

CITY OF CARSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 23-2847

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON RECOMMENDING THAT THE CARSON CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AND CERTIFY THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, ADOPT THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, ADOPT THE CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND ADOPT GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 115-23, THE CITY OF CARSON 2040 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

WHEREAS, the City of Carson initiated an update to the Carson General Plan, to be referred to as the Carson 2040 General Plan Update, to include the following elements: Land Use and Revitalization; Circulation; Community Character and Design; Recreation and Active Lifestyle; Community Health and Environmental Justice; Community Services, Education and Safety; Open Space and Environment Conservation; Noise; Economic Development; and Housing, with the Housing Element update having been considered and adopted separately in 2022, before the remainder of the General Plan Update (excluding the Housing Element, hereinafter, the “General Plan Update”); and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update process included a citizen participation and community outreach program that included numerous public and community meetings, workshops, surveys, and other feedback and input, and satisfied or exceeded applicable legal requirements; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update constitutes a “project” within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). After notice of preparation and scoping were completed as required by CEQA, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) was prepared and circulated in accordance with CEQA the concerning the General Plan Update. The DEIR was prepared by the City’s environmental consultant, working with City Planning staff, and has been independently reviewed by Planning staff and the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, following the DEIR public review period (a 46-day period from September 2, 2022 to October 17, 2022, during which the City also hosted a virtual public meeting on September 29, 2022), written responses were prepared on all comments received, and these comments and responses were incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Report for the project dated December 19, 2022, attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein by reference (“FEIR”); and

WHEREAS, the FEIR also contains revisions to the DEIR, which do not result in any new or increased significant environmental impacts that would result from the project. The revised text does not provide new information that identifies new significant environmental impacts and does not identify mitigation measures that, if implemented, would result in significant environmental impacts. Instead, the additions and corrections made to the DEIR merely “clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications” in the already adequate DEIR, as is permitted by CEQA

Guidelines Section 15088.5(b). Therefore, the text changes provided in the FEIR do not change any of the conclusions presented in the DEIR in a manner that would require recirculation of the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, the FEIR includes and incorporates the information required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, including the DEIR (dated September 2, 2022) and the aforementioned revisions thereto as well as the comments received on the DEIR and the responses thereto. The FEIR also includes a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), which has been prepared in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d); and

WHEREAS, in addition, a “Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations,” attached hereto as Exhibit “B” and incorporated herein by reference (the “Findings & SOR”), was prepared as required by CEQA, including findings pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, and a statement of overriding considerations in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093; and

WHEREAS, the FEIR and the Findings & SOR were prepared by the City’s environmental consultant, working with City Planning staff, and have been independently reviewed by Planning staff and the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing at its meeting of January 10, 2023, to consider the FEIR and the final draft of the General Plan Update. The Planning Commission considered evidence presented at the public hearing, including public testimony, and a report prepared by City staff, and having done so, sees fits and hereby intends to recommend to the City Council approval and certification of the FEIR, adoption of the MMRP therein, adoption of the Findings & SOR, and adoption of the General Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, all of the legal prerequisites to adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission finds that the foregoing recitals are true and correct, and the same are incorporated herein by reference as findings of fact based on the entire administrative record.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission hereby further finds as follows, based on the entire administrative record:

- a. The FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and reflects the City’s independent judgment and analysis as lead agency.
- b. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to recommending approval of the project.
- c. The comments and on the DEIR and the proposed responses have been incorporated into the FEIR and considered and recognized by the Planning Commission. All of the comments have been duly responded to in the FEIR as required by CEQA via

the proposed responses and the DEIR modifications contained in the FEIR. No further revisions to the DEIR or FEIR are required, and no recirculation of the DEIR is required.

- d. The Planning Commission has also considered and recognized the adverse environmental impacts which may result from implementation of the General Plan Update. Based on information set forth in the FEIR, the Planning Commission finds and determines that measures to mitigate certain impacts exist and are included in the FEIR. With incorporation of the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR and MMRP, all environmental impacts of the project are mitigated to a level of less than significance with the exception of the following impacts: Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and Transportation, as well as cumulative impacts as to same. However, the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects thereof, as detailed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in the Findings & SOR.
- e. The Findings & SOR includes findings pursuant to and in compliance with the requirements of Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in the Findings & SOR complies with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Planning Commission makes and adopts the findings set forth in the Findings & SOR as though set forth in full herein.
- f. The MMRP was prepared according to and complies with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d). The MMRP includes and incorporates into the General Plan Update all feasible measures to mitigate or substantially avoid any significant environmental effects of the General Plan Update.
- g. The General Plan Update, including the noticing, preparation, and consideration thereof, is in all respects in compliance with applicable law, including applicable provisions of the City's Charter and Article 6 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code, and will promote and further the public health, safety and welfare in the City.

SECTION 3. Based on the foregoing findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council approve and certify (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15090) the FEIR, adopt the MMRP therein, and make and adopt the Findings & SOR (with the statement of overriding considerations being adopted as to those impacts that cannot be adequately mitigated as described therein and above) concerning the General Plan Update.

SECTION 4. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the General Plan Update (General Plan Amendment No. 115-23, also referred to as the Carson 2040 General Plan), a copy of which is available at https://www.dropbox.com/s/kk9a62wp5cj1yx0/Carson%20%202040_General%20Plan_Hearing%20Draft_121622.pdf?dl=0, (Also can be found: <https://www.carson2040.com/>) and on file with the City's Planning Division, and which is incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 5. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution and transmit a copy of this Resolution to the City Council via the City Clerk.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 10th DAY OF JANUARY 2023.

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

SECRETARY

**EXHIBIT “A”
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (INCLUDING MMRP)**

Final Environmental Impact Report:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/vehwfp2ww64zj5g/0_Carson2040%20FEIR.pdf?dl=0

Draft Environmental Impact Report:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/xu32ldgkytnazuk/Carson%20GP%20Update%20Draft%20EIR.pdf?dl=0>

(Also can be found: <https://www.carson2040.com/>)

EXHIBIT "B"
FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Carson 2040 General Plan Update

The Carson City Council (City Council) finds, determines, and declares that having received, reviewed, and considered the following information as well as all other information in the record of proceedings in this matter, the following:

1. Findings Required by CEQA

The City Council has received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, in addition to all public testimony received on the Project (the Carson 2040 General Plan Update) and the recommendations of City staff. The Final EIR was prepared under the direction of the Community Development Department, Planning Division and reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis of the environmental impacts and comments received on the Draft EIR.

The City Council hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with PRC Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, hereby certifies that:

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

A. Certification Required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15090

The City Council has received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, in addition to all public testimony received on the Project (the Carson 2040 General Plan Update) and the recommendations of City staff. The Final EIR was prepared under the direction of the Development Department, Planning Division and reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis of the environmental impacts and comments received on the Draft EIR.

The City Council hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with PRC Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, hereby certifies that:

1. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
2. The Final EIR was presented to the City Council as the decision-making body of the City and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the project; and

3. The Final EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis.

B. Public Review and Outreach

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082 and 15083, the City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that was circulated to State, regional, and local agencies, and members of the public for 38-day review period starting on starting on November 8, 2017 and ending on December 15, 2017. As part of the NOP, the City advertised a notice of public scoping meeting for the Project. The scoping meeting was conducted on December 7, 2017, from 4-6pm, at the Juanita Millender-McDonald Community Center, 801 E Carson St, Carson, CA 90745. The NOP formally informed the public that the City was preparing a Draft EIR for the Project, and solicited input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR. Four written comment letters from public agencies responding to the NOP were submitted to the City.

During the process of developing the Carson 2040 General Plan, the City determined that the Housing Element Update should be included and an Environmental Justice Element created. As a result, the City recirculated the NOP for a 30-day public comment period starting on March 18, 2021 and ending on April 21, 2021. A virtual scoping meeting was held on April 14, 2021. Nine written comment letters from public agencies responding to the NOP were submitted to the City. Appendix A of the Draft EIR includes copies of written comments submitted to the Community Development Department, Planning Division in response to the NOP, Recirculated NOP, and at both of the public scoping meetings.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15085 and 15086, upon completion of the Draft EIR, a Notice of Completion and Availability (NOA), as well as an electronic copy of the Draft EIR, were submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research for distribution to State agencies. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 46-day public review period that ran from September 2, 2022, through October 17, 2022, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15105(a).

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15087, the NOA was posted in the office of the Los Angeles County Clerk from September 2, 2022, to October 2, 2022.

During the public review period for the Draft EIR, the City received five comment letters on the Draft EIR from agencies and organizations.

A copy of the Draft EIR was available during the comment period at the Community Development Department, Planning Division located at: City of Carson City Hall, 701 East Carson Street, Carson, CA 90745. The Draft EIR was also available online at the City of Carson website:
<https://www.carson2040.com/>.

