

Attachment #5 Findings of Facts

ATTACHMENT #5

Findings of Fact

1. Purpose of Findings

The Final EIR, prepared in accordance with CEQA, evaluates the significant adverse environmental impacts that could result from the project. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091 of the requires that the public agency approving or carrying out the project shall make written findings for each significant impact identified in the EIR, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. These findings include one of the following:

1. Changes or alterations have been required to, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as defined in the Final EIR.
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.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

These findings accomplish the following:

1. They address the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR for the approved project.
2. They incorporate all mitigation measures associated with these significant impacts identified in either the Draft EIR or Final EIR.
3. They explain why a significant effect is avoided or reduced by the adopted mitigation measures to a less than significant level.

The conclusions presented in these findings are based on the Initial Study, the Draft EIR, the Final EIR and other evidence in the record of proceedings.

2. Effect of Findings

To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR would reduce potential impacts of the Specific Plan, the City of Baldwin Park hereby binds itself to implement these mitigation measures. The City Council will adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) concurrently with these findings to ensure that the all

mitigation measures are implemented. The MMRP includes applicable mitigation measures developed as part of the EIR process for the Specific Plan.

3. Project Description

Description

The TOD Specific Plan has been developed with the overarching intent of introducing a transit-oriented development pattern to the 115 acre Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan would guide future development of the Downtown area to create a walkable transit-oriented environment that is proximate to the Metrolink Station and that would provide improved access for all modes of transportation, including transit, walking and bicycling.

The Specific Plan is intended to provide opportunities to build on the City's unique historic and cultural characteristics to enhance the Downtown core; take advantage of the location of the Metrolink Station and access to regional transit; create a strong community identity and sense of place; provide new employment, housing and shopping opportunities; and strengthen the City's tax base. Opportunities exist within walking distance of the Metrolink Station to provide for infill development and adaptive reuse of existing under-utilized structures to better serve the transit-oriented Downtown area and generate new investment. The Specific Plan is intended to guide future development of mixed uses in a walkable environment, streamline the development process, and serve as an incentive for economic development. The goals for the Downtown TOD Specific Plan include:

- Create a mix of uses with residential and employment densities that support transit use.
- Offer a range of housing options proximate to transit.
- Leverage the location of the Metrolink Station to bring revitalizing activities to Downtown;
- Create vibrant and diverse commercial corridors that provide a strong community identity and sense of place in the heart of town;
- Design a pedestrian-friendly environment with well-designed buildings, attractive streetscapes, and engaging public spaces.
- Create multi-modal streets that accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles.
- Increase level of goods and services available to residents of the community;
- Provide new employment and housing opportunities;
- Attract shoppers from outside the community; and
- Strengthen the City's tax base.

The objectives of the Specific Plan, which have been identified to meet the goals listed above, are to identify land use options that include increased housing densities and mixed uses, as well as

create pedestrian linkages between the station, community facilities and major recreation, retail, and residential nodes of activity.

4. Findings Concerning Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The following impacts were identified in the Final EIR as significant and unavoidable.

Air Quality

A. Facts

1. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant air quality impacts associated with NO_x emissions. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2 would reduce the emissions of NO_x. However, because the construction intensity, phasing, length, and schedule of individual projects that would be implemented by the Specific Plan is unknown, construction impacts related to regional air pollutants would be significant and unavoidable.
2. Pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment (ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}) would be generated by the project and would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds for construction. These pollutant emissions would, in conjunction with other past, current, and probable future projects, have the potential to exceed regional thresholds of significance and would be cumulatively considerable. Thus, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. Construction related air quality impacts related to air emissions of NO_x would be significant and unavoidable; mitigation measures provided in the EIR would reduce this impact; however, emissions could exceed thresholds.
2. Impacts related to pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment (ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}) would be significant and unavoidable; mitigation measures provided in the EIR would reduce this impact; however, with inclusion of past, current, and probable future projects, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Noise and Vibration

A. Facts

1. Some of the new developments associated with the project would be constructed immediately adjacent to existing residential structures within the Specific Plan area, and would be exposed to short-term construction-related noise levels that are greater than the

existing ambient noise levels; resulting in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels at those existing land uses.

