below:

1. Increased Job Density
2. Provide Transit-Oriented Development
3. Commute Trip Reduction Marketing
4. Ridesharing Programs
5. Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program
6. End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities
7. Employer-Sponsored Vanpool
8. Employee Parking Cash-Out
9. Limit Residential Parking Supply
10. Unbundle Residential Parking Costs from Property Cost
11. Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements
12. Expand Bikeway Network
13. Extend Transit Network Coverage or Hours
14. Increase Transit Service Frequency
15. Implement Transit-Supportive Roadway Treatments
16. Provide Bus Rapid Transit

Finding: The County has determined that there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to VMT with implementation of the Project. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation.

E. Cumulative Impacts

As indicated previously, the Final PEIR addresses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of construction and operation activities associated with the Project. The Draft PEIR provides a detailed cumulative analysis, and this section, provides the Findings relative to the cumulative environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the Project.

Cumulative Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant:

1. Agriculture and Forestry Resources
2. Energy
3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
4. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
5. Hydrology and Water Quality
6. Land Use and Planning
7. Population and Housing
8. Public Services

- 9. Recreation
- 10. Utilities and Service Systems
- 11. Wildfire

Cumulative Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant with Mitigation:

- 12. Cultural Resources
- 13. Tribal Cultural Resources

Cumulative Impacts Found to Be Significant and Unavoidable:

- 14. Aesthetics
- 15. Air Quality
- 16. Biological Resources
- 17. Noise
- 18. Transportation

E.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project's less-than-significant incremental contribution would not be cumulatively considerable when considered together with the incremental impacts of other cumulative projects because projects facilitated by implementation of the ESGVAP would improve agriculture and forest resources and because, among the types of projects that could adversely affect such resources, site-specific discretionary environmental and permitting processes would address potential significant impacts.
- ii. No significant cumulative condition exists with respect to conflicts with zoning for forest land. Therefore, no significant cumulative impact exists to which the ESGVAP could contribute, and no cumulative impact would occur.
- iii. As mentioned in point E.1 ii, it is unlikely that throughout the county, there is a significant cumulative condition with regard to the conversion of forest land and the Project includes measures intended to protect and conserve forestland. There is no significant cumulative condition to which the Project could contribute and no cumulative impact.
- iv. As mentioned in point E.1 i and E.1 ii, the Project would improve cumulative conditions in agricultural areas. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant cumulative impact that related to changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative agriculture and forestry resources impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to agriculture and forestry resources.

E.2 Energy

Facts/Effects:

- i. Development under the proposed Project would be required to incorporate energy conservation features to comply with applicable mandatory regulations including CALGreen Code and state energy standards under Title 24. Therefore, the impact with respect to electricity and natural gas consumption from new development under the Project would be less than cumulatively considerable.
- ii. Development under the proposed Project would be required to demonstrate consistency with federal and state fuel efficiency goals and incorporate mitigation measures as required under CEQA. Siting land use development projects at infill sites is consistent with the state's overall goals to reduce VMT pursuant to SB 375, and VMT per capita would decrease compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the impact of development anticipated by the Project would be less than cumulatively considerable with respect to transportation energy.
- iii. Development under the proposed Project would be required to comply with the RPS, California Integrated Energy Policy Plan, Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, RTP/SCS, OurCounty Los Angeles Countywide Sustainability Plan, and 2020 CCAP. It would also not conflict with the renewable energy or energy efficiency goals of the Draft 2045 CAP nor other energy efficiency requirements or other regulations. Other cumulative projects would also have to comply with the goals and policies of these plans. Therefore, the impact on the implementation of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative energy impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to energy.

E.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Facts/Effects:

- i. The ESGVAP is a planning document, the approval of which would not directly result in the development of land uses and would not directly result in GHG emissions. Future GHG emissions may result from future development facilitated by adoption of the Project. A future development project's GHG emissions typically would be very small in comparison to state or global GHG emissions and, consequently, they would, in isolation, have no significant direct impact on climate change.
- ii. Given that the Project would not conflict with applicable GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations, emissions associated with future development that could occur under the proposed General Plan update would be less than significant on a cumulative basis.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to greenhouse gas emissions.

E.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Facts/Effects:

- i. All new projects would be subject to the same federal, State, and local traffic regulations, which would ensure the cumulative impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

E.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. When the Project's incremental impacts are considered in combination with the incremental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, its incremental contribution to the interference with groundwater management would not be cumulatively considerable.

- ii. The Project's goals and policies would promote improved water quality and groundwater sustainability in the ESGVAP area, as well as continued compliance with state and local water quality regulations, which is intended to ensure that water quality and groundwater sustainability is managed to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, when the ESGVAP's incremental impacts are considered in combination with the incremental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, its incremental contribution to the interference of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to hydrology and water quality.

