

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. PC 2021-_____

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH NO. 2021040762) FOR THE ENVISION WHITTIER GENERAL PLAN (GPA21-0001) AND THE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT (GPA21-0002)

RECITALS

- A. California Government Code Section 65350 authorizes a city to amend its General Plan.
1. The City of Whittier last completed a comprehensive update of its General Plan in 1993.
 2. The Envision Whittier General Plan is a comprehensive update which entailed an extensive engagement of the public through a wide range of events and activities to discuss and debate the various issues the City faces over the 20-year planning horizon.
 3. Public engagement of the Whittier community including digital access to the update process through the Envision Whittier General Plan website; and a multimedia campaign utilizing both digital platforms and hard-copy distribution of flyers and project updates. A variety of public engagement strategies were used to ensure that every person in Whittier who wished to express an opinion had the ability to do so, utilizing these non-traditional communication methods in addition to public meetings and workshops.
 4. Stakeholder interviews were conducted in July and August 2017 with local organizations for the purpose of informing the community representatives about the Envision Whittier General Plan and to gather feedback on key topics to be addressed.
 5. Four workshops were held in each Council District of the City in September 2017 to launch the update of the General Plan.
 6. Two questionnaires were distributed both electronically and in hard copy form in November 2017 and April/May 2018 through community gathering outlets and events to establish the Envision Whittier General Plan vision and guiding principles, including Housing Element policies.
 7. A Planning Commission workshop was held in December 2017 to provide an overview of the process and solicit input on key themes to

guide the principles of the update to the General Plan.

8. Two additional Public Workshop were held in June and September 2018, with the purpose of the first focused on sharing economic opportunity information and to gather input on land use and transportation strategies; with the purpose of the second focused on the recommended public policy framework.
 9. The first City Council session was held on March 19, 2019 to integrate the community-identified priorities with direction from the City Council to develop the goals and policies, land use policy maps and to determine the City buildout estimate.
 10. A second City Council meeting was held on September 8, 2020 to gain additional direction and approvals for the proposed land use policy map and the buildout estimates, resulting in the Draft Envision Whittier General Plan.
 11. The Draft Envision Whittier General Plan was published in June 2021 for public review and comment.
 12. The City of Whittier sent the Draft Envision Whittier General Plan to affected entities and agencies in compliance with State law and contacted California Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission to invite those tribes to consult on the proposed comprehensive update.
 13. The Envision Whittier General Plan includes the eight mandatory elements as required by the State, reorganized into six topic areas to provide focused discussion of each element and to develop consistent goals and policies including those addressing Environmental Justice; with the 2021-2029 Housing Element as a stand-alone companion document.
 14. The Envision Whittier General Plan is a Citywide document that is an integrated and internally consistent statement of the official land use policy for the City of Whittier.
- B. California Government Code Section 65588(b) requires a city to periodically prepare an update to the Housing Element of the General Plan.
1. State law requires that the update to the Housing Element contain (i) an assessment of the City's housing needs and an analysis of the resources and constraints, both governmental and non-governmental, relevant to the meeting of these needs; (ii) an inventory of land suitable and available for residential development and an analysis of the development potential of such sites; (iii) a statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing; and (iv)

programs that set forth a schedule of actions the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the update.

2. State law requires the update to the Housing Element to identify adequate sites to accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for all income categories, and the City's update identifies sites that can accommodate such housing to satisfy the City's RHNA allocation, which establishes the number of new units needed to accommodate expected population growth over the planning period.
3. Stakeholder interviews were conducted in November 2020 with four groups of local housing advocates and residents for the purpose of informing the community representatives about the challenges and types of approaches that could be undertaken to address the City's constraints to housing production and the City's RHNA allocation.
4. Five Community Workshops, one of which was conducted in Spanish, were held virtually using video conferencing due to COVID-19 restrictions in November and December 2020, with the purpose of collecting input on housing challenges, needs, and strategies from a broad cross-section of residents and stakeholders.
5. In accordance with Government Code Sections 65352-65352.5, the City sent notice regarding the 2021-2029 Housing Element to all California Native American tribes provided by the Native American Heritage Commission and other entities listed to determine if any tribe wished consultation.
6. In accordance with Government Code Section 65585(b), on June 11, 2021, the City submitted the draft 2021-2029 Housing Element to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and received comments in correspondence dated August 10, 2021, which determined that the City's draft required revisions in order to fully comply with State law.
7. The HCD Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element was published in June 2021 for public review and comment.
8. HCD's specific requirements as identified in their correspondence dated August 10, 2021, has been incorporated into revisions to the Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element to ensure that the update complies with State law and can be certified by HCD.
9. The City's Housing Element is a mandatory General Plan Element and was prepared for the 2021-2029 planning period, is consistent with the policies and goals of the Envision Whittier General Plan, and was prepared in accordance with California Housing Element Law (Government Code Section 65580 et seq).

- C. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies and local governments to measure the environmental impacts of development projects or other major land use decisions, and to limit or avoid those impacts if possible.
1. The comprehensive update to Whittier's General Plan and Housing Element are considered a project under CEQA.
 2. On April 30, 2021 the City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) informing community members, Responsible Agencies and all other interested parties of the City's intent to prepare a comprehensive update to its General Plan and Housing Element and that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analysis was going to commence. This NOP requested input from all interested parties regarding the Scope of the EIR analysis, with comments requested between April 30, 2021 and June 1, 2021.
 3. The City held an EIR Scoping meeting on May 17, 2021, via Zoom, in accordance with Covid-19 protocols, to further inform the public that Whittier was evaluating a project under CEQA and to solicit public comments regarding the type and extent of environmental analyses to be conducted.
 4. On July 8, 2021, a Notice of Availability/Completion for the Draft EIR for the Envision Whittier General Plan and the 2021-2029 Housing Element was released.
 5. On July 9, 2021, the Draft EIR for the Envision Whittier General Plan and the 2021-2029 Housing Element was published and circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days in accordance with State law, closing August 23, 2021.
- D. On August 31, 2021, a joint study session with the Planning Commission and City Council was held to conduct a final review of the Draft Envision Whittier General Plan, the Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element, and the Draft EIR.
- E. On September 29, 2021, the Planning Commission of the City of Whittier considered the Envision Whittier General Plan, the 2021-2029 Housing Element and the EIR prepared for both, the staff report, and all testimony, written and spoken, at a duly noticed public hearing.

NOW THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION DOES HEREBY FIND, DETERMINE AND DECLARE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The above recitals are true and correct and are a substantial part of this resolution.

SECTION 2. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared to analyze and

disclose any and all potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project, meeting and satisfying all the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the significant environmental effects of the Project have been adequately evaluated.

SECTION 3. The findings made in this Resolution are based upon the information and evidence set forth in the Final EIR and upon other substantial evidence that has been presented at the hearings and in the record of the proceedings. The documents, staff reports, technical studies, appendices, plans, specifications, and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings on which this Resolution is based are on file for public examination during normal business hours at the location of City Hall.

SECTION 4. Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the City, before approving the Project, make one or more of the following written findings for each significant effect identified in the Final EIR accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding: (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR; or (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible certain mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR and these findings are provided in attached Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 5. Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that if the Project will cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts, the City must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations prior to approving the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that any significant adverse project effects are acceptable if expected project benefits outweigh unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

SECTION 6. Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as significant but which the City finds can be mitigated to a level of less than significant, through the imposition of feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and set forth herein, are described in the Draft EIR, and are incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 7. Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as significant but which the City finds cannot be fully mitigated to a level of less than significant, despite the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and set forth herein, are described in the Draft EIR, and are incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 8. Alternatives to the Envision Whittier General Plan that might eliminate or reduce significant environmental impacts are described in the Draft EIR, incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 9. A discussion of the project benefits and a Statement of Overriding

Exhibit A – CEQA Findings of Fact

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project where an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) has been certified that identifies one or more significant impacts on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more findings for each of those significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

With respect to significant effects which were subject to finding (3) above, the public agency must find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

References for discussion of environmental impacts within the Final EIR are noted with each finding. Impact numbers refer to the section number and the threshold letter referenced in the Draft EIR where the full discussion of impacts is included. The Findings of Fact are presented on the following pages.

A. Effects Determined to Have No Impact or a Less than Significant Impact

The evaluation prepared in the Whittier General Plan Update EIR found and provided substantial evidence that certain environmental issues related to the Whittier General Plan Update would have no impact or have impacts that are less than significant. The City Council agrees with the characterization of the FEIR with respect to all of the Whittier General Plan Update impacts identified as resulting in “no impact” or “less than significant” impacts and finds that those impacts have been described and analyzed accurately and are supported by substantial evidence as described in the FEIR, including the Draft EIR. Reference should be made to the DEIR and FEIR for a more complete description of the findings regarding these impacts. T

This finding applies to the evaluation of the potential impacts for the following items, as further described in the DEIR, that the project will either have no impact or a less than significant impact

Aesthetics

- AES-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- AES-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- AES-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site/planning area or its surroundings.
- AES-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime.
- AES-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.

Agricultural Resources

- AG-1: 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.
- AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract.
- AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest (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)).
- AG-4: Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- AG-5: 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.
- AG-6: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

Air Quality

- AIR-4: Result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Biological Resources

- BIO-1: 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.
- BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

- BIO-4: 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?
- BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.
- BIO-7: Cause substantial adverse impacts with respect to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

- CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.
- CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.
- CUL-4: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.

Energy

- ENG-1: Significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.
- ENG-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.
- ENG-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to energy.

Geology and Soils

- GEO-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 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. (Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)
 - Strong seismic ground shaking.
 - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

- Landslides.
- GEO-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- GEO-3: Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- GEO-4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.
- GEO-5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.
- GEO-6: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.
- GEO-7: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils, including paleontological resources.

Hazardous and Hazardous Materials

- HAZMAT-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- HAZMAT-2: 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.
- HAZMAT-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- HAZMAT-4: 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- HAZMAT-5: For a development 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, resulting in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in or outside the GPU area.
- HAZMAT-6: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- HAZMAT-7: Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

- HAZMAT-8: Cause substantial cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- HYDRO-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.
- HYDRO-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would; (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite; (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (iv) impede or redirect flood flows.
- HYDRO-4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to GPU inundation.
- HYDRO-5: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.
- HYDRO-6: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

- LAND-1: Physically divide an established community;
- LAND-2: Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
- LAND-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.

Mineral Resources

- MINERAL-1: 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.
- MINERAL-2: 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.
- MINERAL-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to mineral resources.

Noise

- NOISE-1: Would the GPU result in generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.
- NOISE-2: Would the GPU result in generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.
- NOISE-4: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the GPU expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.
- NOISE-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to noise or vibration.

