CEQA FINDINGS AND FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

PREPARED FOR THE
SOUTH EL MONTE ATHLETIC FIELDS AND BUSINESS PARK PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2024070062

February 2026

Section 1.0: Introduction

This statement of Findings of Fact (Findings) addresses the environmental effects associated with the South El Monte Athletic Fields and Business Park Project (Project), as described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report and Final Environmental Impact Report (together, EIR) for the Project. These Findings are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.), specifically PRC Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6, and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000 et seq.), specifically Sections 15091 and 15093. The EIR evaluated the potential impacts associated with the South El Monte Athletic Fields and Business Park Project and identified mitigation measures that could be employed to reduce, minimize, or avoid those potential effects.

1.1 CEQA Requirements

The CEQA Statute, PRC Section 21081, and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Section 15091, require that the lead agency, in this case the City of South El Monte (City), prepare written Findings for identified significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. PRC Section 21081(a) affirmatively requires a Lead Agency make one or more of three possible findings in reference to each significant impact. In addition, PRC Section 21081(b) requires an additional finding for impacts that include specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations wherein the Lead Agency affirms that the project benefits outweigh the environmental impacts.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 states, in part, that:

a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

    1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. [referred to in these Findings as “Finding 1”].

    2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. [referred to in these Findings as “Finding 2”].

    3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. [referred to in these Findings as “Finding 3”].

b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subdivision (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(b) further provides that "The findings required by subdivision(a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record." State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(c) states, "The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subdivision (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives."

Additionally, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) provides, "When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures."

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 provides additional guidance for projects with significant unavoidable impacts. To summarize:

a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

The EIR identified potentially significant effects that could result from the Project. The City finds that the inclusion of feasible mitigation measures as part of the approval of the Project will reduce all but one of those effects to less than significant levels. The impact that is not reduced to a less than significant level is identified and overridden due to specific Project benefits, as set forth in Section 7.0 of these Findings.

As required by CEQA, the City Council, in adopting these Findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project. The City Council finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these Findings, meets the requirements of PRC Section 21081.6, by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the Project.

1.2 Record of Proceedings

For the purpose of CEQA and these Findings, the record of proceedings for the Project includes all data and materials outlined in PRC Section 21167.6(e), along with other relevant Project information contained within the City's files. Specifically, the record of proceedings for the City Council's decision on the Project includes the following documents, all of which are incorporated herein by reference and are relied on in supporting these Findings:

1. Notice of Preparation (NOP), Notice of Completion (NOC), Notice of Availability (NOA), Notice of Determination (NOD), and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with this CEQA process and the Project.
2. All written comments submitted by agencies, organizations, or members of the public during the NOP public review comment period, inclusive of the Scoping Meeting.
3. Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) – State Clearinghouse No. 2024070062, including all technical appendices, and all documents incorporated by reference therein.
4. All written comments on the Draft EIR – State Clearinghouse No. 2024070062 submitted by public agencies and members of the public during the public review period established identified in the NOC and the City's responses to those comments.
5. The Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) – State Clearinghouse No. 2024070062, including all documents incorporated by reference therein.
6. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project.
7. All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the City or consultants to the City with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the Project.
8. All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Draft EIR and Final EIR (together, EIR).
9. All written and verbal public testimony presented during public hearings for the Project at which public testimony was taken, including Planning Commission and City Council hearings.
10. Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations as well as any documents expressly cited in these Findings.
11. All resolutions adopted by the City regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions.
12. Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to federal, State, and local laws and regulations.
13. Any documents expressly cited in these Findings, in addition to those cited above, and any other materials required for the record of proceedings by PRC Section 21167.6(e).

1.3 Custodian and Location of Records

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the City as the Lead Agency, is the custodian of the records related to the EIR and Project. These documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available for public review during normal business hours at:

City of South El Monte
1415 Santa Anita Avenue
South El Monte, California 91733

1.4 CEQA Findings of Independent Judgment, Review and Analysis

Under CEQA, the Lead Agency must (1) independently review and analyze the EIR; (2) circulate draft documents that reflect its independent judgment; (3) as part of the certification of an EIR, find that the report or declaration reflects the independent judgment of the Lead Agency; and (4) submit copies of the documents to the State Clearinghouse if there is state agency involvement or if the project is of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance (PRC § 21082.1[c]).

The PRC sections referenced in this section govern key procedural and substantive requirements under CEQA:

- **PRC Section 21081**: Prohibits a public agency from approving a project with significant environmental effects unless the agency makes specific findings to address those effects. The agency must determine that (1) changes or alterations have been incorporated to mitigate the effects, (2) another agency with jurisdiction has or should adopt the necessary changes, or (3) mitigation is infeasible due to economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations. If mitigation is deemed infeasible under (3), the agency must also adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, concluding that the project's benefits outweigh its significant environmental impacts.
- **PRC Section 21081.5**: Establishes that these findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.
- **PRC Section 21081.6**: Mandates the adoption of a MMRP to ensure compliance with required mitigation measures.

The Findings contained in this document reflect the City's conclusions, as required pursuant to CEQA, for the Project. The City has exercised independent judgment, in accordance with PRC Section 21082.1(c)(3), in the preparation of the Draft EIR, the review of materials prepared by the Project Applicant and its consultants, and the preparation of the Final EIR based on comments received during the public comment process.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the information in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, as well as any and all other information in the record, the City hereby makes these Findings pursuant to and in accordance with PRC Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6. It is the finding of the City Council that the Final EIR, as presented for review and approval, fulfills environmental review requirements for the Project, and that the document constitutes a complete, accurate, adequate, and good faith effort at full disclosure under CEQA, and reflects the independent judgment of the City Council.

Section 2.0: Project Description

2.1 Project Location

The approximately 21.17-acre (rounded to 21 acres) project site is located within the City of South El Monte (City or Lead Agency), Los Angeles County, situated at 825 Lexington-Gallatin Road, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 8119-005-032. The Whittier Narrows Recreation Area is located west/southwest of the project site in unincorporated Los Angeles County. State Route 60 (SR-60) is located just north/northeast of the project site, specifically at the Santa Anita Avenue freeway interchange.

The northeast boundary of the project site is bordered by a vacant construction yard; the east side of the project site is bordered by Lexington-Gallatin Road; the southern boundary of the project site is bordered by the Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation facilities; and the southwest and northwest boundaries of the project site are bordered by Santa Anita Avenue. The project site is located approximately two miles northeast of the Whittier Narrows Dam and is within U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) reservoir flowage easement area.

2.2 Project Description

The Project is described in detail in the Draft EIR. The following is a summary for purposes of these Findings.

The Project includes the development of a warehouse use on approximately 10.5 acres of the eastern portion of the project site and the remaining approximately 10.7 acres on the northwestern portion of the project site would be dedicated to the City pursuant to either a long-term ground lease or property donation agreement (referred herein as a dedication) for future development of a City park. A digital billboard is also proposed on that portion of the project site. The single parcel would be subdivided into two parcels to allow for the development of the warehouse on one parcel and the public City park on the other parcel. The Project Applicant does not propose the construction or operation of the City park; therefore, specific information regarding final design and construction will later be determined by the City. However, as explained in the EIR, certain assumptions were made regarding the future development of the City park for CEQA purposes.

The entire project site is located within USACE reservoir flowage easement area associated with the spillway activation elevation of the Whittier Narrows Dam. Flowage easement land is non-federal land on which the United States government has acquired certain perpetual rights, including the right to overflow, flood, and submerge the land; the right to prohibit structures for human habitation; and the right to approve all other structures proposed for construction within the flowage easement. The Project includes the construction of storage and drainage improvements for the required volume of potential flood waters from the Whittier Flood Control Basin by balancing the cut and fill up to the spillway activation elevation of the Whittier Narrows Dam. The total existing volume is 247,100 cubic feet and the proposed volume at the 229 finished floor elevation would be 248,500 cubic feet. The Storage Basin Improvements include but are not limited to the (i) installation of a new storage basin and (ii) installation of a new gravity storm drain connection for the new storage basin. With respect to the storage basin, the future City park portion of the project site would be excavated by approximately three to ten feet below the existing grade of Santa Anita Avenue with a minimum elevation of approximately 213 feet. The finished grade of the warehouse portion of the site would be raised approximately 3 to 10 feet above Santa Anita Avenue with a finish floor elevation of 229 feet, above the spillway activation elevation using the excavated material.

The warehouse component of the Project would include the construction of an approximately 221,815-square-foot (sf) single-story industrial warehouse building with approximately 201,815 sf of warehouse space, approximately 10,000 sf of ancillary office space on the ground level, and approximately 10,000 sf

of ancillary office space on a mezzanine level. Vehicular access to the warehouse would be from two 40-foot-wide driveways on Lexington-Gallatin Road. Both driveways would provide truck and passenger vehicle ingress/ egress to the site. Standard vehicle parking would be provided on the northern side of the warehouse and within the secured lot on the southern side of the building. The secured lot would also be used as a truck maneuvering area with access to the 27 dock doors and would be shielded by a 14-foot-high concrete screen wall. The warehouse would include a total of 277 standard parking stalls, with 92 stalls located within the secured lot on the south side of the warehouse building.

The Project requires a General Plan Amendment from the existing Commercial (C) designation to Commercial-Manufacturing (C-M), the latter of which allows general commercial and limited manufacturing uses to co-locate. The proposed future City park would also be an allowed use under the C-M land use designation. The Project would require a zone change to the Manufacturing (M) zone. The M Zone is intended to provide for and encourage the development of industrial uses in suitable areas throughout the City. As outlined in Municipal Code Section 17.09.020, warehousing and recreational facilities, including but not limited to athletic fields, are principally permitted uses in the M zone.

2.3 Discretionary Actions

City discretionary approvals required for the Project include, but may not be limited to:

1. Certification of the South El Monte Athletic Fields and Business Park Project Final Environmental Impact Report (Environmental Assessment Review No. 25-01) (Final EIR): The Project requires CEQA compliance through the certification of a Final EIR prior to approval of the Project. The Final EIR is intended to serve as the primary environmental document for all actions associated with the approval of the Project.
2. General Plan Amendment (GPA 23-03): The Project requires a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Commercial (C) to Commercial-Manufacturing (CM).
3. Zone Change (ZC 23-01): The Project requires a Zone Change from Commercial (C) to Manufacturing (M).
4. Site Permit Approval.
5. Parcel Map Subdivision.
6. Conditional Use Permit.
7. Development Agreement. A Development Agreement is proposed by and between the City and the Project Applicant for the Project.
8. City Park Donation Agreement. The City park component will be dedicated to the City pursuant to either a long-term ground lease or property donation agreement pursuant to the Development Agreement for the Project.

The Project will require other discretionary and ministerial actions by the City as part of its implementation. These additional approvals include, but are not limited to, haul route permits, site development permits, grading permits, use permits, sign permits, and building permits.

Actions by responsible State and federal agencies are:

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE): Section 408 Permission pursuant to Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, 33 USC 408. This includes approval of a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Assessment leading to a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB): Issuance of a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Construction General Permit.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans): Issuance of a permit for outdoor advertising under the Outdoor Advertising Act (Business and Professions Code, §§5200 et. seq.), inclusive of State highways.

Section 3.0: Environmental Impacts Found to Have No Impact

As a result of the Notice of Preparation, in connection with preparation of the EIR for the Project, the City determined, based upon the threshold criteria for significance, that the Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact on the following potential environmental effects, and therefore determined that these potential environmental effects would not be addressed in the EIR. Based upon the environmental analysis presented in the EIR, and the comments received by the public on the EIR, no substantial evidence was submitted to or identified by the City which indicated that the Project would have an impact on the following environmental areas:

Aesthetics

Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

Basis for Conclusion: The City of South El Monte General Plan (General Plan) Resource Element notes "none of the existing highways, streets, or roads in the City meet requirements for designation as a scenic highway." Interstate 210 (I-210) is the nearest eligible State highway, which is approximately 10 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is not visible from I-210. The project site does not contain any scenic rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or heritage trees. Therefore, the Project would not affect scenic resources along an officially designed or an eligible scenic highway. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?"

Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The nearest designated area of Prime Farmland is located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the project site. No portion of the project site is covered by a Williamson Act Contract. Additionally, the area does not include forest resources, including timberlands, and is not zoned for agriculture. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact concerning mapped farmlands, Williamson Act Contracts, agricultural, forest, or timberland zoning, or the conversion or loss of Farmland, forest land, or timberland. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Biological Resources

Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is not located with an active Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Geology and Soils

Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault or strong seismic ground shaking?

Basis for Conclusion: There are no known active or potentially active faults at the project site, and the project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as designated by the California Department of Conservation (CGS). The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is located approximately three miles northwest of the project site. Therefore, the Project would not directly, or indirectly, cause potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is located on relatively flat ground and is not adjacent to any areas with steep slopes. Additionally, the project site is not located within a Zone of Required Investigation for earthquake-induced landslides. The General Plan states that there is no history of landslides in South El Monte. No areas in the City have been determined to be at high risk of landslides due to South El Monte's relatively flat topography. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?"

Basis for Conclusion: The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; the nearest airport is San Gabriel Valley Airport (also known as the El Monte Airport), which is located approximately three miles north of the project site. Further, the project site is not located within Airport's influence area or noise contours. Therefore, the Project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard or excessive noise for people working or recreating at the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Would the Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Basis for Conclusion: According to CAL FIRE, there are no wildfire Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) in the City. The project site is within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA). The nearest Very High FHSZ is in a LRA approximately 1.1 miles southwest of the project site. The Whittier Narrows Recreation Area is a large open space to the south and west of the project site that could pose a fire risk, however, existing roadways and parking lots create a natural fire break preventing wildfire spread. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Land Use and Planning

Would the project physically divide an established community?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is within an urbanized and established area of the City. The project site is generally bordered by Lexington-Gallatin Road and Santa Anita Avenue and is separated from SR-60 by a vacant parcel. There is an existing residential neighborhood northeast of the project site adjacent to SR-60 that is accessed from Lexington-Gallatin Road. The Project does not propose any new streets or other physical barriers that could physically divide an established community. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Mineral Resources

Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

The project site is not located in a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) per the Mineral Resource Zones in Los Angeles County as mapped by the State of California Department of Conservation. None of the prior uses on the site included those that focus on mineral refinement or mining. There are no known mineral resources or recovery sites located on or immediately adjacent to the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Noise

Within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is located approximately three miles south of the San Gabriel Valley Airport and is not located within the airport's influence area or noise contours. The project site is not located within an existing or projected noise contour associated with any private or public airport. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to excessive airport or airstrip-related noise levels. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Public Services

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service

ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: schools and other public facilities?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is located within the Valle Lindo School District and the El Monte Union High School District. No residential development is proposed. Project employees, including construction workers, are reasonably expected to predominately come from the existing workforce in the City and would therefore not contribute to a significant population increase and associated student population influx to the school districts. Therefore, there would be no impact.

