



**DRAFT**

**Addendum to  
Monterey Park General Plan  
Final Environmental Impact Report**

---

**Monterey Park General Plan Amendment  
Initial Study/Addendum**

---

LEAD AGENCY:

**City of Monterey Park**  
320 W. Newmark Avenue  
Monterey Park, California 91754  
**Contact: Ms. Samantha Tewasart**  
626.307.1315

PREPARED BY:

**RBF Consulting**  
14725 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, California 92618  
**Contact: Ms. Starla Barker, AICP**  
949.472.3505

April 2014

JN 135979





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>Overview .....</b>                              | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1        | Environmental Review and Approval .....            | 1         |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>Purpose of This Initial Study/Addendum.....</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1        | Incorporation by Reference .....                   | 4         |
| 2.2        | Monterey Park General Plan .....                   | 4         |
| 2.3        | Monterey Park General Plan Final EIR .....         | 6         |
| 2.4        | Tiering of the Environmental Review.....           | 9         |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>Project Description.....</b>                    | <b>10</b> |
| 3.1        | Project Location .....                             | 10        |
| 3.2        | Proposed Project .....                             | 10        |
| 3.3        | Approvals.....                                     | 11        |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Initial Study Checklist .....</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>Environmental Analysis.....</b>                 | <b>13</b> |
| 5.1        | Aesthetics .....                                   | 14        |
| 5.2        | Agriculture and Forest Resources.....              | 16        |
| 5.3        | Air Quality .....                                  | 18        |
| 5.4        | Biological Resources .....                         | 21        |
| 5.5        | Cultural Resources .....                           | 23        |
| 5.6        | Geology and Soils.....                             | 25        |
| 5.7        | Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....                     | 28        |
| 5.8        | Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....               | 33        |
| 5.9        | Hydrology and Water Quality .....                  | 36        |
| 5.10       | Land Use and Planning.....                         | 40        |
| 5.11       | Mineral Resources .....                            | 42        |
| 5.12       | Noise .....  | 43        |
| 5.13       | Population and Housing.....                        | 46        |
| 5.14       | Public Services .....                              | 48        |
| 5.15       | Recreation .....                                   | 50        |
| 5.16       | Transportation/Traffic.....                        | 51        |
| 5.17       | Utilities and Service Systems.....                 | 55        |
| 5.18       | Mandatory Findings of Significance.....            | 58        |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Environmental Evaluation Personnel.....</b>     | <b>60</b> |



This page intentionally left blank.



## **1.0 OVERVIEW**

### **1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

This document was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq.*) and *CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000, *et seq.*). The City of Monterey Park (“City”) prepared this addendum to the Certified Final Environmental Impact Report for the Monterey Park General Plan (the “General Plan”) certified on July 18, 2001 (the “FEIR”). The City is the project applicant.

The FEIR analyzes implementation and buildout of the General Plan over a 20-year planning period. Although there were no specific development projects proposed in conjunction with the General Plan, the FEIR analyzes a maximum development potential of approximately 3,030 new dwelling units and 5.0 million square feet of non-residential development in the General Plan area at buildout of properties citywide pursuant to the proposed land use policy.<sup>1</sup>

In 2008, the Monterey Park City Council directed staff to initiate the “greening” of the City. The City’s first step in this process is to create two new General Plan Elements: the Sustainable Community and Healthy Community Elements. In September 2010, the Monterey Park City Council adopted Resolution No. 11366 approving the application for grant funds for the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program under the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84) for preparation of these Elements. The Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements form the foundation from which “Green planning” can occur. The Sustainable Community Element facilitates future development aligned with sustainability principles and smart growth concepts and the Healthy Community Element addresses the health of residents, providing guidance on topics that promote health and initiates programs to regularly monitor health data.

The project analyzed by this Addendum involves the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements and associated Implementation Program. These Elements establish goals and policies to guide City efforts to support and promote a healthier and more sustainable community. Once adopted, these optional Elements would have the same legal status as the mandatory Elements.

The proposed amendment would not modify the Land Use Policy Map or intensities/densities identified within the General Plan Land Use Element. No changes to the maximum development potential approved for the General Plan and analyzed in the FEIR would occur with the proposed amendment.

Under CEQA, once an EIR is certified for a project, there is a strong presumption against requiring further environmental review. Public Resources Code §21166 provides that once an EIR has been completed, the lead agency may not require a subsequent or supplemental EIR unless:

---

<sup>1</sup> The development projections identified for the General Plan represent a development level of approximately 75 to 80 percent of the maximum theoretical buildout (FEIR, page 7).



- Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the EIR;
- Substantial changes have occurred in the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken that will require major revisions in the EIR; or
- New information of substantial importance to the project that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete becomes available.

The *CEQA Guidelines* provide that further environmental review is required only if proposed changes to the project will require “major revisions” to the previously certified EIR because of new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts (*CEQA Guidelines* § 15162). Therefore, once an EIR has been certified, no subsequent EIR should be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - a) *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;*
  - b) *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*
  - c) *Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or*
  - d) *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.*

The Initial Study concludes that the environmental impacts of the General Plan, as modified by the proposed amendment, does not require substantial changes to the FEIR, will not create any form of significant environmental impacts that were not previously analyzed in the FEIR, nor will the impacts of the modified project be more severe than those already analyzed in the FEIR. Therefore, the City has determined that the proposed project requires an Addendum to the



FEIR. CEQA Guidelines § 15164(a) states the following with respect to an Addendum to an EIR:

- (a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.*

An Addendum is appropriate if the minor technical changes or modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum is not required to be circulated for public review; however, an Addendum is to be considered by the decision-making body prior to making a decision on the project.

This Initial Study comprises the Addendum to the Monterey Park General Plan FEIR associated with the proposed amendment.



## **2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY/ADDENDUM**

In accordance with CEQA, this Initial Study/Addendum was prepared to determine potentially significant impacts upon the environment resulting from the proposed amendments to the Monterey Park General Plan. An Initial Study is normally a preliminary analysis prepared by a Lead Agency, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project, in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* § 15063. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project and to determine whether an Addendum, Subsequent EIR, or a Supplement to an EIR is required for the proposed project, in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines*, §§ 15164, 15162, or 15163.

The environmental process being undertaken as part of the proposed project began with the initial project and environmental research. The results of this Initial Study document that an Addendum to the FEIR is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed amendment to the General Plan. As noted, pursuant to the *CEQA Guidelines*, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR is not required to be circulated for public review. However, the City chose to make the Addendum available to the public for a period of 20 days. An Addendum is to be considered by the decision-making body before making a decision on the project. If the City determines that the proposed project will have no significant long-term, unmitigatable environmental effects, an Addendum will be incorporated into the file for the project.

### **2.1 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE**

The following documents were utilized during preparation of this Initial Study and are incorporated by reference in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15148 and 15150.

- City of Monterey Park General Plan, July 2001.
- Monterey Park General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, July 2001.

These documents are available at the City of Monterey Park Community Development Department, 320 West Newmark Avenue, Monterey Park.

### **2.2 MONTEREY PARK GENERAL PLAN**

The Monterey Park General Plan is a long-range plan for the physical development of the incorporated City and its Sphere of Influence (SOI). The General Plan guides the City to the year 2020 by establishing goals and policies for land use, circulation, economic development, and related issues. There are no specific development projects proposed in conjunction with the General Plan.

The General Plan currently consists of the following Elements:

- Land Use
- Economic Development
- Circulation



- Housing
- Safety and Community Services
- Resources

## **LAND USE**

Through maps and text, the Land Use Element defines the distribution and intensity of development of residential neighborhoods, commercial and employment districts, parks and other open spaces, and governmental and institutional uses of property in Monterey Park. The Land Use Element includes the Land Use Policy Map, which graphically illustrates the land use policy. The Land Use Plan identifies a series of focus areas throughout the community where specific policies are implemented to guide the City toward its land use goals. The Land Use Element also includes the Urban Design Plan in order to enhance the visual character of the community.

