

ES.1 Project Description

The City of La Cañada Flintridge (City) proposes a comprehensive update to its General Plan to guide long-range development and redevelopment within the City through 2030. Approval of the General Plan Update (Project) would require the adoption of an updated Land Use Map and eight General Plan Elements: (1) Land Use, (2) Open Space and Recreation, (3) Conservation, (4) Safety, (5) Circulation, (6) Noise, (7) Air Quality, and (8) Housing. Implementation of the Project's proposed goals, objectives, and policies and the updated land use plan would serve to guide the City's future use of land in an effort to encourage compatibility with existing land uses, while identifying the City's future growth needs.

The Project is expected to provide planning guidance through 2030 and could lead to a potential increase in population of 2,523 residents, growing from 21,256 to 23,799. However, because there is little undeveloped land remaining outside areas designated for parks, recreation, open space, and habitat conservation, residential and commercial growth will be focused in the downtown area and the proposed Mixed Use land use designations, with limited growth through residential infill in the more established residential neighborhoods. Under the proposed Project, residential dwelling units are projected to increase by an additional 814 units to a total of 7,883 units, while commercial space is expected to expand from approximately 845,696 to 2,100,703 square feet, an increase of approximately 1,355,783 square feet, with the large majority being added as mixed-use commercial. An industrial land use designation is not proposed, nor does one currently exist.

Details of the General Plan Update are provided in Chapter 3, "Project Description."

ES.2 Project Setting

The plan area encompasses 8.6 square miles within the incorporated limits of the City of La Cañada Flintridge in the urbanized Southern California region. The city is located 13 miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles and 6 miles northeast

of Burbank in Los Angeles County. The city is bordered by Pasadena to the east, Glendale to the south, the Angeles National Forest to the north, and the unincorporated county areas of La Crescenta and Montrose to the west. It is situated in the La Crescenta Valley along the Interstate (I) 210 corridor between the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and the San Raphael Hills to the south. A regional and a local map are provided in Chapter 2, “Environmental Setting.”

ES.3 Areas of Controversy

Section 15123(b)(2) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require any known areas of controversy surrounding the project be disclosed. Environmental issues of concern that have been raised through responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and public scoping meeting are addressed in this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). Comment letters received in response to the NOP are contained in Appendix A.

During the public scoping process, a number of agencies and a few members of the public provided comments. The agency comments are summarized below. The community comments focused on future impacts on air quality related to the extension of I-710, traffic congestion in the morning and afternoon, and animal-keeping regulations in the city (i.e., equestrian activities).

Agency	Summary Comments
California Emergency Management Agency (Cal-EMA)	Examine state planning law and what hazard issues are present within the community.
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Coordination of planning efforts between local agencies and Caltrans districts; preservation of transportation corridors for future system improvements; and development of coordinated transportation system management plans that achieve the maximum use of present and proposed infrastructure.
Colorado River Board of California (CRB)	Comment letter stated no comments at this time.
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works	Sewer maintenance and compliance with County standards.
County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation	Notes that Descanso Gardens is a County facility.
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation	Recommends specific criteria for evaluating transportation impacts and requests that all transit agencies receive a copy of

Agency	Summary Comments
Authority	the NOP.
State of California Native American Heritage Commission	Advises of the legal requirements associated with archaeological resources and offers suggestions on the analysis approach.
Southern California Association of Governments	Provides demographic information within the Project area and requests that the PEIR consider the applicable regional plans in the land use analysis.

Source: Appendix A

ES.4 Summary of Significant Effects

Significant direct environmental impacts and significant cumulative impacts are discussed and analyzed in detail in Chapter 4, “Environmental Analysis” of this PEIR. Technical analyses were prepared to determine potential impacts on air quality; climate change; noise; and transportation, circulation, and parking; their findings have been incorporated into this document, and copies of the worksheets and/or reports are appended to this PEIR.

Project implementation would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on the following issue areas: climate change; cultural resources; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; noise; transportation, circulation, and parking; and utilities. Impacts that would be significant prior to mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation, include the Project’s impacts on air quality; biological resources; geology, seismicity, and soils; and population and housing. Impacts that would be less than significant without any additional mitigation include aesthetics and community character, land use and planning, and public services and recreation.

The proposed Project would also contribute to significant cumulative impacts on the following issue areas: climate change; cultural resources; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; noise; population and housing; transportation, circulation, and parking; and utilities.

Table ES-1 presents a matrix of potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed Project along with mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid the significant impacts.

ES.5 Environmentally Superior Project Alternative

Three project alternatives (including the No Project Alternative) are evaluated in Chapter 5 of this PEIR. The No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative because it reduces impacts on climate change, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, public services and recreation, and utilities. Impacts related to noise; transportation, circulation, and parking; air quality; geology, seismicity, and soils; aesthetics and community character; land use and planning; and population and housing would be similar to those of the proposed Project. Implementation of the No Hillside Residential Land Use Alternative, while potentially feasible, would require the City to purchase private land within the Hillside Residential designation to implement this no build strategy within the hillside areas. This lack of certainty associated with the No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative means that the Project as proposed would provide the greatest avoidance of significant impacts while meeting the objectives of the City of La Cañada Flintridge.

ES.6 Issues to Be Resolved

The decision maker will need to resolve whether to approve the proposed Project in light of the significant environmental impacts and the alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant impacts. The lead agency must consider whether the proposed Project's mitigation has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment, where feasible, in accordance with the Project Findings of Fact (findings) and determine whether any of the remaining significant effects on the environment that were found to be unavoidable within the findings may be considered acceptable in light of the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Table ES-1. Matrix of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
AESTHETICS AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER				
<p>Threshold AES-1: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
<p>Although implementation of the proposed Project would result in moderate development along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, and within the northern and southern mountain areas, several City regulations are in place that would ensure the avoidance of negative impacts that future development could have upon existing views. These regulations include the Hillside Development Ordinance; Downtown Village Specific Plan; design commission review; and goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan Update. Requiring compliance with the regulations listed above would substantially reduce adverse changes to the city’s scenic vistas. Therefore, the proposed Project would have less-than-significant impacts on a scenic vista.</p>				
<p>Threshold AES-2: Would the proposed Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</p>	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact	None
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
<p>Implementation of the Project would result in development within areas that support scenic resources; however, compliance with the City’s Preservation, Protection, and Removal of Trees Ordinance and implementation of the General Plan Update’s goals, policies, and objectives protecting natural areas, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, and rolling hills would ensure that scenic resources located throughout the city are not damaged. In addition, no designated state scenic highways occur within the plan area.</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Therefore, because no state scenic highways are currently designated within the city, implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have no impact on scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway.</p>				
<p>Threshold AES-3: Would the proposed Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p>				
<p>Implementation of the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the city or its surroundings. Existing City regulations including the Hillside Development Ordinance; the Preservation, Protection, and Removal of Trees Ordinance; the DVSP; and the goals, policies, and objectives identified in the General Plan Update would require new development and redevelopment to create and preserve a high quality visual environment. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because existing City regulations, ordinances, goals, and policies provide guidance for the retention of the city’s existing visual character. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold AES-4: Would the proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p>				
<p>Although implementation of the proposed Project would allow some targeted redevelopment along Foothill Boulevard, as well as limited development within semi-rural lands near the mountain areas and in the southeast near Sacred Heart Academy, several City regulations are in place that would ensure the avoidance of negative light and glare impacts that future development could have upon existing daytime or nighttime views. Consequently, new</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>sources of substantial light and glare that would affect daytime or nighttime views in the area are not anticipated. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Cumulative Impact analysis: <u>Impact Determination:</u> Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new mixed-use, residential, multi-family, retail, and office space development within vacant and underutilized parcels throughout the city. As discussed above, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on existing scenic vistas, visual character, and light and glare. The potential small addition of new light sources for security lighting associated with redevelopment at targeted locations along Foothill Boulevard and in the few undeveloped areas within the city would be negligible to the overall cumulative effect.</p> <p>In addition, no officially designated state scenic highways traverse the city; thus, no impacts related to visual resources along a scenic highway would occur. The primary contributor to potential visual changes in and surrounding the city is the proposed Project because no other cumulative projects are proposed within the city boundaries. All new development associated with the General Plan Update would undergo design commission review to ensure compliance with the goals, objectives, and policies identified in the Land Use and Conservation Elements of the General Plan Update; the Hillside Development Ordinance; the Preservation, Protection and Removal of Trees Ordinance; and the Downtown Village Specific Plan. Although past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact, future development associated with the proposed General Plan Update would implement policies of and develop in accordance with the existing plans noted above; therefore, the Project’s incremental contribution to cumulative</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
aesthetic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.				
AIR QUALITY				
<p>Threshold AQ-1: Would the proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>The General Plan Update proactively addresses regional air quality in a manner consistent with policies and measures outlined in the 2007 AQMP. Although the General Plan Update would result in increased population, housing, and VMT over that projected by SCAG, the mixed-use development associated with the General Plan Update would be consistent with the land use and housing portion of SCAG’s RCPG, which promotes mixed-use and walkable downtown communities. In addition, the General Plan Update includes numerous goals, objectives, and policies that would help to support mixed-use development and alternative forms of transportation within the city. Therefore, the General Plan Update is considered consistent with the 2007 AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold AQ-2: Would the proposed Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact AQ-1: The timing and duration of construction activities associated with the buildout projections over the 20-year life of the General Plan Update cannot be determined; therefore, it is not possible to determine the magnitude of construction emissions from each development project or the magnitude of emissions reductions that would be achieved by these policies. Each future development would undergo development review, including in many cases CEQA review to evaluate project-specific impacts.</p>	Significant	<p>MM AQ-1. Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Construction Emissions.</p> <p>The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: If the development review identifies construction emissions that exceed SCAQMD mass emission thresholds, avoidance or minimization measures shall be developed and implemented to ensure that emissions will be reduced below their respective thresholds. In addition to</p>	Less than significant	No Project Alternative, Alternative 2

