CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, February 9, 2015 – 7:00 PM

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC
This Agenda contains a brief general description of each item to be considered. Except as provided by law, action or discussion shall not be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda. Supporting documents, including staff reports, are available for review at City Hall in the Community Development Department or on the City’s website at www.cityoflosalamitos.org once the agenda has been publicly posted.

Any written materials relating to an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Community Development Department, 3191 Katella Ave., Los Alamitos CA 90720, during normal business hours. In addition, such writings or documents will be made available for public review at the respective public meeting.

It is the intention of the City of Los Alamitos to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee, or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, please contact the Community Development Department at (562) 431-3538, extension 303, 48 hours prior to the meeting so that reasonable arrangements may be made. Assisted listening devices may be obtained from the Planning Secretary at the meeting for individuals with hearing impairments.

Persons wishing to address the Planning Commission on any item on the Planning Commission Agenda shall sign in on the Oral Communications Sign In sheet which is located on the podium once the item is called by the Chairperson. At this point, you may address the Planning Commission for up to FIVE MINUTES on that particular item.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL
Vice-Chair Cuilty
Commissioner Daniel
Commissioner DeBolt
Commissioner Grose
Commissioner Loe
Commissioner Riley
Chair Sofelkanik

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
At this time any individual in the audience may address the Planning Commission and speak on any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. If you wish to speak on an item listed on the agenda, please sign in on the Oral Communications Sign In sheet located on the podium. **Remarks are to be limited to not more than five minutes.**

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
A. Approve the Minutes for the Regular Meeting of December 8, 2014
B. Approve the Minutes for the Regular Meeting of January 12, 2015

6. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
None.

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Recommendation:

1. Open the Public Hearing; and,
2. Take Testimony; and,
3. Make a determination as to the definition of Mixed Use that should be included in the Land Use Element; and,

ADOPTION OF THE 2014 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, INCLUDING LAND USE DESIGNATION CHANGES.

8. ITEMS FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
   A. Discussion regarding a change in the date and time that the monthly Planning Commission meeting is conducted.

9. COMMISSIONER REPORTS
   None.

10. ADJOURNMENT

   APPEAL PROCEDURES
   Any final determination by the Planning Commission may be appealed, and must be done so in writing to the Community Development Department, within twenty (20) days after the Planning Commission decision. The appeal must include a statement specifically identifying the portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees and the basis in each case for the disagreement, accompanied by an appeal fee of $1,000.00 in accordance with Los Alamitos Municipal Code Section 17.68 and Fee Resolution No. 2008-12.

   I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing Agenda was posted at the following locations: Los Alamitos City Hall, 3191 Katella Ave.; Los Alamitos Community Center, 10911 Oak Street; and, Los Alamitos Museum, 11062 Los Alamitos Blvd.; not less than 72 hours prior to the meeting.

   Date
   2/4/15

   Tom Oliver
   Associate Planner
MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

REGULAR MEETING - December 8, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Planning Commission met in Regular Session at 7:00 P.M., Monday, December 8, 2014, in the Council Chamber, 3191 Katella Avenue; Chair Loe presiding.

2. ROLL CALL
Present: Commissioners: Mary Anne Cuilty
Will Daniel
Art DeBolt
Wendy Grose
Chair Gary Loe
Vice-Chair Victor Sofelkanik

Staff: Community Development Director Steven Mendoza
Associate Planner Tom Oliver
Assistant City Attorney Lisa Kranitz
Dawn Sallade, Temporary Department Secretary

Absent: Commissioner: John Riley

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Chair Loe led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
Chair Loe opened the meeting for Oral Communications. There being no persons wishing to speak, Chair Loe closed Oral Communications.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
None

6. CONSENT CALENDAR
None.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS
None
8. **STAFF REPORTS**

A. **Proposed 2035 General Plan**

Community Development Director Mendoza addressed the Commission and stated that action on this item will ratify the Commission's previous review of both the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the General Plan. Two resolutions are being brought back as directed by the Commission at the November 10, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. The resolutions must be approved in order, with the EIR being first and the actual General Plan second. Also included with the Staff report are two memorandums from the City's consultant who has worked closely with the City Attorney. The first memorandum explains how the changes made by the Commission remain consistent with the Draft Environmental Impact Report; and the second memorandum demonstrates how the City is accommodating the request of the Airport Land Use Commission.

Chair Loe opened the discussion to the Commissioners.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that several parcels listed under Opportunity Site 6 of the draft Resolution No. 14-32, Page 6 of 10, are not retail and should not be included in the listing. He stated further that the Resolution does not reflect a Mixed Use Overlay designation; however, the property owner of 3561 Howard Avenue has received communication from the City indicating the property is to be designated a Mixed Use Overlay.

Community Development Director Mendoza responded there is some question as to where the retail district and residential district began due to the 2006 Zoning Code update. Mr. Mendoza stated that the intent of listing the properties in question was to allow the first floor to remain commercial, allowing the second, third and fourth floors of the properties to be designated as Mixed Use.

Commissioner DeBolt reiterated that it was his understanding that the intent was to preserve the existing retail uses and allow a Mixed Use Overlay. Commissioner DeBolt suggested the previous Zoning Code update should be corrected.

Assistant City Attorney Lisa Kranitz stated she had previously raised the question regarding the designation of Opportunity Site 6, and the General Plan Consultant, Colin Drukker responded in an e-mail that there is no Mixed Use Overlay; the decision was to move forward with a Mixed Use designation.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that the owner of the property has received notification of the proposed change to Mixed Use Overlay.
Mr. Mendoza responded that zoning of the property is not being changed; only a General Plan Update is being recommended.

Discussion ensued regarding retail zoning of the area, with Mr. Mendoza stating that retail would be allowed on the first floor of a building located in Opportunity Site 6, but there would be no mandatory requirement that a second or third floor should be Mixed Use.

Assistant City Attorney Kranitz stated that in a separate e-mail, Mr. Drukker indicated he would amend the land use element to add a definition that Mixed Use is allowed but not required.

Mr. Mendoza stated that the General Plan states that Mixed Use allows a variety of uses of buildings and structures in a particular area.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that there is a discrepancy between the map presented to the Commission and the parcels listed in the Resolution, and questioned the validity of Public Notices which state the change to the Mixed Use Overlay.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stated that he initially opposed the change to Mixed Use since he wanted to retain Retail at Opportunity Site 6. He stated he did not recall a discussion regarding an Overlay at this site, and expressed his concern over Public Notices indicating a change to Mixed Use Overlay.

Commissioner DeBolt stating that the difference between a Commercial Office Zone and a Retail zone is that on the ground floor of Retail, only 15% of the space is allowed to be used as office space. He stated further that the parcels in question should be reviewed, property owners notified of the review, and a determination made if they should be changed to a Mixed Use.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik suggested the need for corrections to the Resolution, and stated that the Commission should review the parcels in question to determine if they should be changed.

Community Development Director Mendoza requested clarification on the direction of the Commission in regards to changing the zoning for the parcels.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik moved to verify the accuracy of the parcel numbers in question in Opportunity Site 6; confirm the legality of the Public Notice; and decide on the designation of Opportunity Site 6.

Commissioner DeBolt seconded; however, no vote was taken.

Commissioner DeBolt pointed out properties on the map which should be left unchanged, allowing the entire ground floor to be used as office space.
as opposed to the Retail zone, which allows only 15% of non-retail use. He stated that a solution would be an Overlay which would allow businesses to retain their underlying zone.

Assistant City Attorney Kranitz clarified the new definition of Mixed Use as “a vertical or horizontal mix of commercial office, public, quasi-public and/or residential on the same parcel, retail is preferred on the ground floor, office and residential should be above the ground floor; stand alone, not Mixed Use commercial office and public/quasi-public are also permitted.” She stated there would be no harm that the term “Mixed Use Overlay” was used in the Public Notice because it is the same thing, but expressed her concern that certain properties may have been omitted from the Public Notice. She recommended that the Public Notice should be redone.

Commissioner Grose confirmed that the Mixed Use designation would allow the combination of uses or those individual uses, and would not change existing businesses. She further confirmed that the Public Notice would include the properties that were previously omitted from noticing, and suggested that the definition of Mixed Use be included.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik retracted his previous motion with a substitute motion to direct Staff to send parcel specific Public Notices stating that a General Plan amendment to the parcel is being considered; no residential properties to be noticed; and bring the item back to the Commission for discussion at a Public Hearing.

Discussion ensued and during the discussion, Assistant City Attorney Kranitz again read the definition of the term “Mixed Use.” She confirmed it indicates that an office on the ground floor, by itself, would be permitted; and stand-alone residential would not be permitted.

Commissioner DeBolt expressed concern that the Mixed Use designation would allow a change in retail to office use on Los Alamitos Boulevard.

Commissioner Daniel concurred that the wording in the updated General Plan should be specific.

Chair Loe opened the meeting for Public Comment, and asked if anyone present wished to speak.

Mr. Benfanti stated that he was unaware that the commercial property he purchased eleven years ago was changed to Retail Business six years ago. He suggested that any proposed changes should be parcel specific. He stated that his single parcel property would not be suitable for retail, and encouraged the Commission to determine a way to achieve the City’s objectives while maintaining the integrity and value of properties.
Assistant City Attorney Kranitz established that Mr. Benfanti’s “Commercial” property was Professional Office. She clarified that after changes are made to the General Plan, the next step will be to make the Zoning conform to the General Plan designation. She stated discussion indicates that the property may not remain Retail Business, and would return to a conforming use.

Susan Hori, Esq., representing Arrowhead Products stated that Arrowhead Products supports the Planning Commission’s recommendation to keep the property Planned Industrial with a Retail Overlay.

There were no additional persons wishing to speak on the item.

Motion/Second: Sofelkanik/DeBolt
Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission approved:

1. Public Notices, which are parcel specific, to be sent to all property owners in Opportunity Site 6, south of Katella Avenue, stating that a General Plan amendment to their parcel is being considered; and

2. Notices will not be sent to residential properties; and

3. Staff is directed to bring the item back to the Commission for further discussion at a Public Hearing.

B. Planned Sign Program (PSP) 14-01 – Chevron – 5100 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos

Associate Planner Oliver reported that Planned Sign Program (PSP) 14-01 consists of a monument sign, a canopy fascia and gas pump signage for a service station located at 5100 Katella Avenue in the General Commercial (C-G) Zone. The business is a former Unocal gas station which is now a Chevron gas station. Mr. Oliver stated that the owner of the business is Sal Hassan, and the applicant, Kevin Loring of Compass Services is present at the meeting. Mr. Oliver reported that the purpose of a PSP is to provide flexibility of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code (LAMC) while encouraging good sign design, sign variety and better visibility. A previous PSP was never completed and approval has since expired. Mr. Oliver indicated Staff recommends a stone veneer base, as noted in the 2007 PSP and, as a safety measure, Staff has added a condition to keep the sign out of the driveway’s sight safety triangle to the west. He stated that the proposed plan states that wall signs will be removed from the building; however, Staff recommends that wall signs should remain approved, even if removed. This will enable the franchise owner to reattach similar signs at a future date without being required to come back to the Planning Commission for approval. Mr. Oliver
concluded that Staff recommends approval of Planned Sign Program 14-01, with modifications as conditioned.