## **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

The Economic Development Element establishes goals and policies to guide City efforts to maintain an economically viable community. The Element is primarily connected to the Land Use and Housing Elements. The Economic Development Element provides the overall framework for decision making that affects economic development in the City. The Economic Development Strategy Plan presents a set of strategies and actions to maintain the economic health of Monterey Park.

## **CIRCULATION**

The purpose of the Circulation Element is to provide a safe, efficient, and adequate circulation system that responds to all circulation needs. The Element addresses the physical circulation system consisting of freeways, streets, bicycle routes, sidewalks, and trails, as well as modes of transportation, including cars, buses, trucks, trains, bicycles, ridesharing, and walking. Goals and policies are provided to respond to a diverse population with a variety of transportation needs.

## **HOUSING**

The Housing Element represents the City's efforts to provide housing opportunities for all segments of the community. The Element identifies housing needs in the City and sets forth the policies to guide future housing development consistent with the policies in the General Plan. The Housing Element specifies ways in which the housing needs of existing and future resident populations can be met. The City's current Housing Element covers a period extending from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2014.

## **SAFETY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

The Safety and Community Services Element addresses hazards in the physical and built environments and provides goals and policies focused on reducing the potential risk of death, injuries, property damage, and economic and social dislocation from hazards. Hazards include earthquakes, dam or reservoir failure, excessive noise and hazardous materials associated with



commercial and industrial business activity. The Element also addresses the fire and law enforcement services needed to safeguard the community.

## RESOURCES

The Resources Element focuses on the conservation and enhancement of resources within the City. Because the City offers few “natural” resources such as forests or wildlife habitat or agricultural land, the Element directs policy toward preserving those resources important in the urban environment and critical to preserving the City’s heritage for future generations. Resources include City parks and other improved open space areas, historic resources, water resources, and air quality.

## IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The General Plan includes an Implementation Program that identifies programs the City will undertake to implement General Plan goals and policies. Individual implementation programs serve as a guide to City decision makers regarding future programming decisions related to assignment of staff and the expenditure of City funds. The program identifies individual program responsibility, funding sources, and time frame for completion.

## GENERAL PLAN BUILDOUT

The General Plan establishes density and intensity limits for all land use areas. However, existing development has not been built to these maximum limits. The development projections established for the General Plan represent a development level of approximately 75 to 80 percent of the maximum theoretical buildout. The General Plan assumes approximately 3,030 new housing units and 5.0 million square feet of new commercial, office, entertainment, and other nonresidential development could be accommodated by the proposed land use policy. The General Plan assumes this buildout will occur by year 2020, the General Plan horizon year.

## 2.3 MONTEREY PARK GENERAL PLAN FINAL EIR

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following impacts and mitigation measures were adopted by the City Council as part of its CEQA Findings in connection with approving the General Plan. Each will be implemented, as applicable, and are included as part of the project analyzed in this document.

| Impact   | Mitigation   |
|--|--|
| <b>Transportation /Circulation</b>   |  |
| <i>Project Level and Cumulative</i>  |  |
| While the Circulation Element identifies roadway improvements and other measures to minimize the level of impact, significant, unavoidable impacts are anticipated at the following intersections in the City: | 1. The City will monitor traffic volumes at the Atlantic Boulevard/Garvey Avenue and Garfield Avenue/Garvey Avenue intersections in effort to continually review innovative ways to improve LOS. |



| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation</b>  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atlantic Boulevard/Garvey Avenue – Level of Service F</li> <li>• Garfield Avenue/Garvey Avenue – Level of Service F</li> </ul> <p>Significant, unavoidable impacts are anticipated at the following locations immediately adjacent in the City of Montebello:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garfield Avenue/Via Campo</li> <li>• Garfield Avenue/Pomona Boulevard</li> </ul> <p>Significant cumulative impacts due to the project and ambient growth will occur on Interstate 10 (San Bernardino freeway), Interstate 710 (Long Beach freeway), and State Route 60 (Pomona freeway).</p> | <p>2. The City shall coordinate with the City of Montebello to implement improvements at the Garfield Avenue/Via Campo intersection to improve LOS to acceptable levels.</p> <p>3. The City shall coordinate with the City of Montebello and Caltrans to implement improvements at the Garfield Avenue/Pomona Boulevard intersection to improve LOS to acceptable levels.</p> <p>4. Mitigation measures 1 through 3 will be incorporated into the final General Plan as policy and implementing programs.</p>  |
| <b>Air Quality</b>   |  |
| <i>CO Hot Spot</i>   |  |
| Traffic associated with project implementation over the long term could create carbon monoxide “hot spots” at the Garfield Avenue/Garvey Avenue and New Avenue/Garvey Avenue intersections, affecting any future residential or similar sensitive uses.  | 1. If a sensitive receptor locates within approximately 150 feet of the intersection, the property owner shall be responsible for ensuring air-tight construction. Air conditioning must be provided so that open windows will not be relied upon for cooling in the summer.   |
| <b>Noise</b>   |  |
| <i>Interior Noise Levels along Potrero Grande Drive</i>  |  |
| Over the long term, increasing traffic volumes along Potrero Grande Drive, between Markland Drive and Arroyo Drive will result in an approximate 8 decibel increase in the ambient sound environment. This increase will result in sound levels exceeding the levels considered appropriate for residential land uses and will impact residences along Potrero Grande Drive.   | <p>1. Existing exterior noise levels along Potrero Grande Drive between Markland Drive and Arroyo Drive currently exceed 65 dB(A) CNEL. The City will conduct an analysis of interior noise levels at residences and other sensitive receptors along this roadway segment to establish a baseline for future monitoring.</p> <p>2. The City will establish a monitoring program to monitor interior noise levels at the identified sensitive receptors. If, over time, the interior noise levels increase by 3 dB(A) or more over the baseline, and such increase can be attributed to increased traffic volumes on Potrero Grande Drive, the City will engage in a retrofitting program to return interior noise levels to baseline conditions.</p> <p>3. The retrofitting program may include undertaking the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of sound-rated windows</li> <li>• Installation of weather/sound installation</li> </ul> |



| Impact | Mitigation   |
|--------|--|
|        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of sound walls, if can feasibly be accomplished without blocking access</li> <li>• Other structural modifications, features, or measures determined appropriate by the City</li> </ul> <p>4. To fund the retrofitting program, the City will establish a program whereby major development projects that contribute to traffic volumes on Potrero Grande Drive pay their fair-share of the program's costs.</p> <p>5. This monitoring and retrofitting program will be incorporated into the final General Plan as a policy and an implementing program.</p> |

**SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

The FEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan will result in significant unavoidable project-level and cumulative impacts to Transportation/Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, and Solid Waste, which cannot be fully mitigated. The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for these impacts on July 18, 2001 when it certified the FEIR.

The following are the specific significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts that were identified as resulting from General Plan implementation. A detailed discussion of each of the impacts can be found in Section 3.0, *Environmental Impacts*, of the FEIR.

**Transportation/Circulation**

While the Circulation Element identifies roadway improvements and other measures to minimize the level of the impact, significant unavoidable impacts are anticipated at the following intersections in the City:

- Atlantic Boulevard/Garvey Avenue
- Garfield Avenue/Garvey Avenue

Significant unavoidable impacts are anticipated at the following locations immediately adjacent in the City of Montebello:

- Garfield Avenue/Via Campo
- Garfield Avenue/Pomona Boulevard

Significant cumulative impacts resulting from traffic volume increases due to the project and ambient growth will occur on Interstate 10, Interstate 710, and State Route 60.

**Air Quality**

Air pollutant emissions associated with new vehicle trips and stationary sources will result in emissions levels that exceed the thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality



Management District (SCAQMD) for reactive organic compounds (ROC) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). Despite efforts on the part of the City to reduce vehicle trips, including establishment of mixed-use land use districts, and to participate in regional efforts to improve air quality, impacts relative to these pollutants will be significant and unavoidable.