C. Final EIR and City Proceedings

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, the City reviewed all comments received during the Draft EIR review period and provided a written response to each comment in the Final EIR. The Final EIR dated December 2022, consists of the following documents:

- Draft EIR and Technical Appendices dated September 2, 2022
- Final EIR dated December 19, 2022, which includes:
 - A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies that commented on the Draft EIR, as well as the verbatim comments received on the Draft EIR;

- Comments on the Draft EIR written responses to comments;
- Corrections and additions to the Draft EIR; and
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

The Final EIR document was posted for viewing and download with the previously posted Draft EIR prior to the City’s consideration of the Final EIR and Project recommendations at <https://www.carson2040.com/>. In addition, a hard copy can be viewed at City Hall by appointment during normal business hours. In addition, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b), responses were sent to all public agencies that made comments on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to certification of the Final EIR. All individuals that commented on the Draft EIR and provided a physical or email address were notified of completion of the Final EIR.

D. Record of Proceedings and Custody of Documents

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Administrative Record of Proceedings for the Project includes, without limitation, the following documents:

- NOPs, NOA for the Draft EIR, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed Project;
- All written comments submitted by agencies and members of the public during the Draft EIR public review comment period;
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies and members of the public during the Draft EIR public review comment period;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft EIR, and Final EIR;
- The Final EIR for the proposed Project, including the MMRP;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to, federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings or the Final EIR; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by PRC Section 21167.6(e).

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Project Findings are based are located at the Community Development Department, Planning Division located at: City of Carson City Hall, 701 East Carson Street, Carson, CA 90745. The custodian for these documents is the City’s Planning Director. This information is provided in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

E. Project Objectives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b) states that a project description shall contain “a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b) further states that “the statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project.” The intent of the Project, which is also referred to as the Carson 2040 General Plan Update, is to foster a vibrant and sustainable community, respond to an increasingly diverse and aging population, and addresses the myriad of physical, environmental, and other challenges that the city faces. The goals and policies addressed in the proposed General Plan update are intended to respond to these challenges. At the outset of the General Plan update process, the following specific objectives were established for the Project:

- Work with the community to articulate a vision for the city, and translating this vision into a viable implementation program
- Ensure balanced land use development that benefits residents and businesses
- Foster transportation improvements that allow people to easily and safely get around the city by driving, walking, biking, and/or taking transit
- Enhance quality of life and community character
- Improve the City's fiscal and economic health
- Revitalize the community for a diverse, aging, and changing population
- Coordinate with regional planning initiatives and state mandates regarding sustainability, greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental justice
- Establish a long-range vision that reflects the aspirations of the community and outlines steps to achieve this vision
- Establish long-range development policies that will guide City departments, as well as Planning Commission, City Council, and City department decision-making
- Provide a basis for judging whether specific development proposals and public projects are in harmony with plan policies
- Plan in a manner that meets future needs based on the projected population and job growth;
- Allow City departments, other public agencies, and private developers to design projects that will preserve and enhance community character and environmental resources, and minimize hazards
- Provide the basis for establishing and setting priorities for detailed plans and implementing programs, such as the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, specific and master plans, the Capital Improvement Program, the Housing Element, and the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Reduce community-wide GHG emissions consistent with statewide targets

F. Project Description

The Project includes a comprehensive update of all elements of the Carson General Plan, with the exception of the Housing Element, which was recently adopted in February 2022. The General Plan would guide future land use decisions in Carson, providing a long-term vision for the city and, through its policies, would indicate how that vision would be achieved. The Project would be the primary policy document guiding growth and development within the Planning Area through the planning horizon year of 2040. Together with the Zoning Ordinance and related sections of the Carson Municipal Code, the Project would serve as the basis for planning-related decisions made by City staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council.

By law, a general plan must be an integrated, internally consistent statement of City policies. Government Code Section 65302 requires that a general plan include the following seven elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety. According to Senate Bill (SB) 1000 and Gov. Code, Section 65302, since disadvantaged communities have been identified within Carson, the proposed General Plan update must also address Environmental Justice either as a standalone element or integrating related goals, policies, and objectives throughout other elements. This is included in the General Plan as a standalone element. Additional elements may be included as well, at the discretion of the City.

The General Plan Planning Area includes the city of Carson and its unincorporated sphere of influence (SOI). The Planning Area is bounded by East Alondra Boulevard and the city of Compton on the north, the city of Long Beach on the east, the Los Angeles neighborhood of Wilmington on the south, and I-110 and South Figueroa Street on the west. The SOI includes a portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County, located in the northeast section of the Planning Area north of Del Amo Boulevard and east of Wilmington Avenue. The SOI is defined as the ultimate physical boundary and service area of the city, and it encompasses territory that is envisioned to be the city's ultimate service area. The Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles has jurisdiction over defining Carson's SOI and acts on annexations.

The Planning Area comprises approximately 12,120 acres, or about 18.9 square miles, including all of the city of Carson (10,151 acres) as well as 1,969 acres of unincorporated land within the city's SOI. Nearly half (47.2 percent) of the Planning Area is zoned for industrial uses, followed by 25.5 percent for residential uses, 10.3 percent for parks, recreation, public, and community facilities, and 5.5 percent for commercial uses. The remaining 11.5 percent consists of vacant land, rights-of-way, and other uses.

The General Plan seeks to further the city's evolution from an industrial and suburban community to a complete city with an integrated mix of housing, employment, educational, cultural, and recreational options balanced with industrial uses. The General Plan focuses development in the Core, and in centers around the Core, expanding on the energy and success of recent development along West Carson Street and Avalon Boulevard, as well in other locations in the community. Development in the centers, corridors, and large opportunity sites such as the Shell property are envisioned to be connected with Boulevards with improved streetscapes, community gathering spaces, and better pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented streets to foster more vital and livable neighborhoods and districts.

The General Plan outlines strategies for greater integration of uses in different parts of the city and a better connection between employment and residential uses, with more areas designated for mixed-use development rather than single use. It recognizes the physical elements that help define the character of Carson, including existing residential neighborhoods, Carson's central Core, industrial/business centers, and corridors. Together, these elements represent the future urban structure of the city and the relationship between them, as shown in Figure 2-2. Strategies include:

- Most new development will occur in the Core, which encompasses the Downtown Mixed-Use designation along Carson Street and Avalon Boulevard, west of I-405. This builds on the continued momentum of recent development and design improvements in downtown (along West Carson Street), new development underway along Avalon Boulevard; this area in the Core would have the highest intensities. Landscaping, streetscape, pedestrian, and bicycle network improvements will complement the proposed land uses.
- Key industrial areas have been designated as Flex District to limit logistic and heavy truck uses and promote a flexible range of uses for industrial sites being remediated for urban uses. The Flex District land use designation permits office, residential, hotel, retail/commercial, research and development office parks, light industrial/maker uses, and neighborhood commercial uses.
- The Business Residential Mixed-Use north of the Flex District east of I-110 provides live-work units, residential, office, light industrial and manufacturing uses (such as breweries or coffee roasteries), and other similar uses, in an area that is emerging as a vibrant district with a diversity of uses.
- Most residential neighborhoods are retained in their existing use and development density patterns, with enhanced streetscapes and connections to open spaces, and landscaped buffers between industrial and residential uses as feasible.

- The Shell site is envisioned to become a research and development campus with a mixture of uses, including residential, commercial, office, industrial, and a large park.
- The Commercial Automotive District retains auto-oriented uses, such as vehicle sales, while emphasizing an overall cohesive image for the district.
- The General Plan locates several neighborhood centers with Flex District designations; each center is envisioned to contain a mix of uses, including neighborhood and local-serving commercial and residential uses. Development is envisioned to be pedestrian oriented.
- Greenway Corridors are envisioned as green streets with consistent street trees coverage that provide shade and a welcoming community image, with a connected sidewalk network, safe pedestrian crossings, separated or striped bikeways, where feasible, and bus transit. Higher-density housing and commercial uses are generally located along Greenway Corridors.

The Carson 2040 General Plan Update establishes 14 land use designations: Downtown Mixed Use, Business Residential Mixed Use, Corridor Mixed Use, General Commercial, Flex District, High Density Residential, Low Medium Density Mix Residential, Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Heavy Industrial, Light Industrial, Utilities, Public/Institutional, and Park/Open Space. In addition to the base districts, overlay land use designation—Commercial Automotive District—is established and another overlay land use designation—Mobilehome Park Overlay District—may be established.