Population and Housing

- POP-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- POP-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to population and housing.

Public Services

- PS-1: 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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:
 - Fire protection
 - Police protection
 - Schools
 - Parks
 - Other public facilities.
- PS-2: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to public services.

Recreation

- REC-1: 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.
- REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- REC-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation facilities.

Transportation

- TRANS-1: Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- TRANS-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- TRANS-4: Result in inadequate emergency access.

Tribal Cultural Resources

- TCR-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).
- TCR-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
- TCR-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources.

Utilities and Service Systems

- UTS-3: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the GPU that it has adequate capacity to serve the projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

- UTS-4: Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.
- UTS-5: Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
- UTS-6 Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to Utilities and Service Systems.

Wildfire

- WIL-1: Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuated plan.
- WIL-2: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- WIL-3: Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure such as roads fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.
- WIL-4: Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes Sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations
- WIL-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to wildfire.

In addition, the EIR determined that potential impacts with respect to growth-inducing effects and irreversible environmental changes would be less than significant.

B. Impacts Determined to Be Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

The Final EIR (including the Draft EIR) identifies the following significant environmental impacts associated with the Project. Based on the environmental analysis of the Project and the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, and the City has found in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) that *“changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigates or avoid the significant effects on the environment.”* The descriptions of the impacts in these findings are summary statements. Mitigation Measures are numbered to correspond to listings in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Reference should be made to the Draft EIR and Final EIR for a more complete description.

Impact HYDRO-2 – Would the GPU substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the GPU may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Substantial Evidence

The City's primary source of water is groundwater. The following analyzes the City's projected groundwater supply and demand to determine if there are any critical water supply issues that result from the increased population under the GPU. The City's water system is the most appropriate to analyze as it provides water service to the greatest number of people within the Planning Area¹. The City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) assumes 65 percent of the City's population is within its UWMP service area for 2015 through 2040. The UWMP indicates it is based on population projections obtained from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) which incorporates demographic trends, existing land-use, General Plan land use policies, and input and projections from the Department of Finance (DOF) and the US Census Bureau. The City owns and operates three active wells in the Main Basin (No. 13, No. 15, and No. 16) and two active wells in the Central Basin (No. 8 and No. 14). To date, the City has not experienced water supply constraints or deficiencies, and management of the City's primary groundwater supplies is based on legal adjudications of the groundwater basins. The UWMP states the City will be able to rely on the Main Basin, the Central Basin, and recycled water for adequate supply over the next 26 years under single year and multiple year droughts based on current management practices. However, Table 4.10-1 (from the DEIR) indicates the projected population increase under the proposed GPU would exceed the 2040 population estimate upon which the UWMP projected future service. The table also shows the amount of water that could be consumed by the projected population under the GPU (1,580 acre-feet) would be greater than the surplus water supply for 2040 (1,187 acre-feet) estimated in the UWMP.

¹ 54 percent based on a City UWMP 2020 service population of 57,104 compared to the total Planning Area 2020 population of 106,014 persons.

**Table 4.10-1
Groundwater Supply Analysis for GPU Population**

Water-Related Characteristic	2020	2040¹	Difference
City-Wide Population (persons)	87,853	106,014	+18,430 / +21%
65 Percent ² of City-wide Population	57,104	68,909	+11,805 / +20.7%
City UWMP Service Area Assumption ³	56,900	59,500	+2,600 / +4.6%
UWMP Planning Surplus or Deficit ⁴	+204	+9,409	"Surplus"
Water needed to serve "surplus" population (acre-feet or AF) ⁵	+47 AF	+1,580 AF	NA
City Water Supply ⁶	9,272 AF	9,272 AF	0
City Water Demand ⁶	7,569 AF	8,085 AF	+516 AF / +6.8%
Supply Surplus or Deficit	+1,703 AF	+1,187 AF	"Deficit"
Can Water Supply meet the needs of the estimated population growth with GPU?	NA	No	
NOTES:			
1 assuming GPU is approved			
2 City UWMP estimates its water service area is 65% of City-wide population			
3 Table 3-1 from City UWMP			
4 Difference of UWMP Service Area Population compared to 65% of City-wide Population Estimate			
A "surplus" means the estimated population under the GPU is lower than the population estimate used for the UWMP			
5 assumes each additional person consumes 150 gallons/person/day and one AF = 236,000 gallons			
6 Table 7-2 from City UWMP			

It should also be noted the 1993 General Plan projected the Planning Area's population to be approximately 96,023 persons in 2018 and the current population of the Planning Area in 2019 was 141,102 persons. This indicates the City has outpaced the growth assumptions for the 1993 General Plan upon which the various UWMPs for the Planning Area were based. Even if the three other water suppliers could meet the future needs of the residents and businesses within their respective portions of the Planning Area, the projected deficit of the City's water supply represents a potentially significant impact that requires mitigation.

The UWMPs were last prepared around 2015-16 and must be updated every five years according to state law, so they are all due to be revised in the near future. When the UWMPs are next updated, the latest projections from the GPU will need to be incorporated. Since the City only manages a portion of its (ground)water supply, it cannot fully control or mitigate the increased need for water under the GPU until the four UWMPs have been updated as planned. Until the City and other water serving agencies update their UMWPs to incorporate the new growth projections, the proposed GPU may have significant short- or long-term impacts regarding water service which may result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

In addition to the proposed GPU Mobility and Infrastructure Element Goal C10 and its policies on water service, Mitigation Measure UTL-1 (from the Utilities Chapter – 4.19) will reduce potential impacts related to groundwater supplies to less than significant levels

UTL-1 Water Demand Management. New developments under the General Plan Update that will be served by local water utility providers will not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2040 under the most recent Urban Water Management Plan for the involved local water provider.

Finding

Mitigation measure UTL-1 will ensure that potential impacts to groundwater supplies will be less than significant. It will ensure that long-term water demand from the project will not exceed the capability of water providers to make water supplies available. Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding impacts to groundwater supply, the City hereby finds that *changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.* Further evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects related to groundwater supply will be reduced to a less than significant level is provided in Chapter 4.10 of the EIR.

IMPACT UTS-1 – Would the GPU require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Substantial Evidence

There are four water providers that serve the Planning Area. The City of Whittier Public Works Department Water Division operates and maintains a water pumping plant in Pico Rivera that produces 8,000,000 gallons of water per day that fill 11 reservoirs in Whittier. The Whittier Public Works Department provides water service to 48,000 customers in the western half of the Planning Area. The San Gabriel Valley Water Company is an investor-owned water utility that provides water service to the West Whittier-Los Nietos area. Suburban Water Systems is a public utility water company that provides water services to the eastern half and southern portion of the Planning Area. The Orchard Dale Water District primarily serves residential customers in the southern portion of the Planning Area (Whittier, 2017).

The 2021 GPU will substantially increase the projected number of housing units and the population in the City over those projected in the 1993 General Plan. Conversely, the GPU projects substantially less growth in non-residential uses (e.g., commercial, office, light industrial) compared to that projected in the 1993 General Plan. The UWMPs of the four local water serving agencies were based in large part on the land uses and growth projections of the 1993 General Plan. The GPU Planning Area's baseline (2019) service population (residents plus employees) equals 174,866 persons while the growth projected under the GPU would yield a future (2040) service population of 196,451 persons. If each of these additional 21,585 residents and employees consumed an additional 150 gallons per person per day

², the City's growth would eventually require an additional 3.2 million gallons of water per day which would need to be provided by the City and the other three serving agencies. Also, see Table 4.10 above under IMPACT HYDRO-2.

The UWMPs for the City's four water providers were last prepared around 2015-16 and must be updated every five years according to state law, so they are all due to be revised in the near future. When the UWMPs are next updated, the latest projections from the GPU will need to be incorporated. Since the City only manages a portion of its water supply, it cannot fully control or mitigate the increased need for water under the GPU until the four UWMPs have been updated as planned. Until the City and other water serving agencies update their UMWPs to incorporate the new growth projections, the proposed GPU may have significant short- or long-term impacts regarding water service which may result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. In addition to the proposed GPU Goals C10 and C15 and their policies on water service, Mitigation Measure UTL-1 (also referenced under Impact Hydro-2, above) will reduce potential impacts related to water service to less than significant levels.

UTL-1 Water Demand Management. New developments under the General Plan Update that will be served by local water utility providers will not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2040 under the most recent Urban Water Management Plan for the involved local water provider.

Finding

The proposed GPU may have potentially significant impacts on water consumption in the future but impacts to sewer/wastewater treatment, storm drainage, and other utility services in the Planning Area are expected to be less than significant. Mitigation Measure UTL-1 is proposed to reduce potential impacts to future water demand. Therefore, the GPU will not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Mitigation measure UTL-1 will ensure that potential impacts related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, facilities will be less than significant. It will ensure that long-term water demand from the project will not exceed the capability of water providers to make the capital improvements necessary to meet such demand. Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding potential impacts to water treatment and transmission facilities, the City hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. Further evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects related to new or expanded water facilities will be reduced to a less than significant level is provided in Chapter 4.19 of the EIR.

IMPACT UTS-2 – Would the GPU have insufficient water supplies available to serve the GPU and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, & multiple dry years?

² Estimate from City UWMP

Substantial Evidence

The 2021 GPU will substantially increase the projected number of housing units and the population in the City over those projected in the 1993 General Plan. Conversely, the GPU projects substantially less growth in non-residential uses (e.g., commercial, office, light industrial) compared to that projected in the 1993 General Plan. The UWMPs of the four local water serving agencies were based on the land uses and growth projections of the 1993 General Plan.

The GPU Planning Area's baseline (2019) service population (residents plus employees) equals 174,866 persons while the growth projected under the GPU would yield a future (2040) service population of 196,451 persons. If these additional 21,585 residents and employees consumed an additional 150 gallons per person per day of water, the City's growth would eventually require an additional 3.2 million gallons of water per day which would need to be provided by the City and the other three serving agencies. At present, the four UWMPs serving the Planning Area do not indicate they have that additional amount of water available to them at this time. Discussion under IMPACT HYDRO-2, and IMPACT UTS-1, above, also demonstrate that future water supplies within the City may not be adequate for growth projected under the proposed GPU.

The UWMPs were last prepared around 2015-16 and must be updated every five years according to state law, so they are all due to be revised in the near future. When the UWMPs are next updated, the latest projections from the GPU will need to be incorporated. Since the City only manages a portion of its water supply, it cannot fully control or mitigate the increased need for water under the GPU until the four UWMPs have been updated as planned. Until the City and other water serving agencies update their UWMPs to incorporate the new growth projections, the proposed GPU may have significant short- or long-term impacts regarding water supply for reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. In addition to the proposed GPU Goals C10 and C15 and their policies on water service, Mitigation Measure UTL-1 is recommended to help assure future water demand does not exceed available or planned water supplies within the Planning Area.