Development associated with General Plan implementation, together with growth in surrounding cities and unincorporated areas, will result in air pollutant emissions that exceed SCAQMD standards.

### **Noise**

Increasing traffic volumes along Potrero Grande Drive, between Markland Drive and Arroyo Drive will result in an approximate eight decibel increase in the ambient sound environment. This increase will result in sound levels exceeding the levels considered appropriate for residential land uses and will impact residences along Potrero Grande Drive.

### **Solid Waste**

New development has the potential to generate up to an additional 22.8 tons of solid waste (maximum) per day at buildout, despite City programs referenced in the General Plan that are designed to comply with AB 939 requirements to reduce the waste stream. Given the fact that regional landfills are nearing capacity, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

## **2.4 TIERING OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

CEQA § 21093(b) states that “environmental impact reports shall be tiered whenever feasible, as determined by the lead agency.” “Tiering” refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (such as one prepared for a general plan or policy statement) in subsequent EIRs or Initial Studies/Negative Declarations on narrower projects; and concentrating the later environmental review on the issues specific to the later project [CEQA Guidelines § 15152(a)].

Tiering is appropriate when it helps a public agency to focus on issues at each level of environmental review and to avoid or eliminate duplicative analysis of environmental effects examined in previous environmental impact reports [CEQA § 21093(a)].

Subsequent projects should be tiered off the original Program EIR and this Addendum to the greatest extent feasible in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15168.



## **3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **3.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING**

Monterey Park is located approximately seven miles east of downtown Los Angeles in the San Gabriel Valley. The City is bordered by the City of Alhambra on the north, City of Rosemead and the unincorporated community of South San Gabriel to the east, Montebello to the south, and the unincorporated community of East Los Angeles to the west. Three major freeways bound the City: the Pomona Freeway (SR-60) on the south, the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) to the north, and the Long Beach Freeway (I-710) to the west.

The Monterey Park General Plan planning area consists of the City's corporate limits and the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI). The entire planning area encompasses 5,834 acres, with approximately 5,256 acres within the City and 579 acres within the SOI.

### **3.2 PROPOSED PROJECT**

The City of Monterey Park is proposing to amend the General Plan. The amendment involves the addition of two General Plan Elements: Healthy Community and Sustainable Community and associated Implementation Program. The Elements establish goals and policies to guide City efforts to support and promote a healthier and more sustainable community. Once adopted, these optional Elements would have the same legal status as the mandatory Elements.

The proposed amendment would not modify the Land Use Policy Map or intensities/densities identified within the General Plan Land Use Element. No changes to the maximum development potential approved for the General Plan that was analyzed in the FEIR would occur with the proposed amendment.

#### **HEALTHY COMMUNITY ELEMENT**

The Healthy Community Element establishes goals and policies to guide City efforts to support and promote a healthier community by "making the healthy choice the easy choice" for every community member. These efforts are designed to make it easier to eat well, be physically active, access health care, reverse unhealthy habits, and avoid exposure to toxins and disease. This Element addresses a number of topics, including:

- Health at Home
- Active Living
- Healthy Eating
- Community Life
- Health Care and Communicable Disease Prevention
- Alcohol and Tobacco Use

The conditions for creating a healthy community are addressed by a number of other General Plan Elements, such as the Land Use Element, Circulation Element, and Safety and Community Services Element, as well as the proposed Sustainable Community Element. These Elements



contribute to the framework that supports a healthy community by directing where different types of land uses are located, how streets are designed, where parks are provided, and what types of services are offered to community members. Opportunities for physical activity are supported by the goals and policies promoting a walkable and bikeable community in the Sustainable Community Element, Circulation Element, and Land Use Element.

The Healthy Community Element complements these other Elements by providing additional guidance on topics that have particular importance for promoting health, such as recreation and air quality, and introducing topics not addressed elsewhere, namely food, tobacco, alcohol, and health care.

### **SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY ELEMENT**

The Sustainable Community Element establishes goals and policies to guide City efforts to become a more sustainable and resilient community through changes to municipal operations and by promoting and supporting sustainable behaviors of individual community members. These efforts are designed to reduce private automobile dependency, increase conservation of natural resources, reduce waste, and increase community resiliency by preparing for emergencies.

This Element addresses a number of topics, including:

- Land Use and Transportation
- Natural Resources
- Waste Reduction and Diversion
- Emergency Preparedness and Resiliency
- Community Participation and Communications

There is overlap between this Element and other Elements of the General Plan, including the Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Economic Development Element, and Resources Element, as well as the Healthy Community Element. For example, Land Use Element goals and policies encourage a stable economic base and provide for social needs while mitigating environmental impacts and providing for open space. The Circulation Element addresses multiple modes of transportation, including opportunities for non-vehicular travel. The Resources Element includes policies regarding water conservation and improving air quality.

The Sustainable Community Element complements these other Elements, with a focus on the environmental aspects of sustainability. Economic vibrancy is addressed in the Economic Development Element; and social equity is supported throughout the General Plan, most directly in the proposed Healthy Community Element. The Sustainable Community Element addresses topics not already included in other Elements, and expands upon or reinforces other goals and policies to create a comprehensive plan to become a more sustainable community.

### **3.3 APPROVALS**

The proposed project would require the following City approvals:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review – approval of Addendum
- Amendment to the Monterey Park General Plan



## 4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The environmental analysis in Section 5.0 is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the *CEQA Guidelines* and used by the City of Monterey Park in its environmental review process. This Initial Study has been prepared to determine if the proposed changes to the General Plan will trigger any new or more severe significant environmental impacts as compared to those analyzed in the context of the FEIR.

The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance



## 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

An Initial Study is normally a preliminary analysis prepared by a Lead Agency, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project, in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* § 15063. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project.

A Final Program EIR was previously certified for the Monterey Park General Plan; therefore, this Initial Study is being prepared by the Lead Agency, the City of Monterey Park, to determine whether an Addendum, Subsequent EIR or a Supplement to an EIR is required for the proposed project, in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines*, §§ 15164, 15162, or 15163. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* §§ 15164(a), 15162(a)(1), 15162(a)(2), and 15162(a)(3), if the proposed action/revisions to the previous project do not cause “new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects,” then an addendum to the previously certified EIR may be prepared.



## 5.1 AESTHETICS

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

**a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?***

The FEIR concluded that no impact to scenic vistas would occur with implementation of the General Plan, as the Urban Design Plan in the Land Use Element contains goals and policies that will minimize impacts on these views.

The proposed project is the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements to the General Plan. These Elements establish goals and policies to guide City efforts to support and promote a healthier and more sustainable community. The proposed amendment would not modify the Urban Design Plan or allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered in the FEIR. Further, no specific development projects are proposed in conjunction with the General Plan Amendment. Thus, the proposed project would not involve a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus no impacts would occur.

**b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?***

The FEIR concluded that no impact to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur with implementation of the General Plan, as no roadways within the City are designated scenic highways.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan would involve the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements. The proposed amendment would not involve changes to the General Plan Planning Area, potentially resulting in a state scenic highway being located



within the project area. Thus, the proposed project would not involve scenic resources within a state scenic highway not previously considered within the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus no impacts would occur.

**c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?***

The FEIR concluded that the Urban Design Plan will guide the relationship between new development and its surroundings, thus enhancing the visual character of the City. General Plan policies will work to enhance the overall aesthetic quality of streetscapes and development.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan would involve the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements. The proposed amendment would not modify the Urban Design Plan or goals and policies intended to enhance the overall aesthetic quality and character of the City. Further, no specific development projects are proposed in conjunction with the General Plan Amendment. Thus, the proposed project would not involve substantial impacts to the existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings not previously considered within the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus impacts would remain less than significant.