The South El Monte Library is located at 1430 North Central Avenue, approximately one mile north of the project site. Construction and operation of the Project would not result in a substantial permanent population growth that would result in increased use of public services, like libraries, such that a significant deterioration of the facility would occur, or such that new facilities would be required. Therefore, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the construction of a new or physically altered school or other public facilities, like libraries. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Wildfire

If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildlife risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

d) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to significant loss, injury or death involving wildfires, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Basis for Conclusion: Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) are mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as set forth in PRC 4201-4204 and Government Code 51175-89. FHSZs are categorized fire protection within a Federal Responsibility Area under the jurisdiction of a federal agency, a State Responsibility Area (SRA) under the jurisdiction of CAL FIRE, or within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) under the jurisdiction of a local agency. CAL FIRE is responsible for fire protection within SRAs. CAL FIRE defines a SRA as land that is not federally owned, not incorporated, does not exceed a housing density of three units per acre, contains wildland vegetation as opposed to agriculture or ornamentals, and has watershed value and/or has range/forage value (this effectively eliminates most desert lands). Where local fire protection agencies are responsible for wildfire protection, the land is classified as a LRA. The CAL FIRE mapping states "The geographic center of this parcel is located in an area that the State Fire Marshal has identified as having no Fire Hazard Severity Zone in Local Responsibility Area, per Government Code section 51178." The project site is identified as within a LRA, with the nearest Very High FHSZ approximately 0.7 mile southeast of the project site (the 2025 maps show portions of Durfee Avenue and Rosemead Boulevard as Very High FHSZs but not the property adjacent to the roadways. Land east and west of San Gabriel Boulevard, approximately 1.2 miles to the west is designated

Very High FHSZ). Fire protection services in the City are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, with local reliance on the Los Angeles County Fire Station 90 located at 10115 Rush Street, 0.9 mile north of the project site. The Project would tie into existing infrastructure and would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, or power lines that could exacerbate fire risk in the area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Section 4.0: Environmental Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant (No Mitigation Required)

As a result of the preparation of the EIR for the Project, the City determined, based upon the threshold criteria for significance, that the Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact on the following potential environmental effects. No mitigation measures would be required. Where the potential impact can be reduced to less than significant solely through adherence with standard conditions, these measures are considered "incorporated into the project" which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant effect.

Based upon the environmental analysis presented in the EIR, and the comments received by the public on the EIR, no substantial evidence was submitted to or identified by the City which indicated that the Project would have an impact on the following environmental areas evaluated in the EIR:

Aesthetics

Would the Project have a substantial effect on a scenic vista?

Basis for Conclusion: The City of South El Monte General Plan Resource Element does not identify any scenic vistas in the City. The San Gabriel Mountains are approximately 13 miles north of the project site. Views of the San Gabriel Mountains are visible from the project site but publicly accessible views are already limited and interrupted by existing urban development and existing tree lines. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

In an urbanized area, would the Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?"

Basis for Conclusion: The Project would comply with Municipal Code Section 17.09.050, which includes property development standards that apply to all uses within the Manufacturing (M) zone. The development standards are imposed to ensure the building design does not negatively impact the area in which the use is located. Compliance with the M zoning district development standards would be ensured through the City's review during the application process, Project approval process, and future review of building permits. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project is consistent with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Consistency Criterion No. 1 and No. 2 as the Project would not exceed the construction or operational standards and therefore would not exceed the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and would not contribute to an existing air quality violation. The proposed Commercial-Manufacturing land use would generate less employees than the existing Commercial land use. Therefore, the Project would not cause the City's General Plan buildout population forecast to be exceeded. Air pollutant emissions resulting from Project implementation would not exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds, would not increase the frequency or severity of an existing air quality violation or cause or contribute to new violations for air quality pollutants, and would not delay timely attainment of air quality standards or interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMPs or any applicable air quality plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project's regional criteria pollutant emissions during construction would remain below applicable thresholds. Project construction would also comply with SCAQMD Rules 402 (Nuisance) and 1113 (Architectural Coatings) and the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) anti-idling regulations; however, compliance with these rules was not assumed when estimating the Project's construction emissions for purposes of a conservative EIR analysis. Therefore, the Project's maximum-day construction emissions of criteria pollutants would be even lower. The Project's estimated criteria pollutant emissions during construction would be below their respective thresholds. Operational (i.e., area, energy, mobile vehicle, emergency generator, and off-road equipment) emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Therefore, the Project would not violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Basis for Conclusion: The emissions of pollutants on the peak day of construction would not exceed the local significance thresholds (LSTs) established by the SCAQMD and therefore would not create substantial concentrations of pollutants at the sensitive receptors closest to the project site or cause or contribute to an exceedance of federal or State ambient air quality standards. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

For a worst-case scenario assessment, the localized operational emissions conservatively include all on-site project-related stationary sources, on-site off-road equipment (forklifts, yard trucks, and generators), and on-site mobile sources, since a portion of mobile sources could include vehicles idling on the site. The maximum unmitigated daily emissions of these pollutants generated during Project operations would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. Impacts would be less than significant. Project-related emissions would not exceed the regional thresholds or the LSTs, and therefore would not exceed the ambient air quality standards or cause an increase in the frequency or severity of existing violations of air quality standards. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to criteria pollutant levels in excess of the health-based ambient air quality standards. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would not result in any significant effects relating to CO concentrations because sensitive receptors would not be exposed to any CO hotspots as a result of the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The Project (construction and operations combined scenario) would result in a maximum cancer risk of 1.90 at the nearest residential receptors, 0.19 in one million at the nearest student receptors, 1.27 in one million at the nearest recreational receptors, and 0.49 in one million at the nearest worker receptors. Therefore, the SCAQMD threshold of 10 in one million would not be exceeded at the nearest sensitive receptors. Impacts would be less than significant. The EIR evaluates potential chronic non-cancer risk hazard from Project construction and operational emissions. A chronic non-cancer risk hazard index of 1.0 or greater is considered individually significant. Non-carcinogenic hazards would not exceed 1.0 and therefore would be within acceptable limits. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Basis for Conclusion: Odors may be generated during Project construction associated with equipment diesel exhaust, architectural coatings, volatile organic compounds, and paving activities. These standard construction-related odors would be temporary, are not expected to affect a considerable number of people, and would disperse rapidly. The warehouse and public park are not land uses that have been identified by the SCAQMD as significant odor sources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site does not contain any potentially jurisdictional wetlands, marshes or vernal pools, or other protected waterways, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Draft EIR found the site was absent of State or federally protected wetlands though review of the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) database and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) database and during the constraints-level aquatic resources assessment. The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Basis for Conclusion: The City of South El Monte General Plan does not include goals or policies associated with biological resources. The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Tree planting within the future City park component for the Project would be subject to the Approved Tree List and compliance with the City's Tree Policy. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Basis for Conclusion: There are no dedicated cemeteries on or near the project site. No archaeological resources were identified on or near the project site, and the survey conducted did not identify any human remains. Additionally, the project site is highly disturbed due to prior development and associated grading and excavation. Given the absence of known archaeological resources on the site and the extent of existing disturbance, there is low potential for Project excavation and grading to encounter human remains. Despite the low likelihood of discovery, if previously unknown human remains are discovered during the Project's ground-disturbing activities, a substantial adverse change in the significance of such a resource could occur. In the event human remains are encountered during excavation or disturbance activities, compliance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, which is included as Standard Condition (SC) CUL-1, would avoid any significant impacts to human remains. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Energy

Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?

Basis for Conclusion: Fuel energy consumed during construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources. Project construction equipment is required to comply with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and CARB engine emissions standards, and construction fuel consumption associated with the Project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than other similar recreational and industrial developments. Project operation will be supported by the use of photovoltaic (PV) systems, and will adhere to federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency. Implementation of the Project would not use large amounts of fuel or energy in an unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient manner. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project would be required to comply with the California Title 24 energy standards and the CALGreen building code. Compliance with State and local energy efficiency standards would ensure that the Project meets all applicable energy conservation policies and regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Geology and Soils

Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?

Basis for Conclusion: During grading and construction topsoil would be exposed which could result in wind and water erosion. Because the Project would involve the disturbance of one or more acres of soil, it is required that coverage is obtained under the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit). The Construction General Permit requires developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and installing erosion-control and sediment-control best management practices (BMPs) to control potential construction-related erosion. The NPDES permit requires the Project to prepare and implement a SWPPP and erosion control plan that includes construction erosion control BMPs. Hydroseeding may be required for areas of the site that may remain undeveloped subsequent to the construction of the warehouse component of the Project. The BMPs would be required to meet or exceed measures required by the NPDES Construction General Permit to control potential construction-related pollutants and would comply with the South El Monte Municipal Code Section 8.44.110. The Project is also subject to SCAQMD Fugitive Dust, which will lessen erosion impacts through limiting dust creation and movement. Additionally, it can be reasonably assumed that upon completion of construction of the park component, the City park site would be substantially covered with landscaping (athletic fields and lawn areas) and limited impervious surfaces (parking and restroom facilities) to reduce the potential for wind and water soil erosion. Accordingly, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Therefore, compliance with applicable State and federal regulations (NPDES Construction General Permit), required compliance with the SWPPP erosion control plan and construction-erosion BMPs, South El Monte Municipal Code Section 8.44.110 and SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, would minimize soil erosion and topsoil loss and impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Basis for Conclusion: According to the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report prepared for the Project, soil from the project site have very low expansion potential. Therefore, given soil expansion is unlikely due to the site's existing soil composition, impacts from expansive soils would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG?

Basis for Conclusion: On a statewide level, the Climate Change Scoping Plan provides measures to achieve AB 32 and SB 32 targets. On a regional level, the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) *2024 - 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* [RTP/SCS] or Connect SoCal contains measures to achieve VMT and GHG reductions required under SB 375. The City does not have a programmatic mitigation plan to rely on, such as a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan as recommended in the relevant amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines. The analysis in the EIR addresses consistency with the strategies and goals of the Scoping Plan and Connect SoCal. The Project would result in a less than significant impact because it would be consistent with the overarching State regulations on GHG reduction as outlined in the applicable portions of AB 32's *2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan* and SCAG's 2024-2050 RTP/SCS.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project does not contain nor is adjacent to a stream or river. Construction activities could expose and loosen building materials and sediment, which has the potential to mix with stormwater runoff and result in erosion or siltation off of the site. Compliance with the NPDES and Municipal Code require the preparation of a SWPPP (SC HYD-1). As the future City park could be constructed at a future date, erosion-control and sediment-control measures, as required through the NPDES, would be implemented by the Applicant and/or the City to ensure substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site would not occur. Compliance with the City's Municipal Code, SCAQMD, and NPDES Construction General Permit and preparation of a SWPPP would prevent construction-related impacts related to potential alteration of a drainage pattern or erosion from development activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The future City park component would largely remain as a grassy area that is pervious and self-treating. Similar to existing conditions, drainage of this area would be directed to an existing 90-inch reinforced concrete Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) storm drain line, which ultimately discharges into Legg Lakes. The drainage pattern on this portion of the project site would not be altered in a way that would result in substantial erosion or siltation. Runoff from the warehouse component of the Project would include the installation of catch basins, two WetlandMODs, and a detention tank to capture and treat on-site stormwater runoff. These systems would detain and treat water prior to discharging into the LACFCD storm drain. The Final LID Plan, SUMSP, and proposed drainage and water quality design and engineering plans would be reviewed by the City to ensure that the site-specific design limits the potential

for erosion and siltation and to ensure compliance with the NPDES, MS4 Permit, and the City's Municipal Code. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?

Basis for Conclusion: The project site is not within a FEMA-mapped special flood hazard area. The site is classified as Zone X, which is an area of Minimal Flood Hazard. However, the project site is located on flowage easement lands used for additional storage for the Whitter Narrows Dam. The Project includes the construction of storage and drainage improvements for the required volume of potential flood waters from the Whittier Flood Control Basin (Storage Basin Improvements). The Project would be designed such that finished grade elevations of the future City park area would have the same or higher water storage capacity as compared to the existing conditions. Raising the elevation of the warehouse component above the spillway activation elevation would ensure the warehouse and associated structures and equipment would not result in inundation. The on-site flood storage would be captured on the future City park portion of the project site. This area would not include any habitable structures, propane or fuel storage tanks, and as required by USACE, would not include any elements with the potential to result in pollution or interference with the operation of the Whittier Narrows Dam. Therefore, while flooding on the future City park portion of the project site could occur due to USACE reservoir flowage easement lands, compliance with USACE Section 408 Permit, NPDES, and the City's Municipal Code would ensure Project inundation would not result in the release of pollutants. Additionally, the project site is approximately 20 miles from the Pacific Ocean, and outside of the Tsunami Hazard Zone. Therefore, the project site would not be inundated by a tsunami that could result in the release of pollutants, and impacts would not occur. Compliance with the existing regulatory framework would ensure the proper storage of potential pollutants and therefore is not at risk of release if a seiche event were to occur on the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

Would the Project 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?

Basis for Conclusion: Implementation of the Project would result in the development of a warehouse on currently vacant land and provide additional employment opportunities which would support the City and regional economies and thereby equitable communities. The Project would not exceed SCAQMD's local significance thresholds, violate air quality standards, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in criteria pollutant health impacts. Therefore, the Project is consistent with applicable goals of the 2024-2050 RTP/SCS. These goals involve reducing GHG emissions, improving air quality, and supporting healthy and equitable. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with applicable goals and policies in the South El Monte General Plan. Further, the Project would comply with the development standards for the Manufacturing (M) Zone as outlined in Municipal Code Section 17.09.050, Property Development Standards. Following approval of the requested zone change, the Project would not conflict with Municipal Code Title 17. The proposed Project is consistent with pertinent land use planning and policy documents, including Connect SoCal, the South El Monte General Plan, and the Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on a plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

4.1 Noise

Would the Project generate 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?