Chair Loe asked if there were any questions for Staff. There being none, Chair Loe invited the applicant to come forward.

Kevin Loring, Compass Services, stated that the station had a soft opening on December 1, and is currently awaiting Planning Commission approval to proceed with the monument signs. Mr. Loring thanked the Planning Commission for their consideration, and stated that Staff’s recommendations will be adhered to if the Commission grants approval of the PSP.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stated that he remembered the previous PSP request and discussion related to the monument sign blocking the vision triangle to the west. He confirmed with Staff that the property owner and the business owner to the west of the property received proper public notices related to the Planned Sign Program, and neither has indicated that they have any issues related to the PSP.

Mr. Oliver stated that he is requesting the Commission to give approval for Staff to request the sign to be kept out of the driveway’s sight safety triangle.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik questioned why the resolution did not specify that the sign should be located outside of both of the sight safety triangles.

Mr. Oliver responded that the reason for this is that Staff is agreeing to their submission, but making changes by adding a second sight safety triangle. Mr. Oliver stated further that an option is to allow the service station to keep the existing pole sign and keep the dimensions the same.

Community Development Director Mendoza stated that Staff recommended that the applicant bring forward a design that would be acceptable to the Planning Commission and further suggested that the architect could address the issue of the location of the sign.

Mr. Loring stated that the sign plans submitted previously were for a Unocal 76 station, but the intention was to change the franchise to Chevron and the previous applicant never made the sign changes to the property. The present owner would like to retain a pole sign using the existing base, but a custom sign would require Chevron’s approval. He explained that he did not have the exact measurements of the distance of a pole sign from the pole’s base.

Mr. Oliver responded that the original pole sign design went below the required 8 feet, which would cause sight issues. He stated that a large pole sign that is out of the sight safety triangle could have been requested.
Mr. Mendoza stated that proper drawings showing the Commission where the sign will be located are needed. He recommended that this item should come back to the Commission showing the location of the sign with the two site safety triangles superimposed on the drawings.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik asked if Staff would like to see an amended pole sign as another option.

Mr. Mendoza stated that the direction most cities are going is toward a ground based monument sign for a cleaner look, and that was the direction the Commission was going toward previously. He asked if an aerial photo showing the proposed monument sign, the two sight safety triangles and the driveway aprons superimposed over the photo would assist the Commission in making a decision.

The Commission concurred that the photo would be beneficial in making a decision. Staff was directed to bring this item back to the next Planning Commission meeting, and the applicant was directed to provide a photo as requested.

Motion/Second: Sofelkanik/Grose
Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission directed Staff to bring this item back to the next Planning Commission meeting, and include a photo as discussed.

9. ITEMS FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
Community Development Director Mendoza reminded the Commission of the Holiday Dinner to be held the following evening.

10. COMMISSIONER REPORTS
None

11. ADJOURNMENT
The Planning Commission adjourned at 8:54 P.M.

________________________________________
Gary Loe, Chairman

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Steven Mendoza, Secretary
1. **CALL TO ORDER**
The Planning Commission met in Regular Session at 7:02 P.M., Monday, January 12, 2015, in the Council Chambers, 3191 Katella Avenue; Chairman Loe presiding.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Loe.

3. **ROLL CALL**
*Present:* Commissioners: Mary Anne Cuilty
               Art DeBolt
               Wendy Grose
               Chair Gary Loe
               John Riley
               Vice-Chair Victor Sofelkanik

   Staff: Community Development Director Steven Mendoza
          Associate Planner Tom Oliver
          Assistant City Attorney Lisa Kranitz
          Dawn Sallade, Part-Time Clerical Aide

   *Late:* None.

   *Absent:* Commissioners: Will Daniel
   Staff: None.

4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
Chairman Loe opened the meeting for Oral Communications.

   There being no persons wishing to speak, Chairman Loe closed Oral Communications.

Chair Loe requested a change in the order of discussion of agenda items, and further requested that Item 9 followed by item 8A on the agenda be discussed at this time. There were no objections to the requested change of order of discussion.
9. STAFF REPORTS

A. Planned Sign Program (PSP) 14-01 – Chevron – 5100 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos.

Community Development Director Mendoza stated that this item is a continuation from the Planning Commission meeting of December 8, 2014, for a Planned Sign Program application for the Chevron service station located at 5100 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos.

Associate Planner Oliver, summarized the Staff report, and stated that the applicant, Kevin Loring of Compass Services, has resubmitted the site plan with the modifications as requested. The resubmitted site plan for the signage includes the site safety triangles which are clearly marked for the monument sign. Mr. Oliver stated that Staff recommends approval of the pump signage for this program as presented, and also recommends approval for pump-mounted changeable advertisement signs and future attached wall signage.

Chair Loe opened the item for public comment.

Kevin Loring, Compass Services, applicant, requested approval of the signage as resubmitted.

There being no additional speakers, Chair Loe closed the item for public comment and brought it back to the Commission for their comments and action.

Motion/Second: Grose/Cuilty
Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission approved Resolution No. PC 14-33, “A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING PLANNED SIGN PROGRAM (PSP) 14-01, AS MODIFIED WITH CONDITIONS, CONSISTING OF ONE (1) MONUMENT SIGN, A NEW CANOPY FASCIA WITH TWO (2) SETS OF CHANNEL LETTERS AND HALLMARK LOGO, SIX (6) ILLUMINATED PUMP SPANNERS, SIX (6) PUMP-MOUNTED CHANGEABLE ADVERTISEMENT SIGNS, TWELVE (12) PUMP BASE STICKERS, AND FUTURE ATTACHED WALL SIGNAGE LOCATED AT 5100 KATELLA AVENUE, IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (C-G) ZONING DISTRICT, AND DIRECTING A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION BE FILED FOR A CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION FROM CEQA. APN 222-181-03, (APPLICANT: COMPASS SERVICES – KEVIN LORING).”

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Proposed 2035 General Plan
Community Development Director Mendoza reported that an issue was raised at the December, 2014 Planning Commission meeting regarding land use designation for Opportunity Site 6. This site consists of properties north of Katella Avenue and south of Florista Street between Chestnut Street and Reagan Street; and properties south of Katella Avenue and north of Farquhar Avenue. Mr. Mendoza stated that a number of years ago there was a vision for the properties on the south side of Katella to be developed into a retail environment, and accordingly, the properties were designated as Retail Business and given a compatible zoning designation of General Commercial (C-G) at that time. During the current General Plan process, direction was given to encourage the future improvement and intensification of this area by allowing mixed uses, with retail uses on the first floor and offices or residences above these properties.

Mr. Mendoza further reported that at the November Planning Commission meeting it was stated that the Mixed-Use designation would not require that a mixed use development be built and that existing stand-alone uses would be allowed to remain. At the December meeting, a concern was raised that the non-residential properties in this site not be changed to Mixed-Use designation so they could retain their underlying land use. Mr. Mendoza stated that Staff executed Public Hearing Notices for a new hearing for the January 12, 2015 meeting and included all properties within the boundaries that are south of Katella Avenue, north of Farquhar Avenue, east of Los Alamitos Boulevard and west of Reagan Street, as well as those within a 500 foot distance of these boundaries.

Mr. Mendoza stated that in order to proceed with the General Plan process, the Planning Commission must resolve the following issues:

1. What should the boundaries be for Opportunity Site 6; and
2. What is the Planning Commission’s vision for Opportunity Site 6 and what should the land use designation be?

Chair Loe opened the Public Hearing.

Colin Drukker, General Plan Consultant with PlaceWorks stated that the previous General Plan did not have a Mixed-Use designation. The suggestion of Mixed-Use in the proposed General Plan is an opportunity and an option to property owners, but it is not a mandate. Mr. Drukker further explained the options that a Mixed-use designation would allow.

Chair Loe clarified that this discussion was related only to the General Plan, and was not related to any one specific project. Mr. Drukker concurred that there is no specific project envisioned.
Chair Loe questioned if the property at 3562 Howard which is currently used as Commercial-Professional Office, should be included in Site 6. Mr. Drukker stated that this property was omitted to reflect the current boundary between residential and nonresidential uses, and adjusting the General Plan designation for the property should be addressed.

Chair Loe asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak on this item.

Rob Goth, owner of 3562 Howard, stated that his business is located in the building, along with four additional tenants. Mr. Goth stated that he preferred that the property remain as a commercial property and not residential.

Chair Loe stated that the property appears to be zoned Residential, and requested clarification from Staff regarding the current land use designation of the property.

Mr. Mendoza responded that it is difficult to determine the designation from the current zoning map since it did not follow parcel lots, and that building records reflect that the property was zoned Retail Business. He further stated he would not consider it residential because of the confusion related to the zoning of the property. In conclusion, Mr. Mendoza stated that future land use designations can be determined now, with zoning uses to follow.

Mr. Drukker requested clarification whether to change the property to Commercial or include the property in Mixed Use Area 6 which will allow the office to continue as a stand-alone use in perpetuity. Chair Loe responded that for the present time, the property should be included in Area 6 with the Mixed Use land use designation.

Chair Loe asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak on this item.

John Benfanti, 3561 Howard Avenue, stated that he spoke at the previous month’s meeting and wished to reiterate his previous comments. Mr. Benfanti thanked the Commission for initiating a fair and transparent process that will include parcel numbers. He stated that his current building was permitted as a professional or commercial office, and has been used in that capacity since it was built in 1978. He expressed concern that there could be unintended consequences related to changes and definitions over time. He further stated that his single parcel property would not be suitable for retail, and encouraged the Commission to determine a way to achieve the City’s objectives while maintaining the integrity and value of properties. Mr. Benfanti stated that a number of property owners in the area were present and proposed that the Planning Commission evaluate their unique properties and the intended use of the properties. He suggested that the appropriate designation would be Professional Office with an overlay, which would allow Mixed Use in the future.
Assistant City Attorney Kranitz clarified how the General Plan and Zoning relate to each other. She stated that the General Plan is the broadest possible policy statement and Zoning, which is more specific, falls under the General Plan. Ms. Kranitz further stated that the City cannot change or amend the General Plan or Zoning without conducting public hearings and anyone wishing to be notified of proposed amendments or changes can file a request with the City Clerk’s office to be notified by mail.

Dennis Duran, resident of Rossmoor, requested that the Planning Commission take parking into consideration during its planning process. He stated that parking is an issue on his street with many cars turning into and out of his driveway.

Mr. Mendoza clarified that Mr. Duran’s property in Rossmoor is not within the purview of the Planning Commission.

Leah Gerber, 3581 Howard Avenue, stated that she and her husband are the owners of the apartment building at that address. Ms. Gerber stated concern about the Mixed Use designation because of foot traffic, parking, and the impact on property values.

Chair Loe announced that the Public Hearing would remain open, and further opened the discussion for Commission comments.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik requested clarification of the definition of Mixed Use as listed on Page 2 of 5 of the Staff report and asked if it is the most current definition.

Assistant City Attorney Kranitz responded that it is the definition included in the current draft General Plan.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stated he did not think it would be viable for properties east of the alleyway to become retail properties, and a Mixed-Use Overlay would allow them to retain their current use with the opportunity to expand in the future. He suggested that it would be more appropriate that the properties contiguous to Los Alamitos Boulevard, immediately to the east and adjacent to the Boulevard be required to be retail properties. This would allow the Mixed Use Overlay, but would not require anyone to amend current uses and would allow a retail component on the ground floor of the properties that are directly on the Boulevard.