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Given the lack of specifics regarding construction projects, this impact is considered significant and mitigation would be required. Operation of the proposed land uses would increase motor vehicle traffic and area source emissions in the future. Although motor vehicles will emit fewer emissions in the future, increased VMT would result in road dust emissions that would exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds, if uncontrolled. However, current street sweeping activities reduce this impact to less than significant.</p>		<p>compliance with regulatory measures (including compliance with SCAQMD Rules and Regulations), the City shall require all new construction projects to incorporate all feasible mitigation where appropriate.</p> <p>Potential measures to reduce fugitive dust emissions include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Active grading sites will be watered one additional time per day beyond that required by Rule 403. ▪ Contractors will apply approved nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers to all inactive construction areas or replace groundcover in disturbed areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more). ▪ Construction contractors will provide temporary wind fencing around sites being graded or cleared. ▪ Trucks hauling dirt, sand, or gravel will be covered or will maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard in accordance with Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code. ▪ Construction contractors will install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off tires of vehicles and any equipment leaving the construction site. ▪ Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>will be reduced to 15 mph or less.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary traffic controls such as a flag person will be provided during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow. ▪ Construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system will be conducted during off-peak hours to the extent practicable. ▪ The grading contractor will suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 mph or when visible dust plumes emanate from a site; disturbed areas will be stabilized if construction is delayed. <p>In addition, potential measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) and particulates (PM10 and PM2.5) associated with construction equipment exhaust include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use construction equipment rated by the EPA as having Tier 3 or higher exhaust emission limits. ▪ Use diesel oxidation catalysts and catalyzed diesel particulate traps. ▪ Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications. ▪ Restrict idling of construction equipment to a maximum of 5 minutes when not in use. ▪ Install high-pressure fuel injectors on 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold AQ-3: Would the proposed project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>	Significant	<p>construction equipment vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re-route construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas <p>Potential measures to reduce emissions of the ozone precursors (ROG) from architectural coatings include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. <p>Mitigation measure MM AQ-1, as described under Threshold AQ-2, would mitigate construction emissions to less than significant. Thus, construction emissions would not result in a cumulative impact.</p>	Less than significant	No Project Alternative, Alternative 2
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact AQ-2: At this time, the timing and duration of construction activities associated with the buildout projections over the 20-year life of the General Plan Update cannot be determined; therefore, it is not possible to determine the magnitude of construction emissions from each development project or the magnitude of emissions reductions that would be achieved by these policies. Future projects associated with the General Plan Update would be required to undergo development review, including in many cases CEQA review to evaluate project-specific impacts. Future construction would comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations regarding fugitive dust, asphalt paving, and architectural coatings, among others. However, given the lack of specifics regarding construction projects at this time, project-related construction impacts are considered potentially significant</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>and mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Operation of the proposed land uses would increase motor vehicle traffic and area source emissions in the future within the city. Although motor vehicles will emit fewer emissions in the future, increased VMT would result in road dust emissions that would exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. However, current street sweeping activities reduce this impact to less than significant.</p> <p>Threshold AQ-4: Would the proposed project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact AQ-3: Localized emissions of criteria pollutants associated with construction and operation of future development associated with the General Plan Update would potentially exceed LSTs. Future development would undergo development review, including in many cases CEQA review, and would be required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations as well as General Plan Update goals, objectives, and policies. This impact would be significant. Mitigation measure MM AQ-1 under Threshold AQ-2 would help to reduce this impact.</p> <p>Impact AQ-4: New development constructed as part of the General Plan Update within proximity of SR 78 has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Polices within the General Plan Update would reduce the health risk to a level below significance, but it is unknown if these polices would sufficiently reduce the health risks. Future projects will be subject to development review, including in many cases CEQA review. If future projects are determined to potentially pose a significant health risk to sensitive receptors, then mitigation measure MM AQ-2 would reduce this impact’s significance.</p>	Significant	<p>Implement mitigation measure MM AQ-1 for Impact AQ-3.</p> <p>For Impact AQ-4, implement:</p> <p>MM AQ-2: Building Design Measures. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: If the development review identifies potential health risk associated with siting residences near existing pollutant sources, avoidance or minimization measures shall be developed that ensure that the health risk be reduced to a level below SCAQMD thresholds for health risk. Measures shall be specific to each project and be determined during project design and/or development review. Potential building design measures to reduce the health risk associated with development within proximity (i.e., within 500 feet) of busy roadways (e.g. I-210 and SR-2) include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ plant vegetation, preferably tall and finely-needled trees, between receptor and roadway; 	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold AQ-5: Would the proposed project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ construct wall barriers between receptor and roadway that reduce the line of sight between the potential receptors and pollutant sources ; ▪ install only fixed windows; ▪ install a central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system that includes high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters (MERV-13 or higher), and develop a maintenance plan to ensure the filtering system is properly maintained; and ▪ locate air intake systems for HVAC systems as far away from the existing air pollution sources as possible. 	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u> No construction activities or materials are proposed that would create a significant level of objectionable odors. As such, potential impacts during short-term construction would be less than significant.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact C-AQ-1: At this time, the time and duration of construction activities associated with the buildout projections over the 20-year life of the General Plan Update cannot be determined; therefore, it is not possible to determine the magnitude of construction emissions from each development project or the magnitude of emissions reductions that would be achieved by these policies. Future projects associated with the General Plan</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p>Implementation of mitigation measures MM AQ-1 and MM AQ-2 would reduce the impacts from construction activities as well as from exposure to freeway emissions.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No Project Alternative, Alternative 2</p>