**d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

The FEIR concluded that the City standard development procedures and the Urban Design Plan, including specific policies to enhance the quality and character of public areas and private development in the City, would reduce potential impacts associated with light and glare to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan would involve the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements. The proposed amendment would not modify the Urban Design Plan or goals and policies intended to reduce potential impacts associated with light and glare. Further, no specific development projects are proposed in conjunction with the General Plan Amendment. Thus, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare not previously considered within the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

| <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i> | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. 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?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. 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))?  | No  | No  | Yes   | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  | No  | No  | Yes   | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. 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?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) **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?**
- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

The FEIR concluded that no impact to farmland or land zoned for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract would occur with implementation of the General Plan, as no agricultural lands or uses occur within Monterey Park.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan would not involve changes to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Thus, the proposed project would not involve lands identified as



Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or land zoned for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus no impact would occur.

c) ***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))?***

d) ***Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

The FEIR did not address forestland resources. Subsequent to adoption of the FEIR, amendments to the *CEQA Guidelines* resulted in the addition of forestry resources as a topical area to be addressed within *CEQA Guidelines* Appendix G. There are no forest lands located within the General Plan study area. Additionally, the General Plan area is not designated or zoned as forest land. No impacts related to this environmental topic were anticipated as a result of implementation of the General Plan, and no mitigation measures were required.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.

e) ***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?***

Refer to Impact Statements 4.2(a), 4.2(c), and 4.2(d), which concluded no impacts.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



### 5.3 AIR QUALITY

| <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>  | <b>Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</b> | <b>Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</b> | <b>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</b> | <b>Same Impact as “Approved Project”</b> | <b>Less Impact Than “Approved Project”</b> |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   | No   | No   | No   | ✓  |  |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  | No   | No   | No   | ✓  |  |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | No   | No   | No   | ✓  |  |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  | No   | No   | No   | ✓  |  |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   | No   | No   | No   | ✓  |  |

#### Impact Analysis

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

The FEIR concluded that the General Plan Resources Element, which addresses compliance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), is designed to ensure City land-use decisions work to implement and comply with Federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to air quality. The General Plan would not conflict or obstruct implementation of the AQMP and impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan involves the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements. These elements would not result in any new types of land uses or increased development densities/intensities beyond what was previously analyzed in the FEIR. The amendment to the General Plan would not lead to any activities that would result in short- or long-term emissions. The Sustainable Community Element would help reduce overall emissions levels by promoting and supporting conservation of natural resources, reductions in automobile dependency, and reductions in waste generation. As a result, the proposed General Plan amendment has the potential to reduce emissions and would not conflict with the AQMP.

**Conclusion: Same Impact Than “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



**b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

The FEIR concluded that construction-related impacts would be temporary and can be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with existing City, State, and SCAQMD regulations. However, the FEIR concluded that long-term impacts associated with new development in the City would contribute to a relative increase in emissions from mobile and stationary sources. Therefore, long-term air quality impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan were considered significant and unavoidable despite the implementation of goals and policies from the Resources Element.

The proposed General Plan Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements establish goals and policies to guide City efforts to support and promote a healthier and more sustainable community. As described above, the Sustainable Community Element would help reduce overall emissions levels by promoting and supporting conservation of natural resources, reductions in automobile dependency, and reductions in waste generation. Neither the Healthy Community Element nor the Sustainability Element would lead to activities that would result in short- or long-term emissions that would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Further, no specific development projects are proposed in conjunction with the proposed General Plan Amendment. Thus, the proposed project would not involve substantial impacts not previously considered within the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**c) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

The FEIR concluded that as the combined emissions from uses in the City and other cities in the San Gabriel Valley subregion and the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) would continue to exceed State and federal standards, cumulative impacts were concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan would not result in any new types of land uses or increased development densities/intensities beyond that permitted under the General Plan. Additionally, the General Plan amendment would not involve any changes to the development densities/intensities permitted under the Monterey Park Municipal Code (“MPMC”). The proposed amendment would not lead to any activities that would result in short- or long-term emissions. The Sustainable Community Element would help reduce overall emissions levels by promoting and supporting conservation of natural resources, reductions in automobile dependency, and reductions in waste generation. Additionally, no specific development projects are proposed in conjunction with the General Plan Amendment. The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR and would result in no greater impacts than previously identified.



**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

The FEIR concluded that carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations exceed the State 8-hour standard of 9 parts per million (ppm) at two intersections. Impacts at the Garfield Avenue/Garvey Avenue and New Avenue/Garvey Avenue intersections were concluded to be significant. The FEIR included mitigation to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to CO hotspots to a less than significant level. The mitigation requires air conditioning for new residences that would be located within approximately 150 feet of the impacted intersections.

The proposed General Plan amendment would not allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. The proposed amendment would not lead to any new development nor would it result in any activities that would result in any significant impacts on sensitive receptors. The Sustainable Community Element includes policies to reduce private automobile dependence; thereby reducing vehicle trips and potentially reducing CO hotspot impacts at intersections.

**Conclusion: Same Impact Than “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

The FEIR concluded that development that would occur under the General Plan would be similar to current uses in the City and would not generate unusual or noxious odors. Any new uses would be required to comply with SCAQMD and local City regulations regarding odor control. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan Amendment would involve the addition of the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements. The SCAQMD has identified land uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. These uses include activities involving livestock, rendering facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, and businesses involved in fiberglass molding. The Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements would not result in any new types of land uses, including uses identified by the SCAQMD that are associated with odor complaints.

**Conclusion: Same Impact Than “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. 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?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***
- b) ***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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***
- c) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***



- d) ***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?***
- e) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***
- f) ***Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

The FEIR concluded that no unique biological resources or habitat areas occur within Monterey Park. No unique, rare, or endangered species of animals or plants are known to occur in the City. Therefore, no impact to biological resources would occur with implementation of the General Plan.

The proposed amendment would not alter the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Thus, the proposed project would not involve areas with the potential for biological resources not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



## 5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?    | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?                       | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

**a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?***

According to the FEIR, several structures within the City have been identified as having regional and local importance, including the Jardin del Encanto and the Cascades Park complex, which are listed on the California Register of Historic Resources. The General Plan does not change the designation of historic structures, nor the City’s preservation objectives or policies. Therefore, no impacts on historic resources were identified.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan. The proposed project would not involve any changes to the designation of historic structures or modify any existing preservation objectives or policies. Further, the proposed project would not alter the boundaries of the General Plan study area, and therefore would not include areas not previously considered in the FEIR. Any future development within the General Plan study area would continue to be reviewed to determine whether the proposed project would involve removal of a historic resource or indirectly impact a historic resource.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impacts would occur.

**b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?***

**c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

**d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***



According to the FEIR, the City is largely built out and does not contain any known archaeological or paleontological resources. The potential for uncovering significant resources within the City is considered remote, given that no such resources have been discovered during prior development activity and all new development would occur on previously developed sites. Therefore, no impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources or to human remains were identified.

The proposed amendment to the General Plan would not involve project-specific development that could potentially impact a currently unknown/undiscovered archaeological or paleontological resource. Additionally, the proposed project would not alter the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Thus, the proposed project would not involve known archaeological or paleontological resources not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



## 5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |   |   |   |                                   |                                     |
| 1) 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 2) Strong seismic ground shaking?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 4) Landslides?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. 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?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2004), creating substantial risks to life or property?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. 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?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***
- 1) ***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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***
  - 2) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

As stated in the FEIR, no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones have been designated within the City. However, the City overlies a number of blind thrust faults. These faults are capable of producing ground shaking. The General Plan Safety and Community Services Element contains goals and policies to minimize potential property damage and loss of life in the event of



an earthquake. Existing building practices, along with the General Plan goals and policies would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Existing General Plan goals and policies that would minimize damage in the event of an earthquake would remain unchanged. Further, future development within the General Plan study area would be required to comply with the General Plan and existing building practices.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

According to the FEIR, the potential for liquefaction within the General Plan study area is low due to low groundwater levels. Therefore, no impacts associated with liquefaction were identified.