Chair Loe questioned if the alleyway could be vacated in the future, and expressed concern that limits could be placed on the space.

Mr. Mendoza responded that previous suggestions were not intended to place limits but rather to suggest that thoroughfare frontage properties should
have the restriction on the ground floor. He further stated that the demarcation line is up to the Commission.

Discussion ensued regarding the alleyway, with Mr. Mendoza stating that the General Plan could support a larger development opportunity.

Mr. Drukker stated that if the language is modified to read, “Retail is preferred on the ground floor on parcels fronting Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue”, this would provide a degree of specificity in the General Plan and ensure that properties to the east of the alleyway would not be limited.

Vice Chair-Sofelkanik stated that he was not thinking beyond Site 6 and did not think there would be any harm in language that said any Mixed Use that abuts or is contiguous to a major artery “shall be” retail on the ground floor as opposed to “preferred.”

Discussion ensued regarding permitted and existing uses, and uses as allowed by zoning.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik asked Mr. Mendoza to read the Mixed Use definition as listed in the Staff report for the public’s use and information. Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stated that his suggested change to the definition would remedy concerns expressed by property owners and would allow the Commission to look into the future and still maintain a revenue generating core.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that correct and specific language is imperative and suggested that language such as “preferred” should not be used.

Mr. Drukker responded that certain wording, such as “preferred” was used because of existing properties such as the museum and a medical office.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that he has been unable to determine when the zoning changed to Retail, but when that occurred, it made all of the parcels presently under discussion non-conforming parcels.

Mr. Drukker stated that zoning must be consistent with the General Plan and a Mixed-Use designation would allow commercial, office, or other uses on the properties. Existing offices, such as the museum or medical office, would therefore be allowed to stay and would become conforming. This would be a first step in correcting the inconsistencies.

Dr. Chang, representing the dental office property at 3532 Howard Avenue, commented that parking at this location would be restricted if the alleyway were to be blocked.
Chair Loe clarified that previous discussion regarding the alleyway was conceptual and there are no plans to block it.

Mr. Mendoza reiterated that the alleyway discussion was theoretical.

Dr. Chang asked to be apprised of the eventual goals and the length of time involved.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that the wording “preferred” does give flexibility and protects certain properties, but questioned what would happen if larger buildings are replaced and the new facility has a ground floor office. He further asked what influence does the word “preferred” have as opposed to the word “shall?”

Assistant City Attorney Kranitz responded that the General Plan is designed to give flexibility so that when the Commission reaches Step Two, which is to make all of the zoning consistent with the General Plan; it will set forth specifically what can be done. Ms. Kranitz further explained the zoning provisions and the General Plan.

Commissioner DeBolt requested further clarification related to protecting the retail use that is currently in place and at the same time protecting the museum and the small corner.

Ms. Kranitz responded that the amortization provisions can be changed to say that their legal non-conforming use continues indefinitely.

Mr. Drukker suggested language stating, “Retail is required on the ground floor for parcels fronting Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue, unless the parcel is a legal conforming use as of (date).” Mr. Drukker summarized that the intention is to require retail, but not to penalize if the business is a legal conforming use, which would allow the business to remain.

Commissioner Riley asked if the two properties in question, the museum and medical office, are presently non-conforming.

Mr. Mendoza responded that the medical office is legal, non-conforming and the museum is permitted.

Discussion ensued regarding existing legal, non-conforming properties.

Mr. Drukker explained that the amortization schedule would be a method of allowing those legal, non-conforming properties to remain.

Mr. Mendoza stated that when the Commission discusses zone changes, that will be the time and the opportunity to implement specific land use
designations. He stressed that the zoning changes should take place soon after the General Plan is adopted.

Commissioner Riley stated opposition to accommodating non-conforming uses.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that the two properties in question have been allowed to remain even though the area is zoned as Retail. He recalled when his property was rezoning in approximately 1977. He then said that he favors a way to accommodate properties which are legal, non-conforming.

Mr. Mendoza reiterated that the purpose of the General Plan is to set the broad policy statement related to land use patterns and the purpose of the Zoning ordinance is to implement the General Plan.

Commissioner Riley stated that he favored wording as suggested by Mr. Drukker to be used in the proposed General Plan.

Commissioner Cuilty stated that she favored the wording “preferred” in the General Plan, but the wording “required” could be used in Zoning.

Commissioner Grose concurred in that she favored the wording “preferred” in the General Plan and “required” in Zoning.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stated his preference was the wording “required” with the additional language as suggested by Mr. Drukker.

Commissioner DeBolt concurred that he favored the wording “required” with the additional language as suggested by Mr. Drukker.

Chair Loe asked the Commissioners to voice their choice of wording to be used in the Mixed Use land use category and it was the consensus of the Commission that the wording “required” and the additional wording as suggested by Mr. Drukker was the preferred wording to be used in the proposed General Plan.

Commissioner Riley asked Staff to provide future clarification related to a possible Conditional Use Permit (CUP) on the corner property.

Commissioner Grose questioned the inclusion of the property at 3562 Howard in Opportunity Site 6.

Mr. Mendoza confirmed that the property will be included in Opportunity Site 6 and this will be reflected on future maps.

In response to a request from Commissioner DeBolt, Mr. Drukker reiterated that the existing lots that do not front Los Alamitos Boulevard or Katella
Avenue will be allowed to remain, and will come under the definition “stand-alone (not Mixed-Use) Commercial, Office and public/quasi-public uses are also permitted.” He read the proposed draft language. Mr. Drukker stated the language will allow the museum and the dental office (if it is conforming) to continue. The map will be amended to reflect the demarcation line for Opportunity Site 6 and to change the proposed General Plan designation from R-3 to Mixed Use which will allow stand-alone office to continue, therefore bringing it into conformance once the zoning follows through.

Dr. Chang, property owner of 3532 Howard, stated that he has been in the City for 31 years and the corner property under discussion has been a medical/dental office for a number of years. Dr. Chang questioned the requirements of the next property tenant as to the type of business.

Mr. Mendoza stated that the proposed language will allow anything that was legal conforming as of the adoption of the new General Plan to remain legal conforming. He then clarified the requirements for future discussion and presented the following options:

1) If the Commission wishes to discuss any parcel specific, any zone specific, or other opportunity site at the next meeting, that meeting will require a public hearing notice.

2) If the Commission no longer wishes to discuss the above matters, a public hearing notice will not be required.

Mr. Mendoza further clarified that the discussion at tonight’s meeting was for Opportunity Site 6 only and not for the entire City. Mr. Mendoza explained that the Public Hearing at the November Planning Commission was closed and the Commission directed Staff to bring back the resolutions for approval at the December meeting. There was a decision at the December meeting that there was a need for further discussion of Opportunity Site 6 at the January meeting.

Chair Loe confirmed that continuing the Public Hearing to the next meeting will allow further discussion of Opportunity Site 6.

Leah Gerber, resident, requested clarification regarding the proposed language to be used in the General Plan.

Mr. Mendoza stated that the “required retail” is for the properties which front Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue; it is not mandatory that the ground floor be retail for the remaining properties.
Motion/Second: Grose/Sofelkanik
Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission:

1. Continued the Public Hearing to February 9, 2015, to allow further discussion for Opportunity Site 6; and

2. Directed Staff to bring back Resolutions for approval.

RECESS
The Planning Commission took a brief recess at 8:30 P.M.

RECONVENED
The Planning Commission reconvened in regular session at 8:34 P.M.

The following agenda item was taken out of order:

10. ITEMS FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

Community Development Director Steven Mendoza invited the Commission to participate in the annual Race on the Base on February 27, 2015, and indicated he would pay for their entry fee.

The following agenda item was taken out of order:

11. COMMISSIONER REPORTS

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stated that his absence at several Planning Commission meetings was due to the day of the week upon which the meetings are held. Vice-Chair Sofelkanik further stated that he has reviewed the City’s Code and has determined that a change of day or time of Planning Commission meetings is not prohibited. He questioned if any other Commissioners would be interested in a change in date.

Community Development Director Steven Mendoza responded that a consensus was needed to place this matter on a future agenda for discussion.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to direct Staff to place the item on a future agenda for discussion.

The following agenda item was taken out of order:

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approve the Minutes of the Regular meeting of October 13, 2014, with corrections as noted by Commissioner DeBolt.
Motion/Second: Grose/DeBolt
Carried: 5/0/1 (Chair Riley abstained): The Planning Commission approved the minutes of the Regular meeting of October 13, 2014.

B. **Approve the Minutes of the Regular meeting of November 10, 2014.**
   Motion/Second: Grose/DeBolt
   Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission approved the minutes of the Regular meeting of November 10, 2014.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik stressed the importance of accurate minutes and requested that a digital recording of a meeting be provided to Commissioners upon request.

The following agenda item was taken out of order:

5. **PLANNING COMMISSION REORGANIZATION**

This report provided relevant information for the Planning Commission’s annual reorganization, by the election of Chair and Vice-Chair.

Recommendation: Nominate and elect the following officers:
1. Chair
2. Vice-Chair

Planning Director/Secretary of the Board Mendoza presented the Staff report.

Chair Loe turned the meeting over to Secretary Mendoza who opened the floor to nominations for the office of “Chair”.

Commissioner Grose nominated Vice-Chair Sofelkanik.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik nominated Commissioner Riley.

Vice-Chair Sofelkanik explained that although he would not mind serving as Chairman, he has already served in that capacity and felt that all of the Commissioners should have the opportunity to serve in the capacity of Chair.

There being no further nominations, Director/Secretary of the Board Mendoza closed the nominations.

Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission appointed Commissioner Riley as Chair.

**ROLL CALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Cuilty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Daniel</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner DeBolt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Grose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Loe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Commissioner Riley  Yes
Vice-Chair Sofelkanik  Yes

Planning Director/Secretary of the Board Mendoza opened the floor to nominations for the office of “Vice-Chair”.

Commissioner Grose nominated Commissioner Cuilty.

There being no further nominations, Director/Secretary of the Board Mendoza closed the nominations.

Unanimously Carried: The Planning Commission appointed Commissioner Cuilty as Vice-Chair.

ROLL CALL
Commissioner Cuilty  Abstained
Commissioner Daniel  Absent
Commissioner DeBolt  Yes
Commissioner Grose  Yes
Commissioner Loe  Yes
Chair Riley  Yes
Commissioner Sofelkanik  Yes

7.  CONSENT CALENDAR
None.

12.  ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission adjourned at 8:57 P.M.

______________________________
John Riley, Chairman

ATTEST:

______________________________
Steven Mendoza, Secretary
## Summary
At the January 2015 Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners directed Staff to change the definition of Mixed Use to require retail businesses on the first floor of parcels that are adjacent to Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue. To make that change, in its research, Staff found that this change would create more legal nonconforming uses and would be a more restrictive document than is intended by a General Plan. In order to advise all property owners in Opportunity Site 6 of the potential change and provide the opportunity to further discuss this matter, Staff has noticed a new Public Hearing for the affected properties to discuss the appropriate land use designation.