UTL-1 Water Demand Management. New developments under the General Plan Update that will be served by local water utility providers will not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2040 under the most recent Urban Water Management Plan for the involved local water provider.

Finding

Mitigation measure UTL-1 will ensure that potential impacts related to sufficient water supplies available to serve the GPU and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, & multiple dry years will be less than significant. It will ensure that long-term water demand from the project will not exceed the capability of water providers to supply the water necessary to meet such demand. Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding potential impacts to water supply, the City hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. Further evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects related to new or expanded water facilities will be reduced to a less than significant level is provided in Chapter 4.19 of the EIR.

IMPACT NOI-3: Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Substantial Evidence

The proposed GPU could facilitate the future development and construction of mixed-use projects at the intersection of Lambert Road and 1st Avenue, adjacent to the existing Union Pacific railroad corridors along Lambert Road. The FTA's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment document was utilized in the EIR to evaluate recommended ground-borne vibration criteria for general environmental assessments (sensitivity of the land use and frequency of vibration events). Based on the vibration prediction curves outlined in the FTA's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, proposed residential development within approximately 80 feet of a freight line could be exposed to vibration levels that exceed the FTA's recommended threshold of 80 Velocity Decibels (VdB). In addition, other proposed land uses within approximately 60 feet of the freight rail line could be exposed to vibration levels that exceed the FTA's recommended threshold of 83 VdB for land uses with primarily daytime occupancy. The proposed GPU contains no policies to address potential excessive vibration levels from freight train operations and that is considered a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation.

Through the incorporation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, projects near the Union Pacific rail corridor would be required to assess and minimize freight train impacts such that disturbance to building occupants would not occur. In result, the impact would be considered less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI.

NOI-1 The City shall require new residential and commercial projects located within 200 feet of the Union Pacific railroad track to conduct a freight train ground vibration and vibration noise evaluation consistent with approved vibration assessment methodologies (e.g., Caltrans, Federal Transportation Authority).

Finding

Mitigation measure NOI-1 will ensure that potential train vibration impacts will be less than significant by requiring an evaluation of such potential impacts for new residential and commercial projects. Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding potential impacts to water supply, the City Council hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. Further evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects related to train vibration will be reduced to a less than significant level is provided in Chapter 4.13 of the EIR.

C. Effects Determined to Be Significant, Adverse, and Unavoidable

As presented in the Whittier General Plan Update EIR, the City finds that adverse impacts identified below pertaining to Air Quality, Greenhouse Emissions, and Transportation/VMT cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels because no feasible mitigation is available.

Air Quality

IMPACT AIR-1: *Would the GPU conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Substantial Evidence

The City of Whittier is within the South Coast Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD and subject to the requirements outlined in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, which affirms consistency with the AQMP if a Project:

1. Is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP; and
2. Does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation, or cause a new one.

Criterion 1 refers to the assumptions included in the 2016 AQMP, including the growth forecast in the 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS. The 2016 AQMP was designed to achieve attainment for all criteria air pollutants within the Basin while still accommodating growth in the region. Projects that are consistent with the AQMP growth assumptions would not interfere with attainment of air quality standards, because this growth is included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP.

As shown in Table 4.3-6, the anticipated population growth under implementation of the proposed GPU would exceed the 2016 RTP/SCS, while the new employment would not. Therefore, from a population growth standpoint, the proposed GPU would be inconsistent with the AQMP and inconsistent with Criterion 1.

**Table 4.3-6
RTP/SCS and General Plan Update Growth Assumptions**

Scenario	Net New Population Growth	Net New Employment
Proposed GPU		
City	18,430	392
Sphere of Influence	1,759	1,004
Planning Area Total	20,190	1,396
RTP/SCS Growth 2012 – 2040	11,000	4,800
Within Growth Assumptions?	No	Yes
Source: SCAG, 2016; City of Whittier 2021.		

Consistency Criterion 2 refers to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The South Coast Air Basin is designated nonattainment for national and state Ozone (O₃), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} standards. The analyses of potential emissions under Impact Air-2 (see below) indicates the GPU could result in significant emissions during construction activities. Some of these pollutants, such as Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) and Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), are ozone precursor pollutants, and the region is designated non-attainment for ozone. The analysis contained under Impact Air-2 also indicates the unmitigated operational NO_x emissions associated with implementation of the proposed GPU

would exceed the SCAQMD-recommended CEQA thresholds of significance, which have been designed to bring the region into attainment for CAAQS and NAAQS.

The analysis conducted under Impact Air-2 demonstrates that the unmitigated net change in operational emissions between existing land uses in 2040 and those proposed by the GPU would exceed the SCAQMD's operational NO_x CEQA threshold of significance. Construction activities would also have the potential to exceed SCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance. Because these pollutants would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, they would increase the frequency or severity of air quality standards violations and therefore be inconsistent with Criterion 2.

Shown below are Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 which reduce operational and construction emissions

AQ-1 Require a Project-level Construction Assessment for New Discretionary Development Projects. The City shall require applicants to submit a quantitative project-level construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions analysis for future discretionary development projects. The estimated construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions shall be compared against the thresholds of significance maintained by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and, if emissions are shown to be above SCAQMD thresholds, the City shall require the imposition and implementation of mitigation to reduce emissions below the thresholds that have been exceeded. Mitigation to reduce emissions could include, but are not limited to:

- Selection of specific construction equipment (e.g., specialized pieces of equipment with smaller engines or equipment that will be more efficient and reduce engine runtime);
- Requiring equipment to use alternative fuel sources (e.g., electric-powered and liquefied or compressed natural gas), meet cleaner emission standards (e.g., U.S. EPA Tier IV Final emissions standards for equipment greater than 50-horsepower), and/or utilizing added exhaust devices (e.g., Level 3 Diesel Particular Filter);
- Minimizing the idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to two minutes; and
- Application of Low-VOC paints to interior and/or exterior surfaces (e.g., paints that meet SCAQMD Rule 1113 "Low-VOC" or "Super-Compliant" requirements).

AQ-2 Prohibit the Installation of Natural Gas Hearths in New Residential Development. The City shall prohibit the installation of new natural gas hearths/fireplaces in new residential development. Natural gas hearths/fireplaces may be incorporated into remodels / redevelopment if the existing structure(s) proposed for remodel / redevelopment featured natural gas hearths/fireplaces; however, the quantity of natural gas hearths/fireplaces provided by the new structure(s) may not exceed that present prior to the remodel / redevelopment and must meet the most recent U.S. EPA, CARB, and/or SCAQMD emissions standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance

The population growth that could occur under the Project by 2040 would be inconsistent with the 2016 RTP/SCS growth forecast. As discussed under Impact Air-2, the incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would reduce the net change in operational NO_x emissions to a level that is below

the SCAQMD-recommended threshold of significance. Therefore, from a long-term operational standpoint, the proposed GPU would not substantially change emissions compared to if the existing land uses continued their operation in the Year 2040. Nonetheless, because it cannot be definitively known or stated at this time that construction emissions would be able to be mitigated such that all criteria air pollutant emissions would be below SCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance, implementation of the proposed GPU could still increase the frequency and/or severity of air quality violations in the Basin or otherwise impede attainment of air quality standards in the Basin. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding impacts related to inconsistency with applicable air quality plans, the City Council hereby finds that no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist to mitigate the above-discussed potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

IMPACT AIR-2: Would the GPU result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Substantial Evidence

The proposed General Plan Update would set forth the City's vision for the types of development which would occur over the next 20 years. Implementation of the General Plan would result in short-term construction and long-term operational emissions of regulated air pollutants. The SCAQMD has not adopted plan-level-level significance thresholds; however, in developing its CEQA significance thresholds, the SCAQMD considered the emission levels at which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable.

Construction Emissions

The GPU would not directly result in construction of any development or infrastructure; however, future development supported by the GPU would result in short-term construction-related criteria pollutant emissions that have potential to have an adverse effect on air quality. Short-term criteria air pollutant emissions would occur during demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities associated with specific, new development projects. ROG and NO_x emissions are primarily associated with gas and diesel equipment exhaust and the application of architectural coatings. Fugitive dust emissions (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) are primarily associated with site preparation and vary as a function of such parameters as soil silt content, soil moisture, wind speed, acreage of disturbance area, and VMT by construction vehicles on- and off-site.

With the City of Whittier primarily being built out, many projects would require the demolition of existing structures to construct new structures. Fugitive dust (PM₁₀) emissions would typically be greatest during building demolition, site preparation, and grading due to the disturbance of soils and transport of material. NO_x emissions would also result from the combustion of diesel fuels used to power off-road heavy-duty pieces of equipment (e.g., backhoes, bulldozers, excavators,

etc.). ROG emissions would generally be greatest during architectural coating activities. Given the speculative nature of construction activities that could occur under implementation of the proposed GPU, it is not possible at this time to accurately assess the level of emissions that would be generated by future development and redevelopment activities in the City. Overall, project implementation would increase residential dwelling units and non-residential square footage in the City under year 2040 growth conditions. Growth under the Project would result in long-term regional emissions of criteria air pollutants associated with the operation of area sources, energy sources, and mobile sources.

Construction emissions associated with future development activities facilitated under implementation of the proposed GPU could exceed SCAQMD-recommended CEQA significance thresholds for regional criteria air pollutant emissions. This is considered a **potentially significant impact**.

Operational Emissions

Table 4.3-7 of the EIR indicates that the project would not exceed the SCAQMD pollutant thresholds except for NO_x. NO_x area sources (gas fireplaces and landscaping equipment) and mobile sources account for nearly 89% of the NO_x emissions estimated to occur with buildout of the proposed GPU. The TIA prepared by Fehr & Peers for the proposed GPU indicates that the proposed land uses in the GPU would result in a significant VMT impact if left unmitigated. Mitigation Measures VMT-1, VMT-2 and VMT-3 (see text below under Transportation Impacts) have been incorporated into the Project to reduce the magnitude of the VMT impact and consist of expanding the local transit network, improving the bicycle and pedestrian network as envisioned in the City's Bicycle Master Plan and General Plan, and promoting telecommuting and alternative work schedules. The VMT reductions attributable to Mitigation Measures VMT-1, VMT-2 and VMT-3 have not been incorporated into the mobile source emissions estimates provided in Table 4.3-7; however, the increase in emissions from area sources alone would be significant if left unmitigated. Approximately 94% (114 pounds per day) of the net change in NO_x emission from area sources would be from operation of gas fireplaces, while the remaining 6% (7 pounds per day) would be from landscaping equipment.