2. Although implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-6 through NOI-9 provided in the EIR would reduce construction noise levels associated with the Specific Plan to the maximum extent feasible, under circumstances where future construction sites within the Specific Plan area are located immediately adjacent to existing sensitive land uses, the noise impacts related to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the Specific Plan would remain significant. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. Construction-noise impacts on existing sensitive receptors within the Specific Plan area would be significant and unavoidable. In addition, the noise impacts related to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels would be significant and unavoidable. The mitigation measures provided in the EIR are adopted and would reduce this impact, however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

5. Findings Concerning Significant Impacts Reduced to Less Than Significant Levels by Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Project

The EIR identifies significant impacts that are reduced to a “less than significant” level provided that the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are incorporated into the Specific Plan. These measures avoid, minimize, rectify, or reduce the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

A. Facts

1. New sensitive receptors would be exposed to diesel-fueled Metrolink trains that form an existing source of TAC emissions. Sensitive receptors introduced by the Specific Plan would primarily include residential uses. Toxic air contaminants from Metrolink trains would be greatest within 300 feet of the tracks, and sensitive receptors within 300 feet from the tracks would be exposed to DPM emissions. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-3 and AIR-4 that require implementation of all available best management practices and control technologies, such as filtered air supply systems, to reduce emissions at sensitive uses to below regulatory thresholds. This would reduce potential impacts related to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations to a less-than-significant level.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The mitigation measures in the EIR would ensure the project's impacts related to localized air quality from Metrolink trains are reduced to less than significant levels.

Cultural Resources

A. Facts

1. The likelihood of discovering unknown prehistoric archaeological resources within the Specific Plan area is minimal. However, Native American Tribes have historically traversed the Specific Plan area, and because the nature of the Specific Plan would involve ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that unknown subsurface archaeological, and/or historical, or Native American resources could be disturbed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to less-than-significant levels.
2. The Specific Plan area is underlain by younger Quaternary Alluvium, which is unlikely to contain vertebrate fossils. However, the younger Alluvium may be underlain by older Quaternary deposits that are known to contain vertebrate fossils. Fossils have been found within five miles of the Specific Plan area in these types of deposits. Thus, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is included to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.
3. Cumulative impacts related to cultural resources are considered on a broad regional basis. The Specific Plan area is not identified as an area with unique subsurface archaeological or paleontological resources. However, previously unknown and unrecorded resources could exist within the Specific Plan area. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 reduce the potential of project impacts related to archaeological and paleontological to occur, which ensures that cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

2. The mitigation measures in the EIR would ensure that potential impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources are reduced to less than significant levels.

Noise and Vibration

A. Facts

1. Noise from the Metrolink line would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 that would require all future developments that include residential uses within 500 feet of the Metrolink line to implement appropriate land use

planning for exterior private areas, and implement noise reduction measures and insulation features included in the design to meet the City's interior noise standards of 45 dBA CNEL. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, subsequent development projects that would occur pursuant to the Specific Plan would not conflict with the City's noise regulations, and impacts would be less than significant.

2. Mitigation Measures NOI-2 through NOI-4 would prohibit the use of construction equipment that generates high levels of vibration within specified distances from sensitive uses to ensure that vibration impacts associated with building damage and human annoyance would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure NOI-8 would serve to ensure the safety of historic buildings within the Specific Plan area by requiring a certified structural engineer to analyze and provide evidence that no structural damage would result at these buildings due to the construction of adjacent new developments. Mitigation Measures NOI-2 through NOI-4 and NOI-8 would reduce impacts related to groundborne vibration to less than significant.
3. Future development in the Specific Plan area would introduce residential uses in the vicinity of the Metrolink line. Trains are a common source of groundborne vibration, where locomotive-powered passenger trains can generate substantial vibration. Because future mixed use developments associated with the project could be exposed to vibration levels that exceed 75 VdB from the trains traveling through the Specific Plan area, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would be implemented to ensure that all future developments with a residential component located within 150 feet of the Metrolink line not be exposed to a vibration level exceeding 75 VdB from trains traveling through the Baldwin Park Metrolink Station. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-5, impacts from vibration related to the Metrolink track usage would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
4. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-2 through NOI-9 would require implementation of noise reduction devices and techniques during construction activities, which would reduce construction noise levels and would reduce the potential of projects resulting in a cumulative construction noise and vibration impacts a less than cumulatively considerable level.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The mitigation measures would ensure the noise and vibration generated by the project are reduced to less than significant levels.