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Update would be required to undergo development review, including in many cases CEQA review to evaluate project-specific impacts. Future construction would comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations regarding fugitive dust, asphalt paving, and architectural coatings, among others. However, given the lack of specifics regarding construction projects at this time, project-related construction impacts are considered potentially significant and mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Operation of the proposed land uses would increase motor vehicle traffic and area source emissions in the future within the city. While motor vehicles will emit fewer emissions in the future, increased VMT would result in road dust emissions that would exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. However, current street sweeping activities reduce this impact to less than significant.</p>	Significant	<p>MM BIO-1: Habitat Assessment and Focused Surveys for Special-Status Species. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to the issuance of any grading, building, or other construction permit for undeveloped parcels in the Project area, a habitat assessment shall be conducted for the parcel to determine whether the potential exists for special-status species to occur. If the habitat assessment identifies potentially suitable habitat for threatened and endangered species, focused surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine presence or absence. Early consultation</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
<p>Threshold BIO-1: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact BIO-1: Potential Impacts on Special Status Species. Future development projects allowed under the General Plan Update would potentially result in impacts on special-status species, if present. For threatened and endangered species, impacts on individuals or the habitat they occupy would be significant. Mitigation measure MM BIO-1 would reduce this impact to a level less than significant. For non-threatened and non-endangered plant and wildlife species, impacts on individuals or the habitat they occupy would be significant. Mitigation measure MM BIO-2 would help to reduce this impact. Therefore, Impact BIO-1 would</p>	Significant	<p>MM BIO-1: Habitat Assessment and Focused Surveys for Special-Status Species. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to the issuance of any grading, building, or other construction permit for undeveloped parcels in the Project area, a habitat assessment shall be conducted for the parcel to determine whether the potential exists for special-status species to occur. If the habitat assessment identifies potentially suitable habitat for threatened and endangered species, focused surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine presence or absence. Early consultation</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p> <p>Impact BIO-2: Nesting Birds/Raptors. Future development-related impacts on nesting birds/raptors resulting from implementation of development projects allowed under the General Plan Update would be significant. Mitigation measure MM BIO-3 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, therefore, Impact BIO-2 would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>		<p>with the wildlife agencies (i.e., USFWS, CDFG) shall be undertaken for ESA- and CESA-listed species to ensure avoidance to the greatest extent feasible and appropriate “take” authorization.</p> <p>If threatened and endangered species are observed/detected, project-specific mitigation measures shall be developed to mitigate impacts on threatened and endangered species to below a level of significance. This shall apply to all projects if there is a potential to disturb habitat, including grading and other ministerial construction permits. Specific measures shall include, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision of a qualified biological monitor on site during all earth-disturbing activities to ensure avoidance of impacts on listed species. ▪ The use of fencing or flagging to identify sensitive areas that support the listed species and to ensure that the areas are protected from direct and indirect impacts. ▪ Implementation of noise reduction measures (e.g., noise attenuation structures) within habitats occupied by listed avian species, and noise monitoring during the breeding season. ▪ Identification and transplantation of listed plant species populations in accordance with best practices. ▪ Prohibition on construction activities 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>during the breeding seasons for listed species such, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Arroyo toad: March 15 to July 31 <input type="checkbox"/> Least Bell’s vireo: March 15 to September 15 <input type="checkbox"/> Willow flycatcher (all subspecies): March 15 to September 15 <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal California gnatcatcher: February 15 to August 31 <p>If no threatened or endangered species are observed or detected during focused surveys, but potentially suitable habitat for non-threatened and non-endangered plant or wildlife species is present, a site-specific determination shall be made as to whether the potential impacts are significant based on the degree of threat and the size of the population/occupied habitat to be impacted. Focused surveys may be required in order to make a significance determination, depending on the species to be impacted and the size of the project. The measures described above shall be employed as appropriate.</p> <p>MM BIO-2: Bird Nest Avoidance. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: If construction activities occur between January 15 and August 31, a preconstruction survey (within 7 days prior to construction activities) shall be</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold BIO-2: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact BIO-3: Impacts on Riparian and Other Sensitive Habitats. Development projects allowed under the GP Update would potentially result in impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities where present. If sensitive natural communities are to be removed during future project implementation, there would be a significant impact. Mitigation measure MM BIO-3 would help to reduce this impact to less than significant. Impact BIO-3 would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>	Significant	<p>conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests are present within or adjacent to the area proposed for development in order to avoid the nesting activities of breeding birds/raptors.</p> <p>If nesting activities within 200 feet of the proposed work area are not detected, construction activities may proceed. If nesting activities are confirmed, construction activities shall be delayed within an appropriate buffer from the active nest until the young birds have fledged and left the nest or until the nest is no longer active as determined by a qualified biologist. The size of the appropriate buffer shall be determined by a qualified biologist based on field conditions.</p> <p>MM BIO-3: Habitat Assessment/Biology Report. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to the initiation of future development projects within the Project area that have the potential to adversely affect sensitive habitat including ministerial grading and other construction-related actions, a habitat assessment shall be conducted when warranted in areas undisturbed by prior development to determine whether sensitive natural communities (including riparian vegetation) are present. If the habitat assessment identifies sensitive natural communities, a</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>biological report shall be prepared to address impacts on sensitive natural communities resulting from the proposed future project. The report shall identify mitigation measures to reduce all significant impacts to below a level of significance. Mitigation measures shall include, but are not limited to the following, as determined appropriate by a qualified biologist in consultation with the wildlife agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Early consultation with the wildlife agencies (i.e., USFWS, CDFG) for ESA- and CESA-listed species to ensure avoidance to the greatest extent feasible and appropriate “take” authorization. ▪ Provision of a qualified biological monitor on site during all earth-disturbing activities to ensure avoidance of sensitive habitats. ▪ The use of fencing or flagging to identify and avoid sensitive areas and to ensure that the areas are protected from direct and indirect impacts. ▪ Appropriate siting of staging areas within developed or disturbed areas, ensuring such areas are outside of existing sensitive habitats. ▪ Provision of mitigation at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio to ensure no net loss of sensitive habitat. Consultation with the wildlife agencies or professional best practices may result in higher ratios. 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold BIO-3: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on jurisdictional waters, including federally protected wetlands as defined by CWA Section 404 (including, but not limited to, marshes and vernal pools), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact BIO-4: Impacts on Jurisdictional Waters. Development projects in areas such as the Hillside Residential land use designation and the Estate Residential land use designation, which are designations proposed under the General Plan Update, would potentially result in impacts on jurisdictional waters if present. If jurisdictional waters are to be altered and/or removed during future project implementation, there would be a significant impact. Mitigation measure MM BIO-4 would help to reduce this impact to less than significant. Impact BIO-4 would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>	Significant	<p>MM BIO-4: Formal Jurisdictional Delineation. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: If the habitat assessment described in mitigation measure MM BIO-3 identifies potential federal and/or state jurisdictional waters, a formal jurisdictional delineation shall be prepared. This document will map the jurisdictional waters present and overlay it on the grading footprint of the project, thereby allowing a calculation of the total impacts. If jurisdictional waters are to be affected, mitigation is required at a minimum 1:1 ratio, but coordination with USACE (through the Section 404 process) and CDFG (through the Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement process) may determine a higher ratio is required. Mitigation will be achieved through a combination of in-kind creation, restoration, and/or enhancement as determined to be appropriate for each site through consultation with the resource agencies. Mitigation will first be considered on site, then with an approved mitigation bank, and thirdly through offsite mitigation. The appropriate permit applications will be submitted to state and federal regulatory agencies. The permits issued by these agencies will finalize the mitigation requirements.</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold BIO-4: Would the proposed Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact BIO-5: Interference with Wildlife Movement. Future development projects consistent with the General Plan Update that would overlap Arroyo Seco and the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains would potentially impact wildlife movement. Impacts on a wildlife corridor may be significant dependent on the magnitude of the impact and whether the corridor would remain viable after project completion.</p>	Significant	<p>MM BIO-5: Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Wildlife Use. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: If the habitat assessment described in mitigation measure MM BIO-3 identifies that a specific development project will interfere substantially with wildlife movement or established wildlife corridors, avoidance and minimization measures shall be developed that ensure the continued movement of wildlife through a specific corridor or area. Measures shall be specific to each project and be determined by a qualified biologist during project design; however, the following minimization measures shall be incorporated where appropriate, as determined by a qualified biologist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project design shall be sensitive to wildlife movement and, if a corridor is determined to be located on site, the project shall be designed to avoid segmentation of the corridor and the continued viability of the corridor. ▪ Street lighting shall be designed such that it does not increase the overall ambient lighting and glare in the natural area. This may be accomplished by designing street lighting with internal baffles to direct the lighting towards the ground and so there is a zero side angle cut off to the horizon. 	Less than significant	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold BIO-5: Would the proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact BIO-6: Removal of Mature or Scenic Trees. Specific development projects proposed under the General Plan Update would potentially result in impacts on mature or scenic trees. If mature or scenic trees would be impacted this would be considered significant.