Basis for Conclusion:

Off-Site Construction Noise

The Project would generate mobile-source noise from delivery/haul trucks and construction workers traveling to and from the project site during the Project's construction. Haul trucks would travel to and from the project site using Lexington-Gallatin Road and Santa Anita Avenue. Conservatively assuming the worst-case scenario that all 59 haul trucks would pass through the same roadway segment along Lexington-Gallatin Road and Santa Anita Avenue within a 15-minute period, the estimated noise level from the grading phase haul truck trips would be 66.3 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the roadway centerline. This worst-case noise level would not exceed the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Noise and Vibration Thresholds significance criterion of 80 dBA L_{eq} for residential uses and the County's construction noise threshold of 85 dBA L_{eq} for commercial receptors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Operations – Mechanical Equipment Noise

With respect to the warehouse use, potential stationary noise sources related to long-term operations would include mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC equipment) located on the rooftop. Mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC equipment) typically generates noise levels of approximately 52 dBA at 50 feet. The nearest receptors to equipment on the warehouse roof are the commercial/office receptors approximately 70 feet to the west, future City park (Sensitive Receptor [SR]-2) approximately 80 feet to the west of the warehouse building, Whittier Narrows Recreation area (SR-1) approximately 216 feet to the southeast, and residential receptors (SR-3) approximately 370 feet to the southeast. Noise levels from mechanical equipment would not exceed the City or County noise standards at any receptor. The proposed City park is not anticipated to use mechanical equipment that would generate significant noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Operations – Truck and Loading Dock Noise

During loading and unloading activities associated with the warehouse, noise would be generated by the trucks' diesel engines, exhaust systems, and brakes during low gear shifting and braking activities; backing up toward the docks; dropping down the dock ramps; and maneuvering away from the docks. Loading or unloading activities would occur along the southeastern side of the project site. It is also noted that cargo forklifts could be used at the warehouse outdoor loading dock area during daytime and nighttime hours for truck loading/unloading activities. Cargo forklifts generate noise levels of approximately 85 dBA at 3 feet. Medium- and heavy-duty trucks reversing into loading docks would produce noise from back-up alarms (also known as back-up beepers). Back-up beepers produce a typical volume of 97 dBA at one meter (3.28 feet) from the source. The noise levels from loading and unloading trucks, operating cargo forklifts, or truck back-up alarms would not exceed City or County noise standards at any receptors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Recreational Activities and Special Events

Potential noise sources related to the long-term operations of the recreational athletic fields conservatively assumed for the future City park would include sports games and practices, which typically generate noise levels of approximately 74 dBA at 20 feet from the center of the athletic field. Compliant with City and County standards, field lighting would be turned off by 10:00 PM, and noise levels from

sports games and practices would not exceed the City or County noise standards at any receptors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Parking Noise

Parking for the warehouse would be provided along the western and eastern boundary of the warehouse site. The warehouse component is expected to have 155 peak hour trips. Using the FTA's reference noise level of 92 dBA SEL at 50 feet from the noise source, the Project's highest peak hour vehicle trips would generate noise levels of approximately 48.3 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the warehouse parking lot. Parking for the future City park is conceptually proposed to be located on the eastern boundary adjacent to the warehouse. The future City park is forecasted to have 75 peak hour trips. Using the FTA's reference noise level of 92 dBA SEL at 50 feet from the noise source, the Project's highest peak hour vehicle trips would generate noise levels of approximately 48.3 dBA Leq at 50 feet from the parking lot. The noise level from cars in the parking lots would not exceed the City or County's noise standards at any receptors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Composite Operational Noise

Based on the worst-case scenario, the warehouse is assumed to operate 7 days a week, 24 hours per day and based on the conservatively assumed recreational activity at the future City park, the potential maximum Project-related noise level increase at the nearest receptors was conservatively quantified by combining the daytime and nighttime noise levels from the warehouse and City park's various operational noise sources (i.e., composite noise level). The daytime and nighttime composite ambient plus project noise levels would not exceed both the substantial increase threshold (5 dBA) and the noise standard at any of the receptors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

Traffic-generated noise levels on study area roadways would range between 52.3 dBA CNEL and 65.0 dBA CNEL at 100 feet from the roadway centerline. The Project would result in a maximum increase of 3.4 dBA CNEL along Lexington-Gallatin Road (east of Santa Anita Avenue), which would not exceed the substantial increase threshold (5 dBA). Additionally, Plus Project traffic noise levels, as detailed in the EIR, would remain within the County and City's "Clearly Compatible" noise standard. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the project expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Basis for Conclusion: Vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operations that would be used during Project construction range from 0.004 to 0.293 in/sec PPV at 20 feet from the source of activity. Ground-borne vibration generated from construction activities would not exceed the City and County structural damage criterion of 0.30 in/sec PPV. Although the existing commercial/office building is located approximately 20 feet to the west of the project site boundary, the office area of the commercial/office building would be the closest area of human occupation and is approximately 105 feet to the west of the project site boundary. At this distance, ground-borne vibration generated from construction activities could reach a maximum of 75 VdB. Therefore, ground-borne vibration generated from construction activities would not exceed the human annoyance criteria of 80 VdB. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Off-site project construction involves trenches and tractors on Santa Anita Avenue and Lexington-Gallatin Road. The FTA does not have a vibratory reference level for trenchers or tractors. However, it is conservatively assumed that the vibration from trenchers/tractors would be that of a small bulldozer, which creates a vibration level of 0.001 in/sec PPV at 80 feet or 79 VdB at 80 feet. Therefore, ground-

borne vibration generated from off-site construction would not exceed the structural damage criterion (0.3 in/sec PPV) or human annoyance criteria (80 VdB). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Though construction will include truck travel along nearby roadways, the FTA notes that a truck rarely creates vibration levels that exceed 70 VDB when on a roadway. As such, multiple trucks traveling along the roadway would increase the frequency of vibration events but would not affect the vibration velocity experienced by receptors. Impacts would be less than significant. During Project operation, employee use of personal automobiles would not contribute to vibration that would cause damage to buildings in the vicinity. Truck movements at the warehouse would generally be low-speed (i.e., less than 15 miles per hour) and would occur over new, smooth surfaces. Truck movements associated with the Project would be at low speed (not at freeway speeds) and would be over smooth surfaces (not under poor roadway conditions), project-related vibration associated with truck activity would not result in excessive ground borne vibrations; no vehicle-generated vibration impacts would occur. In addition, there are no sources of substantial ground borne vibration associated with the Project, such as rail or subways. The Project would not create or cause any vibration impacts due to operations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

Would the Project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Basis for Conclusion: Based on an employment generation factor of one employee per 749 sf of warehouse use, the warehouse component of the Project could employ approximately 297 employees. Based on an employment generation factor of 5.71 employees per acre of local parks/recreational areas, the City park component of the Project could employ 61 employees. The 358 employees resulting from the Project would increase the City's existing employment by approximately 4.2 percent over the City's existing employment of 8,500 jobs. Given the Project's scale and nature, it is reasonable to assume that employment associated with the proposed uses would not induce substantial direct population growth, in part because it is reasonable to assume that many if not all of the new jobs would be filled by local residents who already reside in the City. Further, it was determined the population growth associated with the employees generated by the Project (358 employees) would not be unplanned as it is less than what can be assumed for the existing commercial uses based on the General Plan land use designation. The increase in new jobs would not induce substantial population growth. Project construction would temporarily increase construction employment, however this would not require a substantial number of workers to relocate from outside the region and as such would not contribute to substantial unplanned population growth. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services

"Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project would incrementally increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services to the project site. The Project would include three public fire hydrants located on the warehouse building frontage on Lexington-Gallatin Road. The fire hydrants would connect to the proposed water line extension in Lexington-Gallatin Road. All driveways have been designed to accommodate the required turning radius for fire engines and would not impair emergency fire service

access. The Project would not require permanent road closures but would result in temporary partial lane closures during specific construction phases such as the connection and/or extension of utilities in Santa Anita Avenue and Lexington-Gallatin Road. Through compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 15.14, temporary partial lane closure during construction would not result in a substantial impact to response times or other performance objectives. Because the project site is currently served by fire protection services and is located in an urban setting where fire protection services and equipment/infrastructure are already in place, the Project does not propose and would not require new or physically altered fire protection facilities to maintain service objectives. Implementation of all applicable California Fire Code requirements would further reduce potential impacts concerning fire protection services. Therefore, compliance with LACFD and the California Fire Code would ensure that the Project would result in less than significant impact with respect to performance objectives for fire protection services. As explained above, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth in the City. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?

Basis for Conclusion: Because the project site is located in an urban setting where services and equipment/infrastructure are already in place, the Project does not propose and would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities to maintain service objectives. The Project would not substantially induce population growth such that a substantial increase in demand for law enforcement would occur. The Project would incrementally require operational police services such as routine police patrols, vandalism, break-ins, and other service calls typically associated with nonresidential buildings and public parks. Security measures, as detailed in the EIR, would discourage criminal activity at the project site. Compliance with these measures would reduce demands on law enforcement services. The Project would be required to comply with applicable City, County, and State code requirements for law enforcement protection and be pay applicable fees. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Recreation

Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project includes a City park site. The City park area would be excavated and graded by the Project Applicant and the land would be dedicated to the City for future development of a City park facility. The EIR evaluated the park as a part of the Project based on a conceptual park design, which assumes two athletic fields, open lawn areas, restroom facilities, and parking for approximately 154 passenger vehicles. Lighting for the future City park area would include safety and security lighting for the parking lots, and has been conservatively assumed to include stadium lighting for the proposed athletic fields. It has been assumed that access to the future City park would be provided via one new driveway with a double swing entry gate off Santa Anita Avenue.

Although the City park improvements may be constructed subsequent to the warehouse, the City park would occur in an area that would be physically disturbed as part of construction of the warehouse to

maintain and improve flood storage capacity. Therefore, there would be no impacts to the environment specifically related to the future City park that have not already been addressed throughout the EIR. Future construction and operation of the City park would be reviewed during the City's development review process and would comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations.

Based on the City's current parkland standard of 2 acres per 1,000 residents, the City would need approximately 39 acres of parkland to serve the City population. Dedication of 10.7 acres to the City for future public park use would provide the community with an additional park and recreational facility to serve the City's population and therefore would not result in accelerated deterioration of recreational facilities. Rather, the Project would improve the City's recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation

Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Basis for Conclusion: Because the Project was accounted for in the City's growth forecast, the Project would be consistent with the applicable goal and policies of the 2024 Connect SoCal and the General Plan. The Project's circulation plan would be consistent with the General Plan pertaining to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. There is currently no vehicular access directly into the project site. Vehicular access to the proposed warehouse would be provided via two 40-foot-wide driveways on Lexington-Gallatin Road for both truck loading/unloading and vehicle parking. It is assumed that access to the future City park component would be provided via one 26-foot-wide driveway off Santa Anita Avenue. Vehicular circulation between the two Project components would not be provided. No changes to the existing roadway network would occur. All driveway improvements would be constructed pursuant to City requirements. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy concerning roadway facilities. Neither the warehouse nor the future City park would impact surrounding roadways and thus would not impact transit facilities through roadway closures or impede public transit mobility. While the Project may incrementally increase the use of transit in the area, it would not result in the need to change existing bus routes or the transit network. Therefore, no transit-related deficiencies are anticipated due to the Project. There are no existing bicycle facilities located on or identified in the General Plan for Santa Anita Avenue or Lexington-Gallatin Road near the project site. The warehouse component would provide on-site bike racks to be located near the ancillary office locations and an outdoor employee break area near the northeast corner of the warehouse site. The future City park component is also anticipated to provide on-site bike racks. There are existing sidewalks on the south side of Lexington-Gallatin Road. The Project is proposing to construct sidewalks on the north side of Lexington-Gallatin Road along the project site frontage.

The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Basis for Conclusion: The Project would result in a net reduction of total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the County under both the existing and cumulative conditions. Because the Project's Existing (2024) and Future Year (2040) are below the 15 percent increase and result in a net reduction of Countywide VMT, the Project would result in a less than significant impact concerning project-generated VMT. The boundary VMT per service population (15.27) remains the same for the with and without Project conditions for the 2040 cumulative year. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact concerning the

Project's effect on VMT. Because Project implementation would not significantly increase VMT, a less than significant impact would occur, and the Project would not conflict with or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Basis for Conclusion: The warehouse component of the Project would be designed to allow for truck turning movements and all drive aisles would accommodate standard fire lane turning radiuses and hammerhead turnaround maneuvers to allow access for emergency vehicles. Warehouse circulation would allow inbound trucks to be able to back into the loading docks without encroaching into the parking spaces or curbs. When exiting the driveway, trucks would cross over the center line, as permitted, and into the eastbound lane for a short segment. Lexington-Gallatin Road to the east has few eastbound trips because it only provides access to the small residential neighborhood and leads to a cul-de-sac in that neighborhood. Therefore, trucks crossing over the center line when exiting the project site would not be a significant hazardous geometric design feature. Overall, site access and circulation would not require sharp curves or dangerous conditions such that Project implementation would result in increased hazards. The Project would be designed to ensure the proposed location of the driveways would provide sufficient sight distance for vehicles traveling along Lexington-Gallatin Road to see vehicles exiting the driveway and that vehicles exiting the project driveways would have adequate sight distance to see any conflicting traffic along Lexington-Gallatin Road. The Project would be constructed in compliance with all applicable State building codes and would meet City standards for design, including sight distance at intersections. The Project does not include the use of incompatible vehicles on the project site. Project traffic would not result in delays or congestion that would affect the circulation of emergency vehicles in the study area in compliance with LA County Fire Code and 2022 California Fire Code under Municipal Code Chapter 15.14. Construction would not result in the closure of any roadways that would impact the mobility of first responders or increase traffic. Construction activities are expected to be primarily contained within the project site boundaries and would not require the complete closure of any public or private streets or roadways during construction. The Project would be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety requirements as set forth by the City during construction and operation. Therefore, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access to the City. As such, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses or result in inadequate emergency access. Compliance with applicable regulations and roadway design standards would not introduce design features incompatible with current circulation patterns. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Utilities

Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Basis for Conclusion*:* Project implementation would require a 16-inch main line extension from Durfee Avenue where it intersects with Santa Anita Avenue, in Santa Anita Avenue to Lexington-Gallatin Road to provide potable water service and fire flow water to the project site. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department has approved the access plan and fire flow/fire hydrant locations for the warehouse. The proposed water system improvements would be designed and constructed in accordance with City and San Gabriel Valley Water Company (SGVWC) requirements and final design would require City and SGVWC approval. Water service to the future City park component of the Project would be provided via by either

connecting to an approximately 550-foot main line extension in Santa Anita Avenue north of the intersection with Lexington-Gallatin Road or running an approximately 2-inch domestic water line through the warehouse component of the Project through an easement. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Basis for Conclusion*:* The Project's total estimated water demand would be approximately 77,087 gallons per day (gpd) or 86.35 acre-feet per year (AFY). The Project would comply with Title 24 water saving features as Chapter 8.46 and Section 17.11.160 of the Municipal Code. There would be sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years as forecasted by the General Plan and the UWMP. Further, all cumulative projects would be required to assess whether adequate water infrastructure and supply exist to serve their demand, and whether additional or expanded water infrastructure would be required. The Project combined with other cumulative development would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts concerning water supply or infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Basis for Conclusion*:* The proposed wastewater system improvements would be designed and constructed in accordance with City and Los Angeles County Public Works Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District requirements. Wastewater collection from the future City park component of the Project would be provided from a domestic sewer line through the warehouse component of the Project pursuant to a public easement on private property. The Project would increase wastewater generation on the project site. As detailed in the EIR, sufficient capacity exists at the existing Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant and the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant to serve the Project's wastewater treatment demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The Project would be subject to compliance with all pertinent local, regional, and State-level regulations concerning new connections, laterals, or trenching. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Basis for Conclusion*:* As detailed in the EIR, sufficient capacity exists at the treatment plants and no expansion or modifications would be required to accommodate the Project in terms of wastewater demand. Therefore, existing wastewater treatment facilities would accommodate the project-generated wastewater and continue to maintain a substantial amount of remaining capacity for future wastewater treatment. Regarding potential cumulative impacts, given the existing available capacity at the Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant and Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant, the wastewater treatment needs of the Project, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the service area for the Los Angeles County Sanitation District, would not result in the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts or exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment facilities. All projects within the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts wastewater service area would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations that would minimize environmental impact and prevent a cumulatively considerable significant impact from occurring. Based on the foregoing, no significant cumulative impact is anticipated

with respect to wastewater capacity, and the Project's contribution would not cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Basis for Conclusion*:* The Project would connect to existing overhead SCE lines along Lexington-Gallatin Road which would enable services to the project site. Although some new utility infrastructure may be required on the project site, extension of services is not anticipated to require the construct of any new off-site electric power facilities to serve the Project. Further, the environmental effects associated with the extension of infrastructure from the street to serve the Project are evaluated as part of the overall environmental analyses. The construction of substantial new telecommunication infrastructures would not be required as the Project would rely on existing telecommunication lines. All projects within the vicinity of the Project would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations that would minimize environmental impacts and prevent a cumulatively considerable significant impact from occurring. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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.

Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Basis for Conclusion*:* The Project would generate approximately 3.1 tons of solid waste per day, which accounts for less than one percent of the maximum daily capacity of the Barstow Landfill, Lander Landfill, Mid-Valley Landfill, San Timoteo Landfill, and the Victorville Landfill, respectively. As detailed in the EIR, the existing landfills would have sufficient capacity to serve the Project and solid waste generated during construction and operations would represent a nominal increase compared to the daily permitted tonnage at the landfills. Compliance with all applicable regulations and laws regarding solid waste would further reduce impacts. Cumulatively, potential future projects in Los Angeles County would increase solid waste generation and decrease available capacity at the Barstow Landfill, Lander Landfill, Mid-Valley Landfill, San Timoteo Landfill, and the Victorville Landfill. However, as with the Project, these projects would be required to comply with federal, State and local regulations to minimize solid waste impacts. Further, the Project would comply, and it is expected that other developments would comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statues and regulations related to solid waste. Based on the foregoing, no significant cumulative impact is anticipated with respect to solid waste and the Project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Section 5.0: Environmental Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) state that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been completed, which identifies one or more significant effects unless the public agency finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

The following potentially significant environmental impacts were analyzed in the EIR, and the effects of the Project were considered in the EIR. Where as a result of the environmental analysis of the Project and compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and the identification of feasible mitigation measures, the following potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) (1) that "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment," which is referred to herein as "Finding 1." Where the City has determined pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2) that "Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency," the City's findings is referred to as "Finding 2," which is not applicable to this Project. These measures are included as Conditions of Approval and set forth in the MMRP adopted by the City Council. Specific findings for each category of such impacts are set forth in detail below.

Aesthetics

Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?"

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM AES-1 and MM AES-2 are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the aesthetic light or glare impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant light or glare impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: The City is largely built out and characterized by existing sources of nighttime lighting, including streetlights, vehicle headlights, and lighting from nearby commercial and residential uses. The Project would introduce new lighting associated with warehouse operations, parking areas, signage, a future City park with potential stadium lighting, and a freeway-adjacent digital billboard.

All proposed lighting would comply with applicable City regulations (Municipal Code Section 17.09.100), California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 energy and glare standards, and federal and State requirements governing outdoor advertising. The 12 assumed stadium lights, ranging from 60 to 80 feet in height, would be directed and shielded to minimize light spill and would only operate until 10:00 PM in accordance with City code. Additionally, the stadium lighting would be required to comply with best practices outlined in MM AES-1, which include orientation, full cutoff fixtures, shielding, light intensity, dimming, etc. Compliance with such measures would help to avoid light pollution and ensure the Project would not result in an adverse light or glare impact. As detailed in the EIR, the Lighting Study prepared for the Project demonstrates that the proposed stadium lighting for the future City park area would not result in light spill at the property line greater than 0.3 footcandles (fc) and therefore would not create a substantial new light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The proposed freeway-adjacent digital billboard would comply with MM AES-2 to ensure display brightness, light levels, display control system, and image appearance and motion do not create hazardous glare or driver distraction. The billboard would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations including, but not limited to, Caltrans requirements under the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (23 U.S.C. 131), the California Outdoor Advertising Act, and the California Vehicle Code. Compliance with MM AES-2 and consistent with the area's existing visual conditions, the billboard would not result in a new substantial source of light or glare.

The Project's warehouse structures would use non-reflective building materials consistent with CCR Title 24 to minimize daytime glare and designed in accordance with Municipal Code Section 17.09.100 , which requires all exterior lighting to be arranged in a manner that will not provide a direct glare or create hazardous interference with highways and neighboring properties. During construction, limited early nighttime lighting, up to 10:00 PM, may be used for safety purposes; however, such use would be temporary and short in duration.

The Project would introduce additional nighttime lighting on the site; however, this would be generally consistent with the existing sources of nighttime lighting in the area. Additionally, potential impacts would be avoided with MM AES-1, MM AES-2, and compliance with the City's established regulatory framework (i.e., the City's Municipal Code and CCR Title 24), which would be verified through the City's plan review process. These measures would ensure the Project does not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measures

MM AES-1: Stadium lights at the future City park athletic fields shall comply with the following requirements:

a. Orientation. Fixtures shall be oriented in such a way that they direct light downward and toward the field, ensuring that no direct light is emitted towards adjacent lands.

b. Full Cutoff Fixtures. Fixtures shall be "full cutoff" type to direct light exclusively onto the playing surface and avoid light spill and glare beyond the field boundaries.

c. Shielding. Shielding or deflectors shall be installed to reduce light spill.

d. Lighting Intensity. The lighting intensity shall not exceed necessary levels for safety and visibility.

e. Dimming Capabilities. Lights shall be dimmable to adjust levels based on the activity or time of day.

f. Scheduling Controls. The lighting system shall have an automatic timer to turn off all lights promptly after events and practices, and to limit unnecessary lighting during non-use periods (e.g., after 10:00 PM).

g. Maintenance and Adjustments. The lighting system shall be subject to annual inspection and adjustments to ensure ongoing compliance with the requirements outlined above. In the event that the above requirements are no longer being met, corrective measures, including re-aiming lights, upgrading fixtures, or adjusting light levels, shall be implemented immediately.

MM AES-2: **Digital Billboard**. The billboard shall comply with the following requirements:

- The display brightness shall be controlled by a photocell or light sensor that adjusts the brightness to the required level based on ambient light conditions without the need for human input. Use of other brightness adjustment methods, such as timer- or calendar-based systems, shall only be used as a backup system.
- The billboard shall comply with outdoor advertising requirements under the Caltrans Federal Highway Beautification Act and the California Outdoor Advertising Act.
- The display shall be factory-certified as capable of complying with the City's illumination requirements.
- The sign shall be equipped with a control system that, in the event of a display or control malfunction, "freezes" the display on either a single, unchanging message, or a blank screen.
- Any sign area not comprising the digital display panel is prohibited. This area includes, but is not limited to, static sign area, appendages, cutout letters, and figures.
- Where screen transitions are used, the transitions shall not give the appearance of moving text or images. The sign copy shall not use flashing, intermittent, or moving lights or produce the optical illusion of movement.
- Each sign copy shall be displayed for a minimum of four seconds. The still images shall not move or present the appearance of motion and shall not use flashing, scintillating, blinking, or traveling lights or any other means not providing constant illumination. Transition or blank screen time between one still image and the next shall not exceed one second.
- The digital billboard shall comply with all applicable laws and regulations concerning brightness, including, without limitation, California Vehicle Code Section 21466.5, as amended.

Biological Resources

Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-6 and MM AES-1 are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the special status species impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant biological resource impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: The Project would involve ground disturbance, including grubbing, clearing, grading, and construction of a warehouse, public park, access roadways, and related infrastructure. These activities have the potential to result in direct impacts (e.g., destruction of habitat or mortality of species) and indirect impacts (e.g., disturbance from noise, vibration, dust, nighttime lighting, or increased human activity) on special-status species.

Special-Status Plant Species

Southern tarplant (Centromadia parryi ssp. australis) was identified as having moderate potential to occur on-site based on nearby populations and habitat conditions. Southern tarplant was not detected during the general biological survey or focused rare plant survey, and no other federally or state-listed or special-status plants are present within the project site or off-site improvement areas. As such, the Project would not result in impacts to special-status plant species.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

The project site provides moderate or low to moderate potential to support American Peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii), Ferruginous hawk (Buteo regalis), Merlin (Falco columbarius), Northern harrier (Circus hudsonius*), Vermilion flycatcher (*Pyrocephalus rubinus*), Yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*), Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), and Yellow breasted chat (*Icteria virens*). Additionally, Lawrence's goldfinch (*Spinus lawrencei*), and Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) were observed on the project site during specific surveys and have the potential to occur on the site.

Western Burrowing Owl. The western burrowing owl, a CESA candidate species, has moderate potential to occur on-site due to the presence of California ground squirrels and associated burrows, despite no burrowing owls being observed during general or focused surveys. Project construction could result in potentially significant impacts to burrowing owls, including death, injury, or harassment. Temporary disturbances from noise, vibration, and dust during construction would be limited in duration and are not anticipated to substantially affect burrowing owl behavior. Stadium lighting from the future City park could also potentially impact burrowing owl hunting success and make burrowing owls easier targets for predators. MM BIO-1 (pre-construction clearance surveys, avoidance buffers, and CDFW consultation), MM BIO-2 (CESA ITP compliance if avoidance is not feasible), MM BIO-3 (construction BMPs, including vehicle speed limits and covering of structures), and MM AES-1 (light and glare management) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Special-Status Bird Species. Two non-listed special-status wildlife species Lawrence's goldfinch and loggerhead shrike were observed on site, and several other special-status birds have moderate potential to occur due to the presence of ornamental trees and non-native grasslands suitable for nesting and foraging. Potential impacts from habitat removal would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of MM BIO-3 (construction BMPs and monitoring), MM BIO-4 (purchase of 10.8 acres of off-site mitigation grassland), and MM BIO-5 (nesting bird surveys and avoidance measures in compliance with CFGC Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513).

Special-Status Mammal Species. The pallid bat, a CDFW Species of Special Concern, may roost in ornamental trees and forage over non-native grasslands. Impacts from habitat removal or construction could result in injury or mortality if bats are present during demolition or tree removal. MM BIO-3 (construction BMPs), MM BIO-4 (off-site grassland mitigation), and MM BIO-6 (pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures for pallid bat) would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

As detailed in the EIR, no additional federally or state-listed wildlife species were observed, and none have moderate to high potential to occur due to lack of suitable habitat. With implementation of MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-6 and MM AES-1, the Project would not result in substantial adverse effects on special-status species through habitat modifications, direct impacts, or indirect disturbances. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measures

MM AES-1 and the following measures are applicable.

MM BIO-1: Regardless of the results of focused burrowing owl surveys, a qualified biologist shall conduct a take avoidance preconstruction survey no less than 14 days prior to the onset of construction activities within the construction limits of the project site and a 500-foot buffer. A second survey shall be conducted within 24 hours prior to the onset of construction activities. Surveys shall be conducted at least seven days apart. The surveys shall assess the presence of burrowing owls and occupied nest burrows and be conducted in accordance with the most current California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) survey methods. If burrowing owls are not observed during the preconstruction survey, no additional conditions may be required to avoid impacts to burrowing owl. A preconstruction survey shall be repeated if Project activities are suspended or delayed more than 14 days from the second survey.

If burrowing owl is documented on site, occupied burrowing owl burrows shall not be disturbed without CDFW authorization. Disturbance avoidance buffers shall be determined and set up by a qualified biologist in accordance with the recommendations included in the BUOW Guidelines (CDFW 2012). A biologist shall be contracted to perform monitoring during all construction activities approximately every other day. The definitive frequency and duration of monitoring shall be dependent on whether it is the breeding versus non-breeding season and the efficacy of the exclusion buffers, as determined by a qualified biologist and in coordination with CDFW.

The project applicant shall submit at least one burrowing owl preconstruction survey report to the satisfaction of the City of South El Monte and CDFW to document compliance with this avoidance and minimization measure. For the purposes of this avoidance and minimization measure, "qualified biologist" is a biologist who meets the requirements set forth in the BUOW Guidelines (CDFW 2012).

MM BIO-2: If take avoidance pre-construction burrowing owl surveys are positive and avoidance is not possible, either directly or indirectly, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be consulted and, if necessary, a California Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Permit (CESA ITP) shall be obtained authorizing take of burrowing owl incidental to approved project activities. All Conditions of Approval outlined in the CESA ITP shall be fully implemented and strictly followed. Conditions of Approval may include, but are not limited to, worker education program, construction/compliance monitoring, best management practices, CDFW notifications, compliance reporting, final mitigation reporting, take minimization measures, burrowing owl mortality reduction plan, burrow replacement plan, pre-construction surveys, burrow avoidance measures, burrow blockage requirements, burrow excavation requirements, operations and maintenance take avoidance measures, habitat management land acquisition, and endowment fund. If the burrowing owl is no longer a candidate or listed species under CESA at the time of Project construction, an ITP would not be required.

MM BIO-3: To avoid impacts to special-status resources and inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of the Project activities, the following monitoring requirements and Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented:

a. To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of work, the construction limits shall be clearly demarcated (e.g., installation of flagging or

temporary visibility construction fence) prior to ground-disturbance activities, and all construction activities, including equipment staging and maintenance, shall be conducted within the marked disturbance limits. The work limit delineation shall be maintained throughout project construction. The use of whiskers with stakes or marking paint is recommended to maintain integrity of work limits.

b. With the exception of any burrowing owls, the qualified biologist shall flush any special-status wildlife species (i.e., avian or other mobile species) from suitable habitat areas within the project development footprint to the maximum extent practicable immediately (e.g., within 24 hours) prior to initial vegetation removal activities. The biologist shall flush wildlife by walking through habitat to be imminently removed.

c. Construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads adjacent to the project site or the right-of-way accessing the site.

d. Construction activities shall occur during daytime hours except where required. Permissible nighttime activities could include pouring of concrete for the warehouse foundation during early and/or nighttime hours.

e. If trash and debris need to be stored overnight during maintenance activities, fully covered trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weather-proof shall be used by the maintenance contractor to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Alternatively, standard trash receptacles may be used during the day, but must be removed each night.

f. The operator shall not permit pets on or adjacent to construction sites.

g. At the end of each workday during construction and in the morning prior to the start of each workday during construction, the applicant or its contractors, shall cover all excavated, steep-sided holes or trenches more than eight inches deep and that have sidewalls steeper than 1:1 (45 degree) slope with plywood or similar materials, or provide a minimum of one escape ramp per 100 feet of trenching (with slopes no greater than 3:1) constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. The project biologist shall thoroughly inspect holes and trenches for trapped animals during biological monitoring.

h. The applicant, or its contractors, shall screen, cover, or elevate at least one foot above ground, all construction pipe, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of three inches or greater that are stored on site overnight. These pipes, culverts, and similar structures shall be inspected by the project biologist for wildlife before such material is moved, buried, or capped.

i. The applicant, or its contractors, shall avoid the use of invasive plant species in the landscaping associated with the development. Invasive species with Moderate or High on the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) list (https://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory) are prohibited from use and shall be removed if found on site. The applicant or contractor shall refer to state resources for lists of appropriate native plant replacements (e.g., Calscape [https://www.calscape.org] and CNPS [https://www.cnps.org/gardening]).

MM BIO-4: Project impacts on non-native grassland (21.6 acres) shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio through the purchase of 10.8 acre of grassland habitat at an approved mitigation bank,

such as the Petersen Ranch Mitigation Bank. Confirmation of the purchase of grassland habitat at an approved mitigation bank shall be provided to the City of South El Monte Community Development Department prior to the issuance of the first action or permit for site disturbance.

MM BIO-5: To ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 and to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds, vegetation clearing, and ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted outside of the bird nesting season (generally January 15 to August 31 for raptors and February 15 to August 31 for other bird species). If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within seven days prior to any disturbance of the site, including but not limited to vegetation clearing, disking, demolition activities, and grading. If the qualified biologist determines that no active bird or raptor nests occur, the activities shall be allowed to proceed without any further requirements.

If active nests of any species protected by the MBTA or CFGC are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable disturbance limit buffers around the nests marked using flagging or staking. The disturbance limit buffer size shall depend on the site conditions, level of activity within the buffer, and species observed. The disturbance limit buffer zones shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied. Any active nests shall be monitored by a qualified biologist during active construction, at a frequency determined using their best professional judgment, but not less than twice per week. If potential affects to nesting birds are observed, avoidance and minimization measures may be adjusted, and construction activities stopped or redirected by the qualified biologist using their best professional judgement to avoid take of nesting birds. Once a nest is no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nest, the project can proceed without further regard to the nest site.