**Table 4.3-7
2040 Project Growth Forecast Operational Emissions**

Emissions Scenario	Maximum Daily Pollutant Emissions (Pounds per Day) ^(A)									
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀			PM _{2.5}		
					Dust	Exhaust	Total	Dust	Exhaust	Total
Project Growth Forecast Operational Emissions in Year 2040										
Area Sources	13,599	1,123	26,653	58	0	3,368	33,688	0	3,368	3,367
Energy Sources	39	339	157	2	0	27	27	0	27	27
Mobile Source	1,058	1,579	10,790	40	4,204	21	4,225	1,051	20	1,071
<i>Total^(B)</i>	<i>14,697</i>	<i>3,041</i>	<i>37,600</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,204</i>	<i>3,416</i>	<i>7,620</i>	<i>1,051</i>	<i>3,415</i>	<i>4,466</i>
Existing Land Uses Year 2040 Condition^(D)										
Area Sources	13,919	1,001	27,265	60	0	3,547	3,547	0	3,547	3,547
Energy Sources	43	367	168	2	0	30	30	0	30	30
Mobile Source	1,001	1,493	10,202	38	3,975	20	3,995	994	19	1,013
<i>Total^(B)</i>	<i>14,963</i>	<i>2,862</i>	<i>37,635</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,975</i>	<i>3,596</i>	<i>7,571</i>	<i>994</i>	<i>3,595</i>	<i>4,589</i>

Net Change in Emissions Levels										
Area Sources	-320	122	-612	-2	0	-179	30,141	0	-179	-180
Energy Sources	-4	-28	-11	0	0	-3	-3	0	-3	-3
Mobile Source	57	86	588	2	229	1	230	57	1	58
Total ^(B)	-266	179	-35	0	229	-180	49	57	-180	-123
SCAQMD CEQA Threshold	75	100	550	150	150			55		
Threshold Exceeded?	No	Yes	No	No	No			No		
Source: MIG, 2021 (see Appendix D) and SCAQMD 2019b.										
(A) Emissions estimated using CalEEMod, V 2016.3.2. Estimates are based on default model assumptions unless otherwise noted in this document. Maximum daily ROG, CO, SOX emissions occur during the summer. Maximum daily NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions occur during the winter.										
(B) Totals may not equal due to rounding.										
(C) See Table 4.3-3.										

Operational Emissions.

As shown in Table 4.3-7, the modeled, maximum daily operational emission associated with potential 2040 growth under the Project would result in NOx emissions that exceed SCAQMD-recommended CEQA significance thresholds. This is considered a **potentially significant impact**. All other potential Project emissions would be below SCAQMD-recommended CEQA significance thresholds.

Significance With Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2, which have been included in the EIR to reduce air pollutant emissions are provided below.

AQ-1 Require a Project-level Construction Assessment for New Discretionary Development Projects. The City shall require applicants to submit a quantitative project-level construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions analysis for future discretionary development projects. The estimated construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions shall be compared against the thresholds of significance maintained by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and, if emissions are shown to be above SCAQMD thresholds, the City shall require the imposition and implementation of mitigation to reduce emissions below the thresholds that have been exceeded. Mitigation to reduce emissions could include, but are not limited to:

- Selection of specific construction equipment (e.g., specialized pieces of equipment with smaller engines or equipment that will be more efficient and reduce engine runtime);
- Requiring equipment to use alternative fuel sources (e.g., electric-powered and liquefied or compressed natural gas), meet cleaner emission standards (e.g., U.S. EPA Tier IV Final emissions standards for equipment greater than 50-horsepower), and/or utilizing added exhaust devices (e.g., Level 3 Diesel Particular Filter);
- Minimizing the idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to two minutes; and

- Application of Low-VOC paints to interior and/or exterior surfaces (e.g., paints that meet SCAQMD Rule 1113 “Low-VOC” or “Super-Compliant” requirements).

AQ-2 Prohibit the Installation of Natural Gas Hearths in New Residential Development.

The City shall prohibit the installation of new natural gas hearths/fireplaces in new residential development. Natural gas hearths/fireplaces may be incorporated into remodels / redevelopment if the existing structure(s) proposed for remodel / redevelopment featured natural gas hearths/fireplaces; however, the quantity of natural gas hearths/fireplaces provided by the new structure(s) may not exceed that present prior to the remodel / redevelopment and must meet the most recent U.S. EPA, CARB, and/or SCAQMD emissions standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

Construction Emissions: Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1, it cannot be definitively known or stated at this time that all future development projects occurring under implementation of the proposed GPU would be able to reduce potential criteria air pollutant emissions to levels that are below SCAQMD thresholds, and the impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

Operational Emissions: The Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would reduce the estimated net change in NOx emissions by at least 114 pounds per day, resulting in a new net change in total NOx emissions of approximately 65 pounds per day. This new mitigated emissions level would be below the SCAQMD-recommended operational NOx threshold of 100 pounds per day. Therefore, with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2, operational criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed GPU would be **less than significant**.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding **construction** impacts related to cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, the City Council hereby finds that, except for Mitigation Measure AIR 1, no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels, and such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, even with the application of Mitigation Measure AIR 1. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

The City Council further finds based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding **operational** impacts related to cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, that, with the application of Mitigation Measure AIR 2, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the City Council hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

IMPACT AIR-3: *Would the GPU expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Substantial Evidence

Growth projected to occur under the Project could expose existing and new sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutants and TAC emissions that pose adverse health effects. The potential for the proposed GPU to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations is evaluated below.

CO Hotspots

Based on the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the proposed GPU (see Appendix D of the EIR), the maximum number of vehicles moving through any study analysis zone under the Project's 2040 growth project would be 5,670 vehicles through the intersection of Whittier Boulevard and Colima Road (during AM and PM peak hours). This level of traffic is substantially below the screening threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour for a CO hotspot analysis. Therefore, the Project would not cause or significantly contribute to CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal ambient air quality standards for CO. This impact would be less than significant.

Construction Emissions

Future development activities facilitated under implementation of the proposed GPU would generate emissions, including emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) which is a TAC, during construction activities. These emissions would occur intermittently over the approximately 20-year growth period associated with the Project. Although specific details regarding project development within the Planning Area are not known at this time, it is possible that one or more projects developed under implementation of the proposed GPU could have the potential to exceed SCAQMD Local Significance Threshold (LSTs) and thresholds of significance for cancerogenic and non-cancerogenic health risks.³

³ In addition to criteria air pollutant emissions on a regional scale and TAC emissions on a local scale, receptor exposure to elevated concentrations of criteria air pollutants (e.g., CO, O₃, and PM) is capable of causing adverse health effects on heart, lung, and other organ systems. As described under Section 4.3.3 of the EIR, the LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standards, which would result in significant adverse localized air quality impacts.

Operational Emissions

As shown in Table 4.3-7 of the EIR (included under Impact Air-2, above), implementation of the proposed GPU would generally reduce the quantity of criteria air pollutants emitted by land uses within the City. As discussed previously, the SCAQMD's CEQA thresholds were developed to attain the CAAQS and NAAQS. In developing the CAAQS and NAAQS, the U.S. EPA and CARB considered scientific evidence linking exposure to air pollutants to health risks. Although each individual's health characteristics, environment, and pre-disposition to adverse respiratory health effects are different, compliance with the CAAQS and NAAQS is intended to protect the most sensitive individuals. As described under Impact Air-2 of the EIR, the proposed GPU's operational emissions would be able to be mitigated such that no SCAQMD CEQA threshold for criteria air pollutants would be exceeded. Therefore, the proposed GPU would not generate operational emissions such that receptor exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations would occur. Even if operational emissions were to have exceeded the SCAQMD's thresholds, a significant impact would likely have not occurred. In the amicus brief filed by the SCAQMD on the California Supreme Court's decision in *Sierra Club versus County of Fresno*, the SCAQMD noted that, "[it] takes a large amount of additional precursor emissions [e.g., NOx] to cause a modeled increase in ambient ozone levels... a project emitting only 10 tons per year of NOx or VOC is small enough that its regional impact on ambient ozone levels may not be detected in the regional air quality models used to determine ozone levels..." (SCAQMD, 2015). The proposed GPU primarily focuses new / redevelopment along Whittier Boulevard; it does not reimagine the City in a manner that would substantially increase the quantity of highly polluting land uses (e.g., industrial facilities). Therefore, the changes in land use proposed by the GPU do not have the potential to alter the city-wide emissions profile in a manner that could exacerbate or contribute to significant health risks at or in proximity of the Planning Area.

Exacerbation of Existing Sources of Pollutants

Project growth would add new residential development in the city and could place new, sensitive receptors in proximity to existing sources of emissions such as Whittier Boulevard and local stationary sources of emissions.

Per the recent ruling by the California Supreme Court in *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, 62 Cal.4th 369 (2015), projects are not required to analyze how existing conditions might impact a project's future users or residents. As such, this analysis does not focus on potential, future receptor exposure to existing emissions from existing sources of pollutants in and near the City. Rather, it focuses on the incremental increase in pollutant concentrations and associated impacts (including adverse health impacts) that could occur if existing operations were to change as a result of Project growth.

Under the 2040 growth projection, the proposed GPU would increase the number of residents in the Planning Area from approximately 141,102 people to approximately 161,291 people, an increase of approximately 20,190 people (14% increase). The proposed GPU would also result in a net increase of approximately 175,236 square feet of non-residential building square footage. Although this growth would occur throughout the City, it would occur primarily in areas focused for redevelopment, such as Whittier Boulevard. The growth envisioned under the Project would generate long-term emissions, primarily associated with area and mobile sources that would combust natural gas or gasoline. As described under Impact Air-2 of the EIR, emissions of operations-related criteria air pollutants would be below SCAQMD significance thresholds after mitigation and would not result in, nor substantially exacerbate, substantial pollutant concentrations at sensitive receptor locations.

Additional Information on Existing Sources of Pollutants

The proposed GPU could result in new sensitive receptors being exposed to significant sources of TAC emissions. The CARB *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook* recommends avoiding the siting of new sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, etc.) within:

- 300 feet of large gasoline fueling stations (with a throughput of more than 3.6 million gallons of gasoline per year);
- Within 300 feet of dry cleaning operations;
- Within 500 feet of freeways, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day; and
- Within 1,000 feet of a major rail service or maintenance yard.

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health, in its *Air Quality Recommendations for Local Jurisdictions*, also recommends a buffer of at least 500 feet between freeways and sensitive land uses.