</p>	Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential noise, motion, and human intrusion impacts shall be minimized by incorporating setbacks, berms, or walls into the project design. Construction-related noise shall be mitigated consistent with the City’s Noise Ordinances by limiting construction activities to daytime hours and requiring construction equipment to be equipped with mufflers. ■ Plant species acceptable for the project’s landscaping must not include any invasive species, as identified by the California Invasive Plant Council (http://www.cal-ipc.org/ip/inventory/index.php). ■ When culverts are included in a project design within areas known to be used as wildlife crossings, they shall be placed in locations suitable for use by wildlife and shall be sized and shaped such as to facilitate wildlife movement through the culvert. <p>MM BIO-6: Tree Plan. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to issuance of any building permit for a new structure or expansion of the footprint of an existing structure no matter how small, or for the addition of a second story, grading permit, or permit for demolition, the applicant shall submit a tree plan to the City. The tree plan shall provide the following information and</p>	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>is subject to all provisions listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The location of all protected trees as defined in Section 4.26.030.A.1 of the City Municipal Code. For all projects requiring discretionary City review, tree identification tags that correspond with the submitted plan shall be installed for field verification. For projects on non-residential property, all trees shall be indicated. ▪ The plan shall show the location, size, and species of all trees to be removed, the reason for removal, and all trees to be retained. Any trees proposed for removal due to poor health or condition shall have the condition of the tree documented in a letter report prepared and signed by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). ▪ The plan shall show the existing and proposed grades, existing and proposed improvements, and septic tanks and utility lines located within 30 feet of potentially removed trees, retained trees, and trees to be planted. ▪ During the construction phase, all applicants shall comply with tree protection guidelines as defined in Section 4.26.040 of the City Municipal Code. ▪ The director of community development shall notify the applicant of the requirement to obtain a tree 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination:</u> Because (1) the area is largely developed, (2) only modest growth is proposed in the General Plan Update, (3) the area where development footprints would overlap natural areas is limited, and (4) mitigation measures MM BIO-1a through MM BIO-5 would be implemented, the overall cumulative impact would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	<p>removal permit for those trees on the tree plan that are intended to be removed and which are subject to the provisions of the City Municipal Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arborist review of the tree plan may be required per the determination of the director of community development or his/her designee. Said arborist shall be contracted and managed by the City, and all fees incurred shall be the responsibility of the property owner. <p>Implement mitigation measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-6.</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3
CLIMATE CHANGE				
<p>Threshold CC-1: Would the Project result in GHG emissions that are inconsistent with GHG emission reduction goals for local governments established by AB 32? <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact CC-1: GHG emissions for the city under BAU conditions would exceed AB 32 target emissions, resulting in 2020 net emissions that are 14.6% higher than current 2007 GHG emissions. This impact would be significant.</p>	Significant	<p>MM CC-1a: Climate Action Plan. Within 24 months of adoption of the General Plan Update, the City shall prepare and adopt a Climate Action Plan (CAP) that, through its full implementation, will reduce emissions from the city to 15% below current levels. At a minimum, the CAP shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quantify the 2020 reductions in GHG emissions using currently accepted methods. ▪ Quantify the impact of state and federal 	Significant and unavoidable	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>GHG reduction measures on projected 2020 BAU emissions in the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify methods to reduce GHG emissions to a level that is 15% below recent (2006) levels by 2020. ▪ Identify additional measures or modify General Plan Update policies as needed for incorporation into the CAP. ▪ Require monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions. ▪ Establish a schedule of actions for implementation through 2020. ▪ Identify funding sources for implementation through 2020. ▪ Identify a process to set a reduction goal for 2030 by 2020. ▪ Adopt feasible, enforceable GHG reduction measures to be required of private activities by the City. ▪ Update the CAP by 2020 to include reduction measures to achieve the adopted 2030 reduction goal. <p>MM CC-1b: Municipal Climate Action Plan. Within 24 months of adoption of the General Plan Update, the City shall prepare a Municipal Climate Action Plan (MCAP) that, through its full implementation, will reduce emissions from the Municipal Operations of the city by 15% as compared to current levels. The MCAP shall meet the same basic requirements described above for the</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>Community Climate Action Plan (mitigation measure MM CC-1a) but will address emissions due to the city’s municipal operations only. The General Plan Update already identifies many specific objectives and policies that, once quantified through the MCAP process, can potentially be included in the MCAP. These include the following:</p> <p>AQ Objective 5.1: Enhance the energy efficiency of City facilities.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.1.1: Prepare and implement a comprehensive plan to improve energy efficiency of municipal facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conducting energy audits for all municipal facilities; b. Retrofitting facilities for energy efficiency where feasible and when remodeling or replacing components, including increased insulation, installing green or reflective roofs and low-emissive window glass; c. Implementing an energy tracking and management system; d. Installing energy-efficient exit signs, street signs, and traffic lighting; e. Installing energy-efficient lighting retrofits and occupancy sensors, and institute a “lights out at night” policy; f. Retrofitting heating and cooling systems to optimize efficiency (e.g., replace chillers, boilers, fans, pumps, 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>belts, etc.);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Installing Energy Star® appliances and energy-efficient vending machines; h. Improving efficiency of water pumping and use at municipal facilities, including a schedule to replace or retrofit system components with high-efficiency units (i.e., ultra-low-flow toilets, fixtures, etc.); i. Providing chilled, filtered water at water fountains and taps in lieu of bottled water; j. Installing a central irrigation control system and time its operation for off-peak use; and k. Adopting an accelerated replacement schedule for energy inefficient systems and components. <p>AQ Policy 5.1.2: Require that any newly constructed, purchased, or leased municipal space meet minimum standards as appropriate, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Requirements for new commercial buildings to meet LEED criteria established by the U.S. Green Building Council; b. Incorporation of passive solar design features in new buildings, including day lighting and passive solar heating; 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Retrofitting of existing buildings to meet standards under Title 24 of the California Building Energy Code, or to achieve a higher performance standard as established by the City/County; and d. Retrofitting of existing buildings to decrease heat gain from non-roof impervious surfaces with cool paving, landscaping, and other techniques. <p>AQ Policy 5.1.3: Ensure that staff receives appropriate training and support to implement objectives and policies to reduce GHG emissions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Providing energy efficiency training to design, engineering, building operations, and maintenance staff; and b. Providing information on energy use and management, including data from the tracking and management system, to managers and other decision makers that influence energy use. <p>AQ Objective 5.2: Implement measures to reduce City employee vehicle trips and to mitigate emissions impacts from municipal travel.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.2.1: Implement a program to reduce vehicle trips by City employees, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Providing incentives and 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>infrastructure for vanpooling and carpooling, such as pool vehicles, preferred parking, and a website or bulletin board to facilitate ride-sharing;</p> <p>b. Providing subsidized passes for mass transit;</p> <p>c. Offering compressed work hours, off-peak work hours, and telecommuting, where appropriate;</p> <p>d. Offer a guaranteed ride home for employees who use alternative modes of transportation to commute.</p> <p>AQ Objective 5.3: Manage the City’s stock of vegetation to reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.3.1: Conduct a comprehensive inventory and analysis of the urban forest, and coordinate tree maintenance responsibilities with all responsible departments, consistent with best management practices.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.3.2: Evaluate existing landscaping and options to convert reflective and impervious surfaces to landscaping, and install or replace vegetation with drought-tolerant, low-maintenance native species or edible landscaping that can also provide shade and reduce heat-island effects.</p> <p>AQ Objective 5.4: Use the City’s purchasing power to promote reductions in</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>GHG emissions by the suppliers of its goods and services.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.4.1: Adopt purchasing practices and standards to support reductions in GHG emissions, including preferences for energy-efficient office equipment, and the use of recycled materials and manufacturers that have implemented green management practices.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.4.2: Establish bidding standards and contracting practices that encourage GHG emissions reductions, including preferences or points for the use of low or zero emission vehicles and equipment, recycled materials, and provider implementation of other green management practices.</p> <p>AQ Objective 5.5: Implement measures to reduce municipal waste generation.</p> <p>AQ Policy 5.5.1: Audit facilities to identify opportunities to reduce waste generation, increase material recovery, and increase beneficial use of organic material.</p> <p>MM CC-1c: Alternative Energy Development Promotion. The City shall prepare an Alternative Energy Development Promotion study to determine the feasibility of implementing alternative energy strategies within the city. This study shall be prepared an Alternative Energy Promotion Study within 24 months that and will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify possible sites for the production 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>of energy using local renewable resources such as solar, wind, small hydro, and biogas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider the potential need for exemption of alternative energy facilities from other General Plan Update policies concerning visual resources, ridgeline protection, and biological resources. ▪ Evaluate potential land use, environmental, economic, and other constraints affecting renewable energy development. ▪ Identify measures to protect renewable energy resources such as utility easements, rights-of-way, and land set-asides. ▪ Evaluate the feasibility of Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) for the city. CCA allows cities and counties, or groups of them, to aggregate the electric loads of customers within their jurisdictions for purposes of procuring electrical services. CCA lets the community choose what resources will serve their loads and can significantly increase renewable energy use. If CCA is ultimately not pursued, evaluate the feasibility of purchasing renewable energy certificates to reduce the city’s contribution to GHG emissions related to county electricity use. ▪ Propose a ministerial permit process for approval of small-scale wind and solar energy systems for onsite home and small commercial. 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold CC-2: Would the Project allow property and persons to be adversely affected by the physical effects of climate change including: flooding, public health, wildfire risk, and other impacts resulting from climate change?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact CC-2: Although the General Plan Update includes policies that promote public health and safety, reduce wildfire risk, reduce risks from flooding, promote a sustainable water supply, and protect natural ecosystems, there are no specific policies integrating climate change adaptation considerations into planning for these subject areas. The likelihood that frequency, severity, and event patterns may change in the future as a result of climate change would still need to be addressed. Implementation of mitigation measure MM CC-2 would seek to determine the frequency, severity, and event patterns by providing a coordinated planning effort with the overarching goal of reducing the physical effects from climate change; however, the effectiveness of this mitigation to reduce these impacts is not known at this time. Thus, Impact CC-2 would remain significant after mitigation.