## Recommendation:
1. Open the Public Hearing; and,
2. Take Testimony; and,
3. Make a determination as to the definition of Mixed Use that should be included in the Land Use Element; and,

Background

Last month, the Planning Commission discussed and agreed to the boundaries of Opportunity Site 6 -- under which a few properties were in question at that time. Opportunity Site 6 now consists of the properties as shown on Attachment 1. Over the course of crafting the General Plan, and in particular the Land Use Plan discussion, the Planning Commission has given Staff direction to encourage the future improvement and intensification of this area by allowing mixed uses in this area. The idea was to encourage retail uses on the first floor, especially along the arterial streets of Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue, and allow offices or residences above these properties.

At the November Planning Commission meeting it was stated that the Mixed Use designation would not require that a mixed use development be built and that existing stand-alone uses would be allowed to remain. In order to clarify this, the Mixed Use land use category was clarified to read as follows (the underlined language is what was added after the November meeting):

```
Vertical or horizontal mix of commercial, office, public/quasi-public, and/or residential uses on the same parcel. Retail is preferred on the ground floor. Office and residential uses should be above the ground floor. Stand-alone (not mixed-use) commercial, office and public/quasi-public uses are also permitted.
```

At this time the Public Hearing was closed and Staff was directed to bring back resolutions relating to both the General Plan and the EIR.

At the December meeting, questions were raised relating to Opportunity Site 6, south of Katella Avenue as to whether the boundaries were correct and whether the designation of Mixed Use should be an overlay or its own designation.

A Public Hearing was re-noticed for January for the properties South of Katella. During this meeting, a number of business and property owners requested some additional language to be added to the definition to provide further clarity on the type of stand-alone uses permitted. During this same meeting, the Planning Commissioners noted that they would like to see retail “required” rather than “preferred” on the ground floor along Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue in the General Plan definition of Mixed Use. The Planning Commission also noted they would like to see certain uses grandfathered in for a period of time.
In accordance with the Planning Commission’s direction, Staff began to draft language for the Land Use Plan “requiring” retail businesses on the first floor of parcels that front Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue. However, as Staff examined what would happen if such language were added, Staff came to the conclusion that this restrictive language would cause some currently “permitted” uses to become “legal nonconforming” and subject to amortization rules that could eventually force certain businesses to move to other locations. Adding the grandfather provisions for certain types of existing uses drew further attention to the fact that other existing uses would not be allowed to remain.

Based on this, Staff determined that it was necessary to re-notice the Public Hearing so that all of the property owners in Opportunity Site 6, both north and south of Katella Avenue, would be advised of the proposed changes. Therefore, Staff noticed tonight’s Planning Commission meeting in the January 28, 2015 News Enterprise and has mailed copies of that notice to all properties within -- and a 500 foot distance outside of -- the boundaries of Opportunity Site 6.

**Discussion**

**General Plan and Zoning**

Prior to getting into the specifics of Opportunity Site 6, it is important to remember the purpose of the General Plan and Zoning.

The General Plan is a long-range planning document which is to guide the physical development of the City and areas within its sphere of influence. The State General Plan Guidelines specifically provide that the General Plan text should be general enough to allow a degree of flexibility in decision-making as times change.

The General Plan, especially the Land Use element, is essentially a vision document of what the Planning Commission and City Council envision for the future of the City, i.e., where the City wants to end up in 20 years. The General Plan is a statement of development policies that sets forth the objectives, principles, and standards that are then supposed to guide the complimentary zoning provisions. The General Plan Land Use Element, including the Land Use Diagram is intended to illustrate general land use patterns that may take form over the next 20 years. It is not supposed to reflect only existing land use patterns---that is left to a separate figure in the Land Use Element as context.

While the General Plan sets the broad policy statement relating to land use patterns, the zoning ordinance implements the General Plan with more specific rules and regulations as to the allowed uses and development standards within the specific area. By law, the zoning of property must be consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Having a broad General Plan definition provides the flexibility that is needed to put specific zoning into place; the zoning ordinance is the place where requirements of land use along Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard should be spelled out, along with
amortization provisions. The zoning ordinances would come forward to the Planning Commission after the General Plan is adopted by the City Council.

As was done for the Arrowhead Products and SuperMedia/City Hall sites, the General Plan designations reflect a desired and/or possible future. The definition of each land use designation indicates the degree to which change is required, encouraged, or simply offered as another development option.

**Opportunity Site 6 - Existing General Plan and Zoning**

With minor exception, the non-residential property in Opportunity Site 6 has an existing General Plan designation of Retail Business and a zoning designation of General Commercial. While the General Plan land use designations are not that well defined in the existing General Plan, the General Commercial zone provides more specific direction. The General Commercial zone is meant to provide for the development of general commercial and highway-related uses. Office uses are allowed in the General Commercial zone, but are restricted to 15% of the ground floor building space. They can occupy 100% of building space above the ground floor if it is a multiple story building.

The proposed Land Use Plan of the General Plan shows the non-residential sites in Opportunity Site 6 changing from what is almost all Retail Business designation to all Mixed Use designation.

As originally conceived, the change was meant to allow current uses to remain and expand the uses that are currently allowed. The definition of Mixed Use included in the December 2014 draft General Plan and is quoted above had the language of retail being “preferred” along Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue, which would accomplish this goal.

However, if the definition of Mixed Use is revised to “require” retail uses on certain parcels, then this would prohibit a wide variety of uses that are currently in existence in Opportunity Site 6 and which are allowed in the General Commercial zone, making them nonconforming. Attached to this report is Table 2-04 which shows the permitted and conditionally permitted uses currently allowed in the General Commercial zone. The highlighted uses are those which Staff believes would no longer be allowed if the General Plan required retail on the bottom floor along Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard, assuming that the direction was to require 100% retail uses. As you will note, even eating establishments would not be allowed. If the language of the General Plan becomes mandatory by using the word “require,” the zoning ordinance will have to be amended to be consistent with such language and conditional use permits will not be available to deviate from this requirement. Therefore, when the City adopts consistent zoning ordinances, it will wind up creating a number of nonconforming uses. Grandfathering provisions that allow legal non-conforming uses to remain are not likely to be of sufficient assistance to protect all existing businesses as non-conformity can also arise from lack of conformance with development standards as well as uses.
While the Commissioners expressed concern that the definition of the Mixed Use designation could be interpreted in several ways, this is not accidental as it provides the flexibility to provide different regulations in different areas of the Mixed Use designated area. The definition is clear that the designation permits -- but does not require a mix of land uses -- nor does it require retail in a certain area. Given the hierarchy of General Plan and Zoning, the General Plan is supposed to provide some flexibility that can be made more specific through the zoning process. As part of the zoning process, the Planning Commission could examine the specific uses allowed and also look at amortization provisions at that time.

In order to proceed with the General Plan process, and move the the draft Elements, including the draft Land Use Plan, and EIR forward to the City Council, there is essentially one issue which the Planning Commission must resolve: which Mixed Use definition does the Planning Commission want to see included in the General Plan Land Use Element. All other issues have been resolved. The two options are:

**Flexible:**

Vertical or horizontal mix of commercial, office, public/quasi-public, and/or residential uses on the same parcel. Retail is preferred on the ground floor. Office and residential uses should be above the ground floor. Stand-alone (not mixed-use) commercial, office and public/quasi-public uses are also permitted.

**Mandatory:**

Vertical or horizontal mix of commercial, office, public/quasi-public, and/or residential uses on the same parcel. For parcels that front Los Alamitos Boulevard or Katella Avenue, the ground floor is required to consist of retail businesses, unless the uses in such areas were conforming uses as of the date of adoption of the General Plan. Office and residential uses should be above the ground floor in other areas. Stand-alone (not mixed-use) commercial, office, and public/quasi-public uses are also permitted.

**Noticing**

This hearing was noticed in the News Enterprise on January 28, 2015 in a 1/8th of a page notice. As well, all property owners and occupants within 500 feet of General Plan Opportunity Site 6 were mailed public notices concerning this meeting on January 28, 2015. The subject area for Opportunity Site 6 is bound by Florista Street on the north, Farquhar Avenue on the south, Reagan Street on the east and Los Alamitos Boulevard on the west. The mailing quantity for this area amounted to approximately 663 notices. Staff noticed this wider area to allow the Commission more room for discussion.
Staff Recommendation

It is the strong recommendation of Staff, including the City Attorney’s office and the Consultant, that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the General Plan with the land use definition of Mixed Use that provides the most flexibility and deal with each specific use and amortization provisions in the zoning ordinance where such regulations more appropriately belong.

Attachments: 1) Resolution No. 14-31
   Exhibit A (CEQA Findings of Fact for the EIR for General Plan Update)
   Exhibit B (Los Alamitos General Plan Update)
2) Resolution No. 14-32
   Exhibit A (General Plan Previously Distributed to Commission)
   Exhibit B (Final Land Use Plan)
3) Table 2-04
RESOLUTION NO. PC 14-31

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL CERTIFICATION OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE LOS ALAMITOS GENERAL PLAN INCLUDING THE LAND USE CHANGES FOR VARIOUS PARCELS AND RELATED FINDINGS, ADOPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

WHEREAS, the City of Los Alamitos (the “City”) desires to comprehensively update the Los Alamitos General Plan to respond to changing conditions in the City, region and around the globe, as well as to revisit the long term sustainability of the City in the future (hereinafter sometimes referred to as either the “Project” or the “General Plan Update”); and,

WHEREAS, in the Fall of 2010, the City elected to update the City’s General Plan in accordance with Government Code Section 65300 et seq.; and,

WHEREAS, in June 2011, the City elected to retain the Planning Center/Placeworks to initiate the public process to discuss, plan, and prepare an updated General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the City and Planning Center/Placeworks conducted an enhanced public outreach exercise that resulted in Los Alamitos residents communicating their vision for the City; reviewed the existing land uses in the City; identified areas that should be protected and areas that could upgrade over time; discussed needed Citywide improvements; proposed various programs and measures to implement Citywide goals; and recommended refreshed changes to the goals, policies, approaches and strategies contained in the 1990 Los Alamitos General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the City and Planning Center/Placeworks has been drafting a General Plan to strengthen its economic position, reaffirm its policy foundation and vision, and comprehensively evaluate several issues of Citywide importance. These issues include the inclusion of Rossmoor into the City’s sphere of influence, a plan for the City’s commercial corridors and downtown, the recent adoption of the Medical Center Specific Plan, and the need to explore economic development opportunities in a built-out environment; and,

WHEREAS, The City has hosted a series of Joint Commission meetings with three of its Commissions: Planning; Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Arts; and Traffic. These joint meetings updated the Commissioners on the progress of the General Plan Update effort and enabled Staff to properly incorporate shared visions into a future report to the City Council. Moreover, these joint meetings provided an unprecedented
opportunity for the three primary Commissions to talk about the General Plan Update collectively and share concerns of other Commissioners, helping to clarify and unify opinions, reactions, and concerns; and,

WHEREAS, a draft Los Alamitos General Plan Update 2014 was developed, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk and incorporated herein by this reference, has been prepared to address the seven mandated elements plus two additional elements: Economic Element and Growth Management Element; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 21065 and 21067 of the Public Resources Code, and Sections 15367 and 15378 of the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, § 15000 et seq.), the proposed General Plan Update is a “project” and the City of Los Alamitos is the lead agency for the proposed General Plan Update; and,