Transportation and Traffic

A. Facts

1. Addition of traffic from build out of the Specific Plan would cause the level of service (LOS) to worsen at a number of locations. The LOS at the signalized intersection of Ramona Boulevard and Maine Avenue would change from LOS D to LOS F, which is considered a significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures TRAF-1 would implement street improvements within the existing right-of-way that would reduce impacts related to the Existing Plus Project condition to a less than significant level. All intersections in the traffic study area would operate at LOS D or better during the am and pm peak hours under Future (2035), with exception of the intersections of Ramona Boulevard and Maine Avenue, and Ramona Boulevard and Baldwin Park Boulevard where LOS F would occur during the pm peak hour, and the increase in volume to-capacity ratio would exceed the City's threshold. Implementation of Mitigation Measures TRAF-1 through TRAF-3 would implement street improvements within the existing Ramona Boulevard right-of-way that would reconfigure the approaches to the intersections of Ramona Boulevard and Maine Avenue, and Ramona Boulevard and Baldwin Park Boulevard, which would preclude the ability to provide wider bike lanes adjacent to the vehicular turn lane.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The mitigation measures would ensure that potential impacts related to LOS are reduced to less than significant level.

6. Findings Concerning Identified impacts that Were Determined to be Less than Significant and Therefore do not Require Mitigation Measures

The EIR identifies impacts that are considered to be “less than significant” not requiring mitigation measures. It is hereby determined that the following environmental impacts of the project would be less than significant.

Aesthetics

A. Facts

1. With build out of the Specific Plan the existing scenic vistas that exist from northward views within roadways and intersections that provide views of this mountain range would not be impacted. Furthermore, the Specific Plan would not introduce structures that would dramatically alter the views available of the Specific Plan area from other areas in the region, which is dominated by urbanized and suburban development in the foreground and the San Gabriel Mountains in the background. Therefore, the implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a less than significant impact to scenic vistas.

2. The Specific Plan provides design guidelines and guides development projects to incorporate architectural elements, which would result in a beneficial effect on the visual character of the area. The development standards, design guidelines, and streetscape improvements provided by the Project would achieve a unifying and identifying character to the Specific Plan area. While the Specific Plan would alter the existing visual character of the area, it would not substantially degrade the area or the surrounding area. Impacts related to visual quality and character would be less than significant.
3. Development within the Specific Plan area would be subject to the light pollution reduction measures of Section 153.140.040 of the Baldwin Park Municipal Code and Policy 2.6 of the General Plan Land Use Element. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare from implementation from the Specific Plan are less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan would not result in impacts related to scenic vistas, degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, and would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. In addition, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact when combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects. Thus, these impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality

A. Facts

1. The new population that would be generated by the Specific Plan would be within SCAG's growth projections, and thus would be consistent with the 2012 AQMP. In addition, the transit-oriented Specific Plan would support AQMP objectives to reduce trips, and would aid in the implementation of the AQMP. Therefore, impacts related to conflict with or obstruction with an applicable air quality plan would be less than significant
2. Operational emissions associated with the build out of the Specific Plan were modeled and the estimated operations emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors were determined to be below SCAQMD's applicable thresholds. Therefore, the Specific Plan's operational emissions would not result in or substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed applicable air quality standards and impacts would be less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan would not conflict or obstruct implementation of an AQMP. No mitigation measures are necessary.
2. Operation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact related to operational air quality emissions. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Cultural Resources

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan prohibits the demolition of the resources or any building in the Specific Plan area that is 50 years old or older, unless it is demonstrated that such building is not a significant historic resource. In addition, any alteration of historically significant buildings is required to be in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Thus, the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact related to historic resources. No mitigation measures are necessary.
2. In the unlikely event that human remains were discovered during project construction, the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that all activities cease immediately and the Coroner shall be contacted to evaluate the remains. Compliance with the established regulatory framework (i.e., California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98) would reduce potential impacts involving disturbance to human remains to less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan includes policies that would reduce impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are necessary.
2. Adherence to state law would ensure that impacts related to the discovery of human remains would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.
3. Adherence to the Specific Plan policy related to historic resources and the state laws related to human remains would reduce potential cumulative impacts to historic resources and human remains to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan's total annual GHG emissions from construction and operational activities would be 19,248.61 MTCO₂e per year. When divided by the number of employees and residents the project would introduce into the Specific Plan area, the GHG efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂e per service population per year would not be exceeded. As such, the Specific Plan would not hinder the state's ability to achieve AB 32 goals, and impacts are less than significant for GHG emissions.
2. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not hinder or adversely affect the statewide attainment of GHG emission reduction goals of AB 32 and would be consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan, the SCAG SCS, and the City's General Plan. Therefore, impacts related to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. Construction and operation of the Specific Plan at build out would not result in the exceedance of GHG thresholds and is consistent with the goals of AB 32, the CARB Scoping Plan, the SCAG SCS, and the City's General Plan. Thus, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A. Facts