</p>	Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow faster expediting (possibly moving such applications to the top of the City’s processing list) of projects that incorporate alternative energy sources. <p>MM CC-2: Climate Change Preparedness Plan. The City shall work with local governments and regional planning agencies to develop a comprehensive plan for adapting to and preparing for the physical effects associated with climate change. The plan shall consider the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scope the climate change impacts to major city sectors and buildings to prepare for climate change. ▪ Identify planning areas relevant to climate change impacts. ▪ Conduct a vulnerability assessment based on climate change projections for the region, the sensitivity of planning areas to climate change impacts, and the ability of communities to adapt to climate change impacts. ▪ Conduct a risk assessment based on the consequences, magnitude, and probability of climate change impacts, as well as on an evaluation of risk tolerance and community values. ▪ Establish a vision and guiding principles for climate-resilient communities and set preparedness goals in priority planning areas based on these guiding principles. ▪ Develop, select, and prioritize possible 	Significant and unavoidable	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact C-CC-1: As discussed above, in the absence of mitigation, the contribution of the General Plan Update on climate change, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be cumulatively significant.</p>	Significant	<p>preparedness actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop measures of resilience, and use these to track the results of actions over time. ▪ Review assumptions and other essential information to ensure that planning remains relevant to the most salient climate change impacts. ▪ Update plans regularly. <p>To maximize effectiveness, the preparedness plan needs to be an ongoing commitment of the City. The first plan shall be completed and adopted no later than 5 years after the adoption of the General Plan Update and shall be updated at least every 5 years thereafter.</p> <p>Implement mitigation measures MM CC-1a, -1b, and -1c, and MM CC-2.</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Threshold CUL-1: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact CUL-1: Although there are historic buildings and structures located throughout the Project area that have been documented through previous cultural resource studies and historical registers, the majority of potentially significant historic</p>	Significant	<p>MM CUL-1: Historic Building/Structure Evaluation. Prior to future project approval and the issuance of any construction permit within the city, including but not limited to a demolition or building permit, and if research indicates that any onsite building(s) or structure(s) is 45 years or older, the applicant shall be required to</p>	Significant and unavoidable	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>resources in the City (over 50 years old) are undocumented. Unique and potentially significant historic structures are likely to exist within the areas that have not been systematically surveyed. Specifically, many historic resources are likely to exist in the DVSP area given the age of most structures, and the General Plan Update would focus much of the redevelopment and infill in this area. Furthermore, as identified in the Housing Element of the existing General Plan, the majority of city residences are in excess of 50 years of age, and thus may be considered significant historic resources. As such, future development focused in the DVSP area as well as infill and redevelopment activities throughout the city, as permitted under the General Plan Update, would significantly impact historic buildings and structures. This impact would be considered significant.</p>		<p>conduct an evaluation of the onsite building(s) or structure(s) to determine if it is eligible for inclusion in the state or local historical registers. The evaluation shall be performed by a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Preservation Professionals. The potentially historic building/structure shall be evaluated according to the NRHP criteria A–C and CRHR criteria 1–3. The historian/architectural historian shall consult with knowledgeable local groups and individuals, appropriate archives, and appropriate repositories in an effort to identify the original and subsequent owners as well as the architect and the builder to establish whether any of these individuals played important roles in local or regional history (criterion B). Additionally, the physical characteristics and condition of the building or structure shall be evaluated under criterion C, and those judged to possess “the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction” shall be further assessed for integrity and context.</p> <p>The results of the archival research and field assessment shall be documented in an evaluation report. This report shall explicitly state whether the resource is eligible for either state or local historical</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold CUL-2: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact CUL-2: There are potentially unknown prehistoric and historic archaeological resources within the Project area. Land use changes proposed as part of the Project could trigger future development and redevelopment activities throughout the city that could impact unknown significant archaeological resources.</p>	Significant	<p>registers and shall also make specific recommendations for mitigation as appropriate. The historian/architectural historian shall complete the necessary California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms (minimally a Primary Record and a Building/Structure/Object Record, with others as required) and include them as an attachment to the report. Copies of the DPR site forms shall be submitted to the CHRIS. Properties found in the evaluation report to meet NRHP criteria A–C or CRHR criteria 1–3 shall be considered "historical resources" as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA regulations. Significant effects on historical resources shall be avoided or mitigated by the lead agency and as recommended by a qualified historian or architectural historian.</p> <p>MM CUL-2a: Phase I Pedestrian Survey, Records Search, and Letter Report. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to future project approvals and the issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to a grading permit, future projects within the city that have the potential to impact archaeological resources shall obtain a qualified archaeologist and Native American consultant, if applicable, to conduct a pedestrian survey and records search to</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>determine the potential for the project area to contain significant archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist shall be a registered professional archaeologist and possess an advanced degree in archaeology, history, or a related discipline. The findings from the pedestrian survey and records search shall be included in a brief archaeological letter report. The report shall indicate whether the project area has a low, moderate, or high potential to contain prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. Projects characterized by no known resources and a low potential for unknown archaeological resources shall not involve any additional investigative work nor require any mitigation related to archaeological resources.</p> <p>MM CUL-2b: Phase II Testing and Evaluation and Data Recovery Plan. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Projects in areas having known resources or a moderate to high potential for significant resources shall undergo test and evaluation to determine if potentially significant archaeological resources are present. A Native American consultant shall be retained for projects involving prehistoric or ethnohistoric resources. If a resource is determined significant based on the evaluation, the site shall be avoided or the</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>qualified archaeologist and Native American consultant shall prepare a data recovery plan and/or require archaeological monitoring during excavation activities, as necessary. If avoidance is not possible, the data recovery or mitigation monitoring plan shall be tailored to the specific circumstances at the site and shall be designed to reduce project-level impacts on the resource to a level less than significant. Cultural materials recovered during test and evaluation or data recovery shall be cleaned, identified, cataloged, and analyzed in accordance with standard professional practices. The results of the field work and laboratory analysis shall be contained in a technical report and the entire collection transferred to a federally recognized curation facility.</p> <p>MM CUL-2c: Project Construction Monitoring. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Monitoring during construction grading or trenching may be required if there is a potential for encountering subsurface cultural resources. This requirement would derive from the management recommendations of either the test and evaluation report or the data recovery report discussed in MM CUL-3. When invoked, the project applicant must provide written proof that a qualified</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold CUL-3: Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact CUL-3: There are potentially unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features within the Project area. Future development associated with the Project could significantly impact unknown paleontological resources. Specific development projects that would excavate more than 10 feet deep or disturb more than 1,000 cubic yards of matrix would be considered to have a potentially significant adverse impact on paleontological resources.</p>	Significant	<p>archaeologist and a Native American monitor, if applicable, have been retained to observe all earth-disturbing activities. Any unexpected discoveries shall be treated in accordance with MM CUL-3.</p> <p>MM CUL-3: Paleontological Monitoring. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Monitoring during construction grading or trenching shall be required for projects that would excavate to a depth of 10 feet or more, or that propose a total cut amount of 1,000 cubic yards or more. When invoked, the project applicant must provide written proof that a qualified paleontologist has been retained to observe all earth-disturbing activities. All fossil materials recovered during mitigation monitoring shall be cleaned, identified, cataloged, and analyzed in accordance with standard professional practices. The results of the field work and laboratory analysis shall be submitted in a technical report and the entire collection transferred to an approved fossil curation facility.</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3
<p>Threshold CUL-4: Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact CUL-4: There are potentially unknown prehistoric human</p>	Significant	<p>MM CUL-4: Inform Construction Crew of Legal Requirements Pertaining to Discovery of Human Remains. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation</p>	Less than significant	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
remains located within the Project area. Future development associated with the General Plan Update would have the potential of resulting in a significant impact on unknown human remains.	Significant	<p>Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to beginning fieldwork on any new projects, the project applicant and their contractors and subcontractors shall be informed of their legal obligations in the event of the discovery of human remains during excavation or trenching. These obligations derive from the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC 5097.98. The discovery of human remains or presumed human remains requires that the area of the discovery be protected from further disturbance and that an immediate call be made to the County Coroner. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, the Coroner, and only the Coroner, is authorized to contact the NAHC. They, in turn, will determine and notify a MLD from the local Native American community. Meaningful consultation between the MLD, qualified archaeologist, project applicant, and the City shall establish a Memorandum of Understanding detailing a reasonable course of action that will reduce adverse impacts to a level less than significant. The Memorandum of Understanding and technical reports from the MLD and the qualified archaeologist shall be submitted and distributed as required.</p>	Cumulatively Considerable	Alternative 3