E.6 Land Use and Planning

Facts/Effects:

- i. All future development would be subject to CEQA and would be required to comply with planning documents, such as the Los Angeles County General Plan, general plans prepared by nearby cities, and regional plans, such as the ESGVAP, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan, and the SCAG RTP/SCS. Projects would be approved if they meet the goals and policies of these planning documents, which have been prepared to reduce environmental impacts. The Project in combination with other cumulative growth in Los Angeles County would contribute to a less than significant impact due to inconsistency with the General Plan or other regional and use plans adopted to avoid or mitigation environmental impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative land use and planning impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to land use and planning.

E.7 Population and Housing

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development, including growth anticipated under the proposed Project, would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing as future development would be required to comply with planning documents, such as the Los Angeles County General Plan, general plans prepared by nearby cities, and regional plans, such as the ESGVAP, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan, and the

SCAG RTP/SCS. The Project in combination with other cumulative growth in Los Angeles County would contribute to a less than significant cumulative-induced population increase.

- ii. The Project contains policies and enacts zoning changes that will offer additional housing unit type options and ensure communities retain their character, amenities, and access to services and infrastructure. Potential displacement impacts associated with all proposed development projects in the Planning Area will be analyzed and, if required, mitigated in accordance with CEQA. Projects would be approved if they meet the goals and policies of the ESGVAP, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan, and the SCAG RTP/SCS, which have been prepared to reduce environmental impacts, including housing and population displacement. The Project in combination with other cumulative growth in Los Angeles County would contribute to a less than significant cumulative housing displacement.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative population and housing impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to population and housing.

E.8 Public Services

Facts/Effects:

- i. Cumulative residential, industrial and commercial projects would depend on existing and expanded fire protection services within the County. The Project would require the incorporation of the County's Developers Fee Program. The County's Developers Fee Program would fund the purchase and construction of new fire stations to provide adequate services as a result of new development. Since the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, the demand for public services would be consistent with regional demand projections and would not increase the cumulative demand compared to current projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for public services would not be considerable.
- ii. When the Project's incremental impacts are considered in combination with the incremental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the Project's incremental contribution to law enforcement service impacts would be cumulatively considerable. However, the Project would cause a potential significant impact that could be avoided/reduced to less than significant with Policy PS/F 1.1 and Policy S 4.5. Since the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, the demand for public services would be consistent with regional demand projections and would not increase the cumulative demand compared to current projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for public services would not be considerable.

- iii. When the Project's incremental impacts are considered in combination with the incremental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the Project's incremental contribution to school services, would be cumulatively considerable. However, the Project would cause a potential significant impact that could be avoided/reduced to less than significant with the school impact fees established by SB 50. Developers would be required to pay a school impact fee in concurrence with building permit approval. The Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, the demand for schools would be consistent with regional demand projections and would not increase the cumulative demand compared to current projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for schools would not be considerable.
- iv. The Project's contribution to a cumulative impact with respect to the overuse and degradation of existing park facilities and the construction or expansion of additional parks and recreation facilities are considered in Section 4.14, Recreation.
- v. When the Project's incremental impacts are considered in combination with the incremental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the Project's incremental contribution to library services would be cumulatively considerable. However, the Project would cause a potential significant impact that could be avoided/reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the library facilities mitigation fee. Present and future projects would be required to pay a fee to reduce the impacts that new development will have on the library system by funding the expansion of library facilities. Since the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, the demand for libraries would be consistent with regional demand projections and would not increase the cumulative demand compared to current projections. The library facilities fee would mitigate cumulative impacts on the Los Angeles County Library system. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for libraries would not be considerable.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts to public services.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to public services below a level of significance.

E.9 Recreation

Facts/Effects:

- i. Adherence to existing regulations, General Plan policies, ESGVAP policies, Implementation Programs, and strategies and guidance from the DPR 2016 PNA and 2022 PNA+ Final Reports would ensure that the funding for parkland acquisition and park development, operation, and maintenance would be proportional to increases in population pursuant to the Quimby Act, additional funding mechanisms including,

Prop A and Measure A, and collaboration with other agencies, school districts, and organizations.

- ii. The majority of cumulative projects for the construction or expansion of these facilities would be discretionary and would be required to demonstrate compliance with CEQA prior to project approval; existing federal, state, and local regulations, would mitigate potential adverse impacts to the environment that may result from the expansion of parks, recreational facilities, and trails. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact associated with construction recreational facilities.
- iii. The Project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on regional trail connectivity, it would not contribute to a cumulative impact on regional trail connectivity. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact associated with interference with regional trail connectivity.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts to recreation below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to recreation.

E.10 Utility and Service Systems

Facts/Effects:

- i. Given that the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, regional utilities would accommodate the local increases without increasing overall regional demand projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for utilities would not be considerable.
- ii. Based on the General Plan's cumulative water demand projections, the County will have enough water to support all water demands including land uses, residential and nonresidential development, and projected population increases. Additionally, future related projects would be required to comply with local regulations and General Plan policies, including Policy PS/F-3.2, Goal PS/F 2, ESGVAP Policy CC-2.2, and ESGVAP Policy CC-4.6. Furthermore, because the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, regional water suppliers would accommodate the local increases without increasing overall regional demand projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for utilities would not be considerable.
- iii. The County has the capacity to treat wastewater from cumulative projects at existing wastewater treatment plants and additional policies and goals outlined in the General Plan will ensure that future projects do not exceed the combined capacity of wastewater

treatment plants in Los Angeles County. Given that the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, regional wastewater treatment facilities would accommodate the local increases without increasing overall regional demand projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for utilities would not be considerable.