WHEREAS, as lead agency, the City of Los Alamitos also retained Planning Center/Placeworks to prepare the necessary environmental documentation for the General Plan Update; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Los Alamitos caused an Initial Study of the Los Alamitos General Plan Update (“Project”) to be prepared to evaluate the potential for adverse environmental impacts and based on the Initial Study, concluded that a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be prepared for the Project; the Initial Study with a Notice of Preparation was mailed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible and trustee agencies and other interested parties; and,

WHEREAS, on December 13, 2013, the City released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the Project to city, county, and state agencies; other public agencies; and interested private organizations and individuals; and,

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2014, a Public Scoping meeting before the Planning Commission was also conducted during the NOP period to solicit comments from the public and potentially affected property owners, i.e., those whose properties were recommended for a reclassification or change in allowable uses. A notice of the meeting was sent to 1,500 property owners and tenants within a 500 foot radius from the subject site sites. There were approximately fifteen (15) persons in attendance at this meeting. There were verbal comments received from persons in attendance at the Public Scoping meeting. These comments were provided to the City’s environmental consultant who assisted with issues to be evaluated and alternatives for EIR analysis; and,

WHEREAS, the City, as the Lead Agency, prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft Program EIR) (SCH# 2013121055), a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk and incorporated herein by this reference, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines; and
WHEREAS, on August 7, 2014, a Notice of Availability and copies of the Draft Program EIR were delivered to the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) (SCH No. 2013121055); and,

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2014, the City posted a Notice of Availability (NOA) concerning the Draft Program EIR and published the NOA in the Los Alamitos News Enterprise newspaper on August 5, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, the Draft Program EIR was circulated for a duly noticed 45-day public review period that began on August 7, 2014 and ended on September 22, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, the City placed copies of the Draft EIR at the City of Los Alamitos Community Development counter and the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor public library; and,

WHEREAS, during the forty-five (45) day Notice of Availability (NOA) review period, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies and others pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15086; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Los Alamitos Local CEQA Guidelines, the City Council shall consider certification of the Final EIR and the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation regarding the Draft EIR to the City Council as an advisory board; and,

WHEREAS, on October 13, 2014, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on this project, at which time Staff presented the details of the proposed Project and the Planning Commission received oral and/or written testimony from the public regarding the applications and the Draft EIR; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission continued the October 13, 2014 public hearing to November 10, 2014 at which time it continued its consideration of the Project and the Draft EIR; and,

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2014 the Orange County Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") held a meeting to determine consistency of the Los Alamitos General Plan Update with the Airport Environments Land Use Plan ("AELUP") for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB) and for the AELUP for Heliports; and,

WHEREAS, the ALUC recommended that the City of Los Alamitos incorporate additional policies into their General Plan to ensure consistency with the AELUPs and additional goals and policies have been added to the Growth Management Element to reflect the ALUC’s consistency determination; and,

WHEREAS, the public hearing was closed on November 10, 2014 and Staff was directed to bring back resolutions reflecting the recommended changes made to the Land Use Element; and,
WHEREAS, on December 8, 2014 the Planning Commission was presented with two resolutions for adoption which Staff believed embodied the direction of the Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, on December 8, 2014 the Planning Commission raised questions regarding the boundaries of Opportunity Site 6 south of Katella Avenue and whether the land use should be changed to Mixed Use or just have a Mixed Use Overlay designation placed over it; and,

WHEREAS, a new public hearing was noticed for January 12, 2015 for those properties south of Katella Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, on January 12, 2015 the Planning Commission indicated that it wished for the definition of the Mixed Use designation to require retail businesses on the ground floor along Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard in Opportunity Site 6; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission’s new direction required a new noticed public hearing which was noticed on January 28, 2015, for all properties in Opportunity Site 6 with the hearing to be held on February 9, 2015; and,

WHEREAS, at the February 9, 2015 the Planning Commission indicated that it decided against the designation to require retail businesses on the ground floor along Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard in definition of the Mixed Use designation for Opportunity Site 6; and,

WHEREAS, on February 9, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed the record of proceedings, including the Staff reports and other written records presented to, or otherwise made available to, the Planning Commission on this matter, and considered all oral comments made during the public hearings; and,

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the Planning Commission has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including the Draft General Plan and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings.

NOW THEREFORE the Planning Commission of the City of Los Alamitos does hereby resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. The Complete Final EIR consists of: the two volume Draft EIR dated August 2014 and a third volume identified as Final EIR dated October 2014, which includes the comments received on the DEIR, the responses to comments, and proposed revisions to the DEIR and two memos from Placeworks analyzing the recommended changes dated November 2014. Together the three volumes constitute the Final Program EIR, which is referred to herein as the “EIR.”
SECTION 2. The Planning Commission has independently reviewed and considered the contents of the EIR and it reflects the Planning Commission's independent judgment and analysis.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission finds that the EIR complies with all of the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City's local CEQA Guidelines and has been prepared and circulated in the manner required by law.

SECTION 4. The Planning Commission finds that the Project will have less than a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Mineral Resources. The support for this finding can be found in the Initial Study, which is contained in Volume 2 of the DEIR.

SECTION 5. The Planning Commission finds that the Project will have less than significant impacts on the following categories and that no mitigation is required for these impact areas: aesthetics; greenhouse gas emissions, with regard to the amount of GHG emissions compared to existing conditions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning; noise, with regard to long-term ambient noise levels, exposure of sensitive receptors to elevated noise levels, and increased noise exposure from operation of Los Alamitos JFTB; population and housing; public services; recreation; transportation and traffic; and utilities and service systems. These findings are further elaborated upon and supported by the information in Section IIC of the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations attached hereto as Exhibit A, as well as the referenced sections of the EIR and any applicable responses to comments.

SECTION 6. The Planning Commission finds that the Project will have significant impacts on the categories listed below, but that the impacts to these areas can be mitigated to a less than significant level based on the mitigation measures included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program which is attached hereto as Exhibit B. The areas that can be mitigated below a level of significance are: air quality, with regard to placement of new sensitive receptors near major sources of toxic air contaminants as well as objectionable odors; and cultural resources. These findings and the related mitigation measures are expanded upon and supported by the information in Section IID of Exhibit A, as well as in the referenced sections of the EIR and any applicable responses to comments.

SECTION 7. The Planning Commission finds that the Project will have significant impacts on the following categories and that although mitigation measures can be imposed related to some of these impacts, there are no mitigation measures which will fully mitigate the impacts below a level of significance, leaving these impacts significant and unavoidable:
• Air quality, with respect to AQMP compliance in that projected buildout will be inconsistent with SCAQMD's AQMP. There are not mitigation measures that can be imposed for this impact.

• Air quality, with respect to construction activities generating a substantial increase in short-term criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed threshold criteria and cumulatively contribute to nonattainment designations of the Southern California air basin. While there are mitigation measures that can be imposed to reduce the impacts, they cannot be entirely eliminated.

• Air quality, with respect to exposing people to substantial pollutant concentrations by placement of sensitive receptors near major sources of toxic air contaminants. While there are mitigation measures that can be imposed to reduce the impact, the impact cannot be entirely eliminated.

• Greenhouse gas emissions, with respect to the ability to meet reduction targets per Executive Order S-03-05. While there are mitigation measures that can be imposed to reduce the impact, the impact cannot be entirely eliminated.

• Noise, with respect to short-term ground borne vibration caused by construction activities. While there are mitigation measures that can be imposed to reduce the impact, the impact cannot be entirely eliminated.

• Noise, with respect to short-term increases in the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses. While there are mitigation measures that can be imposed to reduce the impact, the impact cannot be entirely eliminated.

• Transportation and traffic, with respect to cumulative traffic impacts related to unacceptable levels of service at buildout. Given the roadway constraints, there are no feasible mitigation measures that can be imposed to reduce or eliminate the impact.

These findings and the related mitigation measures are expanded upon and supported by the information in Section IIE of Exhibit A, as well as in the referenced sections of the EIR and any applicable responses to comments. The Mitigation Measures that will be imposed are contained in Exhibit B attached hereto.

SECTION 8. In accordance with CEQA, the EIR analyzed a number of alternatives which are fully described in the EIR and are summarized in Section IIE of Exhibit A. The Arrowhead Products Site Alternative which leaves the 28 acre Arrowhead Parcel as Industrial instead of changing it to General Business is the environmentally superior alternative of those identified in the DEIR, although even this alternative has significant impacts. As further analyzed in the FEIR, the land use pattern which was recommended by the Planning Commission has the potential to have
even less environmental impacts, assuming the Arrowhead Products Site property
remains an industrial use during the life of this General Plan, which is expected based
on representations from the Arrowhead Property owners.

Although the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative, which leaves the Property as
Planned Industrial, is environmentally superior, it does not fully reduce any of the
significant impacts of the Project below a level of significance. The Planning
Commission’s alternative has the advantage of obtaining the benefits of the
environmentally superior alternative which will help retain the operations of a long-
standing business that provides high paying and skilled jobs and is an important asset
to the City, while providing flexibility to change the land use to retail if economic
conditions change. The Planning Commission finds that each of the findings set forth in
the Sections above remain true and correct for the revised Land Use Pattern, with the
advantage that the impacts are less than analyzed for the Project.

SECTION 9. Prior to approving a project for which an EIR was prepared and
water suppliers were consulted pursuant to Section IV,B(4) of the City’s Guidelines, the
City shall determine, based on the entire record, whether projected water supplies will
be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the proposed project, in addition to existing and
planned future uses. The Planning Commission hereby finds that there will be sufficient
water supplies for the General Plan Update.

SECTION 10. The Planning Commission finds that although changes were
made to the General Plan Update since the time that the EIR was made available for
public review, there is no need to recirculate the EIR, as further set forth in Section II F
of Exhibit A.

SECTION 11. The Planning Commission finds that although there are
unavoidable significant impacts, the benefits of the General Plan Update, as revised by
the Planning Commission’s alternative Land Use Pattern, outweigh the impacts, as
further set forth in Section III of Exhibit A.

SECTION 12. Recommendation of the Planning Commission: Pursuant to its
obligations under 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15025(c), the Planning Commission has
reviewed and considered the Project and the Environmental Impact Report prepared for
the General Plan Update and has considered the significant and unavoidable
environmental impacts of the Project, both as originally analyzed and as revised. The
Los Alamitos Planning Commission, recommends that the City Council of the City of
Los Alamitos certify the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the General Plan
Update which consists of the three volumes identified in Section 1 above, adopt the
Findings set forth in Section II of Exhibit A, adopt a Statement of Overriding
Considerations as set forth in Section III of Attachment A, and adopt the Mitigation
Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project as set forth in Exhibit B.

SECTION 13. The recitals are true and correct and are incorporated by
reference herein.
SECTION 14. The Planning Commission finds that all available documentation is available within the Community Development Department at the City of Los Alamitos, 3191 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos, CA 90720. The custodian of records is the Community Development Director.

SECTION 15. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the City Council, and to any person requesting a copy of the same.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 9th day of February, 2015.