The proposed amendment would not alter the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Thus, the proposed project would not involve areas with the potential for liquefaction not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.

**4) Landslides?**

According to the FEIR, soils within the hillside areas can be unstable and susceptible to sliding. Existing City practices and policies in the General Plan would reduce the hazards associated with landslides to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Existing General Plan goals and policies that would reduce hazards associated with landslides would remain unchanged. Further, future development within the General Plan study area would be required to comply with the General Plan and existing building practices.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



- b) ***Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***
- c) ***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 an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?***
- d) ***Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2004), creating substantial risks to life or property?***
- e) ***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?***

According to the FEIR, the General Plan includes goals and policies that would reduce the risk of landsliding or collapse. Existing City regulations and compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements would prevent soil erosion. Development with the City is connected to the citywide sewer system. Less than significant or no impact with regard to soil conditions would occur.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Existing General Plan goals and policies that would reduce hazards associated with landslides and soil conditions would remain unchanged. Further, future development within the General Plan study area would be required to comply with the General Plan and NPDES requirements.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?      | Not Applicable  | Not Applicable  | No  | Not Applicable                    | Not Applicable                      |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | Not Applicable  | Not Applicable  | No  | Not Applicable                    | Not Applicable                      |

### Impact Analysis

**a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***

At the time of certification of the FEIR, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were not part of the required CEQA analysis. Effective March 18, 2010, the State adopted amendments to the *CEQA Guidelines* requiring the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. The *CEQA Guidelines* regarding GHG emissions do not specifically address situations involving subsequent implementation actions for a project with a previously certified EIR. Therefore, a GHG emissions analysis is provided below to respond to Section VII of Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*.

### Global Climate Change

California is a substantial contributor of global GHGs, emitting over 400 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) per year.<sup>2</sup> Climate studies indicate that California is likely to see an increase of three to four degrees Fahrenheit (°F) over the next century. Methane is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which is to increase the earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission.

The impact of human activities on global climate change is apparent in the observational record. Air trapped by ice has been extracted from core samples taken from polar ice sheets to determine the global atmospheric variation of CO<sub>2</sub>, methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) from before the start of industrialization (approximately 1750), to over 650,000 years ago. For that period, it was found that CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations ranged from 180 parts per million (ppm) to 300 ppm. For the period from approximately 1750 to the present, global CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations increased from a pre-industrialization period concentration of 280 ppm to 379 ppm in 2005, with the 2005 value far exceeding the upper end of the pre-industrial period range.

<sup>2</sup> California Energy Commission, *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2011*, August 2013.



## Regulations and Significance Criteria

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) constructed several emission trajectories of GHGs needed to stabilize global temperatures and climate change impacts. It concluded that a stabilization of GHGs at 400 to 450 ppm carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>eq)<sup>3</sup> concentration is required to keep global mean warming below 2 degrees Celsius (°C), which in turn is assumed to be necessary to avoid dangerous climate change.

Executive Order S-3-05 was issued in June 2005, which established the following GHG emission reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- 2020: Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) determine what the statewide GHG emissions level was in 1990, and approve a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to that level, to be achieved by 2020. CARB has approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 million metric tons (MMT) of CO<sub>2</sub>eq.

Due to the nature of global climate change, it is not anticipated that any single development project would have a substantial effect on global climate change. In actuality, GHG emissions from the proposed project would combine with emissions emitted across California, the United States, and the world to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.

In June 2008, the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published a Technical Advisory, which provides informal guidance for public agencies as they address the issue of climate change in CEQA documents.<sup>4</sup> This is assessed by determining whether a proposed project is consistent with or obstructs the 39 Recommended Actions identified by CARB in its Climate Change Scoping Plan which includes nine Early Action Measures (qualitative approach). The Attorney General's Mitigation Measures identify areas where GHG emissions reductions can be achieved in order to achieve the goals of AB 32. As set forth in the OPR Technical Advisory and in the proposed amendments to the *CEQA Guidelines* § 15064.4, this analysis examines whether the project's GHG emissions are significant based on a qualitative and performance based standard (Proposed *CEQA Guidelines* § 15064.4(a)(1) and (2)).

### Greenhouse Gas Thresholds

In 2012, the City of Monterey Park adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to set forth a comprehensive strategy to address GHG emissions related to land use patterns, transportation, building design, energy use, water demand, and waste generation. The CAP outlines a road map to reduce GHGs and promote economic growth based on clean technology and sustainable practices.

---

<sup>3</sup> Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>eq) – A metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential.

<sup>4</sup> Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, 2008.



The CAP was developed to serve as the City’s qualified GHG-reduction plan and programmatic tiering document for the purposes of CEQA for analysis of impacts of GHG emissions and climate change. The City determined that the reduction target under the CAP would result in GHG emissions from activities covered by the CAP that are less than cumulatively considerable under CEQA.

As the CAP has undergone CEQA environmental review (IS/MND dated June 29, 2012) and was publicly adopted by City Council on 2012, and because it is intended to reduce GHG emissions in the City to a less-than-cumulatively-considerable level, it may be relied upon to address the impacts for future projects that are consistent with the CAP. Therefore, the significance of the project will be determined based on its consistency with the City’s adopted CAP.

**Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases**

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. The Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements would establish goals and policies to guide City efforts to support and promote a healthier and more sustainable community.

The Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements would facilitate the implementation of the CAP. For example, the CAP identifies that these elements would promote more sustainable growth within the City, including aligning housing, transportation, and land use. The CAP includes related policies and action steps to enable the City to achieve critical goals such as reduced automobile dependence, reduced GHG emissions, and conservation of energy and water.

Table 5.7-1, *Sustainability Element Consistency with the City’s Climate Action Plan*, provides a consistency analysis between CAP measures and the proposed amendment. It should be noted that the Goals and Policies within the Healthy Community Element are not applicable to GHG emissions or the CAP measures. As depicted in Table 5.7-1, the proposed project would be consistent with the CAP and would not hinder its implementation or effectiveness.

**Table 5.7-1  
 Sustainability Element Consistency with the City’s Climate Action Plan**

| Climate Action Plan Measure   | Sustainability Element Consistency   |
|---|--|
| <b>Building Efficiency</b>  |  |
| <i>E1. Efficiency Requirements for New Development.</i> The City, in coordination with the California Building Standards Commission and the California Energy Commission, will adopt energy efficiency regulations for new construction projects to meet Tier I energy efficiency standards (contained in Section 503.1.2 of the 2008 California Green Building Code [CGBC]). | Goal 9 of the Sustainable Community Element focuses on minimizing GHG emissions from energy production by reducing energy demand and expanding the use of renewable energy sources. Policy 9.1 would increase energy efficiency, Policy 9.2 would focus on renewable energy systems, and Policy 9.3 encourages solar-ready roofs for new construction and renovations. |
| <i>E2. Building Retrofits.</i> The City can focus programming in neighborhoods where these upgrades are most needed and maximize participation in the Los Angeles County Energy Upgrade California Program.   |  |