A review for gas stations and dry-cleaning facilities within the Planning Area indicates there may be eight (8) dry cleaning facilities and approximately 14 gas station facilities located within the City. The gas stations are generally located along Greenleaf Avenue and Whittier Boulevard. There are existing, residential receptors near these facilities, in some cases within 300 feet. The proposed GPU would locate some new residences within 300 feet of these locations, but incorporates General Plan Program RM 35, which would require that any development project that houses sensitive receptors include design features and equipment, as necessary, to mitigate any significant negative air quality impact on project occupants from the existing environment. I-605 is also a major roadway with an ADT of more than 100,000 near the City; however, the Project does not propose siting new sensitive receptors within 500 feet of this roadway.

Although the potential exists for the Project to result in new sensitive residential receptors near existing sources of emissions, the Project would not exacerbate pollutant concentrations or health risks associated with emissions sources and, therefore, would not materially change the existing environmental risks present in the project area.

Based on the analysis in the EIR potentially significant impacts with respect to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, would occur only for construction emissions. There is uncertainty regarding the specific nature of construction activities that would be facilitated under implementation of the proposed GPU. Despite the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires the preparation of project-specific air quality analysis prior to the construction of any new development and incorporation of mitigation if emissions levels are shown to be above SCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance for cancerogenic and non-cancerogenic risks, as well as SCAQMD LSTs, it cannot be definitively known or stated at this time that all future development projects occurring under implementation of the proposed GPU would be able to reduce potential risks and localized construction air pollutant emissions to levels that are below SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, with regard to localized criteria air pollutant and TAC emissions generated during future construction activities, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable** even with the incorporation of feasible mitigation measures.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record regarding **construction** impacts related to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, the City Council hereby finds that, except for Mitigation Measure AIR 1, no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels, and such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, even with the application of Mitigation Measure AIR 1. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

Impact GHG-1- Would the GPU generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Substantial Evidence

GPU implementation would result in construction and operational activities that would generate GHG emissions. As described in more detail below, the GHG emissions generated by the growth envisioned under the GPU would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and result in a significant and unavoidable impact even with the inclusion of feasible mitigation measures.

The greenhouse gas emissions generated by the growth envisioned under the General Plan Update would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and result in a significant and unavoidable impact even with the inclusion of feasible mitigation measures. The growth anticipated through the GPU would result in construction activities that would generate GHG emissions primarily from combustion in equipment during demolition, site preparation, grading, building, construction, paving, and architectural activities and in worker, vendor, and haul trips, although there is uncertainty to the timing and methods of construction activities which could occur for future development projects.

The existing and proposed land uses envisioned by the GPU would result in operational GHG emissions, primarily from mobile sources such as from vehicle trips to and from land uses resulting in CO₂ emissions, energy (if electricity is generated through non-renewable sources), and area sources (such as solid waste and landfill uses).

The total unmitigated GHG emissions estimated to occur under projected 2040 growth conditions are shown below in Table 4.8-4 from the EIR and compared against the potential GHG emissions that could exist in 2040 if the GPU were not approved.⁴ As described above, the SCAQMD recommends the use of an efficiency threshold for plan-level analysis in which potential emissions levels are considered in terms of how many GHG emissions would be produced by each resident and employee using a project's facilities. Thus, the adjusted 2040 project-level efficiency target of 2.6 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent per year per service population (MTCO₂e/yr/SP) is the primary contextual factor considered in evaluating the significance of the GPU's GHG emissions changes.

⁴ Although CEQA generally requires an evaluation of impacts associated with project implementation against the conditions that exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a)(2) allows a lead agency to, "...use projected future conditions (beyond the date of project operations) baseline as the sole baseline for analysis only if it demonstrates with substantial evidence that use of existing conditions would be either misleading or without informative value to decision-makers and the public." Existing conditions GHG emissions for Year 2019 (current baseline conditions) and Year 2040 (future conditions) have been provided in Section 4.3.1. As shown in Table 4.8-4 and described in Section 4.3.1, the existing land uses within the Plan Area would benefit from regulatory actions at the State level (i.e., vehicle and fuel efficiency standards and cleaner electricity), which would continue to reduce emissions over the next approximately 20 years, even if the GPU is not approved or implemented. Therefore, to provide a conservative assessment of emissions associated with implementation of the proposed GPU, GHG emissions associated with operation of the existing land uses in 2040 are compared against those proposed under the GPU in 2040 to paint a more accurate picture of how the land uses proposed by the GPU could change emissions in the Planning Area. This provides a more conservative assessment of emissions because the emissions "gap" between existing land uses (future conditions 2040) and the GPU (2040) is less than that compared to existing land uses (current conditions 2019) and the GPU (2040).

**Table 4.8-5
Mitigated GPU GHG Emissions**

Source	GHG Emissions (MTCO ₂ e / Year)		
	Existing Land Uses (2040) ^(A)	Proposed GPU Land Uses (2040)	Net Change
Area	10,682	10,812	130
Energy	110,921	96,440	-14,481
Mobile	602,963	607,043	10,552
Waste	18,243	19,539	1,296
Water	11,055	10,492	-563
Total ^(B)	753,864	744,327	-3,065
Service Population (SP)	174,866	196,451	21,585
MTCO ₂ e/yr/SP	4.3	3.8	-0.5
SCAQMD Tier 4 Adjusted 2040 Plan Level Efficiency Threshold	--	2.6	--
Exceeds Threshold?	--	Yes	--
Source: MIG, 2021 (see Appendix D).			
(A) See Table 4.8-3 for existing GHG emissions in the Planning Area.			
(B) Totals may not equal due to rounding.			

Per Table 4.8-5, the General Plan Update's 2040 growth projections would result in Greenhouse Gas Emissions that would exceed the adjusted SCAQMD derived plan-level efficiency metric which is considered a potentially significant impact and would require mitigation (refer to GHG-1 and GHG-2 below). Mitigation GHG-1 would require the City to adopt an ordinance that amends the City's Municipal Code to require new residential and non-residential entitlements to install electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. Mitigation GHG-2 would require the City to consider the feasibility of adopting an ordinance which would mandate all new residential and/or non-residential construction in the City meet ZNE standards, as feasible.

The text of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 are shown below.

GHG-1 The 2019 CalGreen Code contains several voluntary measures that are not formally required. Within one year of adoption of the General Plan Update, the City shall adopt an ordinance that incorporates, requires and makes mandatory certain CalGreen Code voluntary measures as described below.

- a. Require new residential tentative tract maps that would allow 17 or more dwelling units to provide electric vehicle infrastructure for each dwelling in compliance with Section A4.106.8.1 of the CalGreen Code, and that each dwelling be equipped with a vehicle charging station that has a similar or better functionality than a Level 2 charging station.
- b. Require new multifamily projects with 17 or more dwelling units to provide electric vehicle infrastructure for each dwelling in compliance with Section A4.106.8.2 of the CalGreen Code, and that each one of the parking spaces that has such electric

vehicle infrastructure be equipped with vehicle charging stations that have a similar or better functionality than a Level 2 charging station.

- c. Require new non-residential development projects to provide designated parking for any combination of low-emitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles pursuant to the Tier 2 requirements of Table A5.106.5.1.2 of the CalGreen Code. Such parking spaces shall be marked pursuant to Section A5.106.5.1.3 of the CalGreen Code.
- d. Require new non-residential development projects to provide electric vehicle charging spaces with electric vehicle infrastructure in compliance with Table A5.106.5.3.2 of the California Green Code and be equipped with vehicle charging stations that have similar or better functionality than a Level 2 charging station. Such spaces shall be marked in compliance with Section A5.106.5.3.3 of the CalGreen Code.

GHG-2 - Within two years of the adoption of the General Plan, The City shall consider and evaluate the feasibility of adopting an ordinance that amends the City's Municipal Code to require all new residential and/or non-residential development subject to Title 24, Part 6 of the California Building Code to achieve Zero Net Energy (ZNE) standards. If the City finds ZNE technology, programs, and/or other strategies are feasible and cost-effective, the City shall adopt a ZNE ordinance as expeditiously as possible given City resources. As defined by the California Energy Commission (CEC), ZNE standards require the value of the net energy produced by project renewable energy resources equals the value of the energy consumed annually by the project, using the CEC's Time Dependent Valuation (CEC, 2015).

The Project would also be subject to mitigation measures AQ-2, VMT-1, VMT-2, and VMT-3, which are provided under Air Quality and Transportation Impacts included in this section.

Per Table 4.8-5, the mitigated GPU GHG emissions would continue to exceed the adjusted SCAQMD derived plan-level efficiency metric and the Project's effect on GHG emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. Specifically, it is unknown how many projects would be subject to Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and it is uncertain at this time if adopting the ZNE provisions in Mitigation Measure GHG-2 would be feasible. Since the GHG emissions reductions attributable to Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 cannot be definitively assessed at this time, and since the GHG emissions reductions associated with Mitigation Measure AQ-2 and VMT-1, VMT-2, and VMT-3 do not meet the interpolated SCAQMD efficiency metric of 2.6 MTCO₂e/yr/SP, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record the City Council finds that the Project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment and that even with the application of all feasible mitigation measures such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

Impact GHG-2- The proposed GPU would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Substantial Evidence*CARB Scoping Plan*

As discussed under Section 4.8.2, the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan is CARB's primary document used to ensure State GHG reduction goals are met. The plan identifies an increasing need for coordination among State, regional, and local governments to achieve the GHG emissions reductions that can be gained from local land use planning and decisions. The major elements of the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, which is designed to achieve the State's 2030 GHG reduction goal, are listed in Section 4.8.2. Nearly all of the specific measures identified in the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan would be implemented at the state level, with CARB and/or another state or regional agency having the primary responsibility for achieving required GHG reductions. The Project, therefore, would have limited ability to directly conflict with any of the specific measures identified in the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Nonetheless, the overarching goal of the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan is to achieve a 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels by the Year 2030. To achieve this statewide goal, the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan recommends a statewide efficiency metric of six metric tons per capita by 2030 and two metric tons per capita by 2050. These statewide per capita targets are based on the statewide GHG emissions inventory that includes all emissions sectors in the State. Under an unmitigated scenario, implementation of the proposed GPU is estimated to result in a GHG emission efficiency of 4.8 MTCO_{2e} per capita; with mitigation, the proposed GPU is estimated to result in a GHG emission efficiency of 4.6 MTCO_{2e} per capita. Project growth would result in emissions that exceed the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan adjusted statewide 2040 metric of four MTCO_{2e} per capita employed for this EIR.⁵ To meet the interpolated CARB Scoping Plan efficiency target of four MTCO_{2e} per capita, the City would need to further reduce its GPU Year 2040 GHG emissions presented in Table 4.8-5 by approximately 105,750 MTCO_{2e}.

SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS

The primary goal of SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS is to reduce GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks by 19% per capita by 2035. Table 4.8-6 (Transportation GHG Emissions and VMT Per Capita), below, compares the existing 2019 and 2040 VMT and transportation-related GHG emissions per capita in the Planning Area.

⁵ The GPU plans for growth through Year 2040. Therefore, the 2040 statewide efficiency metric is linearly derived from the State's 2030 (6 MTCO_{2e} per capita) and 2050 (2 MTCO_{2e} per capita) targets.

**Table 4.8-6
Transportation GHG Emissions and VMT Per Capita**

Metric	2019	2040 Growth	Percent Change
GPU Unmitigated VMT and Transportation GHG			
Population	141,102	161,291	+14%
Annual VMT	1,991,622,809	2,042,308,058	+3%
Annual VMT per capita	14,115	12,662	-10%
Transportation GHG	874,557	635,939	+16%
Transportation GHG per capita	6.2	3.9	-36%
GPU Mitigated VMT and Transportation GHG			
Population	141,102	161,291	+14%
Annual VMT ^(A)	1,991,622,809	1,944,852,672	-2%
Annual VMT per capita	14,115	12,058	-15%
Transportation GHG	874,557	607,043	+16%
Transportation GHG per capita	6.2	3.8	-39%
Source: Fehr and Peers, 2021 and MIG, 2021 (see Appendix D of the EIR)			

As shown in Table 4.8-6, under unmitigated 2040 conditions, the proposed GPU would result in an approximately 10 percent reduction in VMT per capita and an approximately 36 percent reduction in transportation GHG per capita, as compared to 2019 conditions. Year 2005 conditions are not known but are presumed to have a higher (i.e., less efficient) per capita consumption value than 2019 conditions. Under mitigated 2040 conditions, the proposed GPU would result in an approximately 15 percent reduction in VMT per capita and an approximately 39 percent reduction in transportation GHG per capita, as compared to 2019 conditions.

Although the GPU would result in a per capita transportation GHG emission reduction that would exceed the 2040 goal identified by CARB (21 percent reduction in transportation GHG emissions per capita as compared to 2005 conditions), the GPU would be inconsistent with the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS because the growth envisioned in the GPU exceeds the growth envisioned in the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS. As shown in Table 4.3-6 of the Air Quality Section, the GPU's growth far exceeds the population growth assumptions contained in the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS. The GPU's increase in population (approximately 20,190 people) in the Planning Area by 2040 also exceeds the 2020 RTP/SCS population growth assumptions for the City (+11,800 people from 2016 to 2045); however, the GPU's increase in employment in Planning Area (approximately 1,400 workers) is within the 2020 RTP/SCS employment growth assumption (+3,000 workers from 2016 to 2045).

Since the growth envisioned in the GPU is inconsistent with the conditions under which the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS was developed, the additional, transportation-related GHG emissions generated as a result of GPU implementation could exceed that considered during development of the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS. As such, the overall, per capita transportation GHG emission reductions that would need to be achieved by the GPU would have to far exceed those originally identified for the region by CARB (i.e., more growth in the GPU means more emissions, therefore a greater reduction would have to occur in the city for the per capita transportation GHG emissions to meet the same mass emissions benchmark).

As discussed above the GPU's unmitigated GHG emissions would: 1) not be consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan's interpolated per capita GHG efficiency metric. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact. As discussed under Impact GHG-1 the proposed Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2, GHG-1, GHG-2, and VMT-1, VMT-2, and VMT-3, which would reduce GHG emissions in the city. However, these measures do not reduce GHG emissions to levels that meet the interpolated GHG emissions efficiency metric of four MTCO_{2e} per capita associated with the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan. Therefore, the GPU would conflict with the overarching goal of the CARB Scoping Plan, which is designed to achieve the State's 2030 GHG reduction goal and set the State's course for meeting additional, future GHG emission reduction goals. This impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record the City Council finds that the Project would conflict with the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan, which was adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, and that even with the application of all feasible mitigation measures such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

Impact GHG-3 – Would the GPU cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to greenhouse gases?

Substantial Evidence

The increase in Greenhouse Gas emissions is considered a worldwide impact and the impacts generated by a single project would not generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change. As outlined in Impacts GHG-1 and GHG-2, the Project would result in GHG emissions that would exceed the significance thresholds applied in the General Plan Update EIR and would conflict with the CARB2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Even with the application of mitigation measures (AQ-2, GHG-1, GHG-2, and VMT-1, VMT-2, and VMT-3), the impact generated would still be considered significant and unavoidable.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record the City Council finds that the Project would cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to greenhouse gases, and that even with the application of all feasible mitigation measures such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

Transportation

Impact TRANS-2 Would the GPU conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Substantial Evidence

Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) was passed by the legislature and signed into law by the governor in the fall of 2013 which identified that congestion or delay-based metrics such as roadway capacity and Level of Service (LOS) will no longer be the performance measure used for determining transportation impacts of projects. Rather, the new performance measure such as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) will be used. The VMT growth associated with both land use and transportation projects is part of the adopted regional transportation plans (RTPs), regional transportation plans/sustainable communities strategies (RTP/SCSs), and general plans. The plans typically consider the acceptability of VMT growth at a cumulative or programmatic level.

The Project (General Plan Update) went through a detailed analysis and the methodology for determining VMT transportation impacts was obtained from the City of Whittier's Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) which outlines the following process for performing a VMT analysis:

- 1) Determine if VMT analysis is necessary by comparing project characteristics for each land use to the City's screening criteria;
- 2) If a project component does not meet the screening criteria, perform VMT analysis for the component(s) that do not meet the screening criteria to determine that component's VMT (using the appropriate metric based on land-use type).
- 3) Compare the project component VMT to the significance criteria to determine if there is VMT transportation impact.
- 4) If there is an impact, identify mitigation measures to reduce the project impact.

The Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) Regional Travel Demand Model (hereinafter, "*SCAG Model*"), to estimate a project's VMT. VMT is presented in numerous different forms depending on the analysis being conducted. "Home-Based VMT" per capita is used for residential projects and "Home-Based Work VMT" per employee for office projects. For general plans, Total VMT per service population is used to determine potential impacts. The VMT for the GPU included "project generated VMT" for the project Transportation TAZs and project effect on VMT estimates under the conditions consisting of the existing/baseline 2019 conditions, the cumulative base 2040 conditions which represent the 2016-2040 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (RTP/SCS) and the Cumulative Plus Project 2040 Conditions represent the updated General Plan scenario.

Based on State guidance and the City's impact thresholds, as outlined in Table 4.17-8 of the EIR (shown below), the City will achieve double a 15 percent reduction for Total VMT per Service Population trips, in addition, Table 4.17-8 also shows that by 2040 the City will not quite achieve a 15 percent or more reduction for two of the major trip types which are expected to occur within the City; Home-Based VMT per Capita (14.5) and Home-Based Work VMT per Employee (14.7) criteria. Although the total service population VMT achieves the 15 percent reduction; however,

to err on the side of caution, this is still considered a potentially significant impact which would require mitigation.

Table 4.17-8
2040 Plus Project VMT Compared to 2040 Baseline

VMT Metrics	2040 Base	2040 Plus Project	Percent Difference
Total VMT per Service Population	29.5	30.0	1.6%
Home-Based VMT per Capita	14.7	14.5	-1.5%
Home-Based Work VMT per Employee	14.5	14.7	0.8%

Source: Table 5, F&P 2021

All three VMT metrics (i.e., Baseline VMT and Thresholds, 2040 Plus Project VMT Compared to Existing Baseline, and 2040 Plus Project VMT Compared to 2040 Baseline) were analyzed and it was determined that all three VMT metrics perform better than the City's baseline. The State's guidance and the City's adopted VMT approach required that the VMT metrics would need to perform 15 percent better than the City's baseline average to not exceed the significant impact threshold. Mitigation strategies for Home-Based VMT per Capita and Total VMT per Service Population analyzed strategies to expand local transit, bicycle master plans, and telecommuting/alternative work schedules. Based on the analysis performed, it has been determined that the City cannot achieve a 15 percent or more reduction in VMT at this time even with implementation of all feasible mitigation strategies. The proposed Project is not consistent with the State guidance and the City's own VMT impact thresholds.

The proposed GPU does not meet the total service area VMT reduction goal of 15 percent established in the Mobility and Infrastructure Element of the Whittier General Plan, therefore its VMT impacts are significant and adverse even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, uncertainty about funding availability with respect to the timing of implementation and construction of the improvements outlined in the mitigation measures make it difficult to gauge the efficiency of these measure in advance of the 2040 time horizon for the GPU.

Mitigation Measures

VMT-1 Expand Local Transit. The City shall seek ways to expand local transit services including but not limited to: (1) adding shuttle routes connecting several destinations such as Uptown Whittier, the Groves, the proposed Lambert Road/Washington Boulevard Station of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (L Line, formerly Gold Line), the Quad, and Whittier College; and (2) expand local shuttle operations that would occur on weekdays during on-/off-peak hours, with 15-minute headways and a route and stops serving several areas and key destinations.

VMT-2 Bicycle Master Plan. The City shall investigate ways to achieve "early buildout" of the bicycle and pedestrian facility network proposed in the City's Bicycle Master Plan and General Plan. These actions would be in addition to completion of the Whittier Greenway Trail to the eastern City limit for which the City has already designed and secured funding. Such actions would help reduce Total VMT per service population because any trip, whether for employment, residential, or other trip purposes, that shifts to utilizing the bicycle or pedestrian network would lead to a reduction in VMT.

VMT-3 Telecommuting/Alternative Work Schedules. The City will develop specific policies and incentives to encourage telecommuting and alternative work schedules (similar to the shift to telecommuting from Covid-19 and continuing advances in technology). These actions would be applied to selected employment categories such as professional employees and would not be applied to certain other employment categories (e.g., retail employees would still continue to work on-site). For example, the Fehr & Peers Study examined up to one day a week of telecommuting which would reduce the number of commute trips and therefore reduce the total and per capita VMT traveled by employees in that employment category.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record the City Council finds that the Project would be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and that even with the application of all feasible mitigation measures such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

Impact TRANS-5 – Would the GPU cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic?

Substantial Evidence

The traffic study prepared for the General Plan Update (GPU) evaluated the cumulative VMT impacts in 2040 and determined that the City will achieve greater than a 15 percent reduction for cumulative Home-Based VMT per Capita trips (-17%) and Home-Based Work VMT per Employee trips (-21%) by 2040 with mitigation. The GPU would not quite achieve a 15 percent or greater reduction for Total VMT per Service Population trips (-13 percent) by 2040 even with mitigation (see Table 4.17-9).