________________________
John Riley, Chairman

ATTEST:

________________________
Steven Mendoza, Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________
Lisa Kranitz, Assistant City Attorney

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF ORANGE ) ss
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS )

I, Steven Mendoza, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Los Alamitos, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 9th day of February, 2015, by the following vote, to wit:
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FOR THE
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE
LOS ALAMITOS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2013121055

Exhibit A

I. BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a number of written findings be made by the lead agency in connection with certification of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approval of the project pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code. This document provides the findings required by CEQA and the specific reasons for considering the project acceptable even though the project has significant impacts that are infeasible to mitigate.

The lead agency is responsible for the adequacy and objectivity of the EIR. The City of Los Alamitos (City), as lead agency, has subjected the Draft EIR (DEIR) and Final EIR (FEIR) to the agency's own review and analysis.

A. PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project is an update to the City of Los Alamitos General Plan. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update is intended to provide guidance for long-term growth, maintenance, and preservation in the City over the next 20-plus years. The General Plan Update also includes the community of Rossmoor as part of the City's sphere of influence (SOI) to understand future demands for services and implications for growth in Rossmoor and the City. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update addresses the required elements and one optional element: Land Use; Economic Development; Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation; Mobility and Circulation; Housing; Public Facilities and Safety; and Growth Management. The Housing Element was recently updated for the 2014-2021 planning period and was adopted on February 3, 2014. The Housing Element remains a part of the Los Alamitos General Plan, but is not part of the comprehensive General Plan Update.

The proposed land use plan as analyzed would allow for up to a total of 23,003 residents, 18,430 jobs (18,606 jobs with the recommended changes identified by the Planning Commission), 8,735 dwelling units, and 8,881,442 nonresidential square feet of development under the proposed General Plan Update. The theoretical buildout was based largely on the assumption that the majority of the City and Rossmoor would not change. Some incremental intensification was assumed through small projects (e.g., adding a second dwelling unit or expanding a storefront). A handful of parcels were identified as areas where more substantial change could occur. For those parcels, the City created a set of projections and estimated the amount of development that could occur between now and General Plan buildout. In addition, the proposed General Plan Update identifies the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB) as Community & Institutional/JFTB.
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However, it should be noted that although the Los Alamitos JFTB is within the City's municipal boundary, the City has no jurisdiction or land use authority on this U.S. military installation.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The General Plan Update is guided by a set of community values and priorities developed by the Los Alamitos City Council and Commissions with input from the community in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor. The following objectives have been established for the Los Alamitos General Plan Update and will aid decision makers in their review of the project and associated environmental impacts:

- Maintain high levels of safety and service
- Create an attractive and pedestrian-friendly downtown
- Introduce pedestrian bridges
- Maximize retail opportunities along Katella Avenue
- Relocate City Hall
- Offer incentives to preserve and attract business
- Improve the look and identity of the City
- Provide consistent and effective code enforcement
- Maintain a good relationship with the Los Alamitos Unified School District
- Create more open space, parks, trails, community gardens, and recreation areas
- Evaluate annexation carefully
- Establish centralized parking options
- Enhance cultural uses and historical preservation

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The FEIR includes the DEIR dated August 2014, written comments on the DEIR that were received during the public review period, and written responses to those comments and changes to the DEIR (hereinafter referred to collectively as the FEIR). In conformance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Los Alamitos conducted an extensive environmental review of the proposed project. The environmental review process has included:

- Completion of an Initial Study (IS)/Notice of Preparation (NOP) on December 18, 2013. The public review period extended from December 18, 2013, to January 17, 2014. The NOP was posted at the Orange County Clerk's office on December 18, 2013. Copies of the IS were made available for public review at the City of Los Alamitos and the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor Library.

- Completion of the scoping process where the public was invited by the City to participate in a scoping meeting held January 6, 2014 at City Hall. The notice of a public scoping meeting was included in the NOP.

- Preparation of a DEIR, which was made available for a 45-day public review period beginning August 7, 2014, and ending September 22, 2014. The scope of the DEIR was determined based on the City's Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the City. Section 2.3, Scope of this DEIR, of the DEIR.
describes the issues identified for analysis in the DEIR. The Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR was sent to interested persons and organizations, sent to the State Clearinghouse in Sacramento for distribution to public agencies, posted at the City of Los Alamitos, and published in the News Enterprise. The NOA was posted at the Orange County Clerk's office on August 7, 2014. Copies of the DEIR were made available for public review at the City of Los Alamitos and the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor Library.

- Preparation of a Final EIR (FEIR), including comments, the responses to comments on the DEIR, and revisions to the DEIR. The FEIR was released for a 10-day agency review period prior to certification of the FEIR.

- Additional analysis by PlaceWorks regarding the recommended changes by the Planning Commission to the land use designations and additional goals and policies added in order to be consistent with the Airport Environs Land Use Plans.

- Public hearings on the proposed project were held, including a Planning Commission hearing on October 13, 2014; November 10, 2014; December 8, 2014; January 12, 2015; and adoption of the Resolutions recommending approval on February 9, 2015, and a City Council Hearing on March 16, 2015.

D. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the proposed project includes, but is not limited to, the following documents and other evidence:

- The NOP, NOA, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed project.

- The DEIR and the FEIR for the proposed project.

- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the DEIR.

- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the DEIR.

- All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the proposed project.

- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the in the FEIR.

- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the DEIR and FEIR.

- Staff report and recommendation from the Airport Land Use Commission.
The Resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council in connection with the proposed project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein, including comments received after the close of the comment period and responses thereto.

Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Any documents expressly cited in these Findings.

E. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the City's actions related to the project are at the City of Los Alamitos Community Development Department, 3191 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos, CA 90720. The City's Community Development Director is the custodian of the administrative record for the project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request at the offices of the Planning Division. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and Guidelines Section 15091(c).
II. FINDINGS AND FACTS

The City of Los Alamitos, as lead agency, is required under CEQA to make written findings concerning each alternative and each significant environmental impact identified in the DEIR and FEIR.

Specifically, regarding findings, Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

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

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

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 FEIR.

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

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

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

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

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.
The “changes or alterations” referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in Guidelines Section 15370, including:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

A. Format

This section summarizes the significant environmental impacts of the project, describes how these impacts are to be mitigated, and discusses various alternatives to the proposed project, which were developed in an effort to reduce the remaining significant environmental impacts. All impacts are considered potentially significant prior to mitigation unless otherwise stated in the findings.

This remainder of this section is divided into the following subsections:

Section B, Summary of Environmental Impacts, presents the summary of impacts of the proposed project.

Section C, Findings on Impacts Determined to Be Less Than Significant, presents the impacts of the proposed project that were determined in the EIR to be less than significant without the addition of mitigation measures and presents the rationales for these determinations.

Section D, Findings on Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significant, presents significant impacts of the proposed project that were identified in the FEIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and the rationales for the findings.

Section E, Findings on Significant Unavoidable Impacts, presents significant impacts of the proposed project that were identified in the FEIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, the findings for significant impacts, and the rationales for the findings.

Section F, Findings on Recirculation, presents the reasoning as to why recirculation is not required under Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section G, Findings on Project Alternatives and Planning Commission Recommended Changes, presents alternatives to the project and evaluates them in relation to the findings set forth in Section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which allows a public agency to approve a project that would result in one or more significant environmental effects if the project alternatives
are found to be infeasible because of specific economic, social, or other considerations. In addition, this section presents the findings on the changes to the proposed General Plan Update recommended by the Planning Commission.

B. Summary of Environmental Impacts

Based on the NOP and DEIR, the following is a summary of the environmental topics considered to have no impact, a less than significant impact, a less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation measures, and a significant and unavoidable impact.

No Impact

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Mineral Resources

Less Than Significant Impact

- Aesthetics
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) emissions (amount of GHG emissions compared to existing conditions)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise (long-term ambient noise levels, exposure of sensitive receptors to elevated noise levels, and increased noise exposure from operation of Los Alamitos JFTB)
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic (cumulative impacts and inclusion of alternative transportation plans/programs)
- Utilities and Service Systems

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

- Air Quality (placement of new sensitive receptors near major sources of toxic air contaminants, objectionable odors)
Cultural Resources

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact**

- Air Quality (air quality management plan compliance, air quality management district thresholds, operation and construction-related criteria air pollutants, and exposure of sensitive receptors to elevated concentrations of air pollutants)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG reduction targets per Executive Order S-03-05)
- Noise (short-term groundborne vibration and increased construction noise levels near noise-sensitive land uses)
- Transportation and Traffic (cumulative traffic impacts related to unacceptable levels of service at buildout)

**C. Findings on Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant**

**Initial Study**

An Initial Study was prepared by the City of Los Alamitos to identify the potential significant effects of the project. The Initial Study was completed and distributed with the NOP for the proposed project, dated December 18, 2013. The Initial Study determined that the proposed project would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Mineral Resources. All other topical areas of evaluation in the Environmental Checklist were determined to require further assessment in an EIR.

**Draft EIR**

It was determined that several potential environmental effects would not result from the proposed project, or would result but would not have a significant impact on the environment. This determination was made based on the findings of the DEIR prepared for the project. The following summary briefly describes those environmental topics that were found not to be significant with implementation of existing regulations, as detailed in each respective topical section of Chapter 5.0 of the DEIR.

1. **Aesthetics**

| Impact 5.1-1: | Buildout in accordance with the proposed General Plan Update land use plan would alter the visual appearance of the plan area, but would not substantially degrade its existing visual character or quality. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.1, Aesthetics and in particular, starting on page 5.1-8 of the DEIR.

Because the General Plan Update is not a "growth oriented" plan and Los Alamitos is almost entirely built out, new policies, land uses changes, and other components of the proposed General Plan Update are not anticipated to dramatically alter the character or visual quality of the community. No substantial changes in land use or road network are proposed. Policies that would affect the visual

---
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environment are generally aimed at capitalizing on existing opportunities for redevelopment with minimal changes to the existing land use patterns. Furthermore, upon implementation of the General Plan Update, the visual appearance of residential neighborhoods would remain largely unchanged, since few changes are proposed for those areas.

**Impacts of Land Use Element**

As mentioned above, the General Plan Update is not growth oriented; it does not propose substantial increases in allowed density or apply new land use designations to large swaths of the City (or SOI). However, some changes in existing land use would occur prior to General Plan buildout, including development of approximately 535 new housing units and 903,465 square feet of nonresidential space (commercial, industrial, and institutional). The proposed General Plan Update includes land use changes as part of the proposed Land Use Element. Nevertheless, the proposed Land Use Element’s goals and policies would address aesthetic concerns. Goal 4 advocates “neighborhoods and buildings that are well maintained and demonstrate a sense of pride and identity.” Policies 4.1 through 4.5 in particular address community character and context-sensitive development. Implementation of these policies would ensure that opportunities for development and redevelopment in Los Alamitos would also serve as opportunities for enhancement of the community’s visual environment.

**Impacts of Circulation Element**

After changes in land use, the component of the proposed General Plan Update most likely to affect the visual character of Los Alamitos is the Mobility and Circulation Element. The vast majority of streets and roadways in the plan area for the Mobility and Circulation Element are not proposed to be redesigned during the lifespan of the proposed General Plan Update. The element focuses on targeted minor changes in select locations that would increase mobility, access, and safety in the City. These include new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, raised colored and textured intersections, traffic calming measures, and pedestrian bridges (pedestrian bridges are discussed under Subsection 9, Transportation and Traffic, Impact 5.11-3). Such improvements would generally have a minimal effect on the overall visual appearance of the community. To the contrary, intersection improvements and/or traffic calming measures (such as curb extensions and roundabouts) would break up the visual monotony of the City’s wide streets, creating visual interest with new landscaping and material changes.