- iv. Cumulative effects from future projects, population, and development growth accounted for in the General Plan would not require the construction of new solid waste disposal facilities. Additional policies and goals outlined in the General Plan would ensure that future projects do not exceed the combined capacity of solid waste disposal infrastructure in Los Angeles County. Given that the Project would not induce regional population growth beyond SCAG projections, solid waste management facilities would accommodate the local increases without increasing overall regional demand projections. As a result, the Project's contribution to cumulative demands for utilities would not be considerable.
- v. Disposal of waste generated from implementation of the Project would be consistent with all state regulations and the policies within the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Plan. Future development under the proposed Project and other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would be required to comply with all solid waste statutes and regulations. The Project would not cause or contribute to any significant cumulative impact associated with conflict with federal, state, or local statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to utilities and service systems.

E.11 Wildfire

Facts/Effects:

- i. When the Project's incremental impacts are considered in combination with the incremental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, it's incremental contribution to the interference with or impairment of emergency response or evacuation plans would not be cumulatively considerable. Any future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to emergency response and wildland fires. Required compliance with these regulations would ensure impacts related to emergency response and wildfire would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts to wildfire below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to wildfire.

E.12 Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project, as a result of projects facilitated by ESGVAP, would contribute a significant incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact that could be mitigated to a level that would be less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., less than significant) by the implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-4.5-1 through CR-4.5-6. With the implementation of these measures, the Project-specific, incremental contribution, taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts to historical resources over the span of the ESGVAP, would not be cumulatively considerable because they would require, prior implementation of projects that might impact known and unknown historical resources, an architectural historian to identify historical resources, provide recommendations, require archaeological monitoring, and prepare a plan for the treatment of historical resources.
- ii. The Project, as a result of projects facilitated by the ESGVAP, would contribute a significant incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact that could be mitigated to a level that would be less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., less than significant) by the implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-2 through CR-4.5-6. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the Project-specific, incremental contribution, taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts to unique archaeological resources over the span of the ESGVAP, would not be cumulatively considerable because they would require identification and treatment of unique archaeological resources and thereby avoid or reduce significant impacts.
- iii. The Project, as a result of projects facilitated by the ESGVAP, would contribute a significant incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact that could be mitigated to a level that would be less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., less than significant) by the implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-7 through CR-4.5-9. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the Project-specific, incremental contribution, taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts to unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features over the span of the ESGVAP, would not be cumulatively considerable because they would require identification and treatment of unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features and thereby avoid or reduce significant impacts.
- iv. The Project, as a result of projects facilitated by the ESGVAP, would contribute a significant incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact that could be mitigated to a level that would be less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., less than significant) by the implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-10. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the Project-specific, incremental

contribution, taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts on human remains interred outside formal cemeteries over the span of the ESGVAP, would not be cumulatively considerable because the measure would require the project proponent and County to follow the law governing such finds, including by halting work, notifying the County Coroner, and consulting with the MLD or taking other specified, appropriate actions to assure treatment of the remains with appropriate dignity. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during work associated with a project facilitated by the ESGVAP, then the project proponent and/or the County would be required to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials (e.g., Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98).

Mitigation: Implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-1 through CR4.5-10 are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which help to reduce the severity of the cumulative impact to cultural resources.

E.13 Tribal Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact that could be mitigated to a level that would be less than cumulatively considerable (i.e., less than significant) by the implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-2 through CR-4.5-6. With the implementation of these measures, the Project's-specific, incremental contribution, taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts on tribal cultural resources over the span of the ESGVAP, would not be cumulatively considerable because the measure would require the County to initiate consultation (within 14 days of a decision to undertake a project facilitated by the ESGVAP) with California Native American tribes in order to avoid or lessen impacts to tribal cultural resources, as well as require archaeological and Native American monitoring and preparation of a plan for the treatment of such resources.

Mitigation: Implementation of mitigation measures CR-4.5-2 through CR4.5-6 are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The County finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which help to reduce the severity of the cumulative impact to tribal cultural resources.

E.14 Aesthetics

Facts/Effects:

- i. Notwithstanding compliance with objective and quantitative County policies and standards and the adoption of General Plan and zoning amendments as part of the ESGVAP, the extent of physical change that could occur in many areas under the

Project would result in a considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact on scenic vistas. Given the Project's plan for higher density development than currently exists in the Plan Area, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce this significant or unavoidable impact.