The land use designations are meant to be broad enough to give the City flexibility in implementation, but clear enough to provide sufficient direction to carry out the General Plan. The Carson Municipal Code will contain more detailed provisions and standards. More than one zoning district may be consistent with a single General Plan land use designation. In addition to the listed allowable uses, public uses—including parks, government offices, police and fire stations, and public schools—are permitted in all classifications.

2. Findings Regarding the Potential Environmental Effects of the Project

The following sections (Sections 2.A, 2.B, 2.C, and 2.D) set forth the City Council’s Findings regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address the significant impacts. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and PRC Section 21081 only require findings to address significant environmental effects, findings often address impacts that were found to be less than significant; therefore, these findings will account for all effects identified in the Final EIR.

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

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

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

A. Findings of No Impact

The environmental effects listed below were identified as not potentially significant (refer to Section 5.1, *Effects Found Not to Be Significant*, in the Draft EIR). The City Council finds that the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, and the record of proceedings in this matter do not identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant environmental effects of the Project with respect to the areas listed below.

1. Agricultural and Forest Resources
2. Geology and Soils (soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems)
3. Mineral Resources
4. Wildfire

B. Findings of Less than Significant Prior to Mitigation

The City Council finds that although the following environmental effects were identified in the Draft EIR as potentially significant, the Draft EIR, the Final EIR and the record of proceedings in this matter contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to the areas listed below.

1. Aesthetics

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista (Impact AES-1).
- ii. The Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway (Impact AES-2).
- iii. The Project would not result in development that would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality (Impact AES-3).
- iv. The Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area (Impact AES-4).

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

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

2. Air Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (Impact AQ-1).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the

environment with respect to conflicting with or obstructing implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

3. Biological Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not adversely affect federally or state-protected wetlands (Impact BIO-3).
- ii. The Project would not conflict with a tree preservation policy or ordinance (Impact BIO-5).
- iii. The Project would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan (Impact BIO-6).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to adversely affecting federally or state-protected wetlands, conflicting with a tree preservation plan or ordinance, or conflicting with a habitat conservation plan.

4. Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects

- i. The Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (Impact CUL-3).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to disturbing human remains.

5. Energy

Facts/Effects:

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

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

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

6. Geology and Soils

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects involving the risk of geologic hazards (Impact GEO-1).
- ii. The Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (Impact GEO-2).
- iii. The Project would not have a significant impact due to hazards associated with unstable soils, such as on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse (Impact GEO-3).

- iv. The Project would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property due to the presence of expansive soils (Impact GEO-4).
- v. The Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (Impact GEO-5).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to geology and soils, including paleontological resources.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Facts/Effects:

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

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

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

8. Hazardous Materials

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials (Impact HAZ-1).
- ii. The Project would not result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school (Impact HAZ-2).
- iii. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment from a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Impact HAZ-3).
- iv. The Project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport (Impact HAZ-4).
- v. The Project would not impair implementation of or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (Impact HAZ-5).
- vi. The Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires (Impact HAZ-6).

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

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

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality (Impact HYD-1).
- ii. The Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (Impact HYD-2).
- iii. The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; 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; and impede or redirect flood flows (Impact HYD-3).
- iv. The Project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation (Impact HYD-4).
- v. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan (Impact HYD-5).

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

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

10. Land Use and Planning

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not physically divide an established community (Impact LU-1).
- ii. The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (Impact LU-2).

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

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

11. Noise and Vibration

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies (Impact NOI-1).
- ii. The Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise (Impact NOI-2).
- iii. The Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels generated by aircraft (Impact NOI-3).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to construction and operational noise and vibration.

12. Population and Housing

Facts/Effects:

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

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

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

13. Public Services

Facts/Effects:

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

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

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

14. Recreation

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated (Impact REC-1).
- ii. The Project would not have a significant impact due to inclusion of recreational facilities or required construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment (Impact REC-2).

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

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

15. Transportation

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway bicycle and pedestrian facilities (Impact TR-1).

- ii. The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) (Impact TR-3).
- iii. The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access (Impact TR-4).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to transportation, including conflicting with adopted circulation program, plan, ordinance, or policy, increasing hazards due to geometric design features or introducing incompatibly uses, and resulting in inadequate emergency access.

16. Tribal Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (Impact TCR-1).

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant effects on the environment with respect to tribal cultural resources.

17. Utilities and Service Systems

Facts/Effects:

- i. Construction or relocation of utility and service system facilities would not cause significant environmental effects with implementation of the Project (Impact UTL-1).
- ii. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve future development allowed by the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years (Impact UTL-2).
- iii. The Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments (Impact UTL-3).
- iv. The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals (Impact UTL-4).
- v. The Project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste (Impact UTL-5).

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

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

C. Findings of Less than Significant after Mitigation

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

1. Biological Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS (Impact BIO-1).
- ii. The Project would not 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 the CDFW or USFWS (Impact BIO-2).
- iii. The Project would not 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 (Impact BIO-4).

Mitigation:

MM BIO 1: Preconstruction Focused Survey for Special-Status Plants. Prior to initiating disturbance activities for individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), a focused survey for special-status plant species shall be performed by a qualified biologist(s) within the boundaries of the future project area, including all on-and off-site impact areas. If any special-status plants are found, a qualified biologist(s) with a California Department of Fish and Wildlife Scientific Collection Permit shall prepare a plan to relocate these species to suitable habitats within surrounding public open space areas that would remain undisturbed. For those species that cannot be physically transplanted, the biologist(s) shall collect seeds from the plants. To the extent feasible, the preconstruction focused survey shall be completed when species are in bloom, typically between May and November.

MM BIO 2: Special-Status Plants Planting Plan. Prior to initiating disturbance activities for individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and that have the potential to cause direct or indirect impacts on special-status plants, a qualified biologist(s) shall prepare a Special-status Plant Planting Plan for the species to be transplanted. At a minimum, the plan shall include 1) a description of the existing conditions at the project site, including any on- or off-site impact areas, and receiver sites, 2) methods to transplant and/or collect seed for off-site planting and/or seeding, 3) a two-year monitoring program, including performance standards, 4) description of and/or figure showing plant spacing, and 5) long-term maintenance requirements, including a funding mechanism to support long-term maintenance activities. The City shall also require proof that the plan preparer consulted with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife personnel or a qualified botanist in order to maximize transplanting success.

MM BIO 3: Listed Endangered and Threatened Plant Agency Coordination. For individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and would impact state or federally listed plants, in addition to MM BIO 1 and -2, the City shall require the project applicant to provide documentation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) authorizing take of listed plants or concurring the project would not be likely to result in an adverse effect on the species. The federal Endangered Species Act does not address listed plants on private property unless some type of federal action is involved. If a federal action is required for a project (e.g., federal funding, Clean Water Act compliance), a consultation between the lead federal agency and the USFWS must be completed. Under the California Endangered Species Act, Section 2081 subdivision (b) of the Fish and Game Code allows CDFW to authorize take of species listed as endangered, threatened, candidate, or a rare plant, if that take is incidental to otherwise lawful activities and if certain conditions are met.

MM BIO 4: Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Wildlife. For individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and are found to contain suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species (including surrounding areas within 300 feet of the site), no earlier than three weeks prior to initiating disturbance activities, focused surveys for special-status wildlife species shall be completed by a qualified biologist(s) within the boundaries of the future project, including all on-and off-site impact areas. If any special-status wildlife species are found, a qualified biologist(s) with a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Scientific Collection Permit shall prepare a plan to relocate these species to suitable habitats within surrounding public open space areas that would remain undisturbed, unless the biologist determines that such relocation cannot reasonably be accomplished at which point CDFW will be consulted regarding whether relocation efforts should be modified or terminated. The relocation plan,

including relocation methods (e.g., trap and release) and proposed receiver sites shall be approved by the CDFW prior to relocating any wildlife. If relocation is determined to not be a feasible option, the project applicant shall propose other form(s) of compensatory mitigation (e.g., off-site habitat restoration and/or preservation, payment into an existing restoration program, or providing funds to another City-approved conservation program).

MM BIO 5: Listed Endangered or Threatened Wildlife Habitat Assessment. Prior to approval of individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and may impact potentially suitable habitat for federally or state listed endangered or threatened species, the City shall require a habitat assessment to be completed by a qualified biologist(s) well versed in the requirements of the species in question. If no suitable habitat for the listed species is identified within 300 feet of construction or maintenance activities, no further measures would be required in association with the project. If suitable habitat for the species is identified within 300 feet of such activities, prior to construction, the City shall require that a focused survey be completed by a qualified biologist(s) for the species in accordance with protocols established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

In the event a state or federal listed species is determined to occupy habitat located in the proposed project site or within 300 feet of the site, the CDFW and/or USFWS shall be consulted, as required by the California Endangered Species Act and/or federal Endangered Species Act. In order to address and acknowledge the potential for listed species to occur within the Planning Area or be impacted by future development projects, this assessment acknowledges future actions by state and federal resource agencies in addition to the analyses necessary and required under CEQA.