MM BIO-6: To avoid impacts on the pallid bat, any on-site abandoned structures and all trees with suitable roosting cavities shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist prior to demolition or removal. Pre-construction surveys shall take place no more than 14 days prior to the start of demolition activities. If active roosts are identified, a biological monitor shall be employed to direct avoidance measures.

If bats are detected during pre-construction surveys, biological monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that project activities do not result in direct take. The biologist shall be present for all demolition or tree removal activities in areas known or suspected to support roosting bats as determined by the qualified biologist. The biological monitor shall perform clearance surveys at the start of each workday in areas scheduled for immediate demolition. The monitor shall direct project activities away from special-status bat species, should they be found on site, to ensure that impacts on these species are avoided to the fullest extent possible. If present, bats are expected to flush from the project site at the onset of demolition activities. However, if they persist on site through demolition of non-roost site areas, consultation with the CDFW may be required.

Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM BIO-3 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the native vegetation community impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant biological resource impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: Southern north slope chaparral, which is a native vegetation community but is not considered sensitive under CEQA, occurs to the south of the project site. This vegetation community does not occur on-site and would not be directly impacted by Project construction or operation. There would be no direct impacts anticipated from the proposed water main line extension in Santa Anita Avenue as the improvements would occur within the roadway and County right-of-way, therefore avoiding the southern north slope chaparral native vegetation community. Potential indirect impacts would be mitigated through compliance with MM BIO-3, which would require implementation of construction BMPs and monitoring requirements, including the demarcation of construction limits. The Project would not have a substantially adverse impact to southern north slope chaparral. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measure

MM BIO-3 is applicable (see above).

Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM BIO-5 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the migratory bird species impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant biological resource impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: The Project has the potential to impact nesting migratory birds which have acclimated to urban life and nest and forage in the local trees and shrubs. The project site contains vegetation with potential to support nesting birds, migratory birds, and foraging raptors. The direct injury or death of a migratory bird due to construction or other disturbance that causes nest abandonment, nestling abandonment, or forced fledging would be considered a significant impact. The Project would implement MM BIO-5 which would require compliance with CFGC Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513, avoidance of nesting season, nesting bird surveys, and active nest buffers, if applicable. Following compliance with the established regulatory framework and implementation of MM BIO-5, development impacts concerning interference 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 would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measure

MM BIO-5 is applicable (see above).

Cultural Resources

Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM CUL-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the cultural resource impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant cultural resource impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: No known historical or prehistoric archaeological resources are present on the project site. As detailed in the EIR, a records search and site survey confirmed that previously recorded resources in the vicinity are not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and therefore are not considered historical resources under CEQA. The project site has been previously disturbed by grading and development activities, resulting in a low potential for intact buried cultural materials. Although no impacts are anticipated to known historical or archaeological resources, there remains a low potential for inadvertent discovery of unknown subsurface resources during ground-disturbing activities. MM CUL-1 requires archaeological monitoring during grading and excavation. The qualified archaeologist would have authority to temporarily halt or redirect work to allow for sampling, identification, and evaluation of any inadvertently discovered resources. If a resource is determined to be potentially significant, appropriate treatment measures—preferably preservation in place—would be implemented in coordination with the City and, as applicable, Native American tribal representatives regarding any potential Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR). With implementation of MM CUL-1, the Project would avoid or appropriately treat any unknown historical or archaeological resources encountered during construction. The Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measure

MM CUL-1: In the event that cultural resources (archaeological or historical) are inadvertently unearthed or encountered during excavation and grading activities, all work within 60 feet of the find shall cease and an archaeologist, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, and any other consulting tribes, shall be contacted. The archaeologist shall meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualifications in archaeology and will record and evaluate the resource for potential significance. The City of South El Monte, as the Lead Agency shall consult with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, and any other consulting tribes regarding the significance of the resource and its potential as a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) under CEQA. In the event of the discovery of a TCR, refer to Mitigation Measure (MM) TCR-2. The archaeologist shall determine if the resource meets the CEQA definition of historical (State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a)) and/or unique archaeological resources (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21083.2(g)). Should the archaeologist have concerns that the find is potentially significant, the

archaeologist shall prepare a mitigation plan for review and approval by the City. If avoidance of the resource(s) is not feasible, salvage operation requirements pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 shall be followed.

Geology and Soils

Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking including liquefaction?

Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM GEO-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the geology and soils impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant geology and soils impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: As detailed in the EIR, the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation determined that while no active or potentially active faults traverse the site and the Project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, the region is susceptible to seismic ground shaking from nearby faults, including the East Montebello, Whittier, and Raymond faults. In accordance with State law, the Project would be required to comply with all seismic design provisions of the California Building Code (CBC) and the California Health and Safety Code. SC GEO-1 requires preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation for City review and approval; MM GEO-1 requires City verification that all construction plans conform to the recommendations of the Geotechnical Report and applicable engineering standards. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that structures are designed and constructed to withstand expected seismic forces, reducing potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

As detailed in the EIR, the project site is located within a State-designated Liquefaction Hazard Zone, and site-specific analyses identified the presence of potentially liquefiable soils capable of limited settlement during a major seismic event. The Geotechnical Report recommends remedial grading and the use of compacted structural fill to increase bearing capacity and reduce liquefaction potential; see MM GEO-1.

As detailed in the EIR, subsurface testing indicated limited potential for minor, localized subsidence (approximately 0.15 feet) due to soil compaction during construction, which would be mitigated through removal of unsuitable soils and remedial grading in accordance with MM GEO-1. Site soils exhibit low collapse potential and low expansion characteristics; therefore, risks associated with soil collapse would be less than significant. Corrosivity testing identified mildly corrosive soils that could affect ferrous metals; however, corrosion protection measures recommended in the Geotechnical Report and required under MM GEO-1 would prevent structural deterioration.

Through implementation of SC GEO-1, MM GEO-1, and compliance with CBC standards and applicable local regulations, the Project would not result in or be subject to substantial adverse effects associated

with seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or other unstable soil conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition and mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Standard Condition

SC GEO-1: The Applicant shall submit to the City of South El Monte Building and Safety Department for review and approval, a site-specific design-level geotechnical investigation prepared for the project site by a registered geotechnical engineer. The investigation shall comply with all applicable State and local code requirements and:

a) Include an analysis of the expected ground motions at the site from known active faults using accepted methodologies;

b) Determine structural design requirements as prescribed by the most current version of the California Building Code, including applicable City amendments, to ensure that structures can withstand ground accelerations expected from known active faults; and

c) Determine the final design parameters for walls, foundations, foundation slabs, utilities, roadways, parking lots, sidewalks, and other surrounding related improvements.

Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigation in the site-specific investigations. The structural engineer shall review the site-specific investigations, provide any additional necessary measures to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all applicable recommendations from the investigation in the structural design plans and shall ensure that all structural plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.

The City's registered geotechnical engineer or third-party registered engineer retained to review the geotechnical reports shall review each site-specific geotechnical investigation, approve the final report, and require compliance with all geotechnical requirements contained in the investigation in the plans submitted for the grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits.

The City shall review all Project plans for grading, foundations, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements.

Mitigation Measure

MM GEO-1: Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the City of South El Monte Building and Safety Department shall review all Project plans for grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure, and all other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation. This shall include recommendations related to the discovery of groundwater, wet soils, or unstable soils during grading, stabilization, dewatering, fill materials, and foundations.

Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM GEO-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the geology and soils impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds

that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant geology and soils impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: As detailed in the EIR, a paleontological records search from the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County did not identify known fossil localities within the project site. Because a portion of the project site has never been developed and similar fossil have been found in the San Gabriel Valley area, there is a possibility that construction activities could reveal unidentified paleontological resources. In the event previously unknown paleontological resources are unearthed during Project construction, significant impacts could occur. MM GEO-2 addresses the actions to be taken should paleontological resources be found. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measure

MM GEO-2: Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit for ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide evidence to the City of South El Monte Building and Safety Department that a qualified paleontologist has been retained. The selection of the qualified paleontologist shall be subject to the acceptance of the City. If paleontological resources are encountered, the contractor shall immediately cease all earth-moving activities within a 100-foot radius of the area of discovery. The qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the finding and determine an appropriate course of action. If avoidance of the resource(s) is not feasible, salvage operation requirements under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 shall be followed. After the find has been appropriately avoided or mitigated, work in the area may resume.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-2 are feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hazards and hazardous materials impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: As detailed in the EIR, the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) determined that although the project site is not considered a source nor is it within a source area for the San Gabriel Valley (Area 1) National Priorities List (NPL), the project site's location within the Whittier Narrows Operable Unit (OU) and confirmed groundwater contamination represents a recognized environmental condition (REC). Because the project site is not a source and is not located in a source area, ongoing remedial actions, identification of responsible parties, and regulatory oversight by the U.S. EPA, no further action related to current and future use of the project site is anticipated.

According to the Phase I ESA, the project site is located in an intermediate zone with a groundwater plume between 150-300 and 450-600 feet below ground surface (bgs) containing a perchloroethylene (PCE) contamination range of 0.5 to 5 µg/L. Construction activities would not reach the PCE contamination range

of 150 to 300 and 450 to 600 feet bgs and would not result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment. Construction excavation could potentially encounter groundwater due to the historic high groundwater levels in the vicinity of the project site, Although Project excavation would not reach either the intermediate or shallow PCE contamination ranges, there is the potential for construction grading and excavation to encounter contaminated groundwater due to historical high groundwater levels and the project site's location within the Whittier Narrows OU and proximity to the South El Monte OU. Project construction would implement MM GEO-1 which requires City Building and Safety Department review of all project construction plans to ensure compliance with various Geotechnical Investigation recommendations related to the discovery of groundwater, wet soils, or unstable soils during grading, stabilization, dewatering, fill materials, and foundations. The Project would also be required to implement MM HYD-1 which requires the Project Applicant to obtain coverage under the Los Angeles RWQCB General NPDES Permits Order No. R4-2023-0429: Groundwater Discharges from Construction and project Dewatering to Surface Waters, which requires sampling, treatment, and disposal of all extracted water if any groundwater is extracted. Through compliance with established regulatory framework and implementation of mitigation measures, project grading and excavation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-1 are applicable (see above).

Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-2 are feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hazards and hazardous materials impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: The nearest existing school, South El Monte High School, is located approximately 0.2 mile southeast of the project site. Project construction activities may involve limited handling of hazardous materials, such as fuels, lubricants, or other standard construction substances; however, such materials would be used in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. In addition to compliance with MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-2, construction personnel would be trained in spill prevention and response pursuant to OSHA requirements, and necessary containment and personal protective equipment would be available on site. Additionally, buildout of the Project would not generate long-term sources of hazardous emissions or odors that could expose students or other sensitive receptors to significant risk. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-1 are applicable (see above).

Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-2 are feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hazards and hazardous materials impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires DTSC to compile a list of hazardous waste facilities that are subject to corrective action. The project site is located within the San Gabriel Valley (Area 1) NPL Whittier Narrows OU and is adjacent to the South El Monte OU. As detailed in the EIR, the Phase I ESA determined that the project site's proximity to confirmed groundwater contamination in the San Gabriel Valley (Area 1) NPL Whittier Narrows OU listing is considered to represent a REC. Because the project site is not a source and is not located in a source area, ongoing remedial actions, identification of responsible parties, and regulatory oversight by the U.S. EPA, no further action related to current and future use of the project site is anticipated. With implementation of MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-1, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-1 and MM HYD-1 are applicable (see above).

Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM HYD-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hydrology and water quality impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: As detailed in the EIR, Project construction-related activities would generate pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality of downstream receiving waters if appropriate and effective stormwater and non-stormwater management measures are not installed and maintained during construction to remove and minimize on-site pollutants from the site. Construction activities would require a Construction General Permit for Stormwater Discharge Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit). The Project would be required to obtain coverage under the NPDES stormwater program. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) consistent with California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES Construction General Permit is required to minimize pollution of downstream stormwater. Compliance with the NPDES, included as Standard Condition (SC) HYD-1, would be verified during the City's construction permitting process to ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant.

Groundwater may be encountered during excavation and grading due to historically high groundwater levels in the area. If dewatering is necessary, the Project would comply with the Los Angeles RWQCB Groundwater Discharge Permit requirements under MM HYD-1, including sampling, treatment, and safe disposal of extracted groundwater.

During Project operations, stormwater and non-stormwater runoff would be managed separately for the warehouse and City park components to the maximum extent practicable. The warehouse would include impervious surfaces; runoff from these areas would be conveyed through a dedicated stormwater collection and treatment system, including WetlandMOD biofiltration units, underground detention tanks, and source-control BMPs. The future City park would remain largely pervious and self-treating. Stormwater from both Project components would ultimately discharge into the existing 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm drain line. Flow controls would ensure that combined discharges do not exceed the allowable capacity of the existing system and that pollutant removal meets the 85th percentile stormwater treatment standard. Compliance with the Los Angeles County NPDES MS4 Permit, the City's SUSMP requirements, and SC HYD-2 would ensure that operational stormwater runoff does not substantially degrade surface water quality, alter drainage patterns in a manner that increases flooding, or exceed stormwater system capacity. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard conditions and mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Standard Conditions

SC HYD-1: Prior to issuance of any grading or demolition permits, the Applicant shall provide the City Building and Safety Division evidence of compliance with the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of one acre or larger. The Project applicant/proponent shall comply by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) and by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

SC HYD-2: Prior to issuance of the first grading permit, the Applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for approval, a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUMP) in compliance with South El Monte Municipal Code Section 8.44.110, specifically identifying Best Management Practices (BMPs) that shall be incorporated into the Project to control storm water and non-storm water pollutants during and after construction. To ensure compliance, a legal and fiduciary enforcement mechanism in the form of a SUMP shall be executed with the City. This agreement shall additionally be recorded in the office of the County Recorder for the County of Los Angeles. It shall specify BMPs specific to the project site, which shall be integrated into the storm water conveyance plan.

Mitigation Measures

MM HYD-1: Groundwater Dewatering Permits. Prior to initiation of excavation activities, the Project Applicant shall obtain coverage under the Los Angeles Regional Water Resource Control Board (RWQCB) Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles And Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2023-0429, NPDES No. CAG994004), or any other subsequent permit for dewatering activities, and provide evidence of coverage to the City of South El Monte Building and Safety Department. This shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the permit to the Los Angeles RWQCB at least 45 days prior to the start of excavation activities and anticipated discharge of

dewatered groundwater to surface waters. Groundwater dewatering activities shall comply with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, treatment (if required), and reporting of dewatering-related discharges. Upon completion of groundwater dewatering activities, a Notice of Termination shall be submitted to the Los Angeles RWQCB.

Would the Project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM HYD-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hydrology and water quality impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: As detailed in the EIR, there is a potential for groundwater to be encountered during construction if excavation and grading would occur when there are historically high ground water levels, as previously documented in the vicinity of the project site. Any groundwater dewatering would be temporary and limited to the excavation area. As detailed in the EIR, due to the size of the project site as compared to the water basin, and the limited scope of excavation anticipated, the volume of groundwater removed, if encountered, would not be substantial and would not decrease groundwater supplies or impede groundwater management. MM HYD-1 would require the proposed Project to comply with the requirements of Groundwater Discharge Permit, including testing and treatment, if necessary, that would be implemented through the RWQCB and the City's development permitting process.