1. The civic, retail, residential, and open space uses within the Specific Plan area would not introduce substantial volumes of hazardous materials to the area. In addition, compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would reduce impacts related to release of hazardous materials during their transport, use, and disposal to a less than significant level. Thus, implementation of the Specific Plan would not create a significant impact to the public or environment related to hazardous materials.
2. Due to the age of the buildings within the Specific Plan area, demolition of existing structures could result in exposure of the public to hazardous substances such as asbestos, PCBs, or lead-based paints. In addition, the disturbance of soils could result in the exposure of construction workers or nearby employees to health or safety risks if contaminated soils are encountered. However, compliance with regulations for handling of hazardous waste would reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant.
3. The Specific Plan area is underlain by a plume of contaminated groundwater known as the San Gabriel Valley (Area 2) Baldwin Park National Priorities List. The 19 identified Potentially Responsible Parties are ultimately responsible for funding the design, construction, and operation of groundwater cleanup facilities. The California Department of Health Services approved the design and oversees the operation of four Baldwin Park water treatment systems. Because the contamination is being remediated and is located

approximately 196 feet below ground it does not present a potential health or safety risk to the project or its users.

4. Sites exist within the Specific Plan that are on the Cortese List and are being remediated per federal and state regulations and oversight, and as described in the Draft EIR, the sites do not pose a human health threat, impact to public safety and the environment. Thus, impacts related to hazardous material sites from implementation of the Specific Plan would be less than significant.
5. Development permitted by the Specific Plan would be required to comply with applicable California Building Code and Uniform Fire Code requirements, the Baldwin Park Multi-hazard Functional Plan, and the Baldwin Park Emergency Preparedness Plan, which would be verified through the City's review process for each project. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan project would result in less than significant impacts involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project does not involve development on a site that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Thus, these hazards and hazardous materials related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A. Facts

1. With compliance with the Construction General Permit, which includes implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would identify erosion and sediment control BMPs that are designed, implemented, and maintained to address pollutants of concern, as required by the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, General Permit, For Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-09-DWQ). No adverse water quality impacts would occur during construction of activities associated with implementation of the Specific Plan.
2. Subsequent development projects permitted by the Specific Plan would be required to implement Source Control and Treatment Control BMPs to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of site-specific source

control and treatment control BMPs in accordance with the SUSMP standards would remove potential pollutants from runoff and would not contribute additional pollutant loads into receiving waters. Applicable BMPs would be implemented on a case-by-case basis in accordance with County of Los Angeles NPDES MS4 Permit and associated SUSMP requirements, as required per Order R4-2012-0175. As a result, operational impacts related to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

3. The total water demand from build out of the Specific Plan would be accommodated by current water sources for the Valley County Water District (VCWD) (Civiltec, 2011) and there would not be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level such that the production rate of existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. Therefore, impacts related to groundwater supplies would be less than significant.
4. The Specific Plan involves infill development and redevelopment within an existing urban and mainly impervious area, including buildings, paved sidewalks, and parking lots. More than ninety percent of the existing Specific Plan area is impervious, and implementation of the Specific Plan with installation of trees and landscaping as part of streetscape improvements, and BMPs that would be implemented pursuant to NPDES requirements, would result in a decrease in impervious surfaces and increase infiltration and reduce run off, soil erosion, and siltation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
5. The Specific Plan area is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Implementation of the project would not place housing or structures within a 100-year flood zone. Implementation of the Specific Plan with installation of trees and landscaping as part of streetscape improvements, and BMPs pursuant to NPDES requirements, would result in a decrease in impervious surfaces and would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns in such a way as to result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts related to drainage and flooding are less than significant.
6. Subsequent development projects permitted by the Specific Plan would be required to design, install, and maintain drainage systems according to standards set forth by the County of Los Angeles NPDES MS4 Permit and associated SUSMP requirements, as required per Order R4-2012-0175. Thus, impacts related to the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are less than significant.
7. The development projects implemented by the Specific Plan would comply with all County of Los Angeles NPDES, SUSMP, and the City's drainage and grading ordinances to control runoff and regulate water quality. Compliance with these regulations would reduce impacts related to water quality pollutants to less than significant.