**Table 4.17-9
2040 Plus Project VMT With Mitigation**

VMT Metrics	2040 Plus Project	2040 Plus Project with Mitigation	Percent Difference
Total VMT per Service Population	30.0	28.6	-13%
Home-Based VMT per Capita	14.5	13.5	-17%
Home-Based Work VMT per Employee	14.7	14.2	-21%
Source: Table 7, F&P 2021			

The Traffic Study also analyzed the cumulative conditions in terms of traffic volumes against City Mobility and Infrastructure Element standards, which analyzed the expected changes in traffic over existing conditions from ambient growth in existing traffic volumes due to the effects of overall regional growth and development outside the Planning Area. The overall negative growth factor between the existing base and future year no project scenario is attributable to future regional transportation network improvements and transportation demand management (TDM) factors. The TDM factors are consistent with the planned and regional projects and the SCAG RTP/SCS.

Impact TRA-2 above concluded the GPU would have a significant and unavoidable VMT impact even with recommended mitigation (see **Mitigation Measures VMT-1 through VMT-3**). Therefore, the GPU would also make an incremental but significant contribution to a regional (cumulative) VMT impact and would not be fully consistent with the General Plan (Mobility and Infrastructure Element) in that regard.

Finding

Based on substantial evidence in the EIR and the public record the City Council finds that the Project would result in substantial and significant adverse cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic and that even with the application of all feasible mitigation measures such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 7, specific social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts.

6 ALTERNATIVES

This section contains a discussion of the alternatives considered and rejected in the Whittier General Plan Update DEIR, including the No Project - Existing General Plan Development Capacity Alternative (Alternative 1); the Reduced (25%) Overall Development Alternative (Alternative 2); and the Reduced (40%) Residential Alternative (Alternative 3). Since the Whittier General Plan Update focuses on methods to redevelop and improve the entire Plan area, considering alternatives at different locations outside Whittier is not practical or necessary. Therefore, no off-site alternatives were evaluated.\

Project Objectives

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), this EIR does not evaluate every conceivable alternative. A feasible range of alternatives that will allow decision-makers to make a reasoned choice and that meet most of the Project's guiding principles has been evaluated.

The project guiding principles are:

1. Promote healthy and safe neighborhoods with comprehensive approaches that consider best practices around land use, mobility, housing, environmental justice, community services, and design.
2. Create new housing opportunities for a full range of housing types and to increase housing affordability.
3. Strengthen the City's industrial and office sectors.
4. Support a diversified economy with a balance of small and large businesses across a broad range of industries that provide employment, commercial, and experiential opportunities.
5. Strive for a vibrant uptown, celebrates local entrepreneurship, features our civic institutions, and encourages downtown living within a vibrant gathering place for the community.
6. Create an interconnected, active transportation system that recognizes and responds to the critical needs of businesses to move commerce while accommodating the equally important necessity for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists to move around the City with convenience and ease.

7. Engage residents and stakeholders in ensuring equitable and inclusive processes, policies, investments, and service systems. Ensure residents in disadvantaged communities have access to healthy foods, parks, mobility options activity, public programs, and safe homes.
8. Protect people, infrastructure, and community assets from evolving climate threats and vulnerabilities, and from natural and human-caused hazards.

Alternative 1: No Project -Existing General Plan Development Capacity

Substantial Evidence

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative (No Project Alternative) assumes that development would occur within the Planning Area, but only in the locations and at the densities allowed or anticipated under the 1993 General Plan.

The No Project Alternative assumes a continuation of the existing 1993 General Plan. As this alternative would result in a reduction in the amount of development, and would not include any of the updated goals and policies included in the GPU, it would generally meet the following project objectives, but not at the same level as the Project:

1. Promote healthy and safe neighborhoods with comprehensive approaches that consider best practices around land use, mobility, housing, environmental justice, community services, and design.
2. Create new housing opportunities for a full range of housing types and to increase housing affordability.
3. Strengthen the City's industrial and office sectors.
4. Support a diversified economy with a balance of small and large businesses across a broad range of industries that provide employment, commercial, and experiential opportunities.
5. Strive for a downtown that showcases the City's rich history, celebrates local entrepreneurship, features our civic institutions, and encourages downtown living within a vibrant gathering place for the community.
6. Create an interconnected, active transportation system that recognizes and responds to the critical needs of businesses to move commerce while accommodating the equally important necessity for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists to move around the City with convenience and ease.
7. Engage residents and stakeholders in ensuring equitable and inclusive processes, policies, investments, and service systems. Ensure residents in disadvantaged communities have access to healthy foods, parks, mobility options activity, public programs, and safe homes.
8. Protect people, infrastructure, and community assets from evolving climate threats and vulnerabilities, and from natural and human-caused hazards.

Finding

Given the foregoing facts, as more fully delineated in the Project EIR, this City Council finds that the No Project - Existing General Plan Development Capacity Alternative is less desirable than

the proposed Project and therefore rejects the alternative. Public Resources Code § 21081(a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(3).

**Alternative 2: Reduced (25%) Overall Development
Substantial Evidence**

The Reduced Overall Development Alternative assumes that overall development associated with the Project would be reduced by twenty-five percent. This alternative assumes that policies and goals associated with the General Plan Update would be applicable to development under this alternative.

The Reduced Overall Development Alternative assumes a general twenty-five percent reduction of development within the Planning Area when compared to the Project. Additionally, goals and policies within the GPU would be applicable to this alternative. This alternative would generally meet the following project objectives, similar to the Project:

1. Promote healthy and safe neighborhoods with comprehensive approaches that consider best practices around land use, mobility, housing, environmental justice, community services, and design.
2. Create new housing opportunities for a full range of housing types and to increase housing affordability.
3. Strengthen the City's industrial and office sectors.
4. Support a diversified economy with a balance of small and large businesses across a broad range of industries that provide employment, commercial, and experiential opportunities.
5. Strive for a downtown that showcases the City's rich history, celebrates local entrepreneurship, features our civic institutions, and encourages downtown living within a vibrant gathering place for the community.
6. Create an interconnected, active transportation system that recognizes and responds to the critical needs of businesses to move commerce while accommodating the equally important necessity for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists to move around the City with convenience and ease.
7. Engage residents and stakeholders in ensuring equitable and inclusive processes, policies, investments, and service systems. Ensure residents in disadvantaged communities have access to healthy foods, parks, mobility options activity, public programs, and safe homes.
8. Protect people, infrastructure, and community assets from evolving climate threats and vulnerabilities, and from natural and human-caused hazards.

Finding

Given the foregoing facts, as more fully delineated in the Project EIR, this City Council finds that the Reduced Overall Development Alternative is less desirable than the proposed Project and

therefore rejects the alternative. Public Resources Code § 21081(a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(3).

Alternative 3: Reduced (40%) Residential

Substantial Evidence

The Reduced Residential Alternative assumes that residential development would be restricted to areas included in already approved Specific Plans or urbanized areas that include existing infrastructure. This would result in a substantial reduction in residential and population growth; non-residential and hotel/motel development would be similar to the Project. not associated with this alternative. This alternative assumes that policies and goals associated with the General Plan Update would be applicable to development under this alternative.

The Reduced Residential Alternative assumes a reduction in residential development population growth within the Planning Area, but a similar level of non-residential growth as associated with the Project. This alternative assumes GPU goals and policies would be applicable. It would generally meet the following project objectives, similar to the Project:

1. Promote healthy and safe neighborhoods with comprehensive approaches that consider best practices around land use, mobility, housing, environmental justice, community services, and design.
2. Create new housing opportunities for a full range of housing types and to increase housing affordability.
3. Strengthen the City's industrial and office sectors.
4. Support a diversified economy with a balance of small and large businesses across a broad range of industries that provide employment, commercial, and experiential opportunities.
5. Strive for a downtown that showcases the City's rich history, celebrates local entrepreneurship, features our civic institutions, and encourages downtown living within a vibrant gathering place for the community.
6. Create an interconnected, active transportation system that recognizes and responds to the critical needs of businesses to move commerce while accommodating the equally important necessity for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists to move around the City with convenience and ease.
7. Engage residents and stakeholders in ensuring equitable and inclusive processes, policies, investments, and service systems. Ensure residents in disadvantaged communities have access to healthy foods, parks, mobility options activity, public programs, and safe homes.
8. Protect people, infrastructure, and community assets from evolving climate threats and vulnerabilities, and from natural and human-caused hazards.

Finding

Given the foregoing facts, as more fully delineated in the Project EIR, this City Council finds that the Reduced Residential Alternative is less desirable than the proposed Project and therefore rejects the alternative. Public Resources Code § 21081(a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(3).

Exhibit B – Statement of Overriding Considerations

CEQA requires that a Lead Agency balance the benefits of a project against its adverse and unavoidable effects in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a). CEQA requires that a Lead Agency support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or elsewhere in the administrative record pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b). The Lead Agency’s written reasons are referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations. For those significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the Lead Agency is required to find that the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant impacts on the environment.

Regarding a Statement of Overriding Considerations, Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following:

1. CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
2. When the lead agency approves a project that will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
3. If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

The City will approve the Whittier General Plan Update and Zoning Amendments and has prepared a Final EIR that satisfies the requirements of CEQA. The following adverse impacts of the project are considered significant and unavoidable based on the analysis in the Draft EIR (DEIR), Final EIR (FEIR), and the Findings of Fact.

- Impact AIR-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plans because it would exceed the growth assumption of the 2016 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emissions would exceed SCAQMD’s regional threshold, thereby impeding AQMP attainment.
- Impact AIR-2: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of non-attainment criteria pollutants for which the project region is in non-attainment (including NOx).

- Impact AIR-3: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Impact AIR-5: Cause adverse substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to air quality (Cumulative Impact).
- Impact GHG-1: Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- Impact GHG-2: Conflict with the growth assumptions of the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS.
- Impact GHG-3: Cause a substantial adverse cumulative impact with respect to greenhouse gas emissions (Cumulative Impact).
- Impact TRANS-2: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), related to Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT).
- Impact TRANS-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic.

The City has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified above are acceptable because those impacts are outweighed by the economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project, listed below.