The Project's total estimated water demand would be approximately 77,087 gallons per day (gpd) or 86.35 acre-feet per year (AFY). Water demand for the warehouse component would total approximately 42,174 gpd or 47.24 AFY while the estimated water demand for the City park component would total approximately 34,913 gallons per day or 39.11 AFY. According to the SGVWC 2020 UWMP, the available water supply would meet projected demand during normal, dry, and multiple dry years through 2045. Operation of the Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies.

The Project does not propose the use of wells or other groundwater extraction activities. Although the Project would result in additional impervious surfaces, the majority of the future City park component of the Project would be left pervious and therefore would not result in a substantial change to groundwater recharge in this area. In addition, as described previously the on-site soils have a low infiltration rate due to soil conditions, historically high groundwater level, and presence within a liquefaction zone. Therefore, it can be reasonably assumed significant infiltration of water to the existing groundwater basin is neither currently occurring at a substantial rate nor would it occur as a result of the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly impact local groundwater recharge or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measure

MM HYD-1 is applicable (see above).

Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

ii) increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

iii) 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; or

iv) impede or redirect flood flows.

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM HYD-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hydrology and water quality impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: As detailed in the EIR, construction of the Project would require Storage Basin Improvements, demolition activities related to the remnant foundations, excavation of the future City park area and fill of the warehouse area, and construction of the warehouse and future construction of improvements for a City public park. These activities could temporarily alter the existing drainage pattern of the site and could result in flooding, additional and/or polluted runoff, or impede/redirect flood flows if drainage is not properly controlled. Compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit and Municipal Code requires the preparation of a project-specific SWPPP, included as SC HYD-1. The SWPPP includes regular monitoring and visual inspections during construction activities. Preparation of a SWPPP in compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit, included as SC HYD-1, as verified during the City's construction permitting process, would ensure that Project construction-related impacts related to potential flooding, additional and/or polluted runoff, or impeded/redirected flood flows would not occur.

Additionally, in the event that groundwater or perched groundwater is encountered during construction and groundwater dewatering is necessary, it would be completed in compliance with the Groundwater Discharge Permit, as specified in MM HYD-1. The Groundwater Discharge Permit would prevent substantial additional sources of polluted runoff being discharged to the storm drain system through implementation of construction BMPs that target pollutants of concern in runoff from the project site as well as testing and treatment (if required) of groundwater prior to its discharge to surface waters.

The project site is located within USACE reservoir flowage easement lands associated with the Whittier Narrows Dam. Per USACE requirements, the Project would include Storage Basin Improvements (defined above), including excavation of the future City park area of the site by approximately 10 feet to maintain and improve the existing flood storage capacity of the property. The Project would be designed such that finished grade elevations of the future City park area would have the same or higher water storage capacity as compared to the existing conditions. Therefore, implementation would not impede or redirect flood flows on the project site associated with the USACE flowage easement. Compliance with the USACE Section 408 Permit would ensure the future City park portion of the project site would not impede or redirect flood flows.

The future City park would largely remain as a grassy area that is pervious and self-treating. Similar to existing conditions, drainage of this area would be directed to the existing 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm

drain line, which ultimately discharges into Legg Lakes. The drainage pattern on this portion of the project site would not be altered in a way that would result in substantial flooding or additional and/or polluted runoff.

The warehouse component of the Project would introduce impervious surfaces, which could increase surface runoff on the site compared to existing conditions. These proposed changes may impact infiltration rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of stormwater runoff. Although the drainage pattern changes in the proposed condition, project site flow on the warehouse component of project site ultimately discharges into Legg Lake to the northwest via the existing 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm drain line, as it does under existing conditions.

Stormwater from the warehouse component of the Project would initially enter the drainage system through an inlet/catch basin and would be conveyed to the treatment system via a private storm drain line. The stormwater would be treated via two WetlandMODs before continuing to a 5-foot high by 400 linear foot detention tank designed to mitigate the allowable discharge to the existing 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm drain line in a high event storm. Any runoff greater than the treatment capacity of the WetlandMODs would bypass the structure and continue to the detention tank. From the detention tank, water would be released to flow through a dedicated earthen channel that is isolated from the remaining future City park. Eventually the channel would guide stormwater from the warehouse component of the Project to a concrete headwall that would connect to the existing 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm drain line located along Santa Anita Avenue near the northwest project site boundary. With these improvements, the Project would not substantially alter the site's existing drainage pattern through the addition of impervious surfaces.

The Project would be designed to ensure flows from both components of the Project would not exceed the capacity or allowable discharge into the 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm drain line. As the future City park component of the Project would not be designed to detain flows, the detention tank associated with the warehouse would be designed to release 8.10 cubic feet per second (cfs) to ensure any combined flows remain under the 17.33 cfs allowable discharge for the 90-inch RCP LACFCD storm drain line, based on peak flows for a 50-year storm event. Therefore, the Project would not alter the drainage pattern in such a way that would exceed capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

Further, the proposed Project would be required to comply the Los Angeles County Municipal NPDES Permit (MS4 Permit), for which a Preliminary LID has been prepared to identify BMPs to protect surface water quality. Municipal Code Chapter 8.44.110 specifies that new development subject to the MS4 Permit must comply with post-construction runoff pollution reduction BMPs implemented through a standard urban stormwater mitigation plan (SUSMP). Included as SC HYD-2, the Project would be required to prepare a SUSMP, conditions of which would be assigned by the City and would consist of LID BMPs, source control BMPs, and structural and nonstructural BMPs. As part of the permitting approval process, the proposed drainage design and engineering plans would be reviewed by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that the proposed drainage would accommodate the appropriate design flows. Compliance with the NPDES and the City of South El Monte's Municipal Code requirements would ensure operation of the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: result in substantial on-site or off-site erosion or siltation; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on-site or off-site flooding; 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; or impeded or redirect flood flows.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition and mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Standard Condition and Mitigation Measure

SC HYD-1 and MM HYD-1 are applicable (see above).

Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM HYD-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the hydrology and water quality impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

As detailed in the EIR, the use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a SWPPP as required by the NPDES Construction General Permit (implemented through SC HYD-1) and a RWQCB Groundwater Discharge Permit (implemented through MM HYD-1) would serve to ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

The Project would be required to implement a Low Impact Development (LID) Plan, per the Los Angeles County NPDES MS4 Permit, which would identify BMPs also in compliance with the Municipal Code Section 8.44.110 – Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and Low Impact Development (LID) requirements for new development and redevelopment projects. The MS4 Permit, LID Plan, and applicable BMPs, included as SC HYD-2, would be verified as part of the City's permitting approval process, and construction plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations. Further, concerning the Project's potential to conflict with a groundwater management plan, SGVWC would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the groundwater management plan and would not conflict with or obstruct its implementation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition and mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Standard Condition and Mitigation Measure

SC HYD-1 and MM HYD-1 are applicable (see above).

Noise

Would the Project generate 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?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM NOI-1 is feasible, adopted, and will reduce the noise impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion:

On-Site Construction Noise

As detailed in the EIR, during construction, exterior noise levels could affect the receptors near the construction site. The nearest receptors are the residential receptors (SR-3) located approximately 230 feet to the southeast and the commercial/office receptors (an existing non-sensitive receptor located within the Whittier Narrows Recreation area) located approximately 20 feet to the south of the project site.[1] Although Whittier Narrows Recreation area (SR-1) is located approximately 40 feet to the southeast of the project site, the County and FTA have not defined construction noise thresholds for recreational receptors. Therefore, construction noise levels were not quantified for Whittier Narrows Recreation area (SR-1) but have been quantified for the commercial/office receptors within the Whittier Narrows Recreation area.

Because the City has not established quantitative construction noise standards, the EIR analysis conservatively uses the FTA's threshold of 80 dBA (8-hour L_{eq}) for residential receptors. The County has established 85 dBA as the construction noise threshold for nonscheduled operation of construction mobile equipment at business structures. Therefore, noise generated from scheduled Project construction was conservatively analyzed against the County's threshold for the commercial/office receptors. The worst-case scenario construction noise levels at the nearest commercial/office receptors would occur during the overlapping demolition and site preparation phases and would be up to 92.5 dBA L_{eq}. The worst-case scenario construction noise level at the nearest residential use would occur during the overlapping building construction, infrastructure improvements, and paving phases and would be up to 78.5 dBA L_{eq}. As detailed in the EIR, the unmitigated construction noise level would not exceed the FTA standard (80 dBA L_{eq}) at the residential receptors, but would exceed the County standard (85 dBA L_{eq}) at the commercial/office receptors. MM NOI-1 requires a 10-foot-high temporary noise barrier along the construction site perimeter adjacent to the commercial/office receptors to the south, which would reduce construction noise levels by approximately 13 dBA at the commercial/office receptors. The Project would also comply with SC NOI-1 which would include noise shielding and muffling, enclosure of outdoor mechanical equipment, and location of construction staging areas features to further reduce temporary construction noise. Therefore, the mitigated worst-case construction noise level at the commercial/office receptors to the south would be 79.5 dBA L_{eq} and would not exceed the County construction threshold of 85 dBA L_{eq}. Project construction would not result in temporary noise levels in exceedance of standards established by the County and FTA. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition and mitigation measure pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Standard Condition

SC NOI-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of South El Monte Building Official or Chief Engineer, that the construction contracts include the following:

- Noise Shielding and Muffling. The Project will include the installation of noise dampening material and muffling devices consistent with manufacturer's standards or the Best Available Control Technology. Noise dampening material will be installed in equipment hoods, shielding engine noise. Mufflers will be installed on equipment exhaust. All equipment will be properly maintained, and the construction contractor will be required to keep documentation on-site during any earthwork or construction

[1] Although commercial uses are not considered sensitive receptors, this analysis conservatively includes the estimated construction noise level at the commercial uses located within Whittier Narrows Recreation area.

activities demonstrating that the equipment has been maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.

- Enclosure of Outdoor Mechanical Equipment. All stationary outdoor mechanical equipment (e.g., generators, compressors) used during construction will be enclosed to reduce the level of noise between the equipment and off-site noise-sensitive uses.
- Location of Construction Staging Areas. Construction staging areas will be located as far from noise-sensitive uses as reasonably possible and technically feasible in consideration of site boundaries, topography, intervening roads and uses, and operational constraints.

Mitigation Measure

MM NOI-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of South El Monte Building Official or Chief Engineer, that the construction contracts include the installation of a 10-foot-high temporary construction noise barrier along the portion of the southwest project site boundary line that is within approximately 20 feet of the office/commercial uses within Whittier Narrows Recreation area (as depicted in Figure 4.11-2 of the EIR). The temporary construction noise barrier shall have a sound transmission class (STC) of 25 or greater in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Test Method E90, or a density of at least two pounds per sf to ensure adequate transmission loss characteristics. To achieve this, the barrier may consist of steel tubular framing, welded joints, a layer of 18-ounce tarp, a two-inch thick fiberglass blanket, a half-inch thick weatherwood asphalt sheathing, and 7/16-inch sturdy board siding. An alternate design may be proposed by the applicant provided that the noise attenuation requirements above are met. The temporary construction noise barrier shall be free of degrading holes or gaps and shall be designed to prevent structural failure due to factors such as wind, shear, shallow soil failure, earthquakes, and erosion.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) or

ii) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 1 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1)). The City Council finds that MM CUL-1, MM TCR-1, and MM TCR-2 are feasible, adopted, and will reduce the tribal cultural resource impact of the Project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City Council finds that, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and State

CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant tribal cultural resource impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

Basis for Conclusion: A records search conducted through the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) identified three previously recorded cultural resources within the study area: P-19-004828, P-19-191157, and P-19-192581. As detailed in the EIR, none of these resources were determined to be eligible for listing under the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and therefore do not qualify as historical resources under CEQA. A pedestrian field survey conducted on April 23, 2024, confirmed that no new archaeological or tribal cultural resources are present on the site.

The City requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC response was positive, indicating the potential for Native American cultural resources in the area and recommending consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. Consistent with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, the City provided formal notification letters on June 3, 2024, to the Native American tribal contacts identified by the NAHC. Formal consultation was conducted with the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California pursuant to AB 52. The City acknowledged the tribe's request; mitigation reflects this collaboration.

It is unlikely that tribal cultural resources are present on the project site given the prior ground disturbance, pedestrian survey results, record search results, Native American consultation, review of archival and environmental data, and existing additional site disturbance. While low, there is the potential for tribal cultural resources to be inadvertently unearthed during excavation and grading activities. Therefore, Project construction activities could result in potential impacts to previously unidentified tribal cultural resources. To ensure potential impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources would be avoided, the Project would implement MM CUL-1, MM TCR-1, and MM TCR-2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition and mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Standard Condition

SC CUL-1 is applicable (see above).

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-1 (see above) and the following are applicable.

MM TCR-1: **Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities.** The project applicant/City of South El Monte shall retain a Native American Monitor approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, and any other consulting tribes. The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the Project inclusive of the warehouse and future City park at all project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching.

A copy of the executed monitoring agreement shall be submitted to the City of South El Monte (lead agency) prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

The monitor shall complete daily monitoring logs that shall provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitor logs shall identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs shall be provided to the project applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribe.

On-site tribal monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, and any other consulting tribes from a designated point of contact for the project applicant/City of South El Monte that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the consulting tribes to the project applicant/lead agency that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact TCRs.

MM TCR-2: **Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources.** Upon discovery of any tribal cultural resources (TCRs), all construction activities in the immediate vicinity (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) of the discovery shall cease. The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, and any other consulting tribes shall be immediately informed of the discovery, and the Native American Monitor shall promptly evaluate the TCR. The City of South El Monte shall consult with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, and any other consulting tribes to determine the appropriate treatment and/or final disposition for the TCR, which may include one of the following options: preservation in place/avoidance, on-site reburial/relocation, data recovery/excavation, curation, or transfer to the consulting tribes. No project construction activities shall resume in the surrounding 50 feet of the discovered TCR unless and until its assessment/ evaluation/ recovery has been completed.

Section 6.0: Environmental Effects Found to be Significant and Unavoidable

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the Project, the City has determined that either (1) even with compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level, or (2) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report," referred to herein as "Finding 3." This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the City, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 if the Project is approved.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment?

Finding: The City Council adopts CEQA Finding 3 (State CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3)) because even with compliance with applicable policies, ordinances, and regulations, and implantation of mitigation measures, the Project will still have a significant and unavoidable impact concerning GHG emissions at the project level. There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact to a less than significant level and there are no feasible alternatives to avoid the identified unavoidable significant impact. Pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 8.0 below, the City Council has determined that there are specific economic, social, and other public benefits that outweigh the significant unavoidable GHG emissions impact associated with the Project.

Basis for Conclusion:

Short-Term Construction Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

The Project's short-term construction GHG emissions would only occur during temporary construction activities and would cease once construction is complete. As detailed in the EIR, the Project would result in the generation of approximately 681 $MTCO_2e$ throughout the course of construction. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over a 30-year period and then added to the operational emissions. The Project's amortized construction emissions would be 23 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Once construction is complete, the generation of these GHG emissions would cease. In response to the increase in warehouse development in California, the State of California Department of Justice issued a memorandum in March 2021, entitled Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (Memorandum). The Memorandum encourages warehouse projects to implement certain best practices, one of which is that diesel powered construction equipment be turned off when not in use. This Project will follow this best management practice pursuant to Laws, Ordinances, and Regulations (LOR) GHG-1 below.