**Conclusion**

As discussed above, some land use and circulation changes would alter the visual appearance and character of Los Alamitos. However, these changes would likely occur incrementally prior to buildout and would generally result in beneficial aesthetic impacts. Proposed changes would create more visually cohesive neighborhoods along the City’s major corridors while maintaining the current appearance and character of existing residential neighborhoods, including Rossmoor. Additionally, applying the concepts set forth in the Commercial Corridors Plan, new development can be guided to develop projects that would not degrade the environment. Therefore, Impact 5.1-1 would be less than significant.

Finding: Compliance with General Plan policies and design guidelines in the Commercial Corridors Plan would enhance and preserve the City’s existing visual character and quality. Impacts related to visual appearance and character would be less than significant.
2. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

| Impact 5.4-1 | Buildout of the City of Los Alamitos pursuant to the General Plan Update would decrease GHG emissions compared to existing conditions as a result of federal and state GHG emissions regulations and would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and particularly beginning on page 5.4-16 of the DEIR.

Development under the project would contribute to global climate change through direct and indirect emissions of GHGs from land uses in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor. The change in GHG emissions is based on the difference between existing land uses and land uses associated with buildout of the General Plan Update. The community-wide GHG emissions inventory for the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor at buildout (post-2035) compared to existing conditions shows post-2035 changes, including reductions from federal and state measures identified in the California Air Resource Board’s (CARB) Scoping Plan—i.e., Pavley fuel efficiency standards, Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) for fuel use (transportation and off-road), and state reductions for nontransportation measures. It is likely that new federal and state programs would be adopted, resulting in further GHG reductions post-2035.

Compared to the existing emissions inventory, the City of Los Alamitos and SOI would experience a decrease of 13,789 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (MTCO₂e) of GHG emissions at buildout as a result of regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions and turnover of California’s on-road vehicle fleets. As identified by the California Natural Resources Agency’s “Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Pursuant to Senate Bill 97” (CNRA 2009), the CEQA Guidelines do not establish a zero emissions threshold of significance because there is no “one molecule” rule in CEQA. Therefore, emissions generated by additional growth in the City and Rossmoor would be offset by a reduction in existing emissions from implementation of federal and state regulations. As a result, the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor would not experience an increase in GHG emissions at project buildout. GHG emissions in the City would be approximately 5 percent less than the City’s 2013 community GHG emissions, even with additional growth. Consequently, impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** Buildout of the General Plan Update would lessen the amount of GHG emissions compared to existing conditions by approximately 5 percent and would have a less than significant impact.

3. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

| Impact 5.5.1: | Future construction and/or operational activities accommodated by the General Plan Update would involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials; however, existing federal, state, and local regulations would ensure risks are minimized. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.5, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and in particular, beginning on page 5.5-22 of the DEIR.
Buildout of the General Plan Update would expand industrial uses, some of which would involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials and involve demolition of older buildings that contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM) or lead-based paint (LBP). Future development requiring demolition would be required to comply with the California Health & Safety Code, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403 related to removal of ACMs and LBPs. Compliance would require the preparation of LBP and ACM surveys for any building demolitions and appropriate remediation measures for removal of these materials.

In addition, existing regulations address the transport of hazardous materials. Vehicles carrying hazardous materials are required to have placards that indicate at a glance the chemicals being carried and whether or not they are corrosive, inflammable, or explosive. The conductors are required to carry detailed material data sheets for each of the substances on board. These documents are designed to help emergency response personnel assess the situation immediately upon arrival at the scene of an accident and take the appropriate precautionary and mitigation measures. The California Highway Patrol is in charge of spills on or along freeways, with Caltrans, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Orange County Environmental Health Division, and local sheriffs providing additional resources as needed.

Existing regulations with respect to hazardous materials transportation, management, and disposal are designed to be protective of human health. The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, state regulations, provisions of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code, and policies in the General Plan Update all minimize potential hazardous material impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous waste/materials are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Finding: Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations, provisions of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code, and General Plan policies would minimize adverse impacts of hazardous materials to less than significant.

Impact 5.5-2: The City and Rossmoor are included on a list of hazardous materials sites; however, compliance with existing regulations would ensure hazards are remediared to the applicable state and federal standards.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.5, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and in particular, starting on page 5.5-23 of the DEIR.

There are 71 GeoTracker sites in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, including 18 open cases; 10 EnviroStor sites, including 8 open cases; and 86 hazardous materials generators listed on the RCRA database. Of the 18 open GeoTracker cases, 15 are either eligible for closure or are undergoing remediation or verification monitoring.

Because numerous sites are undergoing investigation and/or remediation within and adjacent to the City, impacts from hazardous substance at or adjacent to specific project developments in the City may occur. Future developments in the City in accordance with implementation of the General Plan Update may be impacted by hazardous substances remaining from historical operations, which may pose significant health risks. However, properties contaminated by hazardous substances are...
regulated at the local, state, and federal levels and are subject to compliance with stringent laws and regulations for investigation and remediation. For example, compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; the RCRA; California Code of Regulations Title 22; and related requirements would remedy any potential impacts caused by hazardous substance contamination. Therefore, buildout of the General Plan Update would result in a less than significant impact upon compliance with existing laws and regulations.

**Finding:** Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations would minimize adverse impacts of hazardous materials sites to less than significant levels.

| Impact 5.5-3: | Buildout of the General Plan Update would place additional development and residents in the vicinity of the Los Alamitos Army Airfield; however, land uses would be compatible with the Airport Environ Land Use Plan. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.5, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and in particular, starting on page 5.5-23 of the DEIR.

The Los Alamitos JFTB, which includes Los Alamitos Army Airfield (AAF), occupies much of the southern part of the City. Approval and implementation of the General Plan Update would have no impact on land uses within the Los Alamitos JFTB Clear Zone, since the City of Los Alamitos does not have authority over land uses on the Los Alamitos JFTB. No impact regarding land-use regulation respecting airport-related hazards would occur.

The Los Alamitos JFTB Airport Environ Land Use Plan (AELUP) also establishes horizontal and three-dimensional airspace where obstructions to aircraft movement are prohibited. The entire City and Rossmoor are within the height-restriction zone for the Los Alamitos JFTB (ALUC 2002). Building heights in the City are regulated under the City’s Zoning Code (Municipal Code Title 17), not the General Plan; the General Plan Update does not propose changes to building-height standards in the Zoning Code. Furthermore, new land uses built pursuant to the General Plan Update would be required to comply with standards outlined in the AELUP. This would ensure that land uses allowed under the proposed General Plan Update would not encroach into areas required for the safe takeoff and landing of aircraft at the Los Alamitos AAF. Compliance with these policies and land-use restrictions included in the airport’s AELUP would minimize potential safety hazards for people residing and working near the Los Alamitos AAF. Therefore, no significant impacts relating to airport hazards are anticipated.

Furthermore, on October 16, 2014, the Airport Land Use Commission found that the General Plan Update was consistent with the AELUP with the incorporation of additional policies that were consistent with policies already contained in the General Plan.

**Finding:** Compliance with the City’s Zoning Code and Los Alamitos JFTB’s AELUP would ensure land use compatibility with the Los Alamitos AAF, and impacts are less than significant.
4. Land Use and Planning

**Impact 5.6-1:** Implementation of the General Plan Update would not conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating and environmental effect.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Land Use and Planning* and in particular, starting on page 5.6-5 of the DEIR.

**State Planning Law and California Complete Streets Act Consistency**

The General Plan Update is consistent with California Government Code Section 65302 because it addresses the seven required elements. More specifically, the General Plan Update involves a revision to the land use map and reorganizes the current General Plan into seven elements. Throughout the various elements, the General Plan Update outlines development goals and policies and includes forecasts of long-term conditions; exhibits and diagrams; and objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals. The proposed land-use plan and the goals and policies in the General Plan Update strive to preserve and ensure land-use compatibility throughout the City and Rossmoor.

Various elements of the General Plan Update contain policies that help the City implement AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act. By implementing Complete Streets policies, the City would increase the number of trips made by alternative modes of travel (e.g., transit, bicycling, and walking), correspondingly reducing the number of vehicle trips and associated greenhouse gas emissions. An increase in transit trips, bicycling, and walking would thus help the City meet the transportation needs of all residents and visitors while reducing traffic congestion and helping meet the greenhouse gas reduction goals of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act, and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), which are implemented through the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) (SCAG 2012).

**SCAG 2012–2035 RTP/SCS Consistency**

The 2012–2035 RTP/SCS goals are directed to transit, transportation and mobility, and protection of the environmental and health of residents. The analysis in Table 5.6-1 of Section 5.6, *Land Use and Planning*, of the DEIR, concludes that the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable RTP/SCS goals. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant land-use impacts related to relevant RTP/SCS goals.

**Airport Environs Land Use Plan Consistency**

Approximately 50 percent of the City’s total land area is occupied by the Los Alamitos JFTB. The City falls within the airport planning area of the JFTB; land uses within the airport planning-area boundaries are required to conform to safety, height, and noise restrictions established in the AELUP for the JFTB. Additionally, the entire City and Rossmoor fall within the height restriction zone for the JFTB, and portions of the City fall within the 60 and 65 decibel noise contours.

ALUC review is required for adoption of or amendments to a General Plan or Specific Plan; zoning ordinance; master plan for public use airports; and heliports within the airport influence area (Public Utilities Code Sections 21676(b), 21676(c), 21664.5, and 21661.5.)
Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 21676, local governments are required to submit all general plan and zoning amendments that occur in the ALUC planning areas for consistency review by ALUC. On October 16, 2014, the ALUC determined that the General Plan Update was consistent with the AELUP with the incorporation of additional policies that were consistent with policies already contained in the General Plan.

**Potential Hazards to Aircrafts, People, and Property**

The City has no land-use jurisdiction within the Los Alamitos JFTB boundaries or its Clear Zone. Additionally, no changes are proposed to the land-use designations of the Los Alamitos JFTB under the General Plan Update, and no development is forecast to occur that would affect airport operations.

The entire City and Rossmoor fall within the height restriction zone for the Los Alamitos JFTB, and as stated in Section 5.5 of the DEIR, building heights in the City are regulated under the City's Zoning Code (Municipal Code Title 17), and not the General Plan; the General Plan Update does not propose changes to building height standards in the Zoning Code. Additionally, new land uses built pursuant to the General Plan Update would be required to comply with standards outlined in the AELUP. Adherence to the AELUP would ensure that land use allowed under the proposed General Plan Update would not encroach into areas required for the safe takeoff and landing of aircraft. Therefore, no significant impacts relating to airport hazards are anticipated.

**Potential Aircraft Noise Impacts**

Sensitive land uses within the 60 and 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of the Los Alamitos JFTB include existing residential homes on the western and northern edges of the Los Alamitos JFTB. Approximately 30 single-family homes on the northeast site of the Los Alamitos JFTB and approximately 20 homes to the west of the Los Alamitos JFTB are exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL. Because this area is developed with single-family residential homes and the project would not change the land use designation at the residential areas surrounding the airport; the proposed project would not intensify the number of persons exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would not expose new noise-sensitive land uses to incompatible levels of aircraft noise.