- The project will allow the City to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation and comply with State Housing Element legal requirements.
- The project will increase badly needed housing opportunities and provide a wide range of housing types. This positive effect on housing will contribute to housing affordability in Whittier.
- The project will maintain the City's economic viability and productivity over the long term by encouraging an efficient and sustainable pattern of development.
- The project increases the potential for employment generating uses, thereby increasing employment opportunities within Whittier.
- The project provides for a dynamic mix of businesses, uses, and employment that sustains a strong local economy, with design qualities that contribute to their success.
- The project provides for the development and maintenance of a citywide bicycle network of off-street bike paths, on-street bike lanes, and bike streets. Including.
- The project supports a connected, balanced, integrated, safe, and multi-modal transportation system that accommodates all travel options.
- The project promotes the use of transit within the City as a means of reducing local traffic congestion, achieving greenhouse gases reduction targets, and connecting the community physically and socially.

- The project includes energy efficiency and conservation measures that reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The project will increase the potential for retail and other revenue-generating land uses for the City.
- The project will concentrate mixed-use development at designated nodes and catalyst sites along Whittier Boulevard and Lambert Road to provide opportunities for clustering similar and compatible uses, support economic development, create and maintain vibrant pedestrian-oriented spaces and experiences and reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The project will promote development surrounding the Metro L Line station that provides transit-supportive housing types/densities and businesses that contribute to a lively living environment and reduce VMT and Greenhouse Gas emissions.
- The project will establish development standards and design guidelines that promote high-quality project designs that are attractive, functional, and create a sense of place.

The City Council hereby finds that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through the approval of the project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated. The City Council finds that each of the Project benefits separately and individually outweighs all of the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable. The City Council further finds that no feasible alternative exists that both would provide all of the foregoing benefits to the public and reduce environmental impacts when compared to the Project.

Exhibit C – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
<i>AIR QUALITY</i>						
<p>Consistency with SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants.</p> <p>Cause substantial adverse cumulative air quality impacts.</p>	<p>AQ-1: Require a Project-Level Construction Assessment for New Discretionary Development Projects. The City shall require applicants to submit a quantitative project-level construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions analysis for future discretionary development projects. The estimated construction criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions shall be compared against the thresholds of significance maintained by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and, if emissions are shown to be above SCAQMD thresholds, the City shall require the imposition and implementation of mitigation to reduce emissions below the thresholds that have been exceeded. Mitigation to reduce emissions could include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of specific construction equipment (e.g., specialized pieces of equipment with smaller engines or equipment that will be more efficient 	Project Proponent/Applicant	City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division.	Prior to discretionary project approval.		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
	<p>and reduce engine runtime);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring equipment to use alternative fuel sources (e.g., electric-powered and liquefied or compressed natural gas), cleaner emission standards (e.g., U.S. EPA Tier IV Final emissions standards for equipment greater than 50-horsepower), and/or utilizing added exhaust devices (e.g., Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter); Minimizing the idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to two minutes; and Application of Low-VOC paints to interior and/or exterior surfaces (e.g., paints that meet SQAQMD Rule 1113 “Low-VOC” or “Super-Compliant” requirements). 					
<p>Consistency with SCAQMP Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>AQ-2: Prohibit the Installation of Natural Gas Hearths in New Residential Development. The City shall prohibit the installation of new natural gas hearths/fireplaces in new residential development. Natural gas</p>	<p>City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division.</p>	<p>City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division.</p>	<p>Project approval (subject to conditions of approval). Prior to occupancy to verify implementation..</p>		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
<p>Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants.</p> <p>Cause substantial adverse cumulative air quality impacts.</p>	<p>hearths/fireplaces may be incorporated into remodels / redevelopment if the existing structure(s) proposed for remodel / redevelopment featured natural gas hearths/fireplaces; however, the quantity of natural gas hearths/fireplaces provided by the new structure(s) may not exceed that present prior to the remodel / redevelopment and must meet the most recent U.S. EPA, CARB, and/or SCAQMD emissions standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</p>					
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS						
<p>Generate Significant Greenhouse gas Emissions.</p> <p>Conflict With an Applicable GHG Reduction Plan, Policy or Regulation.</p> <p>Cause Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impacts with Respect to Greenhouse Gases</p>	<p>GHG-1: The 2019 CalGreen Code contains several voluntary measures that are not formally required. Within one year of adoption of the General Plan Update, the City shall adopt an ordinance that incorporates, requires and makes mandatory certain Calgreen Code voluntary measures as described below.</p> <p>e. Require new residential tentative tract maps that would allow 17 or more dwelling units to provide electric vehicle infrastructure for each dwelling in compliance with Section A4.106.8.1 of the CalGreen Code, and that each dwelling be equipped with a vehicle</p>	<p>City of Whittier City Council.</p>	<p>City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division.</p>	<p>Within one year of the adoption of the General Plan Update.</p>		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
	<p>charging station that has a similar or better functionality than a Level 2 charging station.</p> <p>f. Require new multifamily projects with 17 or more dwelling units to provide electric vehicle infrastructure for each dwelling in compliance with Section A4.106.8.2 of the CalGreen Code, and that each one of the parking spaces that has such electric vehicle infrastructure be equipped with vehicle charging stations that have a similar or better functionality than a Level 2 charging station.</p> <p>g. Require new non-residential development projects to provide designated parking for any combination of low-emitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles pursuant to the Tier 2 requirements of Table A5.106.5.1.2 of the CalGreen Code. Such parking spaces shall be marked pursuant to Section A5.106.5.1.3 of the CalGreen Code.</p> <p>Require new non-residential development projects to provide electric vehicle charging spaces with electric vehicle infrastructure in compliance with Table A5.106.5.3.2 of the California Green Code and be equipped with vehicle charging stations that have</p>					

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
	similar or better functionality than a Level 2 charging station. Such spaces shall be marked in compliance with Section A5.106.5.3.3 of the CalGreen Code.					
<p>Generate Significant Greenhouse gas Emissions.</p> <p>Conflict With an Applicable GHG Reduction Plan, Policy or Regulation.</p> <p>Cause Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impacts with Respect to Greenhouse Gases</p>	<p>GHG-2: Within two years of the adoption of the General Plan, The City shall consider and evaluate the feasibility of adopting an ordinance that amends the City’s Municipal Code to require all new residential and/or non-residential development subject to Title 24, Part 6 of the California Building Code to achieve Zero Net Energy (ZNE) standards. If the City finds ZNE technology, programs, and/or other strategies are feasible and cost-effective, the City shall adopt a ZNE ordinance as expeditiously as possible given City resources. As defined by the California Energy Commission (CEC), ZNE standards require the value of the net energy produced by project renewable energy resources equals the value of the energy consumed annually by the project, using the CEC’s Time Dependent Valuation (CEC, 2015).</p>	City of Whittier City Council, Planning Division and Building Division	City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division.	Within two years of adoption of the General Plan		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY						
<p>Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies.</p> <p>Conflict With or</p>	<p>UTL-1: Water Demand Management. New developments under the General Plan Update that will be served by local water utility providers will not be</p>	Project Proponent	City of Whittier Planning Division and Building	Prior to approval of development permits.		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
<p>Obstruct Implementation of Water Quality Control Plan.</p> <p>Cause Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impacts with Respect to Hydrology or Water Quality.</p>	<p>approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2040 under the most recent Urban Water Master Plan for the involved local water provider.</p>		<p>Division</p>			
NOISE						
<p>Exposure to Noise Levels in Excess of Standards.</p> <p>Cause a Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impact with Respect to Noise.</p>	<p>NOI-1: The City shall require new residential and commercial projects located within 200 feet of the Union Pacific railroad track to conduct a freight train ground vibration and vibration noise evaluation consistent with approved vibration assessment methodologies (e.g. Caltrans, Federal Transportation Authority).</p>	<p>Project Proponent</p>	<p>City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division</p>	<p>Prior to approval of land use applications or issuance of building permits.</p>		
PUBLIC SERVICES						
TRANSPORTATION						
<p>Conflict with Program Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System.</p> <p>Cause a Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impact with Respect to Transportation.</p>	<p>VMT-1: The City shall seek ways to expand local transit services including but not limited to: (1) adding shuttle routes connecting several destinations such as Uptown Whittier, the Groves, the proposed Lambert Road/Washington</p>	<p>City of Whittier in collaboration with transit providers.</p>	<p>Through the annual CIP/General Plan Consistency Review by the Planning Commission and City Council</p>	<p>Progress and accomplishments with respect to expanded transit service to be identified and reviewed annually as part of the CIP/General Plan consistency review.</p>		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
	Boulevard Station of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (L Line, formerly Gold Line), the Quad, and Whittier College; and (2) expand local shuttle operations that would occur on weekdays during on-/off-peak hours, with 15-minute headways and a route and stops serving several areas and key destinations.					
<p>Conflict with Program Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System.</p> <p>Cause a Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impact with Respect to Transportation.</p>	<p>VMT-2: The City shall investigate ways to achieve “early buildout” of the bicycle and pedestrian facility network proposed in the City’s Bicycle Master Plan and General Plan. These actions would be in addition to completion of the Whittier Greenway Trail to the eastern City limit for which the City has already designed and secured funding. Such actions would help reduce Total VMT per service population because any trip, whether for employment,</p>	City of Whittier in collaboration with transit providers.	Through the annual CIP/General Plan Consistency Review by the Planning Commission and City Council	Progress and accomplishments with respect to expanded transit service to be identified and reviewed annually as part of the CIP/General Plan consistency review.		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
	residential, or other trip purposes, that shifts to utilizing the bicycle or pedestrian network would lead to a reduction in VMT.					
<p>Conflict with Program Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System.</p> <p>Cause a Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impact with Respect to Transportation.</p>	<p>VMT-3: The City will develop specific policies and incentives to encourage telecommuting and alternative work schedules (similar to the shift to telecommuting from Covid-19 and continuing advances in technology). These actions would be applied to selected employment categories such as professional employees and would not be applied to certain other employment categories (e.g., retail employees would still continue to work on-site). For example, the Fehr & Peers Study examined up to one day a week of telecommuting which would reduce the</p>	City of Whittier Planning Division	City of Whittier Planning Division and Building Division	Within two years of the adoption of the General Plan Update.		

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
	number of commute trips and therefore reduce the total and per capita VMT traveled by employees in that employment category.					
<i>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</i>						
<p>Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Water, Wastewater Treatment, Stormwater Drainage, Electric Power, Natural Gas, or Communications Facilities.</p> <p>Have Sufficient Water Supplies Available to Serve the Project and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Development.</p> <p>Cause a Substantial Adverse Cumulative Impact with Respect to Utilities and Service Systems.</p>	<p>UTL-1: New developments under the General Plan Update that will be served by local water utility providers will not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2040 under the most recent Urban Water Master Plan for the involved local water provider.</p>	<p>See discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality above.</p>	<p>See discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality above.</p>	<p>See discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality above.</p>		