8. The projects implemented by the Specific Plan and all reasonably foreseeable future projects would be required to implement measures set forth by the County of Los Angeles NPDES MS4 Permit that were developed to reduce the cumulative impacts to water quality and hydrology, and to ensure that the incremental effects of individual projects do not cause a substantial cumulative impact related to water quality, erosion, flooding, and drainage. In addition, the EIR has identified that sufficient water supplies are available to serve build out of the Specific Plan in addition to the existing water supply demand and the demand from the identified related projects. Thus, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts that would combine to be adversely cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts are less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan would not result in a significant impact involving violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, nor substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Additionally, the project would not 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 that would degrade water quality. Furthermore, the project would not result in impacts that could combine to be adversely cumulatively considerable. Thus, these hydrology and water quality related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Land Use and Planning

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan would provide for additional residential development and improved connectivity within the existing community, and would not result in the division of an established community. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
2. The Specific Plan would implement many of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) policies related to high-density, infill development that is pedestrian and transit-oriented. In addition, the Specific Plan would be consistent with other policies related to incentives for energy efficiency, balance of jobs and housing, and utilization of existing infrastructure. Furthermore, inconsistencies between SCAG policies and the Specific Plan would not occur, as described in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact related to applicable land use plans, policies or regulations.
3. The Specific Plan would rezone and amend General Plan land uses of specific parcels within the project area to introduce a transit-oriented development pattern to the area, which is consistent with the existing residential, commercial, and public land uses; and

consistent with projects within the City of Baldwin Park and areas within the City of Irwindale that are adjacent to the Specific Plan area. The related projects in the cumulative study area. Similar to the Specific Plan, the related projects are infill developments that would reinforce the existing urban and developed character of the area. Therefore, the Specific Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to land use impacts.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan project would not physically divide a community or result in a significant impact involving conflict with any applicable policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Thus, these land use and planning related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Noise and Vibration

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan would implement new land uses that would include residential, commercial, civic, open space, and mixed-use developments. Development permits would be provided pursuant to compliance with City Municipal Codes related to noise, which are provided to reduce potential noise impacts. With implementation of existing City regulations, noise impacts from operation of future Specific Plan developments would be less than significant.
2. The Specific Plan would contribute to an increase in local traffic volumes, which results in higher noise levels along local roadways. The traffic volumes introduced by build out of the Specific Plan would increase local noise levels by a maximum of 2.5 dBA CNEL, which would not exceed the identified thresholds of significance. Thus, traffic noise impacts would be less than significant.
3. Implementation of the City's noise standards, which regulate the appropriate location for various types of land uses in relation to noise generation, would ensure that operational noise would not combine with related projects to result in a cumulatively considerable increase in ambient noise from operating land uses.
4. The primary noise source contributing to cumulative operational noise levels from future development projects under the Specific Plan and related projects would be traffic. As shown, cumulative development at build out of the Specific Plan would not increase noise levels above the 5 dBA CNEL noise threshold. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with mobile source noise would be less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. Operation of the Specific Plan would not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the City's General Plan or noise ordinance that regulates the location of new uses. In addition, vehicular noise from implementation of the Specific Plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Population and Housing

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan would accommodate anticipated growth and assist in meeting housing demands from projected population growth in the City and the region. Build out of the Specific Plan would not exceed the estimated projections on which the City has based plans related to provision of public services, utilities, and other amenities to maintain the current quality of life it provides its residents. As such, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to population and housing.
1. The identified related projects would provide commercial and residential uses that would be consistent with the Specific Plan land uses, and are within SCAG's population projections. The Specific Plan, in combination with development of cumulative projects in the area, would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, and cumulatively considerable impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan would not result in a significant impact involving population growth, either directly or indirectly. The Specific Plan would plan for the location of future mixed-uses that are within walking distance from the Metrolink station and growth that is consistent with regional projections. Thus, population and housing related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Public Services

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan area is within 1.5 miles of two fire stations (Station 29 and 48) that currently provide services to the area. The Specific Plan would result in a gradual increase in calls for fire services over the incremental implementation of the plan and the fire department would add staff, equipment, and maintenance on an as-needed basis in order to accommodate these increased demands over the 20 year Specific Plan planning period. However, no new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be required

to serve the build out of the Specific Plan; thus, implementation of the Specific Plan would have less than significant impact related to fire protection services.