- ii. The implementation of policies included in the Project and the County's General Plan that would guide the design of future development in these areas, would be anticipated to lessen this effect to the extent that such development would integrate into the existing character of those communities, would have gradual transitions between areas of differing density, and would not have an adverse impact to existing views of the ESGVAP area from elevated vantage points, as are available from regional riding, hiking, and multi-use trails. For this reason, development that would occur pursuant to the Project would be anticipated to have a less-than-cumulatively-considerable impact on the significant cumulative impact to views from regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trails.
- iii. Development in unincorporated communities further to the north, may be briefly visible from SR 57; however, based on the level of densification anticipated to occur pursuant to the Project, such development is not anticipated to be visibly discernable from those distances. For this reason, implementation of the Project is not anticipated to substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and its contribution to a potentially significant cumulative impact to scenic resources would be less-than-cumulatively considerable.
- iv. As development pursuant to the Project and cumulative could be denser and taller than most or all of the existing adjacent development, some areas currently appreciated as open space could be developed with new housing. Even though the maximum allowable height for future development projects under the ESGVAP would be reduced to fifty feet (from the currently allowable 65-foot height limit), given that the Project and cumulative development would result in higher density development than currently exists in the Plan Area and no feasible mitigation is available to address unknown potential future project-specific impacts to visual character, public views, or scenic quality, this impact is considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.
- v. Anticipated development patterns within the ESGVAP would not preclude other cities and counties within East San Gabriel Valley viewsheds from developing substantial new sources of light or glare. For this reason, there would be a potential cumulatively significant impact related to the creation of new sources of substantial light or glare, which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the East San Gabriel Valley area. However, with the application of relevant County policies related to the control of sources of light and glare, implementation of the Project would have a less-than-cumulatively-considerable contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to aesthetics to a less than significant level.

Finding: The County has determined that no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to aesthetics to a less than significant level. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to aesthetics.

E.15 Air Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not conflict with AQMP construction, land use, and transportation strategies that are intended to reduce construction emissions, VMT, and resulting regional mobile source emissions. In addition, construction and operation would not conflict with growth projections as the County continues to coordinate with SCAQMD and SCAG to ensure county-wide growth projections, land use planning efforts, and local development patterns are accounted for in the regional planning and air quality planning processes. As such, a cumulatively considerable impact would be less than significant.
- ii. The cumulative analysis of air quality impacts follows SCAQMD's guidance such that construction or operational project emissions would be considered cumulatively considerable if project-specific emissions exceed an applicable SCAQMD recommended significance threshold. Future development facilitated by adoption of the Project may result in construction or operational emissions that could exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to air quality to a less than significant level.

Finding: The County has determined that no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to air quality to a less than significant level. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to air quality.

E.16 Biological Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Due to the loss of common habitats and diminished resource availability, impacts to special-status species remain significant at the ESGVAP level. It is presumed that direct impacts to special-status species and their habitats would be mitigated, as feasible, in other regions of the cumulative impacts study area. The significant incremental contribution of future individual projects under the ESGVAP, when taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts to special-status species over

the span of the ESGVAP, is cumulatively considerable and are significant and unavoidable.

- ii. Depending on the location of future ESGVAP projects, construction could result in significant impacts to riparian and other sensitive natural communities. The significant incremental contribution of future individual projects under the ESGVAP, when taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts to riparian and other sensitive natural communities over the span of the ESGVAP, is cumulatively considerable and are significant and unavoidable.
- iii. Depending on the location of future ESGVAP projects, construction could result in impacts to state and/or federally protected wetlands or waters, particularly those located in proximity to water bodies. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4.4-1 would require identification of state and federally protected wetlands and waters, implementation of avoidance and minimization measures, obtaining necessary permits, and compensatory mitigation for projects that would result in the direct removal, filling, or other alteration of protected aquatic resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Presuming that impacts to wetlands would be similarly mitigated in other regions of the cumulative impacts study area, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.
- iv. There are no proposed changes to the zoning or land use intensities within oak woodlands or other unique native woodlands that would result habitat loss or conversion. As such, there would be no cumulative impacts to oak woodlands or other unique native woodlands.
- v. While there are no proposed changes that increase intensities of the existing zoning or land use intensities within regional wildlife linkages or SEAs, future construction could result in impacts to nesting resident and migratory birds such as through disruption of nesting activity due to construction-related noise and direct removal of active nests associated with construction or vegetation removal/disturbance. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4.4-2 would avoid and/or minimize impacts to nesting avian species and active nest at the project level. Thus, the significant incremental contribution of future individual projects under the ESGVAP, when taken into consideration with the cumulative projects' impacts to wildlife movement and corridors over the span of the ESGVAP, is less than significant.
- vi. Future individual projects implementing the ESGVAP's goals, policies, strategies, and implementation actions would also be consistent with those identified in the General Plan, as well as other local, state, and federal regulations, for the protection of biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant at the ESGVAP level. Similarly, applicable County policies and ordinances pertaining to biological resources protection would be applied to projects within the cumulative impacts study area. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact associated with special-status species and their habitats, and sensitive natural communities. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-4.4-1 and BIO4.4-2 are required to reduce impacts below a level of significance for impacts related to aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat, and related to nesting birds.