MM BIO 6: Nesting Bird Surveys. All vegetation clearing for construction and fuel modification for individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) shall occur outside of the breeding bird season (February 1 and August 31), if feasible, to ensure that no active nests would be disturbed unless clearing and/or grading activities cannot be avoided during that time period. If clearing and/or grading activities for individual projects cannot be avoided during the breeding season, all suitable habitats shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist(s) no earlier than three weeks prior to initiating disturbance activities. Suitable nesting habitat within the Planning Area include ornamental landscaping trees and shrubs, mixed-riparian woodland, and non-native woodland communities. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged along with a 300-foot buffer for song birds and a 500-foot buffer for raptorial birds (or otherwise appropriate buffer as determined by the surveying biologist), and shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined by the surveying biologist that the nest is no longer active.

MM BIO 7: Use of Buffers Near Active Bat Roosts. During the November 1 to March 31 hibernation season, disturbance activities for individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) shall not be conducted within 100 feet of woodland habitat that provides suitable bat roosting habitat. Bat presence is difficult to detect using emergence surveys during this period due to decreased flight and foraging behavior. If a qualified biologist who is highly familiar with bat biology determines woodland areas do not provide suitable hibernating conditions (for example, cavities in the trunk or branches, woodpecker holes, loose bark, cracks, splits and thick ivy) and therefore, bats are unlikely to be present in the area, work may commence as planned.

MM BIO 8: Bat Maternity Roosting Surveys. Prior to approval of individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt

projects) and may impact potentially suitable habitat for bats, the City shall require a bat maternity roosting survey. No earlier than three weeks prior to initiating disturbance activities, a nighttime evening emergence survey and/or internal searches within large tree cavities shall be conducted by a qualified biologist who is highly familiar with bat biology during the maternity season (April 1 to August 31) to determine presence/absence of bat maternity roosts in wooded habitat in the project site or surrounding areas within 300 feet of the project site. All active roosts identified during the survey shall be protected by a buffer width to be determined by a qualified biologist. The buffer will be determined by the type of bat observed, topography, slope, aspect, surrounding vegetation, sensitivity of roost, type of potential disturbance, etc. Each buffer would remain in place until the end of the maternity roosting season. If no active roosts are identified, then work may commence as planned. Survey results are valid for 30 days from the survey date. Should work commence later than 30 days from the survey date, then additional surveys shall be conducted prior to starting the work.

MM BIO 9: Bat Roosting Replacement. All bat roosts that are permanently lost due to an individual project that is subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) must be documented via submission to the California Natural Diversity Data Base by the project's designated biologist and shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio on- or off-site with a roost suitable for the displaced species (e.g., bat houses for colonial roosters). The design of such replacement habitat shall be coordinated with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Each new roost shall be in place prior to the time that the bats are expected to use the roosts as determined by a qualified biologist who is highly familiar with bat biology and shall be monitored annually for two to five years to ensure proper roosting habitat characteristics (e.g., suitable temperature and no leaks). The roost shall be modified as necessary to provide a suitable roosting environment for the target bat species.

MM BIO 10: Sensitive Natural Communities. To mitigate potential impacts on sensitive woodland, shrubland and scrub natural communities provided a California Department of Fish and Wildlife state sensitivity rank of S1 to S3, future projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) shall implement the following mitigation measures prior to any ground disturbance:

- If avoidance cannot be reasonably accomplished, impacts to any S1 to S3 categorized shrubland, scrub or woodland alliance shall be mitigated through on- or off-site restoration, enhancement and/or preservation. For off-site mitigation, the applicant shall acquire mitigation land of similar habitat at a ratio of at least 1:1. On-site mitigation shall also be completed at a ratio of at least 1:1. A habitat mitigation plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City for approval, prior to any ground disturbance.
- For projects that have the potential to result in direct or indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities, a habitat mitigation plan shall be prepared and approved in writing by the City prior to any ground disturbance. The plan shall include adaptive management practices to achieve the specified ratio for on- or off-site restoration (and/or preservation. At a minimum, the plan shall include a description of the existing conditions at the mitigation site(s), goals and timelines, installation methods, monitoring procedures, plant spacing, adaptive management strategies, and long-term maintenance requirements.

MM BIO 11: Jurisdictional Waters. To mitigate for impacts to waters of the U.S. and/or waters of the state, future projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) shall implement the following measures in consultation with the regulating agencies (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE],

California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW], and Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB], as applicable):

- **The applicant shall provide on- and/or off-site compensatory mitigation in order to offset permanent impacts to USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW jurisdictional waters and wetlands at a ratio of no less than 1.5:1 and/or include the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program.**
- **If compensatory mitigation is required, a compensatory mitigation plan shall be prepared in accordance with applicable agency policies and implemented, once approved by relevant agencies and the City.**

Finding: The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that lessen significant impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, riparian habitat or sensitive natural habitat, and wildlife corridor or wildlife nursery sites as identified in the Final EIR. The City Council finds that based on the Final EIR and the record of proceedings, with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to these biological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

2. Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 (Impact CUL-2).

Mitigation:

MM CUL-2. Prior to development of individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and involve ground disturbance, the project proponent shall retain a qualified archaeologist, defined as meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology, to conduct an archaeological resources assessment including: a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center; a Sacred Lands File search at the Native American Heritage Commission; a pedestrian field survey; recordation of all identified archaeological resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms; an assessment of the project area's archaeological sensitivity and the potential to encounter subsurface archaeological resources and human remains; subsurface investigation to define the horizontal and vertical extents of any identified archaeological resources; and preparation of a technical report documenting the methods and results of the study. All identified archaeological resources shall be assessed for the project's potential to result in direct and/or indirect effects on those resources and any archaeological resource that cannot be avoided shall be evaluated for its potential significance prior to the City's approval of project plans and publication of subsequent CEQA documents. The qualified archaeologist shall provide recommendations regarding protection of avoided resources and/or recommendations for additional work, treatment, or mitigation of significant resources that will be affected by the project.

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

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

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

1. Air Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. Construction and operation of future projects facilitated under the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (Impact AQ-2).
- ii. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operations due to potential development generating substantial emissions in proximity to sensitive receptors (Impact AQ-3).
- iii. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to other emissions (such as those leading to odors) during construction or operation of future projects facilitated under the Project (Impact AQ-4).

Mitigation:

MM AQ-1: Applicants for new development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds during construction for emissions of NOX, CO, PM10 and/or PM2.5 shall implement one or more of the following measures, as applicable to the development project, or implement other comparable measures taking into account technologies that may become commercially available over time, to reduce substantial adverse effects related to violating air quality standards. Such measures may include the following or other comparable measures identified and approved by the lead agency:

- a) **Require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the cleanest technology emissions standards available at the time of construction demolition or grading permit issuance for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Carson Building and Safety Division that such equipment is not commercially available or feasible. For purposes of this mitigation measure, “commercially available or feasible” is defined as equipment built by the original manufacturer and available for lease or hire within 20 miles of the City of Carson and available in a similar timeframe to standard options. If cleanest technology equipment is not commercially available, the contractor must show proof that the equipment is not commercially available by providing letters from at least two independent rental companies, each of which must own or operate a construction equipment fleet with total maximum horsepower of greater than 2,500 horsepower, for each piece of off-road equipment where the cleanest equipment is not available. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) regulations**

During construction, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the construction site for verification by the City of Carson Building and Safety Division. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers of construction equipment on-site. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

- b) Construction contractors shall ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with Section 2449 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9.**
- c) Require the use of electric or alternative-fueled (i.e., non-diesel) construction equipment, if available, including but not limited to concrete/industrial saws, pumps, aerial lifts, material hoists, air compressors, forklifts, excavators, wheel loaders, and soil compactors.**
- d) Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of significant construction activity to maintain smooth traffic flow, where necessary.**
- e) Provide dedicated turn lanes for the movement of construction trucks and equipment on-and off-site, where applicable**
- f) Ensure that vehicle and equipment traffic inside the project site is as far away as feasible from sensitive receptors.**
- g) Provide physical barriers to deter or minimize neighborhood truck and equipment traffic near sensitive receptors (e.g., schools).**
- h) Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.**
- i) Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.**
- j) Suspend the use of all construction activities that generate air pollutant emissions during first-stage smog alerts**
- k) Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.**
- l) Require covering of all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.**
- m) Install other control measures such as wheel washers, gravel pad, etc., where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site for each trip.**
- n) Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).**
- o) Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible to minimize dust**
- p) Pave road and road shoulders, where applicable**
- q) Sweep streets at the end of the day with South Coast AQMD Rules 1186 – PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads, and Livestock Operations and 1186.1 – Less-Polluting Sweepers compliant sweepers if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (recommend water sweepers that utilize reclaimed water).**

MM AQ-2: Applicants for new development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds during construction for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) as a result of VOC off-gassing emissions from architectural coatings and industrial maintenance coatings shall require the construction contractor to use SCAQMD Low-VOC and/or Super-Compliant VOC architectural coatings and industrial maintenance coatings such

that daily volume of coatings applied would not result in emissions that exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold for VOC, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Carson Building and Safety Division that such coatings for a required application are not available. During construction, construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

MM AQ-3: Applicants for new development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance thresholds during operations shall, prior to issuance of a building permit for new development projects within the General Plan Update area, show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency. Installation of Energy Star or equivalent appliances shall be verified by the City of Carson Building and Safety Division prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

MM AQ-4: Applicants for new residential development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance thresholds during operations shall, prior to issuance of a building permit for new development projects within the Planning Area, indicate on the building plans that the feature below has been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Carson Building and Safety Division prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

- For multifamily dwellings, electric vehicle charging shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code (or its successor code).