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact C-CUL-1: Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future</p>		Implement mitigation measures MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-4.		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>projects have resulted in a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources. The proposed Project would lead to limited new development or redevelopment of existing buildings. Mitigation is required to prevent future adverse effects on cumulatively considerable impacts; however, because of the uncertainty associated with redevelopment of existing buildings over 50 years old, it cannot be concluded that impacts on potentially historic structures would be less than significant..</p>	Significant	<p>MM GEO-1. City Earthquake Fault Zoning and Alquist-Priolo Act Requirements for Sierra Madre Fault. The City shall work with staff of the California Geological Survey and/or qualified, state-licensed consultant personnel to: (1) determine if a the portion of the Sierra Madre Fault Zone lies within city limits and, if so, (2) adopt as a city ordinance an Earthquake Fault Zone. The provisions of this ordinance shall be consistent with all relevant provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The City shall thereby enforce Alquist-Priolo Act requirements for project proposals involving parcels within the new City-designated Earthquake Fault Zone for the Sierra Madre Fault.</p>	Less than significant	None
GEOLOGY, SEISMICITY, AND SOILS				
<p>Threshold GEO-1a: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects—including the risk of loss, injury, or death—involving rupture of a known earthquake fault?</p>	Significant	<p>MM GEO-1. City Earthquake Fault Zoning and Alquist-Priolo Act Requirements for Sierra Madre Fault. The City shall work with staff of the California Geological Survey and/or qualified, state-licensed consultant personnel to: (1) determine if a the portion of the Sierra Madre Fault Zone lies within city limits and, if so, (2) adopt as a city ordinance an Earthquake Fault Zone. The provisions of this ordinance shall be consistent with all relevant provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The City shall thereby enforce Alquist-Priolo Act requirements for project proposals involving parcels within the new City-designated Earthquake Fault Zone for the Sierra Madre Fault.</p>	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p>	<p>Impact GEO-1: Although the Sierra Madre fault zone is not currently zoned by the State of California, accumulating evidence suggests that it may be active; it may also be subject to coseismic rupture associated with large earthquakes on the San Andreas Fault north of the city. Property damage and personal safety impacts from surface rupture on any of the traces in the Sierra Madre Fault Zone could be significant.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold GEO-1b: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects—including the risk of loss, injury, or death—involving strong seismic ground shaking?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u> Risk of property damage and the corollary personal safety hazard associated with strong seismic groundshaking cannot be eliminated entirely, but compliance with the City’s adopted building code and, where applicable, any additional recommendations of site-specific geotechnical investigations would ensure that these risks are addressed consistent with the current engineering standard of care. Additional risk reduction would be realized through implementation of the General Plan Update policies identified above. Impacts are considered less than significant.</p>		<p>MM GEO-2. Ridge-Top Shattering Risk Assessment and Mitigation for Hillside Development. The City shall amend its hillside development ordinance to require the mandatory geotechnical reports prepared for all hillside development consistent with General Plan Safety Element Policy 1.1.3 and implementing ordinances to include a site- and project-specific assessment of ridge-top shattering risks. If appropriate in the professional judgment of the geotechnical engineer and/or certified engineering geologist of record, the report shall also identify geotechnical measures to mitigate the hazard to the extent feasible.</p>	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold GEO-1c: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects—including the risk of loss, injury, or death—involving seismically induced ground failure? <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact GEO-2: The City currently has no mechanism to manage risks related to ridgetop shattering. Impacts would be geographically limited but could be substantial for some projects, potentially rising to the level of a significant impact.</p>	Significant	<p>MM GEO-3: Ordinances Implementing General Plan Update Policies Relevant to Landslide Hazards Reduction. The City shall modify its existing Hillside Development Ordinance or establish new ordinances to require the following.</p>	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
Update policies SE 1.1.3, SE 1.1.4, SE 1.1.5, and SE 1.1.6, but could still be significant if ordinances implementing these policies are not established..		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For any hillside development qualifying as a project as defined by the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, the City shall require preparation of a site-specific geotechnical investigation that includes an evaluation of landslide hazard. Reports shall be prepared by qualified, California-licensed professional personnel—geotechnical engineer (GE) and certified engineering geologist (EG)—and shall be independently peer reviewed by personnel with commensurate licensure. The City shall enforce recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical investigation via the building permit process, and shall be responsible for proper implementation. ▪ For any new development in rangefront areas, the City shall require a site-specific assessment of risks related to landslide runout. The assessment shall be performed and reported by qualified, California-licensed professional personnel—GE and certified EG—and shall be independently peer reviewed by personnel with commensurate licensure. The City shall enforce any recommendations of the report via the building permit process, and shall be responsible for proper implementation. 		
<p>Threshold GEO-2: Would the proposed Project result in substantial loss of topsoil?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p>	Less than Significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Infill and edge development that would occur in previously undeveloped areas would be required to limit the extent of soil disturbance to the minimum needed for construction, staging, and access and would also be required to stockpile topsoil removed during grading for reuse. Therefore, topsoil loss impacts in undeveloped areas would be less than significant..</p>				
<p>Threshold GEO-3: Would the proposed Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u> Compliance with the City’s adopted building code, and, where applicable, any additional recommendations of site-specific geotechnical investigations, would ensure that the grading and fill activities required for new and rehabilitation construction under the proposed General Plan Update are properly designed and implemented. Impacts related to improperly designed or implemented excavations and fills are expected to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold GEO-4: Would the proposed Project be located on expansive soils, as defined in the current City building code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u> Building code compliance provides a mechanism (through the City’s building permit process) to ensure that any expansive soil hazard that may exist at a site-specific level is addressed in manner consistent with current engineering practices and the prevailing engineering standard of care. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold GEO-5: Would the proposed Project be constructed on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not</p>	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>available for the disposal of wastewater?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>In the short-term, code compliance and the City’s septic permit process will provide appropriate oversight to ensure against inappropriate siting of septic facilities, and impacts are expected to be less than significant. Over the longer term, with septic usage superseded by the completion of citywide sanitary sewer service, impacts related to septic tank siting would be avoided, and there would be no impact.</p>	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact	None
<p>Threshold GEO-6: Would the proposed Project result in loss or substantial reduction in availability of a known mineral resource of regional, statewide, or local value?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not alter the availability of known mineral resources. There would be no impact.</p>	Significant	Implement mitigation measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2; no additional mitigation is required at the cumulative level.	Less than significant	None
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>With implementation of project-specific mitigation measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2, seismic risks would be mitigated to a level consistent with the current engineering standard of care. Risks cannot be entirely avoided, but adverse effects would be further reduced as the City implements Safety Element Policies SE 1.1.10, 1.1.11, 1.1.13, 1.1.14, and 3.1.12. With these commitments in place, contributions to regional seismic risk exposure would be mitigated to the extent feasible.</p>				
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
<p>Threshold HAZ-1: Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the</p>	Less than	No mitigation is required.	Less than	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	significant		significant	
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Impacts related to Threshold HAZ-1 would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold HAZ-2: Threshold HAZ-2: Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</p>	Significant	<p>MM HAZ-1: Phase I, Phase II, or Phase III Environmental Site Assessment Prior to Development of Sites Related to the Use, Transport, or Storage of Hazardous Materials Sites.</p>	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact HAZ-1: The proposed Project is not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, mitigation is proposed to ensure development follows proper protocol to investigate potential hazards and to ensure remediation is initiated when appropriate. Impact HAZ-1 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of mitigation.</p>		<p>Prior to the issuance of any grading permits for any future project under the General Plan Update that would take place on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List), or on a site that was previously occupied by a land use that used or generated hazardous materials or wastes, the project applicant shall complete a Phase I, II, or III Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), prepared by a Registered Environmental Assessor (REA). Any recommendations for remediation or further analysis, such as a Phase II or Phase III ESA, shall be implemented prior to issuance of any grading permit. If monitoring during construction is recommended, the project applicant shall provide a letter of verification to the Community Development Director, stating that an REA has been</p>		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>retained to implement the monitoring program during construction activities. The program shall detail the pollutants or evidence of pollutants whose presence is being monitored, as well as the actions to be taken should any pollutant or evidence of pollutant be uncovered. If such a pollutant or evidence of the pollutant is encountered during construction activities (e.g., grading, clearing, or demolition activities), it should be evaluated by an REA and handled in accordance with applicable environmental laws and regulations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Phase I ESA is required for the development or redevelopment of a property suspected of historically containing hazardous materials and shall include, but not be limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A comprehensive records search. ▪ Consideration of historical information. ▪ Onsite evidence of hazardous material use, storage, or disposal. ▪ A recommendation as to whether a Phase II soil testing and chemical analysis is required. 2. If the results of the Phase I ESA conclude that a Phase II ESA is necessary, the Phase II ESA shall include, but not be limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A work plan that includes the 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>number and locations of proposed soil/monitoring wells, sampling intervals, drilling and sampling methods, analytical methods, sampling rationale, site geohydrology, field screening methods, quality control/quality assurance, and reporting methods. Where appropriate, the work plan is approved by a regulatory agency such as the DTSC, RWQCB, or County HMD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A site-specific health and safety plan signed by a Certified Industrial Hygienist. ▪ Necessary permits for encroachment, boring completion, and well installation. ▪ A sampling program (fieldwork) in accordance with the work plan and health and safety plan. Fieldwork is completed under the supervision of a State of California registered geologist. ▪ Hazardous materials testing through a State-certified laboratory. ▪ Documentation, including a description of filed procedures, boring logs/well construction diagrams, tabulations of analytical results, cross-sections, an evaluation of the levels and extent of contaminants found, and conclusions and recommendations regarding the environmental 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
Threshold HAZ-3: Would the proposed Project emit hazardous	Less than	No mitigation is required.	Less than	None