Finding: The County has determined that no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to biological resources to a less than significant level. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to biological resources.

E.17 Noise

Facts/Effects:

- i. Construction of future projects under the ESGVAP and other projects in the vicinity could occur at the same time and in proximity to each other and sensitive receptors. Therefore, cumulative construction noise impacts could be potentially significant. Cumulative impacts during construction are considered significant and unavoidable. Stationary operational noise sources at each site within the ESGVAP area will be required to comply with the County's noise ordinance. Nonetheless, it is possible that the operation of future projects under the ESGVAP and other projects in the vicinity could occur in proximity to each other and sensitive receptors. Therefore, the cumulative stationary operational noise impacts could be potentially significant. Despite implementation of mitigation measures NOI-4.11-1 and NOI-4.11-2, cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As such, cumulative impacts during future operations are considered significant and unavoidable.
- ii. It is possible that construction of future projects under the ESGVAP and other projects in the vicinity could occur at the same time and in proximity to each other and sensitive receptors. Despite implementation of mitigation measure NOI-4.11-3, cumulative impacts during construction would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, cumulative construction vibration impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact associated with construction and operational noise and vibration. Implementation of mitigation measures NOI-4.11-1 through NOI-4.11-3 are required to reduce the severity of cumulative impacts, but they would remain significant and unavoidable.

Findings: The County has determined that no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to noise to a less than significant level. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to noise.

E.18 Transportation

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not contribute to a cumulative impact with respect to consistency with programs, plans, policies, and ordinances. Cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.
- ii. The Project may result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts to VMT per service population, although the cumulative impact of the proposed Area Plan traffic along with other regional growth will be reduced through mitigation measures TR-4.15-1 and TR-4.15-2, along with regional programs that are the responsibility of other agencies such as cities within the Planning Area and Caltrans. In addition, as described above, the goals and policies of the Project would result in a decrease in VMT per capita by prioritizing transit-oriented development, mixed use development, as well as safe and accessible multi-modal transportation circulation improvements. Future plans and programs implemented by cities within the Planning Area would also be subject to the State and regional policies that encourage or require similar improvements and reductions in VMT per capita and per service population. However, if these programs and policies are not implemented by the agencies with the responsibility to do so, the cumulative transportation and traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Under these circumstances, the proposed Area Plan could result in a cumulatively significant traffic impact that may remain significant and unavoidable.
- iii. The Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to hazards.
- iv. Implementation of the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to emergency access. Cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact associated with transportation. Implementation of mitigation measures TR-4.15-1 and TR-4.15-2 are required to reduce the severity of cumulative impacts, but they would remain significant and unavoidable.

Finding: The County has determined that no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the cumulative impact related to transportation to a less than significant level. Based on the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings, the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to transportation.

3. Evaluation of Alternatives

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the 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. The Project's objectives are provided above in Section 1.2, *Project Objectives*.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) states that the selection of project alternatives “shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” Because the Project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts after implementation of the mitigation measures, the County considered alternatives to the Project specifically to reduce those impacts. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) further direct that “the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) goes on to say that the “range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making.”

The PEIR considers a total of five alternatives to the Project. Two alternatives were considered but were not selected for further analysis due to a failure to meet most of the basic Project Objectives, infeasibility, and/or an inability to avoid significant environmental impacts, and in accordance with the criteria established in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c). Three alternatives were comprehensively evaluated in the Draft PEIR, including the “no project” alternative and two reduced transit planning radius alternatives, which reduce the transit planning radius for transit centers from a one-mile radius to a 0.5-mile and 0.25-mile radius, respectively. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR, and that if the “no project” alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative with the least adverse impacts on the environment.

The alternatives considered or evaluated in the Draft PEIR include:

- Alternative Location/Alternative Sites (rejected from further consideration in the Draft PEIR)
- Reduced Development (rejected from further consideration in the Draft PEIR)
- No Project Alternative (evaluated in detail in the Draft PEIR)
- 0.5-Mile Transit Planning Radius Alternative (evaluated in detail in the Draft PEIR)
- 0.25-Mile Transit Planning Radius Alternative (evaluated in detail in the Draft PEIR).

The impacts of each of alternative evaluated in detail in the Draft PEIR are compared to the Project's impacts in Draft PEIR Chapter 5, *Alternatives*, with a summary of comparative impacts provided in in Draft PEIR Table 5-1.