MM AQ-5: Applicants for new non-residential development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District significance thresholds during operations shall, prior to issuance of a building permit for new development projects within the Planning Area, indicate on the building plans that the features below have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Carson Building and Safety Division prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

- Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code (or its successor code).
- Facilities shall be installed to support future electric vehicle charging at each nonresidential building with 30 or more parking spaces. Installation shall be consistent with Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code (or its successor code).

MM AQ-6: Applicants for new development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and are within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of a sensitive land use shall, prior to issuance of a building permit, submit a construction-related air quality study that evaluates potential localized project construction-related air quality impacts to the City of Carson Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing localized significance thresholds (LST) air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted

thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning Division.

MM AQ-7: Applicants for new development projects within the Planning Area that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and are within one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) of a sensitive land use shall, prior to issuance of a building permit, submit a construction-related air quality study that evaluates potential health risk impacts to the City of Carson Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing health risk impacts. If health risk impacts are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning Division.

MM AQ-8: Future development projects with heavy-duty truck loading docks shall provide appropriate signage at the loading dock that identifies applicable idling restrictions pursuant to the CARB Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Section 2485, or its successor regulation, and contact information to report violations to CARB and the SCAQMD.

Finding: The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which reduce significant impacts to air quality as identified in the Final EIR. The Project would implement MM AQ-1 through AQ-8 to help to reduce the severity of impacts related to the cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and the generation of other emissions, such as odors, to the maximum extent feasible. The City has determined that there are no other feasible mitigation measures. Based on the Final EIR and the record of proceedings even with the implementation of MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during construction and operation.

2. Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Construction of future projects facilitated under the Project could result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources as it is impossible to know if future development will avoid substantial adverse impacts on historical resources without information on specific future projects (Impact CUL-1).

Mitigation:

MM-CUL-1: Prior to development of individual projects that are subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., non-exempt projects) and within areas that contain properties more than 45 years old, the project proponent shall retain a qualified architectural historian, defined as meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for architectural history, to conduct a historic resources assessment including: a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center; a review of pertinent archives, databases, and sources; a pedestrian field survey; recordation of all identified historic resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms; and preparation of a technical report documenting the methods and results of the assessment. All identified historic resources will be assessed for the project's potential to result in direct and/or indirect effects on those resources and any historic

resource that may be affected shall be evaluated for its potential significance under national and state criteria prior to the City's approval of project plans and publication of subsequent CEQA documents. The qualified architectural historian shall provide recommendations regarding additional work, treatment, or mitigation for affected historical resources to be implemented prior to their demolition or alteration. Impacts on historical resources shall be analyzed using CEQA thresholds to determine if a project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. If a potentially significant impact would occur, the City shall require appropriate mitigation to lessen the impact to the degree feasible

Findings: The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which reduce significant impacts to historical resources as identified in the Final EIR. The Project would implement MM CUL-1 to help to reduce the severity of impacts related to historical resources. The City has determined that there are no other feasible mitigation measures. Based on the Final EIR and the record of proceedings even with the implementation of MM CUL-1 the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impacts to historical resources.

3. Transportation

Facts/Effects:

- i. The Project does not meet the total service area VMT reduction goal of 15 percent, as established in the Circulation Element, and as such, would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) (Impact TR-2).

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce total VMT per service population.

Findings: The City Council has determined that there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to VMT with implementation of the Project. Based on the Final EIR and the record of proceedings the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impacts related to VMT.

E. Cumulative Impacts

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

a) Cumulative Impacts Found to Be Less than Significant

1. Aesthetics

Facts/Effects:

- i. Reasonably foreseeable growth within the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including Carson, could have cumulative effects on the region's aesthetic character. However, with the implementation of proposed policies found in the General Plan update, the contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to scenic vistas and visual character in a non-urbanized area would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. No state scenic highway is located within the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including the Carson, and thus reasonably foreseeable growth within the South Bay region of southern central Los Angeles County, including Carson, would not substantially damage scenic resources within the corridor of a state scenic highway.

- iii. Substantial light and glare created by reasonably foreseeable growth within the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including Carson, could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. However, with adherence to provisions found in the Carson Municipal Code, the contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to substantial light and glare would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

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

2. Air Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. Since the City's proposed General Plan update would not conflict with AQMP construction, land use, and transportation strategies that are intended to reduce construction emissions, VMT, and resulting regional mobile source emissions, the contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to consistency with air quality plans would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts related to consistency with applicable air quality plans below a level of significance.

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to consistency with air quality plans.

3. Biological Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Due to limited biological resources and habitats within the Planning Area, consistency with the proposed policies of the General Plan update, and implementation of Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-11, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to biological resources.

4. Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development in the Los Angeles Basin, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could result in a [substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact.](#) However, with implementation of MM CUL-2 and compliance with proposed General Plan policies and applicable local, state, and federal laws, the Project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. Future development in the Los Angeles Basin, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could [disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact.](#) However,

as all future development under the Project would be required to comply with state laws pertaining to the discovery of human remains, the Project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM CUL-2 is required to reduce cumulative archaeological impacts below a level of significance.

Finding: The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that lessen significant cumulative impacts to archaeological resources, as identified in the Final EIR. The City Council finds that based on the Final EIR and the record of proceedings, with the implementation of a mitigation measure, cumulative impacts to archaeological resources and human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

5. Energy

Facts/Effects:

- i. Development under the proposed General Plan update would be required to incorporate energy conservation features in order to comply with applicable mandatory regulations including CALGreen Code and state energy standards under Title 24. Therefore, the impact with respect to electricity and natural gas consumption from new development under the Project would be less than cumulatively considerable.
- ii. Development under the proposed General Plan update would be required to demonstrate consistency with federal and state fuel efficiency goals and incorporate mitigation measures as required under CEQA. Siting land use development projects at infill sites is consistent with the state's overall goals to reduce VMT pursuant to SB 375, and VMT per capita would decrease compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the impact of development anticipated by the Project would be less than cumulatively considerable with respect to transportation energy.
- iii. Development under the proposed General Plan update would be required to comply with CALGreen and Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and other regulations. Proposed General Plan policies and mitigation would also further reduce emissions associated with new development through increased energy efficiency, renewable energy generation, improved transit, and reduced consumption and waste. Therefore, the impact on the implementation of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be less than cumulatively considerable.

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

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

6. Geology and Soils

Facts/Effects:

- i. Impacts related to geology and soils are generally site-specific, rather than cumulative in nature, because each development site has unique geologic considerations that would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards. Therefore, future development in the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to geology and soils.
- ii. Future development in the Los Angeles Basin, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological

resource or site or unique geologic feature, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, with implementation of proposed General Plan policies and adherence to applicable local, state, and federal laws, the Project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils, including paleontological resources, below a level of significance.

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to geology and soils, including paleontological resources.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Facts/Effects:

- i. Given that the Project would not conflict with applicable GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations, emissions associated with future development that could occur under the proposed General Plan update would be less than significant on a cumulative basis.

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

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

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future projects developed under the proposed General Plan would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to hazardous materials during construction and operation, which would ensure that the Project's contribution to a cumulative impact related to the routine use, transportation, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. Future projects developed under the proposed General Plan would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to hazardous materials when handling hazardous materials and waste near a school. Therefore, the Project's contribution to this cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- iii. Past development in Carson has occurred on sites listed on hazardous materials databases, but compliance with federal, State, and local regulations and appropriate remediation of these sites has reduced any impact to human and environmental health. Future development under the proposed General Plan would also be required to adhere to site-specific investigation and remediation requirements, as applicable, and as a result, the cumulative impact related to development of sites identified on a list of hazardous materials sites would be less than significant.
- iv. All new projects would be subject to the same federal, State, and local traffic regulations, which would ensure the cumulative impact related to emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant.
- v. Since the Planning Area is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Safety Zone (VHFHSZ), nor is one mapped in the vicinity, no cumulative impact associated with wildland fire would occur.