Long Term Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of the Project. As detailed in the EIR, GHG emissions would result from direct emissions such as Project generated vehicular traffic, any on-site combustion of natural gas, and operation of any landscaping equipment. Operational GHG emissions would also result from indirect sources, such as off-site generation of electrical power, solid waste generation, and the

energy required to convey water to, and wastewater from the Project. The Project's unmitigated long-term operational GHG emissions would be approximately 8,665 $MTCO_2e$ annually from operations with amortized construction. Project-related GHG emissions would exceed the 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold. It should be noted that the majority of the unmitigated GHG emissions (89%) are associated with non-construction related mobile sources. Fuel efficiency and emission standards are regulated at the State level and those regulations are becoming more stringent over the years to reduce mobile source emissions. However, because emissions of motor vehicles are controlled by State and federal standards; neither the Project Applicant nor the City has control over these standards.

The Project would implement MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-6 and MM GHG-8. MM GHG-1 requires landscaping equipment to be 100 percent electrically powered. MM GHG-2 requires the installation of photovoltaic solar panels to offset energy emissions. MM GHG-3 requires the Project to meet or exceed CALGreen Tier 2 standards to further improve energy efficiency. MM GHG-4 requires appliances to be Energy-Star certified. MM GHG-5 requires appliances and end uses to be 100 percent electrically powered. MM GHG-6 requires the Project to divert 75 percent of waste from landfills. MM GHG-8 requires forklifts and yard trucks to be 100 percent electrically powered and standard emergency generators to be Tier 4 certified.

The EIR conservatively does not include emissions reduction credits associated with MM GHG-7 or MM GHG-9. MM GHG-7 and MM GHG-9 require the preparation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program and Water Use Efficiency and Conservation Plan for the Project, respectively. The amount of GHG emissions reductions that would result from implementation of these mitigation measures cannot be precisely determined at this time. The Project would also be required to comply with Laws, Ordinances, and Regulations (LOR) GHG-1 through LOR GHG-8 which would be required by local, State, or federal regulations or laws.

As detailed in the EIR, implementation of MM GHG-1, MM GH-2, MM GH-3, MM GH-4, MM GH-5, MM GH-6 and MM GH-8 would reduce GHG emissions to approximately 7,928 $MTCO_2e$. The majority of the Project's GHG emissions are generated by mobile emissions. Additional mitigation to reduce the Project's mobile emissions is not feasible due to the limited ability of the City to address emissions resulting from mobile sources and/or emissions generated by cars and trucks outside of the City's limits. As with all land use projects, the Project's mobile and transportation related GHG emissions are a function of two parameters: emissions control technology and VMT. Mitigated GHG emissions would exceed the 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold despite implementation of all feasible mitigation. Therefore, project-related GHG emissions would be significant and unavoidable notwithstanding compliance with the following LORs and implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

Laws, Ordinances, and Regulations

LOR GHG-1: Require diesel powered construction equipment to turn off when not in use per Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2449.

LOR GHG-2: Limit idling time for commercial vehicles to no more than five minutes per Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485.

LOR GHG-3: In accordance with California Title 24 Standards, buildings will be designed to have 15 percent of the roof area "solar ready" that will structurally accommodate later installation of rooftop solar panels. If future building operators pursue providing rooftop solar panels, they will submit plans for solar panels prior to occupancy.

LOR GHG-4: Design buildings to be water-efficient. Install water-efficient fixtures in accordance with Section 5.303 of the California Green Building Standards Code Part 11.

LOR GHG-5: Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste in accordance with Section 5.408.1 of the California Green Building Standards Code Part 11.

LOR GHG-6: Provide storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in readily accessible areas in accordance with Section 5.410 of the California Green Building Standards Code Part 11.

LOR GHG-7: To facilitate future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE), construction shall comply with Section 5.106.5.3 (nonresidential electric vehicle charging) of the California Green Building Standards Code Part 11.

LOR GHG-8: Tenants of the warehouse shall comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Warehouse Indirect Source Rule (Rule 2305). This rule is expected to reduce NO_X and PM_{10} emissions during operations. Compliance with Rule 2305 is enforced by the SCAQMD through their reporting process and is required for all warehouse projects greater than 100,000 square feet.

Mitigation Measures

MM GHG-1: **Electric Landscape Equipment.** Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit for the warehouse, the City of South El Monte Community Development Department, Building and Safety Division shall confirm that tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all handheld landscaping equipment used on site shall be 100 percent electrically powered. The warehouse building, as well as the parking lots for the future City park and warehouse components, shall be equipped with exterior electrical outlets to accommodate this requirement. This requirement shall be included in the third-party vendor agreements for landscape services for the building owner and tenants, as applicable. Therefore, this mitigation measure is applicable to the warehouse and City park.

MM GHG-2: **On-Site Renewable Electricity Generation.** The Project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on the site or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load. (i.e., the Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, anticipated to be approximately 5.75 kilowatt hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot). This mitigation measure is only applicable to the warehouse.

MM GHG-3: **CALGreen Tier 2.** Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant or successor in interest, and the City (as applicable) shall provide documentation to the City of South El Monte Community Development Department, Building and Safety Division demonstrating the following:

- The warehouse shall be designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification to meet or exceed CALGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time of building permit application.
- The Project (warehouse and City park) shall provide facilities to support electric charging stations per the Tier 2 standards in Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the 2022 CALGreen Code.

MM GHG-4: **On-site Electricity Efficiency.** Prior to the issuance of tenant occupancy permits for the warehouse, the Planning Division shall confirm that tenant lease agreements include

contractual language that appliances used on site shall be ENERGY-STAR Certified. This mitigation measure is only applicable to the warehouse.

MM GHG-5: **Require All-Electric Development.** Prior to the issuance of building permits for the warehouse, the City of South El Monte Community Development Department, Building and Safety Division shall confirm that building plans require the Project to use all-electric appliances and end uses instead of natural gas. The Project shall not include natural gas utility lines or connections. This mitigation measure is only applicable to the warehouse.

MM GHG-6: **Solid Waste Diversion.** The warehouse shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of a tenant occupancy permit for the warehouse by the City of South El Monte Community Development Department, Planning Division, a recyclables collection and load area shall be constructed in compliance with City standards for recyclable collection and loading areas. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant permits for the warehouse and not the warehouse building shell approvals. The diversion plan shall also comply with the established solid waste and recycling laws including AB 939 and AB 341.

The City park shall divert a minimum of 50 percent of land fill waste in compliance with AB 75 and AB 939. In addition, a recyclables collection and load area shall be constructed in compliance with City standards for recyclable collection and loading areas.

MM GHG-7 Prior to issuance of tenant occupancy permits for the warehouse, the tenant/facility operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.
- Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site.
- Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching services.
- Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.

This mitigation measure applies only to tenant occupancy and not the building shell approvals. Therefore, this mitigation measure is only applicable to the warehouse.

MM GHG-8: **Non-Diesel Off-road And Emergency Equipment.** Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit for the warehouse, the City of South El Monte Community Development Department, Building and Safety Division shall confirm that the Project plans and specifications show the following:

- All outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, and forklifts) are zero emission/powered by electricity. The building shall include the necessary charging stations for cargo handling equipment. Note that SCAQMD Rule 2305 (Warehouse Indirect Source Rule) Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions (WAIRE) points may be earned for electric/zero

emission yard truck/hostler usage. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell approvals.

- Any and all standard emergency generators shall meet California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final emissions standards. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification) and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City.

This mitigation measure is only applicable to the warehouse.

MM-GHG 9: **Water Use Efficiency and Conservation Plan.** The Project Applicant or designee shall implement a Water Use Efficiency and Conservation Plan that includes the following minimum requirements:

Indoor Conservation Features and Operations*:*

- **Install low-flow Fixtures**: Install low-flow toilets at 1.28 gallons per flush, faucets at 1.2 gallons per minute, showerheads at 1.8 gallons per minute, kitchen faucets at 1.8 gallons per minute. In common areas, install faucets at 0.5 gallon per minute and urinals at max of 0.25 gallon per minute/flush. (These fixtures use less water while maintaining efficient performance.)
- **Install dual-flush toilets**: These toilets offer two flush options: one for liquid waste less than 1 gallons per minute and another for solid waste at 1.28 gallons per minute. (This allows the appropriate use of water for flushing needs.)
- **Use water-efficient appliances**: The Project Applicant or designee shall install energy-efficient and water-saving appliances with the ENERGY STAR label only.
- **The Project will capture and reuse HVAC condensation**: The Project Applicant or designee shall direct condensation from air conditioning units to water plants or for other non-potable uses.
- **Good housekeeping and regular maintenance**: The Project Applicant or designee shall regularly check and maintain plumbing fixtures, irrigation systems, and appliances to ensure they are functioning efficiently and not wasting water.

Outdoor Conservation Features and Operations:

- **Install only "Smart Irrigation Systems" for community landscaping**: The Project Applicant or designee shall use smart sprinkler systems that adjust watering schedules based on weather conditions, soil moisture, and plant needs to avoid over- or wasteful watering. The Project Applicant or designee shall also incorporate seasonal specific controls to ensure watering occurs during the most efficient times of day.
- **Adjustable Water Pressure Regulator**: The Project Applicant or designee shall install pressure regulators to maintain optimal water pressure, preventing overuse and leaks.
- **Drought-tolerant landscaping**: The Project Applicant or designee shall include native and drought-tolerant vegetation that requires less water to thrive and is known to survive in the City of South El Monte. The Project Applicant or designee shall replace drought-tolerant landscaping if it dies through enforceable Project CC&Rs.

This mitigation measure is applicable to the warehouse and City park (i.e., restroom facilities and landscaped areas).

Section 7.0: Findings Regarding Project Alternatives Not Selected for Implementation

Under CEQA, the identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental part of the environmental review process. Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21002.1(a) establishes the need to address alternatives in an EIR by stating that in addition to determining a project's significant environmental impacts and indicating potential means of mitigating or avoiding those impacts, "the purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify alternatives to the project." Each alternative was evaluated for its feasibility, its ability to attain the Project's basic objectives, and its ability to reduce and/or eliminate significant impacts associated with the Project.

The EIR analyzed four alternatives to the Project as proposed, and evaluated these alternatives for their ability to meet the Project's basic objectives. CEQA requires evaluation of alternatives that can reduce the significance of identified impacts and "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project." (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6.) Therefore, the Project objectives must be considered when the City Council is evaluating alternatives.

7.1 Project Objectives

Objective 1: Provide public benefits to the City by increasing employment opportunities during construction of the Project and occupancy of the warehouse building and increasing property sales and tax revenues that the City will receive as part of the warehouse building improvements.

Objective 2: Provide additional public benefits to the City under the Development Agreement for the Project by creating opportunities for City development of a public park to meet the recreational needs of the City and providing digital billboard advertising revenue sharing.

Objective 3: Develop the warehouse component of the Project consistent with the guidelines and policies of the City of South El Monte General Plan land use designation (Commercial-Manufacturing (CM)) and Zoning designation (Manufacturing (M)) proposed as part of the Project and applicable Municipal Code provisions.

Objective 4: Develop a single pad Class A warehouse of sufficient size and with sufficient trailer truck doors and parking to be competitive within the industrial warehouse marketplace in the vicinity.

Objective 5: Develop a warehouse use proximate to the State Route 60 transportation corridor.

Objective 6: Improve the Property's flood storage capacity via Storage Basin Improvements in the USACE Easement area.

7.2 Elimination/Reduction of Significant Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) (14 CCR) states that "Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (PRC §21002.1), the discussion of 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." As explained above, with implementation of the MMRP for the Project, all but one of the potentially significant impacts resulting from the Project would be reduced to a level considered less than significant. The Project would be expected to result in a significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas (GHG) emission impact even after compliance with all applicable LORs and implementation of all feasible mitigation measures pursuant to the MMRP for the Project.

7.3 Alternatives Considered But Rejected

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) notes that the EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. Reasons underlying the lead agency's determination may include factors such as failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, infeasibility, or inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. The City did not identify additional alternatives for consideration in this EIR and none were identified during the public scoping process beyond what is addressed in the EIR.

Alternative Project Location

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2), alternate sites should be evaluated, if any feasible sites exist, where significant impacts associated with the Project can be lessened. An alternative location was considered and rejected in the EIR because there are no site-specific significant and unavoidable impacts that would be lessened if an alternate site were selected. It is required under CEQA that alternative site(s) be evaluated if any feasible sites exist where significant impacts can be lessened. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact. The majority of the Project's GHG emissions are associated with mobile sources (i.e., vehicle and truck trips), therefore, GHG emissions would not be reduced by relocating the proposed Project to an alternate location. Additionally, due to the cumulative nature of GHG emissions, the environmental impacts of development on any other site in the City would be similar to those of the proposed Project. In addition, other sites, depending on their known on-site resources may have similar or greater impacts than the Project. Given the nature of the proposed Project, an alternative location would not alleviate the GHG emissions impact because a relocation of the proposed Project would not lessen the significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact. Therefore, an alternative location may meet most of the basic Project objectives but would not lessen or substantially lessen impacts and meet the CEQA definition of a feasible alternative. Therefore, this alternative was rejected by the City, consistent with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

7.4 Project Alternatives Considered

Alternative A: No Project/No Development

Description: CEQA requires an analysis of a "no project alternative." Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B), the "no project alternative" for a development project on identifiable property is the circumstance under which the proposed project does not proceed, and the discussion of the no project alternative must compare the environmental effects from the project site remaining in its existing state, versus the environmental effects that would occur if the Project is approved. Accordingly, under Alternative A, the project site would remain in its existing condition and no development would occur. The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the Project would not be developed, consistent with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, which means there would be no Storage Basin Improvements (defined above), warehouse facilities, future City park, digital billboard, landscape or infrastructure improvements, or surface lot improvements developed on the project site. In its existing condition, the project site would remain vacant apart from the scattered remnants of previous uses (including remnant building pad foundations and radio tower footings/pile caps).

Environmental Effects: Alternative A's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed Project in Section 6.5.1 of the EIR. Because no development would occur, the significant unavoidable GHG emissions impact associated with the proposed Project would not occur. As detailed above, with the exception of the GHG emissions impact, all significant impacts associated with the Project would be mitigated to a less than significant level pursuant to the MMRP for the Project. The No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would eliminate all of the potentially significant impacts of the Project. The State CEQA Guidelines state that should the No Project Alternative be the

Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR shall identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the remaining Alternatives.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives. Alternative A fails to meet any of the Project's basic objectives because there would be no Project and no development would occur on the project site. This alternative would not provide public benefits to the City by increasing employment opportunities during construction of the Project and occupancy of the warehouse building or increasing property sales and tax revenues that the City would receive as part of the warehouse building improvements. Therefore, Alternative A would not meet Project Objective 1. Alternative A would not provide additional public benefits to the City by creating opportunities for development of a public City park and providing digital billboard advertising revenue sharing because there would be no Project or associated public benefits. Therefore, Alternative A would not meet Project Objective 2. There would be no development on the project site under Alternative A, meaning that Project Objectives 3, 4, and 5, which are related to developing a warehouse building on the property, would also not be met. This alternative would continue to meet the flood storage capacity of the Whittier Narrows Dam USACE reservoir flowage easement but would not improve flood storage capacity via Storage Basin Improvements and therefore, would not meet Project Objective 6.