| Climate Action Plan Measure  | Sustainability Element Consistency  |
|--|---|
| <p><u>E3. Appliance Upgrades.</u> The City will partner with SCE, the Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas), and the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), and provide additional outreach to the community to increase awareness about rebate and incentive programs, the efficiencies that may be gained from Energy-Star-rated appliances, and the cost savings associated with Energy Star appliances.</p>  | <p>Goal 10 focuses on energy efficiency and the associated policies would encourage the City to achieve the San Gabriel Valley Energy Wise Partnership Platinum level.</p> <p>Additionally, Policy 10.2 would facilitate activities that contribute towards meeting the goals of the City's adopted CAP regarding energy efficiency and conservation. Policy 10.3 would promote the use of renewable energy in City-owned facilities to reduce the municipal "carbon footprint" (total GHG emissions from energy production).</p>   |
| <p><u>E4. Smart Meters.</u> The City will perform outreach with SCE, other jurisdictions, and organizations to accelerate "Smart Grid" integration in the community.</p>   |   |
| <b>Increase Renewable Energy</b>   |   |
| <p><u>R1. Solar Water Heating.</u> The City will facilitate compliance with the California Solar Water Heating and Efficiency Act of 2007 (AB 1470) created a 10-year program aimed at installing solar water heaters in homes and businesses.</p>   | <p>As described above, Goal 9 would reduce GHG emissions by expanding the use of renewable energy sources. Policy 9.2 promotes the installation of small-scale renewable energy systems such as solar panels and wind turbines in new and existing development. Policy 9.3 would encourage the use of solar-ready roofs for new construction and renovations.</p>   |
| <p><u>R2. Solar Photovoltaic Systems.</u> The City will provide targeted outreach to developers and builders about renewable energy incentives and energy efficiency programs offered by the CSI, CEC, U.S. Department of Energy, and energy utilities when they apply for permits, and will encourage them to participate.</p>  |   |
| <b>Land Use</b>  |   |
| <p><u>LU1. Mixed-Use Development.</u> The City will create additional incentives to build and actively facilitate new mixed-use development near existing and planned transit corridors.</p>   | <p>Goal 1 of the Sustainable Community Element provides for a mix of land uses in order to reduce the need for vehicle travel by making other transportation options viable. Additionally, Policy 1.1 requires incentives and active facilitation of mixed-use development near existing and planned transit corridors.</p>   |
| <p><u>LU2. Service Nodes.</u> The City will revise the zoning code to allow for commercial and retail services in employment centers.</p>  | <p>Policy 1.2 encourages supportive uses within or close to large employment centers. Policy 1.3 encourages plazas and outdoor areas to encourage pedestrian use, and Policy 1.4 encourages qualified infill projects to take advantage of California law SB 226, CEQA Streamlining for Infill Projects.</p>  |
| <b>Transportation</b>  |   |
| <p><u>T1. Increase Transit Use.</u> The City will expand the program to provide either discounts to other resident groups, such as students, or increase the subsidy in order to lower the barrier to transit ridership. Additionally, the City will develop marketing or outreach programs to promote the use of the Spirit Bus and other transit options.</p>  | <p>Goal 4 encourages frequent, convenient, and direct transit service, which allows travel within Monterey Park and access to regional transit networks. Related policies would provide comfortable and safe bus stop areas for waiting and boarding, promote use of the Spirit Bus and regional transit services, and facilitate expansion of transit services.</p>  |
| <p><u>T2. Increase Walking and Biking.</u> The City will focus on implementation of traffic-calming projects and other necessary pedestrian amenities and safety improvements to enable walking as an attractive travel mode.</p> <p>The City will also identify opportunities to install bicycle parking in public spaces or to modify existing parking requirements for bicycles, with the aim of increasing the supply of bicycle parking and work with local employers to facilitate the expansion or provision of these facilities.</p> | <p>Goal 5 encourages a connected, multimodal transportation network that promotes walking and bicycling. Policies 5.1 through 5.6 would support this goal and ensure that there are pedestrian networks, multipurpose trails, access from neighborhoods, and various other pedestrian amenities.</p> <p>Additionally, Goal 6 provides for amenities along streets and at popular destinations to make bicycling and walking trips more enjoyable and convenient. Associated policies would address public and private bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities at businesses.</p> |



| Climate Action Plan Measure  | Sustainability Element Consistency   |
|--|--|
| <i>T3. Transportation Demand Management (TDM).</i> The City will designate a TDM Coordinator who will promote these programs at local businesses, showcase the current municipal program as an example, and encourage additional TDM at existing and future businesses.  | Goal 2 of the Sustainable Community Element provides that employers use TDM to discourage peak-hour commuting in single-occupancy vehicles. Policies 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 address municipal TDM, non-commercial TDM, and employer-led TDM respectively.   |
| <b>Water Conservation and Waste Reduction</b>  |  |
| <i>W1. Conserving Water.</i> The City will implement programs and actions in the UWMP with the goal of reducing water consumption by 20% per capita by 2020 (in compliance with SB 7X and the 2010/2011 UWMP). The City will also work with MWD to increase participation in these programs and raise awareness of water conservation practices. | The purpose of Goal 8 of the Sustainable Community Element would be to conserve, protect, and replenish water resources for a sustainable water supply. Associated policies would promote the use of green building and on-site water recycling, drought tolerant City landscaping, and water-efficient landscaping.   |
| <i>W2. Reducing Waste.</i> The City will conduct a variety of outreach programs to increase participation in waste reduction, recycling, and composting programs.  | Goal 12 and the associated policies strive to make Monterey Park a zero waste city where all discarded material resources are reduced, re-used, and recycled back into nature or the marketplace in a manner that protects human health and the environment, with all materials being managed to the highest and best use, eliminating waste sent to landfill. |

Source: City of Monterey Park, *Climate Action Plan*, January 2012.

**Conclusion:** Less than significant impact.

**b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

As noted in Impact Statement 5.7(a), the Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements would facilitate implementation of the City’s CAP. The General Plan amendment to include the Sustainable Community and the Healthy Community Elements are intended to further connect the CAP with the General Plan. These elements would ensure that future development in the City is sustainable, including aligning housing, transportation, and land uses. The CAP includes related policies and action steps to enable the City to achieve critical goals such as reduced automobile dependence, reduced GHG emissions, and conservation of energy and water. As described above, implementation of the Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements would not conflict with facilitation or implementation of the City’s CAP.

**Conclusion:** Less than significant impact.



## 5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. 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?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. 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?                                   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. 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 for people residing or working in the project area? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***
- b) ***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?***
- c) ***Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***



As stated in the FEIR, businesses that use, transport, or dispose of hazardous materials would comply with Federal, State, and local regulations. The General Plan goals and policies along with existing regulations would protect public safety. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Existing General Plan goals and policies that would protect public safety would remain unchanged. Further, new businesses that use, transport, or dispose of hazardous materials within the General Plan study area would be required to comply with the General Plan and existing regulations.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

- d) *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?***
- e) *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 for people residing or working in the project area?***
- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***
- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***
- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

According to the FEIR, the City is not located within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Monterey Park participates in the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) that provides a framework for coordinating multi-agency emergency responses in case of a hazardous materials emergency. The City does not contain nor is it adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. As a result, no new hazardous materials sites, public airports or private airstrips, or wildland areas not previously considered in the FEIR would occur. Further, the proposed amendment would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.