3.1 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the following factors may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration: the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic Project Objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that were considered but rejected after initial analysis include the Alternative Location/Alternative Sites Alternative, which seeks to put the project in another location, and the Reduced Development Project which would reduce or eliminate the amount of candidate parcels proposed for re-designation. As identified in PRC Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, findings are required only for "alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." Alternatives that are not reviewed in detail in an EIR because they have been determined to be infeasible need not be discussed in the findings (*Crenshaw Subway Coalition v Los Angeles County Metro. Transp. Auth.* (CD Cal, Sept. 23, 2015, No. CV 11-9603 FMO [JCx]) 2015 US Dist Lexis 143642, 2015 WL 6150847). Therefore, findings are not provided for alternatives considered in the Draft PEIR and rejected from detailed analysis.

a) Alternative Location/Alternative Sites

Pursuant to Section 15126.6(f)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County considered the potential for alternative locations to the Project. As stated in Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A), the key question and first step in analyzing alternative sites is whether any of the significant effects of a project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting that project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of a project need to be considered in the PEIR.

The ESGVAP also aims to create a more robust housing stock within the ESGV that provides affordable options while still meeting the County's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations. The Project aims to increase residential uses throughout the ESGV Planning Area by primarily increasing the allowable residential uses and densities primarily around transit to foster smart growth within the County. The County has also identified that additional residential uses could be obtained from rezoning agricultural-zoned parcels that currently support residential uses as residential, as well as establishing streamlined zoning to create consistency across the Plan Area.

Specifically, the Project's proposed land use changes would allow for the increase in commercial and residential development within one mile of major transit stops, within a half-mile of High-Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), and near major intersections where there is accessibility to existing or proposed frequent transit and commercial services. The goal of these land use changes would be to target growth near transit and active transportation facilities and everyday commercial services, and coordinate growth with improvements and investments that support walkable, thriving, and connected communities.

In order to achieve the desired smart-growth around transit centers and HQTAs within the ESGV Planning Area, the County determined that a one-mile planning radius for transit centers and a 0.5-mile planning radius for the HQTAs is the appropriate distances to maximize the usage of transit services as a means to decrease vehicle mile traveled (VMT) and other related environmental impacts, such as air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, within the ESGV Planning Area. Due to the nature of creating transit-focused development, the County could not consider alternative locations outside of the identified planning radii because the effectiveness of locating residential uses near transit centers as a way to foster smart growth decreases as the distance between the two uses increase.

For the existing agricultural-zoned properties currently serving as residential uses, the County would rezone these properties for residential uses to create consistency between the County's land use and zoning documents and existing use of those properties. Similarly, the County would also streamline zoning to create consistencies throughout the ESGV, which in turn could create new residential uses. For these zoning processes, the parcels that meet the County's existing land use and zoning designations would be applicable, where alternative sites or locations that do not match the County's zoning criteria would not apply. Therefore, due to the nature of land use and zoning designations being site-specific, the County could not consider alternative sites or alternative locations for these two zoning processes.

For the reasons listed above, the County rejected the alternative site or location alternative as it would not achieve the objectives of the Project and would not foster the desired type of development within the ESGV Planning Area. This alternative is not further evaluated within this PEIR.

b) Reduced Development Project

The County considered an alternative that would reduce or eliminate the amount of candidate parcels proposed for re-designation under the proposed land use and zoning amendments as a way to reduce environmental impacts compared to the Project (hereinafter refer to as the Reduced Development Alternative). However, the Reduced Development Alternative was rejected as it would not allow for the increase in designated residential uses throughout the ESGV Planning Area that is necessary to accommodate the County's share of the regional housing allocation established by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the 2021–2029 planning period. Furthermore, the Project would update and reorganize the existing overlapping land use plans, policies, and regulations throughout the East San Gabriel Valley communities, as well as simplify and streamline land use and zoning regulations for the ESGV Planning Area. In contrast, the Reduced Development Alternative would only partially achieve these land use and zoning goals, as the excluded parcels from the ESGVAP would remain subject to existing land use and zoning designations, which would create further land use and zoning inconsistencies in the ESGV Planning Area as the entire Planning Area would not be updated as a whole. For these reasons, the Reduced Development Alternative was considered but rejected from further evaluation within this PEIR.

3.2 Alternatives Analyzed in the PEIR

a) No Project Alternative

As specified in 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 (Alternative 1) 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 not adopting and implementing the ESGVAP. Future development under the No Project Alternative would continue to be guided by the County's existing General Plan land use, including the recently adopted Housing Element Update, and zoning designations. The No Project Alternative would result in the continuation of existing conditions and planned development within the County as no land use or zoning amendments would be processed under this alternative. No new significant environmental impacts or an increased severity of environmental impacts identified in the County's General Plan, including the updated Housing Element, or Community Plan EIRs would occur under this alternative because it would retain the current General Plan and Community Plan land use designations and policy provisions.

Finding. The County rejects the No Project Alternative and finds that the alternative is infeasible because it would not fully achieve the Project Objectives.