2. Build-out of the Specific Plan is estimated to require four additional sworn officers to maintain the current ratio of 0.92 officers per 1,000 residents. The demand for police services would increase gradually over the incremental implementation of the Specific Plan; however, the City's police station, which is located adjacent to the Metrolink station within the Specific Plan area, would not require physical alteration, which could cause significant environmental impacts. Thus, impacts related to police facilities are less than significant.
3. Development throughout the Specific Plan area is subject to the impact fees of SB 50, which constitutes full mitigation related to school facilities under CEQA. With implementation of SB 50 fees, impacts related to school facilities are less than significant.
4. As described in the Draft EIR, new or physically altered facilities would not be required to accommodate build out of the Specific Plan in combination with related projects. Therefore, the contribution of the Specific Plan to cumulative impacts on public utilities would not be cumulatively considerable.
5. The new residents generated by build out of the Specific Plan are anticipated to utilize Morgan Park, the Arts Park, other City park and recreation facilities, and the existing regional parks. The addition of the 3,665 new residents over the 20-year planning horizon is not anticipated to result in need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for parks and recreation.
6. The cumulative projects include development of 163 residential units within the City of Baldwin Park (73 of which are within the Specific Plan area), which would combine with the Specific Plan development to gradually increase use of park and recreational facilities. However, the City implements the Quimby Act, which allows the City, by ordinance, to require the dedication of land, the payment of fees in-lieu of, or a combination of both, as a condition to the approval of a final tract map or parcel map. The Baldwin Park Municipal Code provides a dedication ratio of three acres of park area for 1,000 residents, a density factor of 4.44 persons per dwelling unit, and payment of parkland fees pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 154: Development Fees. Each development project proposed within the City would be required to comply with these Municipal Code requirements related to payment of fees and/or dedication of facilities or parkland, which would offset the increased demand for park and recreation facilities generated by build out of the Specific Plan. Overall, the addition of the new residents from the Specific Plan and cumulative projects over the 20-year planning horizon are anticipated to be served by Morgan Park, the Arts Park, and other existing City and County park and recreation facilities; and implementation of the Specific Plan in addition to the cumulative projects would not result in the need for new or physically altered park and recreation facilities that could result in environmental impacts. Therefore, the

contribution of the Specific Plan to cumulative impacts on park and recreation facilities would be less than cumulatively considerable.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan would not result in a significant impact involving the need for new or physically altered fire, police, school, or park and recreation facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Thus, public service and park and recreation related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Transportation and Traffic

A. Facts

1. All development within the Specific Plan would be required to be consistent with City street, sidewalk and public place design standards (outlined in Chapter 97 of the City's Municipal Code). As a result, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less than-significant impacts associated with potential traffic safety design hazards.
2. Development activities would not be allowed to result in potential impacts related to emergency access, as all projects are required to go through development review and approval with the City Planning Department and Fire Department. For those reasons, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less than-significant impacts associated with provision of adequate emergency access.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. Build out of the Specific Plan would have less than significant impacts related to increase hazards due to design features or emergency access. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Utilities and Service Systems

A. Facts

1. The residential, commercial, and open space land uses implemented by the Specific Plan would not discharge wastewater that contains harmful levels of toxins that are regulated by the LARWQCB and all effluent would be required to comply with the wastewater treatment standards of the RWQCB. In addition, the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant has an excess treatment capacity of approximately 29.6 million gallons per day and would have sufficient capacity to process the additional average wastewater flow of

216,634 gallons per day that would be generated by the Specific Plan at build out. As a result, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB and wastewater treatment capacity.

2. The increased sewer flows with build out of the Specific Plan would be accommodated by the capacity of the planned sewer system, and the increase in flows from build out of the Specific Plan would not require expansion of any wastewater infrastructure (Baldwin Park, 2014).
3. Implementation of the Specific Plan with installation of trees and landscaping as part of streetscape improvements, and BMPs that would be implemented pursuant to NPDES requirements, would result in a decrease in impervious surfaces and would reduce the overall amount of surface runoff generated and entering existing storm drains. Therefore, new development pursuant to the Specific Plan would not result in the need to expand storm drain facilities. Thus, impacts to the environment resulting from the construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities would be less than significant.
4. The land uses within the Specific Plan area are anticipated to build out by 2035; at which time the Valley County Water District (VCWD) would have approximately 452.55 AFY of surplus supplies available. The Specific Plan would utilize 57.45 AFY at full build out, leaving 395.10 AFY as available surplus supplies. As a result, the Specific Plan would not result in the need for new or expanded water supply entitlements. The total water demand generated from the Specific Plan would be accommodated by current water sources from the VCWD. Therefore, impacts related to water supply entitlements would be less than significant.
5. The San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant has an excess treatment capacity of approximately 29.6 million gallons per day and would have sufficient capacity to process the additional average wastewater flow of 216,634 gallons per day that would be generated by the Specific Plan at build out. Thus, the Specific Plan would not result in the exceedance of wastewater treatment plant capacity and the total wastewater generated by the project would be accommodated by current wastewater facilities for the SJCWRP. Thus, impacts to the wastewater treatment plan are less than significant.
6. Build out of the Specific Plan would generate an additional 11,923 pounds (5.96 tons) of solid waste per day; 50 percent of which would be recycled and/or diverted from landfills and 50 percent of which (2.98 tons per day) would be disposed of at Azusa landfill that accepts a maximum of 8,000 tons of solid waste per day. The landfill has a remaining capacity of 51,512,201 cubic yards, and there is approximately 64 percent of the permitted space remaining. The current permit anticipates operation of the landfill through 2045. Therefore, the addition of solid waste from implementation of the project would be within the permitted capacity of the landfill, and impacts related to solid waste facilities would be less than significant.