**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



## 5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

#### a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

As stated in the FEIR, the General Plan does not involve any discharge into surface water or groundwater resources. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development. Thus, the proposed project would not involve any discharge into surface water or groundwater resources. The proposed Sustainability Element includes policies for protection and access to clean water,



including exceeding State requirements for stormwater pollution prevention in all public projects and encouraging private projects to exceed requirements. Implementation of the policies would support and enhance the water quality goals and policies within the General Plan Resources Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

According to the FEIR, although the City relies solely on groundwater for its water supply, buildout associated with the General Plan would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The Main San Gabriel Basin has determined and assigned an annual safe yield, which is the amount of groundwater that can be withdrawn from the Basin without depleting groundwater supplies. If the City withdraws additional groundwater, it is purchased from Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and fed back into the basin. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area, potentially resulting in greater water demand than previously analyzed in the FEIR. Further, the proposed amendment would not change the maximum amount of residential development and/or non-residential development anticipated to occur over the 20-year period analyzed as part of the FEIR. Existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to reduce potential impacts to groundwater resources. The proposed Sustainability Element includes policies for conserving water, which would further support and enhance the groundwater supply goals and policies within the General Plan Resources Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

**d) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

As stated in the FEIR, development facilitated by the General Plan would mostly be in the form of public and private redevelopment projects on currently developed land. The General Plan



includes goals and policies to protect public and private property from the effects of soil erosion and flooding. Impacts on drainage patterns were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. Existing General Plan goals and policies that would protect public and private property from the effects of soil erosion and flooding would remain unchanged.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

- e) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***
- f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

According to the FEIR, development facilitated by the General Plan would occur through the redevelopment of currently developed properties and through infill development. New development would be required to comply with the stormwater regulations set forth by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Compliance with existing regulations would minimize potential impacts. It was also concluded in the FEIR that adoption and implementation of the General Plan would not involve any activity that would discharge pollutants into groundwater or otherwise adversely impact water quality. General Plan policies focus on ensuring clean, adequate water supplies. No impacts would occur.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development. Thus, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff or degrade water quality. The proposed Sustainability Element includes policies for protection and access to clean water, including exceeding State requirements for stormwater pollution prevention in all public projects and encouraging private projects to exceed requirements. Implementation of the policies would further support and enhance the water quality goals and policies within the General Plan Resources Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

- g) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***
- h) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***



As stated in the FEIR, the City is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The National Flood Insurance Program rate maps classify all of Monterey Park as an Area X (minimal chance of flooding).

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area that would result in housing or structures being located within the 100-year floodplain.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.

**i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

According to the FEIR, the City could experience flooding associated with dam failure. In the event of failure, properties located to the north and south of Garvey Reservoir could be flooded. Failure of the Laguna Basin would result in flooding to the interchange of the I-710 and I-10 freeways. The General Plan Safety and Community Services Element contains goals and policies to minimize flood impacts from Garvey Reservoir and Laguna Basin. Existing City practices and the goals and policies of the General Plan would minimize flood impacts associated with dam failure to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area that would involve areas of flooding associated with a levee or dam failure not previously considered in the FEIR. The proposed amendment would not expose people or structures to significant flood risk associated with failure of a levee or dam.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

According to the FEIR, the City is not subject to tsunamis due to its elevation and distance from the ocean. The possibility of a seiche at either Garvey Reservoir or Laguna Basin is considered extremely low. Mudflows are addressed in the Geology and Soils section. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

Similarly, the proposed amendment would not result in modifications to the General Plan study area that would potentially subject people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

#### a) *Physically divide an established community?*

According to the FEIR, the General Plan does not propose significant changes in established land use patterns. The General Plan does not provide for any new roadway or other physical feature that would disrupt these patterns. The FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development, including roadways, or changes to existing land use designations.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.

#### b) *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

According to the FEIR, the General Plan implementation program would provide for subsequent amendments of documents to ensure City plans/programs are consistent. Thus, no impacts would result. The General Plan population growth forecasts are within the range of SCAG's 2020 growth forecasts for the City. General Plan policies also support SCAG's regional transportation and mobility goals and the overarching goals set forth in SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific



development. The proposed elements would be consistent with existing General Plan Elements. Further, the proposed elements would not allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. The proposed elements would support SCAG's overarching goals related to reducing vehicle miles traveled, encouraging alternative forms of transportation, and reducing energy consumption.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

As stated in the FEIR, Monterey Park does not contain any unique habitat, and no natural community conservation plan applies to any part of the City. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.

The proposed amendment would not result in modifications to the General Plan study area that would involve areas subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



## 5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. 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?                                | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***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?***
- b) ***Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

The FEIR concluded that no impact associated with the loss of known mineral resources or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site would occur, as no mineral resources occur within the City.

The proposed amendment would not result in modifications to the General Plan study area that would involve areas with known mineral resources or locally-important mineral resource recovery sites not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



## 5.12 NOISE

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

**a) *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

The FEIR determined that compliance with the noise regulations in the MPMC and related regulations would mitigate construction noise to a less than significant level. The FEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan goals and policies would avoid stationary source noise impacts on sensitive uses, resulting in a less than significant impact in this regard. However, operational vehicular traffic noise was determined to result in a significant increase in noise levels along Potrero Grande Drive between Markland Drive and Arroyo Drive. Operational Impacts to residences were concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area. As a result, the proposed amendment would not increase traffic noise (the proposed project would not generate any traffic) or create new stationary noise sources. The existing General Plan goals and policies would also ensure that noise levels comply with the City's standards.



**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR and would result in no greater impacts than previously identified.

- b) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***
- d) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

According to the FEIR, no major sources of groundborne vibration or noise occur in the City. The Monterey Pass Road industrial area largely contains light industrial uses such as food export/import and clothing-related industries that do not create groundborne vibrations or excessive exterior noise. Zoning regulations generally prohibit more intensive industrial businesses. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development. Thus, the proposed project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Further, the proposed amendment would not modify existing land uses or zoning regulations that prohibit more intensive industrial businesses within the City.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

- c) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Refer to Impact Statement 5.12(a), above. The FEIR determined that operational vehicular traffic noise would result in a significant increase in noise levels along Potrero Grande Drive between Markland Drive and Arroyo Drive. The proposed amendment would not generate any traffic and would not contribute to this impact.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR and would result in no greater impacts than previously identified.

- e) ***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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***
- f) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

According to the FEIR, the City is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.



The proposed amendment would not result in modifications to the General Plan study area that would involve areas located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impact would occur.



## 5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial 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)? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) *Induce substantial 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)?***

According to the FEIR, the City’s projected population increase associated with implementation of the General Plan would be slightly higher than projected for the subregion. The growth rate reflects a continuance of the relatively modest growth pattern and largely built-out character of the City. The General Plan is supportive of regional growth management goals and objectives and will provide opportunities for housing and employment-generating development. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes to existing land use designations. The proposed amendment would not induce population growth within the City.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***
- c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

According to the FEIR, the General Plan would facilitate new housing largely within the proposed mixed-use land use categories near activity centers. General Plan policies preserve existing neighborhoods, and thus would not result in displacement of existing homes or people.



Direction provided in the General Plan for new housing and population growth would result in a less than significant impact.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes to existing land use designations. The proposed amendment would not displace existing housing or people.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |   |   |   |                                   |                                     |
| 1) Fire protection?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 2) Police protection?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 3) Schools?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 4) Parks?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| 5) Other public facilities?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

a) ***Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:***

- 1) ***Fire protection?***
- 3) ***Police protection?***
- 5) ***Other public facilities?***

According to the FEIR, current fire and police staffing and equipment are sufficient to meet City needs. The gradual population increase with General Plan implementation would incrementally increase demand for fire and police services. The General Plan Safety and Community Services Element includes goals and policies to minimize impact on fire and police services. General Plan policies and existing regulations would sufficiently address fire and police protection. Impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes to existing land use designations that would allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR.



**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**3) Schools?**

The FEIR concluded that impacts to schools would be less than significant. The effects of construction and operation of additional school facilities would be evaluated by each school district when planning for new or rehabilitated schools. The City would work the school districts to facilitate collection of school impact fees.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes to existing land use designations that would allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**4) Parks?**

Refer to Impact Statements 5.15(a) and 5.15(b), which concluded impacts were less than significant.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.15 RECREATION

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. 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?                        | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***
- b) ***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?***

According to the FEIR, residents of Monterey Park are well-served by the existing park system. Additional acreage for open space, parks, and other recreational facilities is included in the General Plan Land Use Plan Map. Goals in the General Plan Resources Element would optimize use of established parks and facilities and create additional passive recreation opportunities. Construction of new recreational facilities would follow regulations for new development and design guidelines in the General Plan. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. No changes to existing land use designations that promote open space, parks, and other recreational facilities are proposed. The Healthy Community Element includes goals and policies that promote active living and encourage recreational programs and activities, as well as the availability of parks for physical activity. Implementation of the policies would support and enhance the goals and policies within the General Plan Resources Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

At the time of certification of the FEIR, review of parking impacts was part of the required CEQA analysis. Effective March 18, 2010, the State adopted amendments to the *CEQA Guidelines* Appendix G that eliminated the review of parking impacts in CEQA documents (previous Appendix G question XV(f)). However, the FEIR concluded parking impacts were less than significant.