condition of the site and the need for further assessment. A remedial action plan will be developed as determined necessary by the Principal Investigator. Contaminated groundwater will generally be handled through the NPDES/dewatering process.

- A disposal process, including transport by a State-certified hazardous material hauler to a State-certified disposal or recycling facility licensed to accept and treat the identified type of waste.

3. If hazardous materials are determined to be present, a Phase III ESA shall be prepared and the responsible party shall contact the local CUPA or applicable regulatory agency to oversee the remediation of the property in compliance with all applicable local, county, state, and federal laws. The property owner, developer, or responsible party shall be responsible for funding or securing funding for the site remediation and shall provide proof to the City that the site contaminants have been properly removed in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations prior to project development.

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	significant		significant	
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Impacts related to Threshold HAZ-3 would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold HAZ-4: Is the proposed Project 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	Less than significant	Implement mitigation measure MM HAZ-1.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact HAZ-2: The proposed Project boundaries contain sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Although it is speculative to discuss projects not yet proposed, mitigation is proposed to ensure proper protocol is followed. As a result, the General Plan Update would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts related to Threshold HAZ-4 would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>				
<p>Threshold HAZ-5: Would the proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts related to Threshold HAZ-5 would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold HAZ-6: Would the proposed Project expose people or</p>	Significant	MM HAZ-2: Notification of Property	Significant and	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact HAZ-3: The proposed Project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. Mitigation, although required, would not reduce Impact HAZ-3 to a level considered less than significant.</p>	Significant	<p>Owners. All property owners shall be noticed when purchasing or building a home in the WUI area that they have accepted that the areas have certain risks that make their property, homes, and safety susceptible to wildfires.</p> <p>Implement mitigation measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2.</p>	<p>unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p>	Alternative 3
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
<p>Threshold HYD-1: Would the proposed Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The city is permitted under NPDES MS4 Permit (Order No. 01-182, NPDES No. S004001). Per the requirements of the Order, the City adopted a Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance. Compliance with the Order and Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance requires the preparation of an USWMP. Additionally, the city has nine debris basins designed to collect sediment and any loose debris eroded from the steep hillside watershed of the San Gabriel Mountains (City 2007b). The City</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>will also require the implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) practices into developments that will increase the stormwater peak flow of a site (see MM HYD-1, below). LID practices include tree boxes, pervious pavement, retention basins, bioswales, and rain gardens. Moreover, the City will encourage the implementation of the BMPs set forth in the Arroyo Seco Watershed Management and Restoration Plan. Compliance with the RWQCB's Order, Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance, and USWMP requirements, and encouragement of LID practices would minimize potentially significant impacts to water quality standards.</p> <p>Compliance with the Sanitary Sewer Plan would prevent the overflow of sanitary sewer into surface waters. At buildout, the Project would not increase the amount of point source pollution from land uses such as industrial development because implementation of the Project would not result in the designation of new industrial land uses. Moreover, policies listed under CNE Objective 1.2 would be implemented during discretionary permit reviews conducted by the Department of Community Development. Thus, the Project would not result in significant impacts on water quality through point source pollution.</p>	Significant	<p>MM HYD-1: Low Impact Development (LID) Practices. The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: All new developments shall be required to incorporate LID practices into their stormwater drainage plans. The incorporation of LID practices would include the following measures from CNE 1.2.2: (a) minimizing pollutant loading and changes in hydrology; (b) ensuring that post-development runoff rates from a site do not negatively impact</p>	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold HYD-2: Would the proposed Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>Impact HYD-1: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the creation of new imperviousness, which would minimize the existing surface area available for groundwater</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>recharge in the Project area. A reduction of groundwater recharge through stream flow is not anticipated because the Project does not propose any activities within the existing streams. At buildout, the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts on groundwater recharge and water table levels.</p>		<p>downstream erosion and stream habitat; (c) minimizing the amount of stormwater guided to impermeable surfaces; (d) maximizing percolation of stormwater into the ground where appropriate; (e) preserving wetlands, riparian corridors, and buffer zones; (f) establishing reasonable limits on the clearing of vegetation from a project site; and (g) requiring incorporation of structural and non-structural best management practices to mitigate projected increases in pollutant loads and flows to ensure that, during a wet weather event, all stormwater remains on site. The incorporation of BMPs such as the use of tree boxes, retention basins, bioswales, rain gardens, and roof gardens will minimize impacts on the groundwater basins by allowing stormwater to percolate into the groundwater basins.</p>		
<p>Threshold HYD-3: Would the proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Impact Determination:</u> Compliance with the regulations set forth in the NPDES MS4 Permit (Order No. 01-182, NPDES No. S004001) and Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.</p>				
<p>Threshold HYD-4: Would the proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, in a manner that</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>would result in flooding on- or off-site?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Compliance with the City’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance requires all developments subject to approval from the planning commission or seeding the issuance of a grading or building permit to prepare an USWMP. Implementation of the USWMP would require peak stormwater runoff rates from new development to not exceed predevelopment levels. In addition, compliance with the RWQCB’s Permit (Order No. 01-182, NPDES No. S004001) and required maintenance of catch basins would alleviate flood hazards. As a result, implementation of the Project would not increase stormwater runoff in such a way that would result in flooding. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	Significant	Implement mitigation measure MM HYD-1.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold HYD-5: Would the proposed Project create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Compliance with the City’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance requires the preparation of an USWMP, which requires new developments to reduce runoff to pre-development conditions. Compliance with the RWQCB Permit (Order No. 01-182 NPDES No. S004001) and the City’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Ordinance would minimize the potential of stormwater runoff to result in additional sources of polluted runoff and exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. To further minimize the potential for new pollutants into waterways, the City will require new developments to implement LID practices, such as bioswales and tree boxes, to allow stormwater to percolate into the ground (MM HYD-1). As a result, the Project would result in less-than-</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.				
<p>Threshold HYD-6: Would the proposed Project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact HYD-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project has the potential to pollute groundwater.</p>	Significant	<p>MM HYD-2: Sanitary Sewer Line. The City shall require that prior to issuance of permits for the development of existing vacant lands designated for residential and mixed-use uses, the City shall confirm that a wastewater treatment facility will treat the wastewater generated by the new development and that the new development will be connected to that facility.</p>	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold HYD-7: Would the proposed Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flow?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact	None
<p>Threshold HYD-8: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>The Project would not increase the exposure of people or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold HYD-9: Would the proposed Project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>Impact HYD-3. Development may occur in the Hillside Residential land use designation. Consequently, homes may be</p>	Significant	No mitigation is feasible because the General Plan Update would allow residential development in high risk areas.	Significant and unavoidable	Alternative 3

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>exposed to high risk areas for mudflow. The risk to persons and structures from mudflow would be significant.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination</u> Future development associated with the General Plan Update would not result in a cumulatively significant impact on water quality or hydrology.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implement mitigation measure MM HYD-1.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
LAND USE AND PLANNING				
<p>Threshold LU-1: Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u> The Project would not result in physically dividing an established community.</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Threshold LU-2: Would the proposed Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u> The plans listed in Section 4.9, “Land Use and Planning,” are consistent with the proposed Project, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Threshold LU-3: Would the proposed Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u> Because the proposed Project is not located within any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>None</p>

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
areas, there would be no impacts.				
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>No cumulative impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the proposed Project.</p>	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact	None
NOISE				
<p>Threshold NOI-1: Would the proposed Project expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of the other agencies?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>Impact NOI-1: Impacts associated with traffic and stationary noise sources could conflict with the City’s Land Use Compatibility Matrix and significantly affect existing and future noise-sensitive land uses based on their location throughout the city. Therefore, separate noise studies would be required to analyze the noise environment and provide mitigation to reduce impacts. Impacts from operational sources would remain significant and unavoidable. Because construction-related noise is exempted under the City’s Municipal Codes, construction-related impacts would be less than significant.</p>	Significant	<p>MM NOI-1: Noise Study. The 60 dBA CNEL contour would be expected to increase approximately 158 feet for I-210 and 24 feet for SR 2. The 65 dBA CNEL contour could be expected to increase approximately 96 feet for I-210 and up to 128 feet for SR-2. The 70 dBA CNEL contour could be expected to increase approximately 55 feet for I-210 and up to 92 feet for SR-2. All three of these contours would increase due to ambient growth in Southern California.</p> <p>Therefore, pursuant to NE Policy 2.2.1 and NE Policy 2.2.5 of the proposed General Plan Update, the following requirements shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program and made part of future noise studies and mitigation requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise Reducing Features. All noise-producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, 	Significant and unavoidable	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
		<p>shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. During operation, mobile or fixed “package” equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of Electrical Equipment. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible. ▪ Location of Equipment and Support Areas. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors. ▪ Speed Limits. Construction site and access road speed limits shall be established and enforced during the construction period. ▪ Signal Limits. The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. ▪ Use of Audio Equipment. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor. ▪ Resolution of Complaints. The onsite construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive 		