7. All uses within the Specific Plan area will be required comply with all federal state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.
8. Cumulative projects consist of commercial, light industrial (warehouse) and infill residential projects would increase the use of water and reduce the available water surplus supplies. However, exiting water supplies would continue to be available after build out of the Specific Plan and the cumulative projects. Therefore, there are sufficient water supplies to support the existing and related developments. As a result, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to water supply.
9. The San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant has an excess treatment capacity of approximately 29.6 million gallons per day, which would provide sufficient capacity to process the additional average wastewater flow of 216,634 gallons per day that would be generated by the Specific Plan at build out, in addition to the flows generated by the cumulative projects. As a result, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to wastewater treatment.
10. Build out of the Specific Plan would result in a decrease in impervious surfaces and would reduce the overall amount of surface runoff generated and entering existing storm drains. Therefore, build out of the Specific Plan would not result in impacts related to stormwater drainage that could combine to be cumulatively considerable. Thus, cumulative impacts related to storm drain facilities would be less than significant.
11. The Specific Plan would result in a solid waste increase of less than 0.1 percent of the maximum permitted waste per day. The related projects are similar in nature and would require similar amounts of waste disposal. Because the cumulative increase is less than half a percent and the landfill is operating with capacity until 2045, there is sufficient capacity to support the existing land uses, build out of the Specific Plan, and the related projects.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The Specific Plan would not result in a significant impact to the environment involving conflict with wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, water supplies, stormwater drainage infrastructure, water and wastewater, and landfill facility and service capacity. Utility and service system related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Growth Inducement

A. Facts

1. The Specific Plan would provide for increase of approximately 833 residential, which is anticipated to increase the City of Baldwin Park's population by approximately 3,665; and approximately 289,135 square feet of non-residential employment generating uses that would create 755 employment opportunities by build out of the Specific Plan in 2035. This growth would not exceed SCAG projections upon which the City has based plans related to provision of public services, utilities, and other amenities to maintain the current quality of life it provides its residents. In addition the population estimated in the Draft EIR is conservative estimate because it assumes that the maximum number of residential units allowed under the Specific Plan would be constructed and that full occupancy (no vacancy) would occur.

The introduction TOD near the Metrolink Station would reduce the effects of growth by reducing vehicle trips and providing residential uses within walking distance of commercial and open space areas. Although the proposed Specific Plan project would result in growth, it would be self-contained, and conform to regional and local projections and policies for sustainable growth. The planned TOD land uses and pedestrian linkages in the Specific Plan are designed to centralize population and employment growth so that growth over time is sustainable. The Specific Plan does not add additional roadways, lanes, or extend roadways to areas not served by vehicular traffic, in a manner that would increase capacity, such that growth would occur. The improvements proposed by the Specific Plan would enhance circulation to provide for multi-modal transportation. Overall, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less than significant indirect growth inducing impacts.

B. Findings

The City finds that:

1. The TOD development implemented by the Specific Plan would not exceed SCAG projections and would be sustainable overtime. Overall, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less than significant indirect growth inducing impacts.

7. Findings Concerning Alternatives

CEQA requires an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the project objectives and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Alternatives to the Specific Plan evaluated in the EIR include the: No Project Alternative, Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative, and Reduced Development Alternative.