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

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

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. All future development in the Dominguez watershed, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would be subject to the requirements of the NPDES program and other regulations such as pollution control ordinances. Adherence to these regulations would minimize degradation of water quality associated with the construction and operation of individual projects. As such, the cumulative impact with respect to water quality would be considered less than significant.
- ii. The West Coast and Central groundwater basins are adjudicated, and thus have limits on the amount of groundwater that is pumped for potable use. Therefore, the potential for overdraft is limited. With respect to groundwater recharge, the area over these basins is heavily urbanized and primarily built out with impervious surfaces. Therefore, future development over the West Coast and Central basins, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would not result in substantial increases of impervious surfaces such that groundwater recharge would be hindered. In addition, the groundwater recharge basins for the Central Basin are in the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel Coastal Spreading Grounds along the Rio Hondo and the San Gabriel Rivers and groundwater recharge for the West Coast Basin is primarily done through injection wells. Thus, replenishment of groundwater is not reliant on natural recharge or percolation within the area. For these reasons, the cumulative impact with respect to depletion of groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge would be considered less than significant.
- iii. As the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County is heavily urbanized, future development would not involve the direct alteration of existing streams, rivers, or other drainage patterns. However, potential future development in the South Bay region, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could impact the existing drainage system. Future development in the area would be subject to floodplain management and stormwater and urban runoff pollution control ordinances for each jurisdiction that would prevent flood damage resulting from hydromodification. Adherence to these ordinances would also limit surface runoff from future development, thus reducing siltation and erosion. For these reasons, the cumulative impact with respect to storm drainage would be considered less than significant.
- iv. Future development in the area served by the Dominguez Channel, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would be subject to floodplain management and stormwater and urban runoff pollution control ordinances for each jurisdiction that would prevent flooding. For these reasons, the cumulative impact with respect to flooding would be considered less than significant.

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

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

10. Land Use and Planning

Facts/Effects:

- i. All future development in the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County would be required to comply with each jurisdiction's general plan and zoning code and regional plans such as Connect SoCal. In addition, all future development in the region would be required to undergo individual project planning reviews to ensure that future development would not divide an established community. For these reasons, future development in the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to land use and planning.

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

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

11. Noise and Vibration

Facts/Effects:

- i. Noise is a localized phenomenon, and because the city is predominately developed with urban uses, it is unlikely that multiple construction projects would occur simultaneously and in close enough proximity to each other to create a significant combined noise impact. Instead, periodic infill development in various areas of the city would be expected to occur. As a result, the contribution of the Project to any potential cumulative construction noise impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. Permanent increases in noise would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to development under the proposed General Plan update and ambient growth through 2040 throughout the region. Related development in adjacent jurisdictions may contribute traffic to the city roadway network. While a cumulative impact related to traffic noise would occur at sensitive receptors, the amount of traffic noise attributable to the proposed General Plan update would be below the threshold of significance for traffic noise. Therefore, the contribution of the Project to this cumulative traffic noise impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- iii. Vibration is a localized phenomenon, and because the city is predominately developed with urban uses, it is unlikely that multiple construction projects would occur simultaneously and in close enough proximity to each other to create a significant combined vibration impact. Instead, periodic infill development in various areas of the city would be expected to occur. Therefore, the contribution of the Project to any potential cumulative construction vibration impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- iv. Permanent increases in vibration would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to development under the proposed General Plan update and ambient growth through 2040 throughout the region. Vibration from these sources, while remote, could combine and exceed vibration thresholds at sensitive receptors, thus resulting in a potential cumulative operational (traffic) vibration impact. However, as vibration levels from traffic generated by growth anticipated by the proposed General Plan update would be well below the thresholds for human annoyance and structural damage, the contribution of the Project to any potential cumulative operational (traffic) vibration impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to noise and vibration.

12. Population and Housing

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development in the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would not result in the displacement substantial numbers of existing people or housing as future development would be required to follow existing state law governing relocation of residents. Therefore, a significant cumulative impact with respect to displacement of exiting residents or housing would not occur.
- ii. Future development in the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area as future development would have to be consistent the general plans and zoning codes of local jurisdictions in the area, and therefore would not be unplanned. For these reasons, a significant cumulative impact with respect to inducing unplanned population growth would not occur.

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

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

13. Public Services

Facts/Effects:

- i. A significant cumulative environmental impact would result if future growth in the county would exceed the ability of the Los Angeles County Fire Department to adequately meet its commitments, thus requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Proposed General Plan policies related to fire prevention would help enhance public safety and keep service demand increases to a minimum. In addition, the Project promotes compact development patterns with infill development, thus ensuring that new development would be located close to existing fire stations. Therefore, the contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to fire services would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. A significant cumulative environmental impact would result if future growth in the county would exceed the ability of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department to adequately meet its commitments, thus requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Proposed General Plan policies related to community involvement, education, and crime prevention strategies would help enhance public safety and keep service demand increases to a minimum. In addition, the Project promotes compact development patterns with infill development, thus ensuring that new development would be located close to existing police stations. Therefore, the contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to police services would not be cumulatively considerable.
- iii. A significant cumulative environmental impact would result if future growth within the Los Angeles Unified School District and the Compton Unified School District would exceed the ability of these districts to adequately meet the needs of its students, thus requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. The increase in school enrollment generated by future growth under the Project would be very modest, where future enrollment would continue to be below anticipated facility capacity. For this reason, the

contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to schools would not be cumulatively considerable.

- iv. The Project's contribution to a cumulative impact with respect to the overuse and degradation of existing park facilities and the construction or expansion of additional parks and recreation facilities would not be cumulatively considerable.
- v. A significant cumulative environmental impact would result if future growth in the county would exceed the ability of the Los Angeles County Library system to adequately serve its patrons, thus requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Population growth anticipated under the Project would not result in the need for new public facilities such as libraries, and new facilities would be subject to environmental review under CEQA, proposed General Plan land use designations, and proposed General Plan policies related to construction impacts. For this reason, the contribution of the Project to a cumulative impact related to other public facilities would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

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

14. Recreation

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development in the South Bay region of southern Los Angeles County, including future development allowed under the proposed General Plan update, could have an adverse effect on existing parks and recreational facilities in the region, and thus could result in a potentially significant cumulative impact with respect to the overuse and degradation of existing park facilities. The city currently has a ratio of about 1.9 park acres per 1,000 residents which is maintained as the standard in the proposed General Plan update. As potential park locations identified by the proposed General Plan update would allow the City to maintain this standard through 2040, the Project's contribution to this cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. Demand for parks and recreation facilities due to future development in the area, including future development allowed under the proposed General Plan update, could result in the construction or expansion of additional parks and recreational facilities, the construction of which might have adverse physical effects on the environment. As a result, the construction or expansion of additional parks and recreation facilities could result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. The proposed General Plan update contains plans for additional recreational facilities in the Planning Area in keeping with the needs and preferences of the population. All new facilities would be subject to CEQA guidelines, proposed General Plan land use designations, and proposed General Plan policies related to construction impacts. Elements of the proposed General Plan update are designed to minimize potentially cumulatively considerable environmental impacts of new development. Therefore, the Project's contribution to this cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

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

15. Transportation

Facts/Effects:

- i. It is possible that traffic generated by future development in the region could conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, given the consistency of the proposed General Plan update with the various local, regional, and state regulatory frameworks that are in place, the contribution of the proposed General Plan update to this cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- ii. It is possible that traffic generated by future development in the region could substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact. The proposed General Plan update includes multiple policies to improve the multi-modal network, expand pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and enhance public transportation services. These policies would improve compatibility between different transportation modes and between the transportation system and adjacent land uses, and therefore the proposed General Plan update would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. In addition, future development under the proposed General Plan update would be compliant with the City's design guidelines that incorporate safety and emergency access needs, where applicable. For these reasons, the contribution of the proposed General Plan update to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

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

16. Tribal Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development in the Los Angeles Basin, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact. All future development would be required to comply with SB 18 and AB 52 consultation, which would ensure that tribal cultural resources are properly identified and that mitigation measures are identified to reduce impacts on these resources. For this reason, the Project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

Finding: The City Council finds that the Final EIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence establishing that the Project will not result in significant cumulative effects on the environment with respect to tribal cultural resources.