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold NOI-2: Would the proposed Project expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> Impacts from vibration would be less than significant because the proposed Project would result in vibration levels below acceptable standards.</p>				
<p>Threshold NOI-3: Threshold NOI-3: Would the proposed Project result in a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</p>	Significant	Implementation of mitigations measure MM NOI-1 could reduce construction-related impacts (Impact NOI-2) to less-than-significant levels. However, because site-specific development is not proposed at this time, specific details are not available to conclude that operational impacts (Impact NOI-1) would be reduced to a level less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to traffic would be significant and unavoidable. Temporary or periodic noise impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.	Significant and unavoidable	No Project Alternative
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> Impact NOI-1: Impacts associated with traffic and stationary noise sources could conflict with the City’s Land Use Compatibility Matrix and significantly affect existing and future noise-sensitive land uses based on their locations throughout the city. Therefore, separate noise studies would be required to analyze the noise environment and provide mitigation to reduce impacts. Impact NOI-2: Future construction and construction-related traffic could affect noise-sensitive land uses. Therefore, impacts from construction-related noise are considered potentially significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold NOI-4: Would the proposed Project expose people</p>	Less than	No mitigation is required.	Less than	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels by being located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip?	significant		significant	
<p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>Impacts regarding noise related to public airports would be less than significant. Because there are no private airstrips in the Project area, there would be no impact related to private airstrips.</p>				
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>Impact C-NOI-1: Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects have resulted in, and will continue to result in, a cumulatively significant impact on the noise environment. The proposed Project would lead to new development or redevelopment of existing buildings and therefore would be considered cumulatively considerable. No mitigation beyond the measures listed above is available to reduce the Project’s cumulative contribution.</p>	Significant	Beyond implementing mitigation measure MM NOI-1, no mitigation is available for cumulative traffic noise impacts due to the uncertainty associated with the lack of siting information and other future project details.	Significant and unavoidable	No Project Alternative
POPULATION AND HOUSING				
<p>Threshold POP-1: Would the proposed Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would accommodate the development of approximately 814 additional housing units, which would support a moderate increase in population growth. The Project would implement a new Mixed Use land use designation and Overlay district in order to permit mixed-use commercial-residential development within vacant and underutilized parcels in the city.</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Existing vacant residential land uses, including Hillside Residential, Estate Residential, and the DVSP would also contribute to the addition of single-family, multi-family, retail, and office development. Development standards, land-use regulations, and design guidelines would ensure compatibility of future development with available public service and infrastructure requirements. Additionally, all growth that would occur as a result of the Project would be in substantial conformance with goals and policies of SCAG’s Growth Visioning and 2% Strategy. No additional significant physical impacts related to a substantial growth in the area would occur that are not already analyzed in the applicable resource sections (e.g., Section 4.2, “Air Quality,” Section 4.13, “Transportation, Circulation, and Parking,” Section 4.14, “Utilities,” etc). Impacts related to Threshold POP-1 would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold POP-2: Would the proposed Project displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The proposed project would allow for a maximum increase of 814 single-family and multi-family units on existing commercially designated land within the Project area, and would be potentially used to house seniors. No replacement housing would be required off site. Impacts related Threshold POP-2 would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold POP-3: Would the proposed Project displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not displace a substantial number of people, but would rather encourage new residents through land use policies that would emphasize the residential neighborhood</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>character. Impacts related to Threshold POP-3 would be less than significant.</p>		<p>Mitigation measures are proposed for resource areas that would be affected by the increase in population. Please see the resource section for a list of mitigation measures related to a particular resource. No additional mitigation has been identified.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>	<p>None</p>
PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION				
<p>Threshold PUB-1: Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the 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 following public services:</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No Project Alternative; Alternative 2; Alternative 3</p>
<p>Pub-1a. Fire Protection</p>				
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> Because of the modest amount of overall development, no additional facilities are expected to be needed; therefore the proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts associated with fire services. Furthermore, the Project would provide several policies that would seek to ensure that adequate emergency response, including fire response, is maintained. Impacts related to Threshold PUB-1a would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Pub-1b. Police Protection</p>	<p>Less than</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than</p>	<p>No Project</p>

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>Because of the modest amount of overall development and the addition of policies designed to ensure that police service is maintained, the proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts associated with police services. Impacts related to Threshold PUB-1b would be less than significant.</p>	significant		significant	Alternative; Alternative 2; Alternative 3
<p>Pub-1c. Schools</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not adversely affect school services because the Project is not anticipated to substantially increase the school age population. Currently, schools would have the capacity to serve the projected increase in population and no new facilities are needed. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to pay SB 50 fees to the LCUSD prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy. Under the provisions of SB 50, payment of these fees would be considered full and complete mitigation of impacts on LCUSD schools. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse impact on the LCUSD’s ability to adequately serve the Project area. Impacts related to PUB-1c would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Pub-1d. Parks</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The Project would provide approximately 16.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents and a significant impact is not expected to occur.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2
<p>Pub-1e. Libraries</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not adversely affect library services. Currently, the projected increase in population would not place a new demand on library facilities such that new or physically</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>altered facilities would need to be developed in order to maintain performance objectives. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse impact on library services. Impacts related to PUB-1e would be less than significant.</p>		No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold PUB-2: Would the proposed Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> Future development would be required to pay Quimby Fees to increase the available parkland available to the city residents, and particularly to accommodate the future residents of proposed development. Thus, impacts on existing parks and recreational facilities would be generally off-set because the existing parks and recreational facilities would not experience a significant increase in use. Therefore, impacts related to PUB-2 would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold PUB-3: Would the proposed Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p>	Less than significant	Mitigation is addressed under specific resource areas such as biological resources, cultural resources, and air quality. No additional mitigation has been identified.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> New construction and expansion of recreational facilities is unlikely due to the built out condition of the city and limited opportunities to increase existing park areas. Small neighborhood parks would be created in existing developed areas and generally would replace existing uses. Impacts related to replacement of a small intense use (e.g., strip commercial) with a less intense use (pocket park) would be less than significant. Therefore, because of the limited area available for parkland and the nearly built out nature of the Project area, the addition of a pocket or small neighborhood park replacing a more intense use would not be</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
considered significant.				
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination</u> The Project’s incremental contribution to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative public services and recreation impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2; Alternative 3
TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING				
<p>Threshold TR-1: Would the proposed Project cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips or the volume to capacity ratio on roads)? <u>Impact Determination:</u> Impact TR-1: At buildout, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to a roadway segment that is operating at, or are projected to operate at, an unacceptable level of service (LOS E or worse): Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).</p>	Significant	Although widening Verdugo Boulevard would improve LOS, an expansion is not considered feasible because the location is not within the jurisdiction of the City. Thus, no feasible mitigation is available to the lead agency to reduce impacts along Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane.	Significant and unavoidable	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2
<p>Threshold TR-2: Would the proposed Project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? <u>Impact Determination:</u> The proposed Project would not exceed a level of service standard established by the County CMP for designated roads or highways, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2
<p>Threshold TR-3: Would the proposed Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
The proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, and impacts would be less than significant.				
Threshold TR-4: Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
Specific impacts cannot be identified at the programmatic level regarding the increase of hazards due to a design feature or any incompatible uses; therefore, potential significant impacts are considered to be less than significant.				
Threshold TR-5: Would the proposed Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.				
Threshold TR-6: Would the proposed Project result in inadequate parking capacity?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
The proposed Project would not result in inadequate parking capacity, and impacts would remain less than significant.				
Threshold TR-7: Would the proposed Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<u>Impact Determination:</u>				
The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
impacts would be less than significant.				
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis: <u>Impact Determination</u> Impact C-TR-1: At buildout, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to two roadway segment operating at, or projected to operate at, unacceptable levels of service (LOS E or worse): (1) Verdugo Boulevard east of Alta Canyon Road (LOS F) and (2) Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).</p>	Significant	Although widening Verdugo Boulevard would improve LOS, an expansion is not considered feasible because of the lack of public right-of-way, the physical limitations set by private property lines, and the City’s desire to maintain a small town atmosphere. Thus, no feasible mitigation is available to reduce impacts along Verdugo Boulevard east of Alta Canyon Road and between Park Place and Lanterman Lane.	Significant and unavoidable	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2
UTILITIES				
<p>Threshold UTIL-1: Would the proposed Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? <u>Impact Determination</u> Future development under the proposed Project would be required to comply with the NPDES program, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold UTIL-2: Would the proposed Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? <u>Impact Determination</u> Impacts related to the development or expansion of existing water and wastewater facilities is considered to be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>Threshold UTIL-3: Would the proposed Project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p> <p>Significant impacts would not occur due to construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold UTIL-4: Would the proposed Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination</u></p>	Significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant and unavoidable	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2; Alternative 3
<p>Impact UTIL-1: The proposed Project would increase the demand for water supply at buildout. The existing FMWD 2005 UWMP does not identify additional water resources beyond what is currently planned without the Project, and, therefore, does not adequately provide assurance that the associated water agencies would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources. The lack of mitigation that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level means that the proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable adverse impact related to water supply.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p>Threshold UTIL-5: Would the proposed Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</p> <p><u>Impact Determination:</u></p> <p>The proposed Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has or does not have adequate</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
<p>capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to existing entitlements, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold UTIL-6: Would the proposed Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> The proposed Project would not exceed permitted capacity for solid waste disposal facilities serving the city, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold UTIL-7: Would the proposed Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> Because the proposed Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Threshold UTIL-8: Would the Project result in a demand for Energy Systems such as electricity and natural gas in which the existing utility systems are insufficient to meet the Project need and would therefore require new systems to be constructed?</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant	None
<p><u>Impact Determination</u> At the programmatic level of analysis, the projected increase in population and residential and commercial space would not adversely impact gas facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. Also, given the proposed Project’s projected population increase and planned land use changes, the electrical service provider would have capacity to accommodate the change</p>				

Environmental Effects	Level of Significance	Proposed Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Alternatives that May Reduce Impacts
in demand for electrical services, and impacts would be less than significant.				
<p>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</p> <p>Impact Determination</p> <p>Impact C-UTIL-1: The proposed Project, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in an increase in the demand for water supply. The lack of available water supplies documented in the FMWD 2005 UWMP beyond the existing condition and the lack of mitigation that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level means that the proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impact related to water supply.</p>	Significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Less than significant	No Project Alternative; Alternative 2; Alternative 3