Basis for finding: Although the No Project Alternative would reduce the Project's significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact to a less than significant level, it would also result in three new significant and unavoidable impacts associated with GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, and wildfire. Furthermore, while the significance conclusion would be the same as the Project, Alternative 1 would result in more severe impacts related to energy and GHG emissions, as the energy efficiencies and savings and reduction in VMT would not be provided to the same extent as the Project. Finally, while the significance conclusion would be the same as the Project, Alternative 1 would result in less severe impacts related to population and housing, as growth would occur at a slower rate as projected in the County's General Plan and Communities Plans. As such, this alternative would not accomplish some of the project objectives (e.g., promote economic development via an active regional hub near transportation centers with diverse options for housing, shopping, entertainment, recreation, and public services and encourage a diversity of housing options and affordability) to the same degree as the Project.

b) 0.5-Mile Transit Center Planning Radius Alternative

The 0.5-Mile Transit Center Planning Radius (Alternative 2) would be similar to the Project, with the exception that the transit planning radius for transit centers would be reduced from a one-mile radius to a 0.5-mile radius. The 0.5-mile planning radius for High-Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), as well as all other Project components, would remain the same as the Project under this alternative. By reducing the Planning Area from a one-mile radius to a 0.5-mile radius, it would be reasonable to assume that the Planning Area used for the Project would be roughly reduced by 50 percent under this alternative, thus the developable area of the ESGVAP would be limited.

Finding. The County rejects the 0.5-Mile Transit Center Planning Radius Alternative and finds that the alternative is infeasible because it would not fully achieve the Project Objectives.

Basis for finding: Implementation of Alternative 2 would not reduce any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, noise, or transportation to a less than significant level, but would reduce the severity of these impacts due to the reduction in developable area contained in the Alternative. While the significance conclusion would be the same as the Project, Alternative 2 would also reduce the severity of impacts associated with cultural resources, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, and tribal cultural resources. Moreover, since the authority of the ESGVAP would be restricted to the Alternative 2 Planning Area, the energy efficiency and savings policies, goals, and development features of the ESGVAP would not be as widely applied throughout the County. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have more severe energy impacts than the Project, and as such, would not provide the additional energy benefits of the Project. Lastly, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to all other issue areas as the Project but would achieve the Project's objectives on a reduced scale compared to the Project since it would allow for fewer future housing options, which would limit growth around transit centers and HQTAs, and provide less opportunity for an increase in commercial uses due to the reduced developable area.

c) 0.25-Mile Transit Planning Radii Alternative

The 0.25-Mile Transit Center Planning Radius (Alternative 3) would be similar to the Project, with the exception that the transit planning radii for both transit centers and HQTAs would be reduced from one mile and 0.5-mile, respectively, under the Project to 0.25-mile for both under this alternative. By reducing the Project Planning Area from a one-mile planning radius to a 0.25-mile planning radius for transit centers and from a 0.5-mile planning radius to 0.25-mile planning radius for HQTAs, it would be reasonable to assume that the Planning Area used for the Project would be roughly reduced by 75 percent under this alternative.

Finding. The County rejects the 0.25-Mile Transit Center Planning Radius Alternative and finds that the alternative is infeasible because it would not fully achieve the Project Objectives.

Basis for finding: Implementation of Alternative 3 would not reduce any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, noise, or transportation to a less than significant level, but would substantially reduce the severity of these impacts due to the considerable reduction in developable area. While the significance conclusion would be the same as the Project, Alternative 3 would also reduce the severity of impacts associated with cultural resources, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, and tribal cultural resources. Moreover, since the authority of the ESGVAP would be restricted to the Alternative 3 Planning Area, the energy efficiency and savings policies, goals, and development features of the ESGVAP would not be as widely applied throughout the County. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have more severe energy impacts than the Project, and as such, would not provide the additional energy benefits of the Project. Lastly, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to all other issue areas as the Project but would achieve the Project's objectives but on a substantially reduced scale since it would allow for fewer future housing options, which would limit growth around transit centers and HQTAs, and result in less opportunity for an increase in commercial uses due to the reduced developable area.

3.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be identified and the reasons for such a selection be disclosed and if the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, then the EIR is required to identify an alternative from among the others evaluated as environmentally superior. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of adverse impacts. As detailed in Chapter 5 of the Draft PEIR (see Table 5-1), the No Project Alternative would reduce the Project’s significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact but would also result in three new significant and unavoidable associated with GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, and wildfire. Therefore, this alternative is not the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative 2 and 3 would result in similar impacts and would partially achieve the Project Objectives. However, since the developable area would be greater under Alternative 2, this Alternative would provide greater benefits to the communities within the ESGVAP area as the policies, goals, and implementation actions of the ESGVAP would be applied to a larger area than Alternative 3. While Alternative 2 would not reduce any of the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts, this Alternative would reduce the severity of those impacts, as well as impacts related to cultural resources, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, and tribal cultural resources. However, since the authority of the ESGVAP would be restricted to the Alternative 2 Planning Area, the energy efficiency and savings policies, goals, and development features of the ESGVAP would not be as widely applied throughout the County. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have more severe energy impacts than the Project, and as such, would not provide the additional energy benefits of the Project. Lastly, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to all other issue areas as the Project.