17. Utilities and Service Systems

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development within the service area of the F.E Weymouth Treatment Plant, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could result in the plant nearing capacity if upgrades are not planned, thus resulting in a potential cumulative impact with respect to water treatment capacity. However, the Project's contribution this impact would

not be cumulatively considerable as policies in the proposed General Plan update aim to conserve water by curbing demand for domestic and commercial purposes and promoting water conservation strategies, thus reducing demand for water, and in turn, demand for water treatment.

- ii. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California has consistently stated that its water supplies are fully reliable to meet the demands of its customers, in all hydrologic conditions, through at least 2045. Future development under the proposed General Plan update would be evaluated by the City on a project-by-project basis to determine potential impacts to water supplies. The continued assessment of individual projects for impacts to water supply would assure projects would only be approved if adequate water supplies exist at the time of their implementation. All future development would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, and regulations in place for water supply. Therefore, the Project's contribution to any potential water supply impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
- iii. Future development within the service area of the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could result in the plant nearing capacity if upgrades are not planned, thus resulting in a potential cumulative impact with respect to wastewater capacity. However, the Project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable as policies in the proposed General Plan update aim to conserve water by curbing demand for domestic and commercial purposes and promoting water conservation strategies, thus reducing demand for water, and in turn, the generation of wastewater.
- iv. Future development within the service area of landfills that receive solid waste from the city of Carson, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could exacerbate regional landfill capacity issues in the future, thus resulting in a potential cumulative impact with respect to solid waste disposal capacity. However, the Project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable as compliance with solid waste regulations and proposed General Plan policies would reduce the amount of solid waste generated in the city.

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

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

b) Cumulative Impacts Found to Be Significant after Mitigation (Significant and Unavoidable)

1. Air Quality

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development that may occur under the proposed General Plan update may result in construction or operational emissions that could exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure(s) MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-5. Therefore, even with implementation of these measures, the cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation: Implementation of mitigation measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-5 would help to reduce the severity of the cumulative impact.

Finding: The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which help to reduce the severity of the cumulative impact. However, since the size, scale, and intensity of future projects are unknown at this time, it

would be speculative to assume that mitigation measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 would be able to reduce future cumulative air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the cumulative impact related to project emissions that could exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds would remain significant and unavoidable.

2. Cultural Resources

Facts/Effects:

- i. Future development in the Los Angeles Basin, including growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update, could result in a [substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, thus resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact](#). There are no federal or state-designated or listed properties within the city. However, the city has not been subject to a comprehensive citywide historic resources survey and all historic-age structures are potential historical resources. Therefore, there is the possibility growth anticipated under the proposed General Plan update could adversely affect historical resources. The City cannot be sure that all impacts on historical resources can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Even with implementation of proposed General Plan policies, as well as applicable local, state, and federal laws and MM-CUL-1, the Project's contribution to a potentially significant cumulative impact to historical resources would be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: Implementation of mitigation measures MM CUL-1 would help to reduce the severity of the cumulative impact.

Finding: The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which help to reduce the severity of the cumulative impact to historical resources. However, since the size, scale, and location of future projects are unknown at this time, it would be speculative to assume that mitigation measures MM CUL-1 would be able to reduce future cumulative impacts to historical resources to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the cumulative impact to historical resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

3. Transportation

Facts/Effects:

- i. As a result of the amount of development anticipated by the proposed General Plan update, it was determined that the city will achieve greater than a 15 percent reduction for cumulative Home-Based VMT per Capita (-15.5 percent) and Home-Based Work VMT per Employee (-21.8 percent) by 2040. However, the City will not achieve a reduction of 15 percent or more in total VMT per service population (-8.1 percent) by 2040. Therefore, the proposed General Plan update would make an incremental but significant contribution to a cumulative regional VMT impact.

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

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

3. Evaluation of Alternatives

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the

project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. The Project's objectives are provided above in Section 1.E, *Project Objectives*.

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

The EIR considers a total of four alternatives to the Project. Two alternatives were considered but were not selected for further analysis due to a failure to meet most of the basic Project Objectives, infeasibility, and/or an inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Two alternatives were comprehensively evaluated in the Draft EIR, including the "no project" alternative and a corridors alternative, which clusters new development around major thoroughfares throughout the city. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR, and that if the "no project" alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative with the least adverse impacts on the environment.

The alternatives considered or evaluated in the Draft EIR include:

- Core Alternative (rejected from further consideration in the Draft EIR)
- Centers Alternative (rejected from further consideration in the Draft EIR)
- No Project Alternative (evaluated in detail in the Draft EIR)
- Corridors Alternative (evaluated in detail in the Draft EIR)

The impacts of each of alternative evaluated in detail in the Draft EIR are compared to the Project's impacts in Draft EIR Chapter 4, *Alternatives*, with a summary of comparative impacts provided in in Draft EIR Table 4-1.

A. Alternatives Considered and Rejected

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the following factors may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration: the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic Project Objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that were considered but rejected after initial analysis include the Core Alternative, which seeks to concentrate new development in a central area in the city, expanding on the energy and success of recent development along Carson Street, and the Centers Alternative, which focuses on nodal development throughout the city. As identified in PRC Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), findings are required only for "alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." Alternatives that are not reviewed in detail in the EIR because they have been determined to be

infeasible need not be discussed in the findings (*Crenshaw Subway Coalition v Los Angeles County Metro. Transp. Auth.* (CD Cal, Sept. 23, 2015, No. CV 11-9603 FMO [JCx]) 2015 US Dist Lexis 143642, 2015 WL 6150847). Therefore, findings are not provided for alternatives considered in the Draft EIR and rejected from detailed analysis.

a) Core Alternative

The Core Alternative seeks to concentrate new development in a central area in the city, expanding on the energy and success of recent development along Carson Street. New development would be concentrated in approximately a 1.5-mile radius from Carson Street and Avalon Boulevard, resulting in a vibrant, connected core area with a diverse mix of uses. Streetscape, pedestrian, and bicycle-way improvements would be focused in this core area to promote active, walkable environments, with easy access to stores, services, parks, and other public uses. Additional development would occur in select focus areas outside of this core.

The mixed-use pattern of new development along Carson Street is envisioned to expand along the portion of the corridor between I-110 and Wilmington Avenue. A density increase overlay would be located on the blocks north and south of Carson Street to provide additional housing that would reflect a density more similar to a “downtown.” Avalon Boulevard would connect the inner core area to key large-scale development opportunities along Interstate 405 (I-405), including the 157-acre opportunity site where The District at South Bay project is proposed, as well as the South Bay Pavilion Mall.

Victoria Golf Course would be redeveloped as an “innovation center” that would provide contemporary office buildings and workplaces, with higher density development than found elsewhere in Carson. This area would be designed from the ground up to accommodate a variety of businesses—including, for example, financial and technology offices—in an integrated, walkable setting, connected with the other parts of the community by a “green spine” along the Dominguez Channel. As this area was formerly used as a landfill, higher development intensities, including buildings ranging from six to 12 stories tall, may have been necessary to justify remediation or working within the environmental constraints.

The Core Alternative would include a large, central city park with portions of research and development (R&D) uses on the Shell site. The area north of I-405, between Dominguez Channel and SR-91, would be a transitional area between the core and industrial uses near the city’s northern border. This transition zone would create a buffer between residential and industrial uses, providing live-work units, light industrial and manufacturing uses (e.g., breweries or coffee roasteries), R&D office parks, and neighborhood commercial uses in close proximity to California State University, Dominguez Hills. Overall, the Core Alternative emphasizes Carson Street and Avalon Boulevard, including potential redevelopment of City Hall, as connectors to new regional centers.

The Core Alternative was not considered for further analysis since it would not meet the basic project objectives of revitalizing other portions of the city, including underutilized commercial properties along the corridors and locating additional services near existing residential areas. This alternative envisions the Victoria Golf Course as an “innovation center” with office building six to twelve stories tall.

Development of the Victoria Golf Course at the scale envisioned was found to be infeasible due to the hazardous conditions of the closed landfill. In addition, Los Angeles County owns and maintains the course and is proposing redevelopment of the site as The Creek at Dominguez Hills, a recreation complex that would include a multi-use indoor sports complex, youth learning experience facility, indoor skydiving facility, marketplace, clubhouse, recreation and dining center, restaurant uses, and a sports

wellness center. The Core Alternative was also not considered further since new development to be built on the Core was incorporated into the Project.

b) Center Alternative

The Centers Alternative focuses on nodal development throughout the city. Each node or center would contain a different mix of uses, depending on location and available opportunity sites, with each node containing various housing, employment, and commercial uses in a walkable, higher-density pattern. These centers would not only accommodate new projected growth in the community, but would also act as focus areas for the surrounding neighborhoods, providing stores and services to existing neighborhoods that lack such uses and an improved pedestrian-scaled public realm with cafés, restaurants, and public gathering places. The radius around each node would be approximately one-half mile, or a ten-minute walking distance, in order to keep development walkable.