Finding: The City Council rejects this alternative on the following grounds which provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Based on substantial evidence in the entire record, the City finds that the No Project/No Development Alternative would reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project and would avoid the significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact. However, this alternative would not realize any of the basic Project objectives by maintaining the site in its existing condition. Therefore, this alternative would not provide any of the public benefits proposed by the Project, including but not limited to increased employment opportunities, increased property sales and tax revenues, the opportunity for City development of a public park to meet the recreational needs of the City, or the Storage Basin Improvements. The Findings set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below provide support for the approval of the Project and the rejection of this Alternative.

Alternative B: Existing Land Use and Zoning Designations – Commercial Development

Description. The Existing Land Use and Zoning Designations – Commercial Development Alternative (Alternative B) assumes development of the project site pursuant to existing General Plan and zoning designations. Alternative B assumes development of the project site consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation of Commercial (C), and existing Commercial (C) zoning. Alternative B assumes the development of 228,690 sf of commercial uses, in the form of a retail shopping center, based on the maximum FAR of 0.5 as established in the General Plan on approximately 10.5 acres of the eastern portion of the site. Compared to the Project, Alternative B would represent an increase of 6,875 sf of building area. Under this alternative scenario, the retail use would provide 763 passenger vehicle parking spaces, based on 1 space for every 300 sf of retail gross floor area. The remaining approximately 10.7 acres on the northwestern portion of the site would be excavated by approximately 10 feet to improve the existing storage capacity of the property pursuant to the Storage Basin Improvements but would remain vacant and in private ownership. Alternative B would not include the dedication of land for a future City park and revenue sharing associated with digital billboard advertising.

Environmental Effects: Alternative B's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed Project in Section 6.5.2 of the EIR. Like the Project, this alternative assumes that the entire project site would be graded. Therefore, the environmental issues tied to project site disturbance would be the same for the Project and Alternative B. Therefore, there would be no change in the significance of impacts associated

with Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Tribal Cultural Resources, which would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures (where required). Alternative B would result in less impacts than the Project regarding land use and planning because it would not require a General Plan Amendment or zone change. Alternative B would not include the digital billboard or future City park and therefore would not have lighting associated with the billboard or potential stadium lighting resulting in less impacts associated with Aesthetics. Further, potential impacts on burrowing owl, if present on nearby habitat, would not occur as no lighting from the billboard or future City park stadium lighting would be directed into or near that habitat. Therefore, compared to the Project, Alternative B would result in less impacts associated with Biological Resources.

Alternative B would construct approximately 6,875 sf more development than the Project (based on the maximum FAR of 0.5 as established in the General Plan) and therefore would result in more construction materials and equipment and would require more internal improvements and employees than a warehouse facility (i.e. increased water, wastewater, electrical power and natural gas demand). Further, as detailed in the EIR, a retail shopping center would have more operational truck and passenger vehicle traffic when compared to the Project. Accordingly, impacts associated with Air Quality, Energy, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, and Utilities and Service Systems could be greater under Alternative B as compared to the Project, but nonetheless be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures (where required). As detailed in the EIR, Alternative B would also result in a significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact.

Under Alternative B, the 10.7-acre area would not be dedicated to the City for future development of a public City park and would be left undeveloped as private property under the ownership of the Project Applicant. Therefore, the Project would expand the City's recreational facilities while Alternative B would result in no dedication of land for recreational facilities. Alternative B could incrementally increase the use of regional recreational facilities due to increased public and employee use of the commercial development; however, it would not be to the extent that could result in accelerated or substantial physical deterioration. Accordingly, impacts associated with Recreation could be greater under Alternative B as compared to the Project, but nonetheless be less than significant.

Alternative B would generate substantially more daily trips than the Project and would require a VMT impacts analysis based on the size of the project. Alternative B could result in significant VMT impacts and it is unknown whether any such significant VMT impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant level. Therefore, Alternative B could result in greater impacts than the Project regarding Transportation and VMT impacts.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Alternative B would increase employment opportunities during construction and occupancy of the retail development and increase property sales and tax revenues that the City would receive as part of the building improvements; therefore, Objective 1 would be met. Development under Alternative B would not provide additional public benefits to the City through the dedication of land for a future City park or through digital billboard advertising revenue sharing. Therefore, Alternative B would not meet Project Objective 2. There would be no warehouse building under Alternative B, meaning that Project Objectives 3, 4, and 5, which are related to developing a warehouse building on the property, would not be met. Like the Project, Alternative B would improve the flood storage capacity of the Whittier Narrows Dam USACE reservoir flowage easement by providing Storage Basin Improvements; therefore, Objective 6 would be met.

Finding: The City Council rejects this alternative on the following grounds which provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Based on substantial evidence in the entire record, the City Council finds that while many environmental impacts would be lessened

or remain the same under this Alternative, the significant and unavoidable GHG emission impact would still occur and could be worsened due to increased construction and operational demands associated with a retail shopping center, as well as corresponding increases in Air Quality, Energy, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Utilities and Service Systems impacts. This alternative would meet some but not all the basic Project objectives. Accordingly, this alternative would not provide the same public benefits proposed by the Project, including but not limited to the opportunity for City development of a public park to meet the recreational needs of the City.

Therefore, the Existing Land Use and Zoning Designations – Commercial Development Alternative is rejected. The findings set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below provide support for the approval of the Project and the rejection of this Alternative.

Alternative C: Reduced Warehouse

Description. The Reduced Warehouse Alternative (Alternative C) assumes development of a smaller warehouse on the project site to reduce the GHG emissions impact to a less than significant level. Under this alternative, the total warehouse building area would be reduced by approximately 63 percent, resulting in an 82,072-sf warehouse with 10 truck dock doors and 100 passenger vehicle parking spaces on approximately 10.5 acres of the eastern portion of the site. Alternative B would represent a reduction of 139,744 sf of building area when compared to the Project. The remaining 10.7 acres on the northwestern portion would be excavated by approximately 10 feet to improve the site's storage capacity pursuant to the Storage Basin Improvements but would remain vacant and in private ownership. As with the Project, Alternative C would require a General Plan Amendment to Commercial-Manufacturing (CM) and a Zone change to Manufacturing (M) to allow the warehouse use; however, a Development Agreement would not be proposed. Therefore, no digital billboard or future City park would be included under this alternative, and the public benefits associated with those components would not be provided.

Environmental Effects: Alternative C's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed Project in Section 6.5.3 of the EIR. Like the Project, Alternative C would require a General Plan Amendment and a Zone change to allow for a warehouse use and assumes that the entire project site would be graded. Therefore, the environmental issues tied to site disturbance, would be the same for the Project and Alternative C. Therefore, there would be no change in the significance of impacts associated with Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Land Use, and Tribal Cultural Resources which would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated (where required).

Alternative C would not include the digital billboard or future City park and therefore would not have lighting associated with the billboard or park stadium lighting resulting in less impacts associated with Aesthetics. Further, potential impacts on burrowing owl, if present on nearby habitat, would not occur as no lighting from the billboard or future City park stadium lighting would be directed into or near that habitat. Therefore, compared to the Project, Alternative C would result in less impacts associated with Biological Resources.

Alternative C would result in a reduction of 139,744 sf of building area compared to the Project and therefore would result in a shorter construction schedule and less construction materials and equipment and would require less internal improvements and employees due to the reduced warehouse size (i.e., reduced water, wastewater, electrical power and natural gas demand). Further, the reduced warehouse square footage would have less operational truck and passenger vehicle traffic when compared to the

Project. Accordingly, impacts associated with Air Quality, Energy, GHG Emission, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems would be less under Alternative C as compared to the Project, and, similar to the Project, less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures (where required). Notably, due to the smaller warehouse size, the GHG emissions impact under Alternative C would be reduced to a less than significant level, thereby avoiding the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact.

Under Alternative C, the 10.7-acre area would not be dedicated to the City for future development of a public City park and would be left undeveloped as private property under the ownership of the Project Applicant. Therefore, while the Project would expand the City's recreational facilities, Alternative C would result in no dedication of land for recreational facilities. Alternative C could incrementally increase the use of regional recreational facilities; however, it would not be to the extent that could result in accelerated or substantial physical deterioration. Accordingly, impacts associated with Recreation would be greater under Alternative C as compared to the Project, but nonetheless be less than significant.

The State CEQA Guidelines state that should the No Project Alternative be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR shall identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the remaining Alternatives. Aside from the No Project Alternative, the environmentally superior alternative to the Project is the one that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the EIR found Alternative C: Reduced Warehouse to be the environmentally superior alternative.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Alternative C would only partially meet the basic Project Objectives. Alternative C would not provide additional public benefits to the City through the dedication of land for a future City park or through digital billboard advertising revenue sharing. Therefore, Alternative C would not meet Project Objective 2. Alternative C would not meet Project Objective 4 because according to the Project Applicant, the construction of an 82,072-sf warehouse, which is more than 63 percent smaller than the Project, would not qualify as a "Class A" warehouse of sufficient size and with sufficient trailer truck doors and parking to be competitive in the industrial marketplace of the region. Alternative C would increase employment opportunities during construction and occupancy of the warehouse building, consistent with Objective 1, but not to the same extent as a larger warehouse facility. Alternative C would increase property sales and tax revenues, consistent with Objective 1, but not to the same extent as a larger warehouse facility. Alternative C would develop a warehouse component consistent with the proposed General Plan CM land use designation and M zoning, but the warehouse would be much smaller than the Project. Therefore, Alternative C would partially meet Project Objectives 1, 3, and 5 but not to the same extent as the Project, which proposes a much larger "Class A" warehouse facility and also includes a City public park and related recreational and employment opportunities. Alternative C would improve the flood storage capacity of the Whittier Narrows Dam USACE reservoir flowage easement through the provision of Storage Basin Improvements; therefore, Project Objective 6 would be met. However, it is unknown whether the Project Applicant would pursue development on the project site with the reduced-size warehouse building under Alternative C that would not be a marketable "Class A" warehouse.

Finding: The City Council rejects this alternative on the following grounds which provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Based on substantial evidence in the entire record, the City Council finds that this alternative would reduce certain environmental impacts and avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact. However, the reduced size of this alternative would only partially meet some but not all of the basic Project objectives. Accordingly, this alternative would not provide the same public benefits proposed by the Project, including but not limited to the opportunity for City development of a public park to meet the recreational needs of the City. This

alternative would provide increased employment opportunities and increased property sales and tax revenues, but not to the same extent as the Project.

Therefore, the Reduced Size Warehouse Alternative is rejected. The findings set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below provide support for the approval of the Project and the rejection of this Alternative.

Section 8.0: Statement of Overriding Considerations

CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines provide, in part, the following:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable." (Section 15093(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines.)

(b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant environmental effects which are identified in the EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. (Section 15093(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines.)

(c) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings include but are not limited to: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Section 15091(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines.)

(d) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination (Section 15093(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines.)

The City , having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Draft EIR for the Project, the Final EIR for the Project, Responses to Comments and the public record (collectively, Public Record), adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations that have been balanced against the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact in reaching a decision on this Project.

While the significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact cannot be fully mitigated, the City Council has balanced that impact against the benefits of the Project, as detailed below, and has determined that the benefits of the Project outweigh the impact. The City Council finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been imposed pursuant to the MMRP for the Project, which would lessen all other Project impacts to less than significant levels. Additionally, the City Council finds that while the Project alternatives would have similar or less environmental impacts as compared to the Project, the alternatives to the Project are rejected as infeasible because they do not provide the public benefits (or the same extent of public benefits, as applicable) when compared to the Project, or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible when compared to the Project, as described herein.

1. The City Council , having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Public Record, and having balanced the benefits of the Project against the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact, finds such unmitigated impact to be acceptable in view of the following overriding considerations. The City finds that any one of these Project benefits standing alone would be sufficient to sustain the Statement of Overriding Considerations:

2. The Project will develop additional storage for the Whitter Narrows Dam by the construction of Storage Basin Improvements (defined above) for the required volume of potential flood waters from the Whittier Flood Control Basin, which would provide a public safety benefit, including for USACE, the City, and its residents.
3. The Project will create an opportunity for the City to develop a public park to meet the recreational needs of the City and benefit the public through the provision of new public recreational facilities and an outdoor open space area for the pubic to enjoy.
4. Construction spending will create a one-time stimulus to the local and regional economies.
5. The Project will enhance the City's fiscal health through increased property taxes, sales taxes, and other local revenue streams. These revenues will support essential public services such as public safety, parks, and infrastructure maintenance.
6. The Project will generate substantial economic activity, including construction jobs during the development phase and permanent operational jobs. These jobs will directly support the local workforce and contribute to economic stability within the City and surrounding region. Specifically, approval of the Project is expected to create approximately 358 new jobs, in addition to temporary construction jobs.
7. The Project will meet the needs of the growing logistics sector and will attract similar business that can expedite the delivery of essential goods to consumers and businesses in the City and region, thereby fostering long-term economic growth.
8. The Project will contribute towards maximizing employment opportunities within the City to improve the jobs-housing balance, typically viewed as housing rich and job poor, which will help to reduce systemic unemployment within the City.
9. The Project will improve the efficiency of regional and national goods movement by providing a strategically located warehouse building. The Project is strategically located in close proximity to major freeways (State Route 60, Interstate 5 and Interstate 605) and the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, thereby improving the efficiency of movement of goods and a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.
10. By optimizing goods movement, the Project will indirectly reduce inefficiencies in the transportation system, which benefits local communities, including the City, through improved access to goods and services.
11. The Project will provide infrastructure improvements including sidewalk improvements on the north side of Lexington-Gallatin Road, curb and gutter improvements on Santa Anita Avenue, and drainage and water quality treatment improvements, which are public and environmental benefits.
12. The Project will enhance the City's fiscal health by creating an advertising revenue sharing opportunity for the City through construction of the digital billboard, which will in turn support essential public services such as public safety, parks, and infrastructure maintenance.
13. While the Project's GHG emissions would exceed the applicable significance threshold, the efficiency gains in logistics operations support broader regional and state goals to reduce GHG emissions from inefficient goods movement activities.
14. The Project incorporates advanced sustainability practices. Among other things, the Project will comply with the California Title 24 energy standards and the CALGreen building code.

15. The Project fulfills key objectives of the City's General Plan by promoting economic growth, creating employment opportunities, and enhancing industrial development. As explained in the Economic Development Element of the City's General Plan, the City's economic strength lies in industrial businesses and much of the City's revenue comes from the sales associated with industrial enterprises. As explained therein: "Maintaining South El Monte's healthy industrial base and accommodating new industrial businesses represents the City's primary economic development goal. The industrial sector provides a wide range of jobs, generates revenue through direct non-retail sale of goods, and defines the community as a good place to do business." Implementing the City's General Plan as a policy is a legal and social prerogative of the City.

In conclusion, the City Council has identified substantial economic, social, and technological benefits, as well as critical public policy objectives, that will result from the implementation of the Project. These Project characteristics will not only provide significant advantages to the City and its residents but also offer benefits to surrounding communities and the broader region.

The City Council has carefully balanced these substantial economic and social benefits against the significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact of the Project. The City Council recognizes that the Project's efficient goods movement infrastructure, job creation, increased revenue for public services, and alignment with regional planning objectives contribute to critical economic stability and growth for the City and the region.

Given these and the other significant and far-reaching benefits identified above, the City Council finds that the Project's identified advantages outweigh its significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact, and the City Council hereby determines, based on substantial evidence in the Public Record, that these benefits override the Project's one significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impact.