While Alternative 2 would reduce the severity of the Project impacts, this Alternative would not fully achieve the Project’s objectives nor provide the Project’s benefits to the same extent as the Project. This Alternative would limit the developable area targeted for transit-oriented growth and would not uniformly apply streamlined land and zoning processes across the County. Alternative 2 is considered the environmentally superior alternative for CEQA purposes because it would result in similar adverse impacts but would provide the greatest long-term benefit to the communities within the ESGVAP area.

4. Findings Regarding the Final PEIR

The Responses to Comments, provided as Chapter 2 of the Final PEIR, includes the comments received during the public review period on the Draft PEIR, as well as the County's responses to these comments. The focus of the Responses to Comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues as raised in the comments, as specified by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(c). The County provided a written proposed response to each public agency on comments made by that public agency pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b).

The purpose of the Final PEIR is to respond to all comments received by the County regarding the environmental information and analyses contained in the Draft PEIR. Corrections and Addition to the PEIR, provided as Chapter 3 of the Final PEIR, includes any clarifications/corrections to the text, tables, figures, and appendices of the PEIR generated either from responses to comments or independently by the County. The County finds that comments made on the Draft PEIR, the responses to these comments, and revisions to the PEIR clarify or update the analysis presented in the document but do not change the analysis or conclusions of the PEIR. Accordingly, no significant new information, as described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, was added to the PEIR after the Draft PEIR was made available for public review.

The comments, responses to comments, and the clarifications to the PEIR do not trigger the need to recirculate the PEIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. These changes merely clarify or update the discussion but do not change the analysis or conclusions of the PEIR. Based on the analysis in the Draft PEIR, the comments received, and the responses to these comments, no substantial new environmental issues have been raised that have not been adequately addressed in the PEIR. Also, no changes to the analysis or conclusions of the PEIR are necessary based on the comments, the responses to the comments, and the revisions to the PEIR.

All feasible mitigation measures are included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that will be adopted if the County approves the Project. As discussed above, the County finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make it infeasible to mitigate significant impacts with respect to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, noise, and transportation.

Nonetheless, as indicated above, some significant and unavoidable impacts will remain, and all of the feasible mitigation measures are included in the Project's MMRP, which will be adopted by the County if the Project is approved. The MMRP ensures implementation of the mitigation measures and provides the following information: (1) the full text of the mitigation measure and the impact statement(s) to which it applies; (2) the agency responsible for enforcing implementation of the mitigation measure; (3) the phase of the Project during which the measure would be monitored; and (4) the agency responsible for monitoring implementation of the mitigation measure. The MMRP is provided in Chapter 4 of the Final PEIR. For significant and unavoidable impacts, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared to provide substantial evidence that the Project's benefits outweigh its significant environmental impacts and will be adopted by the County if the Project is approved. The Statement of Overriding Considerations is provided in Section 5 of these Findings of Fact.

5. Statement of Overriding Considerations

The County finds on the basis of the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings in this matter that the unavoidable significant impacts of the Project and the unavoidable significant cumulative impacts are acceptable when balanced against the benefits of the Project. This determination is based on the following factors and the substantial public, social, economic, and environmental benefits flowing from the Project as identified in the Final PEIR and the record of proceedings in the matter.

The Final PEIR identifies significant environmental effects that will occur as a result of implementation of the ESGVAP. With implementation of the Project's mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, as discussed in the Final PEIR, these effects can be mitigated to levels considered less than significant, except for significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, noise and transportation as described above.

Considering the information contained in and related to the Final PEIR, and pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15092, the County finds that in approving the Project, it has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant and potentially significant effects of the Project on the environment where feasible as shown in these Findings. The County further finds that it has balanced the economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project against the remaining unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the Project and has determined that those benefits outweigh the unavoidable risks and that those risks are acceptable. The County makes this statement of overriding considerations in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 in support of approval of the Project. Specifically, in the County's judgment, the benefits of the Project, as proposed, outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts, and the Project should be approved. The following provides the County's rationale:

- The proposed ESGVAP will provide for the orderly build-out of new development; residential units of varying densities; mixed-use development; retail, office, and industrial uses; public lands; and parks, open space, and recreational facilities.
- The proposed ESGVAP implements principles of sustainable growth by promoting economic development via an active regional hub near transportation centers with diverse options for housing, shopping, entertainment, recreation, and public services; thereby minimizing land consumption while maintaining open space, habitat, and recreation uses throughout the ESGVAP area.
- The proposed ESGVAP improves mobility options through the establishment of more public spaces and the creation of walkable communities linked by paths and greenways.
- The proposed ESGVAP encourages the development of a variety of housing types that are needed to meet the needs of all of the ESGVAP's residents, to meet its fair share housing allocation without dividing established communities.

Accordingly, the County hereby concludes that the Project's benefits outweigh and override its unavoidable significant impacts for the reasons stated above. The County reached this decision

after having: (1) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (2) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the Project, (3) rejected alternatives that do not fully meet the Project objectives (4) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (5) balanced the benefits of the Project against its significant and unavoidable impacts.