Carson Street redevelopment was envisioned to expand, though concentrated around the intersections of Carson and Main streets, along Carson Street and Avalon Boulevard, and at densities somewhat lower than envisioned in the Core Alternative. Additional centers would occur in the vicinity of Main Street and Del Amo Boulevard, which complements development of The District at South Bay and would take advantage of proximity to major highways. The South Bay Pavilion would be another center, which would provide retail and visitor commercial (i.e., hotels, entertainment) uses close to the major thoroughfares and transitions into mixed-use, office, and industrial flex uses further from the highway. In another center, industrial flex and intensification of underutilized industrial parcels would create an employment-centered mixed-use area in proximity to the Del Amo Blue Line Station. Other centers would provide more housing and commercial near California State University, Dominguez Hills, and in the southern portion of the city around Main Street and Sepulveda Boulevard.

The centers would be connected via arterial streets redeveloped as greenways that would improve mobility and provide a consistent, welcoming image for the city of Carson. Additional density would occur in the city's industrial areas. While some of the opportunity sites identified in this alternative were similar to the Core Alternative, they were proposed at different densities and with different uses.

The Centers Alternative focused on development of central "nodes", which contains various housing, employment, and commercial uses in a walkable, higher-density pattern, to help enliven certain portions of the city. While this planning intention is good in theory, this alternative was not considered for further analysis since the sites that were chosen for land use changes were ultimately determined to be infeasible due to existing land use limitations and the City's desire to retain some of these areas as industrial. Furthermore, this alternative largely focused development only within these certain nodes and does not meet the basic project objective of revitalizing other portions of the city, particularly along major corridors and other key opportunity sites. The Centers Alternative was also not considered further since the Project incorporates a similar concept, called Neighborhood Villages, which seeks to achieve the same planning outcome of walkable, mix-use centers throughout the city.

B. Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR

a) No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, all current land use designations and definitions from the current General Plan as amended to date, and future development in the Planning Area would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, development standards, and land use designations of the existing

Carson General Plan. Specifically, the area around the Core would not be designated as Downtown Mixed Use nor would the corridors have the Corridor Mixed Use designation, both of which allows for greater development within these areas. Further, there would be no new Flex District or Business Residential Mixed Use land use designations which allow for a greater variety and intensity of uses. All change areas as identified in the Project would retain their existing 2004 General Plan designations. Policies concerning topics such as transportation, economic development, parks, open space, the environment, climate change, environmental justice, health, and housing would also remain unchanged.

Finding. The City rejects the No Project Alternative and finds that the alternative is infeasible because, although it is environmentally superior to the Project, it would not fully achieve any of the Project Objectives.

Basis for Finding. The No Project Alternative would not result in any of the significant impacts associated with the Project. However, under the No Project Alternative, none of the land use designations and policies in the proposed General Plan update designed to foster a vibrant and sustainable community, respond to an increasingly diverse and aging population, and address a myriad of physical, environmental, and other challenges that the city faces would be implemented. Therefore, this alternative would either not accomplish some of the project objectives (e.g., work with the community to articulate a vision for the city and translating this vision into a viable implementation program.) or accomplish some of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the Project (e.g., reduce community-wide GHG emissions consistent with statewide targets).

b) Corridors Alternative

The Corridors Alternative clusters new development around major thoroughfares throughout the city, with an increased focus on corridors with the greatest development opportunities. The overall scale and density of development would vary somewhat throughout the city; however, overall, the density of development would be lower than in the Core or Centers Alternatives and would be more evenly spread throughout the city. Generally, mixed-use development would occur along major streets, with supporting retail, housing, office, and employment uses around the periphery of the mixed-use areas. Main Street, Figueroa Street, and Broadway would be revitalized from nearly the southern border to the northern border of Carson. The Carson Street redevelopment would be extended from the city's western border to Wilmington Avenue, with some additional commercial redevelopment envisioned along Carson Street in the Lincoln Village neighborhood. Additional development would occur along Alameda Street, Sepulveda Boulevard, Del Amo Boulevard, and Avalon Boulevard.

While this alternative concentrates on development along major corridors, other large sites throughout the city would support surrounding neighborhoods. The Shell site would be redeveloped as a new, state-of-the-art R&D campus, bringing more jobs to Carson. A new street grid and linear park in this area would foster connectivity to industrial flex across the street along Del Amo Boulevard and adjacent existing single-family neighborhoods. R&D and industrial flex uses would be increased along Broadway in the northern portion of the city and sphere of influence (SOI). This higher-density, modern industrial area can help to revitalize the low-density, old industrial buildings currently located in this area and provide a more prominent gateway to the city. Both of these R&D areas are in close proximity to California State University, Dominguez Hills, and could help to provide jobs for students. In this alternative, the Victoria Golf Course would be redeveloped as a recreational/open space area and South Bay Pavilion would provide a location for additional housing.

Finding. The Corridors Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, energy (operational), GHG emissions (operational), noise and vibration (operational), population and housing, public services, VMT, and utilities, but would result in greater impacts with respect to land use planning and recreation. This alternative would not avoid the Project's potentially significant and unavoidable with respect to air quality, historical resources, and VMT. In addition, the Corridors Alternative would result in an additional significant and unavoidable impact with respect to the deterioration of recreational facilities as not enough parkland would be provided by this alternative to meet demand. While the Corridors Alternative would achieve all of the objectives for the Project, this alternative would not achieve the project objectives to the same degree as the Project. For these reasons, the City has rejected the Corridors Alternative.

Basis for Finding. While the Corridors Alternative would result in incrementally reduced environmental impacts related to a number of environmental issues, this alternative would not reduce the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, historical resources, and VMT to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the Corridors Alternative would result in an additional significant and unavoidable impact with respect to the deterioration of recreational facilities as not enough parkland would be provided by this alternative to meet demand. Therefore, while the Corridors Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the City would reject this alternative as it does not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project and would result in an additional significant and unavoidable impact.

4. Findings Regarding the Final EIR

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

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

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

All feasible mitigation measures are included in the MMRP that will be adopted if the City approves the Project. As discussed above, the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make it infeasible to mitigate significant impacts with respect to air quality, historical resources, and transportation.

Nonetheless, as indicated above, some significant and unavoidable impacts will remain and all of the feasible mitigation measures are included in the Project's MMRP, which will be adopted by the City if the Project is approved. The MMRP ensures implementation of the mitigation measures and provides the following information: (1) the full text of the mitigation measure and the impact statement(s) to which it applies; (2) the agency responsible for enforcing implementation of the mitigation measure; (3) the phase of the Project during which the measure would be monitored; and (4) the agency responsible for monitoring implementation of the mitigation measure. The MMRP is provided in Chapter 4 of the Final EIR. For significant and unavoidable impacts, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared to provide substantial evidence that the Project's benefits outweigh its significant environmental impacts and will be adopted by the City if the Project is approved. The Statement of Overriding Considerations is provided in Section 6 of these Findings.

5. Statement of Overriding Considerations

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

The Final EIR identifies significant environmental effects that will occur as a result of implementation of the Carson 2040 General Plan Update. With implementation of the Project's mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, as discussed in the Final EIR, these effects can be mitigated to levels considered less than significant, except for significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of air quality, historical resources, and transportation as described above.

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

- The proposed General Plan update will provide for the orderly build-out of new development; residential units of varying densities; mixed-use development; retail, office, and industrial uses; public lands; and parks, open space, and recreational facilities;

- The proposed General Plan update implements principles of sustainable growth by concentrating new urban development in the City's core, areas around the core, and along key commercial and transportation corridors; thereby minimizing land consumption while maintaining open space, habitat, and recreation uses throughout the Planning Area;
- The proposed General Plan update will create a safe, efficient, and balanced transportation network throughout the Planning Area, providing links within the City and with the neighboring South Bay region, and accommodating automobile, truck, pedestrian, recreational, rail, and public transit needs which will meet current and future development requirements within the Planning Area;
- The proposed General Plan update improves mobility options through the development of a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity, supports community development patterns, limits traffic congestion, promotes public and alternative transportation methods, and supports the goals of the adopted regional transportation plan;
- The proposed General Plan update addresses adverse environmental effects associated with global climate change by facilitating sustainable development, promoting energy efficiency, and promoting development that reduces greenhouse gas emissions;
- The proposed General Plan update encourages the development of a variety of housing types that are needed to meet the needs of all of Carson's residents, to meet its fair share housing allocation without dividing established communities, and to be consistent with the recently adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element; and

The proposed General Plan update will promote and support economic development to provide jobs in concert with future population growth.