In addition, the March 18, 2010 amendments also modified the Transportation/Traffic questions in Appendix G, which are reflected above. The Initial Study and FEIR for the General Plan utilized the questions below for analysis and thresholds. Noted below is the current related question letter from the table above shown in parentheses ( ).

- (a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (*Question a*)



- (b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (*Question b*)
- (c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (*Question c*)
- (d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (*Question d*)
- (e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (*Question e*)
- (f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (*Eliminated*)
- (g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (*Question f*)

### **Impact Analysis**

- a) ***Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?***
- b) ***Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

According to the FEIR, buildout of the General Plan would result in the Atlantic Boulevard/Garvey Avenue and Garfield Avenue/Garvey Avenue intersections operating at an unacceptable level of service (LOS). Although implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts; impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the City cannot ensure implementation of identified improvements at the intersections of Garfield Avenue/Via Campo and Garfield Avenue/Pomona Boulevard. Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. Since no mitigation exists to reduce impacts on the I-10, I-710, and SR-60 freeways, impacts on these CMP facilities were concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development and would not allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. Further, the proposed amendment would not limit the maximum amount of residential development and/or non-residential development anticipated to occur over the 20-year period analyzed as part of the FEIR. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated to continue to occur at the identified intersections and CMP facilities with the proposed amendment.



**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR and would result in no greater impacts than previously identified.

**c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

As stated in the FEIR, Monterey Park does not have an airport within the City limits, nor is it located within an airport land use plan.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development or modifications to the boundaries of the General Plan study area that would involve airport land use areas not previously considered in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impacts would occur.

**d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

**e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

As stated in the FEIR, the General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements address design issues and land use compatibility. The Circulation Element introduces traffic calming measures and all new development anticipated by the General Plan would be subject to the Urban Design Plan and goals of the Circulation Element. These practices would minimize hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. In addition to the City’s Emergency Response Plan, the Safety and Community Services Element calls for annual reviews by the City to assess response times and other indicators to ensure adequate fire and police protection. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment does not involve project specific development and would not allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. Additionally, the proposed amendment would not modify the Urban Design Plans or goals and policies of the Circulation and Safety and Community Services Elements.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**f) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?***

As stated in the FEIR, the General Plan Circulation Element includes goals and policies that address the use of public transit and alternative modes of transportation. The Circulation Element supports alternative and public transportation that will benefit the residents of Monterey Park. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.



The proposed amendment does not involve project specific development and would not allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. The proposed amendment would not modify goals and policies of the Circulation Element. However, the Healthy Community and Sustainability Elements propose goals and policies that would encourage and enhance alternative transportation such as public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian safety and accessibility, consistent with the Circulation Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impacts would occur.



## 5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                     | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| e. 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? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***
- b) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***
- c) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

According to the FEIR, new development would discharge wastewater to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts' Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The General Plan would not result in development of uses that could result in exceeding established treatment standards. No impacts would occur.

All water, sewer, and drainage improvements and infrastructure would be provided on a project-by-project basis. Payment of fees would provide funds for new regional systems and facilities to



accommodate growth. The City, as part of its standard development review process, would review all individual improvement plans and control their construction. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes to existing land use designations that would allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

According to the FEIR, new development associated with implementation of the General Plan would exceed water demand projections identified in the City’s Water Master Plan. However, the City is entitled to a percentage of the annual safe yield from the Main San Gabriel Basin and if the City withdraws more groundwater than its entitled amount, the City would purchase water from MWD that is fed back into the basin. MWD’s entitlements are considered adequate to provide the City with water to offset pumping from the aquifer. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes that would allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. Further, the proposed Sustainability Element includes policies for conserving water and use of recycled water. Implementation of the policies would support and enhance the water conservation goals and policies within the General Plan Resources Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**e) *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?***

According to the FEIR, the Sewer Master Plan makes recommendations to improve the sewer system in order to accommodate a projected 2015 population of 80,000. The General Plan Safety and Community Services Element includes policies for implementation of the recommended sewer system improvements. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes that would allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR.



**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.

**f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?***

According to the FEIR, the addition of hazard and nonhazardous waste associated with implementation of the General Plan would result in an adverse and significant impact due to the shortage of future landfill space.

The proposed amendment does not involve project-specific development and would not allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. Further, the proposed amendment would not limit the maximum amount of residential development and/or non-residential development anticipated to occur over the 20-year period analyzed as part of the FEIR. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts on the capacity of landfills are anticipated to continue to occur with the proposed amendment.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR and would result in no greater impacts than previously identified.

**g) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

As stated in the FEIR, the City has a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) in order to divert solid waste in compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939). The General Plan Safety and Community Services Element provides goals and policies that address solid waste reduction. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed amendment involves the addition of Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements to the existing General Plan and does not propose project-specific development or changes that would allow for additional growth beyond what was identified and analyzed in the FEIR. The Sustainable Community Element proposes goals and policies that encourage waste reduction, recycling, and composting, consistent with the Safety and Community Services Element.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, impacts would remain less than significant.



## 5.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Same Impact as "Approved Project" | Less Impact Than "Approved Project" |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  | No  | No  | No  | ✓                                 |                                     |

### Impact Analysis

- a) ***Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

As stated in the FEIR, there are no unique biological resources or habitat conservation areas in Monterey Park. No unique, rare, or endangered species of animals or plants are known to occur in the City. The General Plan would not change historic designations or the status of historical structures, or the City's existing preservation objectives or policies. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that no impact would occur in this regard.

Similarly, the proposed amendment would not potentially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The proposed project involves an amendment to the General Plan to include Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements within the General Plan. The proposed project would not



involve any changes to the designation of historic structures or modify any existing preservation objectives or policies.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus, no impacts would occur.

**b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

As concluded in the FEIR, the General Plan could potentially result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with transportation and traffic, air quality, noise, schools, and utilities and service systems, .

As concluded in the previous discussions, the proposed project involves an amendment to the General Plan in order to include Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements within the General Plan. The proposed amendment does not propose site-specific development and would not involve changes to the General Plan study area. Further, the proposed amendment would not limit the maximum amount of residential development and/or non-residential development anticipated to occur over the 20-year period analyzed as part of the FEIR. It is anticipated that cumulatively considerable impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan, as identified in the FEIR, would continue to occur with the proposed amendment.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR and would result in no greater impacts than previously identified.

**c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

As concluded in the FEIR, the purpose of the General Plan is to guide long-term development and ensure land use compatibility in the City, and to provide a safe living and working environment for the residents of Monterey Park. The General Plan is anticipated to result in an overall beneficial effect on people. Impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

The proposed project involves an amendment to the General Plan in order to include Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements within the General Plan. The proposed amendment does not propose site-specific development and would not involve changes to the General Plan study area. Implementation of the Healthy Community and Sustainable Community Elements would further enhance the overall health and well-being of residents, providing overall beneficial impacts, consistent with the existing General Plan.

**Conclusion: Same Impact as “Approved Project.”** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the FEIR; thus impacts would remain less than significant.



## **6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION PERSONNEL**

### **LEAD AGENCY:**

**City of Monterey Park**  
320 W. Newmark Avenue  
Monterey Park, California 91754

Contact:

*Ms. Samantha Tewasart, Associate Planner*

### **CONSULTANT:**

**RBF Consulting**  
14725 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA 92618

Contacts:

*Ms. Collette L. Morse, AICP, Project Director*  
*Ms. Starla Barker, AICP, Project Manager/Senior Environmental Analyst*  
*Mr. Achilles Malisos, Manager of Air and Noise Studies*