No Project Alternative

(Build Out According to Existing Zoning)

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would represent the continuation of the existing Baldwin Park General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. None of the changes under the Specific Plan would take place, including development of a new Arts Park across from City Hall. Pursuant to the existing General Plan and zoning, some intensification of development and some new mixed use uses would occur. The resulting development of new land uses under this alternative would be less than build out of the Specific Plan. The architectural design elements under this alternative would be similar to the existing conditions, and would not unify the Downtown area, as would be done by the Specific Plan. This alternative would not result in the introduction of unifying design and development guidelines that are intended to create a distinctive center for the Downtown area with attractive streets and public spaces that would be implemented by the Specific Plan. The No Project (Build Out According to Existing Zoning) Alternative would not implement TOD development in a planned manner that would maximize TOD opportunities within the area. With the absence of a Specific Plan to guide development through 2035, TOD would be considered on a project-by-project basis, which would not provide for a cohesive future land use plan that would maximize TOD land use and circulation opportunities. This alternative would not implement SCAG policies that encourage greater densities in areas with TOD opportunities and less dependence on the automobile. Therefore, this alternative would not result in an improvement in aesthetics and enhancement of character within the Downtown area nor would it achieve the project objectives of providing pedestrian linkages or TOD connectivity.

The City finds that this alternative is less desirable than the Specific Plan and rejects this alternative for the following reason:

1. The EIR concluded that while the No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the Specific Plan, it would not meet the project objectives of providing pedestrian linkages or the TOD connectivity.

Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative

The Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative would remove the area proposed to remain Industrial Commercial in the northeastern area from the Specific Plan and would not provide for additional residential uses within 500 feet of the Metrolink station. This alternative would develop 130 fewer residential units and 27,217 fewer square feet of non-residential space than the Specific Plan. Compared to the Specific Plan, the potential environmental impacts from the Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative would be less than the Specific Plan in the areas of operational air quality, greenhouse gasses, operational noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, and utilities. The Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative would have similar impacts related to aesthetics, construction related air quality, cultural resources, hydrology, water quality, construction noise, hazardous materials, transportation and traffic. The Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative would have greater impacts related to land use and planning than the proposed Specific Plan. Additionally, the Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable construction air quality and noise impacts of the proposed Specific Plan to a less than significant level. Because this alternative would allow less mixed use and high density residential development near the Metrolink Station compared to the proposed Specific Plan, it would not maximize the potential for TOD development within the Downtown area and

would be less consistent with the SCAG policies that encourage maximizing opportunities related to TOD and less dependence on the automobile. The Reduced Specific Plan Area Alternative would implement the Project objectives; however, to a lesser degree than the proposed Specific Plan.

The City finds that this alternative is less desirable than the proposed Specific Plan and rejects this alternative for the following reason:

1. The No Project Build-out to Existing Specific Plan Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the proposed Specific Plan and it would meet many of the project objectives. However, the reduced density and less mixed use development near the Metrolink Station compared to the proposed Specific Plan, would not maximize the potential for TOD development within the Downtown area and would be less consistent with the SCAG policies that encourage maximizing opportunities related to TOD and less dependence on the automobile.

Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative would reduce the overall increase in maximum development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan by 25 percent. This alternative would develop 208 fewer residential units and 72,284 less square feet of non-residential space than the proposed Specific Plan. This alternative would provide an Arts Park, active storefronts, pedestrian nodes with amenities such as street furniture, and lighting. In addition, this alternative would implement all of the circulation improvements included in the proposed Specific Plan. The environmental impacts from the Reduced Development Alternative would be less than the proposed Specific Plan in the areas of operational air quality, greenhouse gasses, hazardous materials, operational noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities. The Reduced Development Alternative would have similar impacts related to aesthetics, construction related air quality, cultural resources, hydrology, water quality, construction noise. The Reduced Development Alternative would have greater impacts related to land use and planning than the proposed Specific Plan. Additionally, the Reduced Development Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable construction air quality and noise impacts of the proposed Specific Plan to a less than significant level.

The City finds that this alternative is less desirable than the proposed Specific Plan and rejects this alternative for the following reason:

1. Compared to the proposed Specific Plan, the potential environmental impacts from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than the proposed Specific Plan. The Reduced Project Alternative would meet project objectives; however, to a lesser degree than the proposed Specific Plan. The Reduced Project Alternative would not maximize the potential for TOD development within the Downtown area and would be less consistent with the SCAG policies that encourage maximizing opportunities related to TOD and less dependence on the automobile.

Of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the Reduced Development Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce the proposed Plan's significant impacts to a greater extent because it represents the least amount of development spread over a larger area.