**Finding:** Development in accordance with the General Plan Update would be consistent with California Government Code requirements for General Plans and for Complete Streets; the 2012-2035 SCAG RTP/SCS; and the Airport Environ Land Use Plan. Compliance with existing regulations and the City’s municipal code would reduce impacts to less than significant.

5. Noise

**Impact 5.7-1** The General Plan Update would not result in a substantial long-term increase in ambient noise levels generated by vehicle traffic.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, Noise, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-18 of the DEIR.

Future development in accordance with the proposed General Plan Update would cause increases in traffic along local roadways. In community noise assessments, a 3 dBA (A-weighted decibel) increase is considered "barely perceptible," and increases over 5 dBA are generally considered "readily perceptible" (Caltrans 2009). Noise-sensitive residential uses are considered normally acceptable.
under ambient noise conditions of 60 dBA community noise equivalent level (CNEL). Because the expected ambient noise increase would occur over a long period—more than 20 years—as opposed to an immediate change, a significant impact would occur for roadways where buildout of the General Plan Update would result in a noise increase of 3 dB or more in an environment where the ambient noise level is 60 dBA CNEL.

Under the 2035 scenario, the ambient noise environment would be higher than 60 dBA CNEL along most of the study-area roadway segments. However, buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would only result in noise level increases up to 1.1 dB from existing conditions. These incremental increases would be below the levels that are considered barely perceptible and would be below the thresholds. Therefore, traffic-related noise impacts to offsite uses from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would be less than significant.

**Finding:** Buildout of the proposed project would only result in an increase of up to 1.1 dB from existing conditions, which is considered barely perceptible and below thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact 5.7-2:** The General Plan Update would not expose sensitive receptors to elevated noise levels from traffic and stationary noise.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, _Noise_, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-19 of the DEIR.

Noise-sensitive land uses include residential, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, hospitals, and open space/recreation areas. Commercial and industrial areas are not considered noise sensitive and have much higher tolerances for exterior noise levels. Noise-sensitive land uses would be exposed to transportation sources, including vehicular traffic and aircraft overflights.

Traffic noise contours were calculated for long-range, 2035 conditions. According to the traffic noise contours, several portions of the City will be in areas exposed to noise levels above 60 dBA CNEL, which is the level considered normally compatible with the development of residential uses. For the purpose of assessing the compatibility of new development with the anticipated ambient noise, the City uses the Community Noise and Land Use Compatibility standards. The extent of the exposure to noise depends on site-specific conditions and location of buildings. Further review would be required as future development is proposed. New sensitive land uses would have to demonstrate compatibility with the ambient noise levels. Any siting of new noise-sensitive land uses within a noise environment that exceeds the normally acceptable land use compatibility criterion represents a potentially significant impact and would require a separate noise study through the development review process to determine the level of impacts and required mitigation. The City's Municipal Code includes several noise standards in Chapter 17.24 to control noise from stationary sources. In addition, the General Plan Update includes policies in the Public Facilities and Safety Element. Policies 4.1 through 4.6 would reduce noise impacts from transportation and stationary noise sources to sensitive uses by requiring an assessment of potential noise impacts and the implementation of mitigation measures to meet applicable standards; by coordinating with Caltrans and the Los Alamitos JFTB to minimize roadway and aircraft noise; and by controlling noise at the source at business operations.
Finding: With the noise standards in the City's Municipal Code and implementation of the General Plan Public Facilities and Safety Element policies related to noise, impacts from transportation and stationary noise sources would be less than significant.

Impact 5.7-5: Implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in increased noise exposure from operation of the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, Noise, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-28 of the DEIR.

As discussed above, the Los Alamitos JFTB is a military aviation facility, and operations at the Los Alamitos JFTB would continue to contribute to the ambient noise environment. The major sources of noise at the base are vehicular traffic on City roadways, major events at the base, and aircraft operations.

Aircraft Noise

The AELUP establishes standards for the compatibility between the Los Alamitos AAF and surrounding parcels. The standards identify land uses that are considered inconsistent with airport operations and areas where the greatest noise from aircraft is expected to occur, and establish height limits in select areas around the runway. Approximately 30 existing single-family homes to the northeast of the Los Alamitos JFTB and approximately 20 homes to the west of the JFTB are exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL. Because this area is developed with single-family residential and the project would not change the land use designation at the residential areas surrounding the airport, the proposed project would not intensify the number of persons exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would not expose new noise-sensitive land uses to incompatible levels of aircraft noise. Because the project would not introduce new sensitive receptors to areas that would be inconsistent with the AELUP, noise impacts from aircraft noise at the Los Alamitos JFTB related to the implementation of the General Plan would be less than significant.

Vehicular Traffic and Events

In addition to military operations, the Los Alamitos JFTB hosts community events such as the annual Race on the Base, the Wings, Wheels and Rotor Expo. The Los Alamitos JFTB also houses the Sunburst Youth Challenge Academy, Youth Baseball Fields, and Aquatic Center, all of which are used by civilians. On weekends and other select training periods, activities can increase substantially. The 2035 noise level contours for the segment of Lexington Drive between Katella Avenue and the Los Alamitos JFTB were calculated for a typical traffic condition, without events or military exercises. The 70 dBA CNEL noise level contour falls within the road right-of-way, and the 65 dBA CNEL contour falls within 30 feet of the road centerline. The nearest homes are approximately 45 feet from the road centerline, outside the 65 dBA CNEL of the road. Therefore, during normal traffic conditions, the residential areas along the road are compatible with traffic noise on Lexington Drive. The other access route to the Lexington Drive entrance is provided via Farquhar Avenue, which is exposed to less noise than Lexington Drive.
According to the Los Alamitos JFTB staff, the base hosts major military training exercises approximately once a month, when there is an increase in vehicular activity due to military truck conveys accessing the base. These events would continue to be sporadic, causing noise increases due to truck passbys that occur for short periods of time. Finally, the project would not modify the land use plan for the areas in the vicinity of the base south of Katella Avenue and east of Los Alamitos Boulevard. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** The proposed project would not modify land use changes in the vicinity of the Los Alamitos JFTB; therefore, aside from sporadic noise increases from military training exercises and community events, noise impacts would be less than significant.

6. **Population and Housing**

**Impact 5.8-1:** The proposed project would result in an increase of 1,385 people and 3,770 employees in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor; however, the General Plan Update accommodates future growth in the City by providing for infrastructure and public services to accommodate this projected growth.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Population and Housing*, and in particular, starting on page 5.8-8 of the DEIR.

**Housing and Population Growth**

The General Plan Update would permit development of a net increase of up to 532 residential units for a total of 8,735 units, which would result in a net increase of 1,385 people in the City and Rossmoor. At General Plan Update buildout, the estimated total population of the City and SOI would be 23,003, a 6.4 percent increase in population from existing conditions.

The forecast population of the City and Rossmoor at General Plan buildout would slightly exceed the existing regional population forecast for 2035 (22,653 persons) by 350 persons, or 1.5 percent. The estimated number of housing units in the City and Rossmoor at General Plan buildout would exceed the existing regional housing forecast for 2035 (8,150 units) by 585 units, or 7.2 percent. However, General Plan Update buildout could occur after the 2035 horizon. Thus, the increases in population and housing due to General Plan Update buildout compared to regional forecasts for 2035 would not be a substantial adverse impact.

**Employment Growth**

Buildout of the General Plan Update would entail an increase of 903,465 nonresidential square feet in the City and SOI for office, commercial, retail, industrial, and mixed uses. Consequently, the General Plan Update would accommodate 18,430 employees in the City and SOI. The General Plan Update would result in a net increase in employment of 3,770 employees, a 25.7 percent increase in employment compared to existing conditions, all of which would be in Los Alamitos except for 13 more employees in Rossmoor. General Plan Update buildout could occur over a longer buildout horizon than 2035. Therefore, the increase in employment due to General Plan Update buildout compared to regional forecasts for 2035 would not be a substantial adverse impact.
The jobs-housing balance in Los Alamitos and the SOI would be 2.11, an increase of 0.32 jobs per housing unit compared to 2013, which means the City of Los Alamitos would continue to draw a large daytime population due to the amount of employment-generating land uses in the City. SCAG policy aims to balance jobs and housing within the regions, not within specific cities or communities. Therefore, the analysis of impacts on jobs-housing balance is for comparison only; the impact would not be a significant impact under CEQA.

**Finding:** Implementation of the General Plan Update would directly induce population and employment growth in the area. However, the General Plan Update accommodates future growth in the City by providing for infrastructure and public services to accommodate this projected growth. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact relating to population and employment growth.

### 7. Public Services

**Impact 5.9-1:** The proposed project would introduce new structures and residents into the Orange County Fire Authority service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for fire protection facilities and personnel. However, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary service improvements to provide for adequate fire protection (staffing and facilities) upon buildout of the General Plan Update.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9.1, *Public Services*, and in particular, starting on page 5.9-8 of the DEIR.

Under the General Plan Update, staffing levels for fire protection and emergency services in Los Alamitos would continue to be established by the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA). Public safety in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, including fire protection and emergency services provided by OCFA, is paid for with county revenue generated by property taxes. Although there is no direct fiscal mechanism that ensures that funding for fire and emergency services would grow exactly proportional to an increased need for services resulting from population growth in the City, property taxes would be expected to grow roughly proportionate to any increase in residential units and/or businesses in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor. OCFA would also maintain appropriate firefighter staffing to ensure compliance with the National Fire Protection Association standards for response time and coverage. Furthermore, policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan Update encourage maintaining staffing, facilities, and training activities to effectively respond to general and emergency public service calls.

Despite the predicted increase in population, OCFA does not currently foresee the need for additional fire stations within the next five years. Additionally, Fire Stations No. 17 and 48 have recently been rebuilt. New developments over 50 units would also be required to enter into a Secured Fire Protections Agreement to provide for fair-share funding of capital improvements (Hernandez 2014).

In addition, if construction impacts of development projects that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update necessitate the closure of roadways that serve a particular project, project applicants would be required to coordinate road closures and emergency access with OCFA and the City to ensure that adequate access for emergency vehicles is provided and that an adequate level of
fire protection services is maintained at the adopted service levels. Future development projects that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update would also be reviewed by the City of Los Alamitos and OCFA on an individual basis and would be required to comply with requirements in effect at the time building permits are issued. Development projects would also be required to comply with the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of Los Alamitos, Orange County, and the State of California.

Therefore, project implementation impacts on fire protection and emergency services and facilities are less than significant.

Finding: Compliance with existing City and OCFA regulations, including fire and building codes and life safety standards, as well as policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan Update would minimize adverse impacts to fire services to less than significant levels.

| Impact 5.9-2: | The proposed project would introduce new structures, residents, and workers into the Los Alamitos Police Department's service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for police protection facilities and personnel. However, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary service improvements to provide for adequate police protection upon buildout of the General Plan Update. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9.2, Public Services, and in particular, starting on page 5.9-13 of the DEIR.

Buildout is anticipated to result in an approximate total of 1,385 new residents and 3,770 additional employees in the City and SOI compared to existing conditions. Additional police equipment, facilities, and personnel would be required to provide adequate response times, acceptable public service ratios, and other performance objectives for law enforcement services. Additionally, the Los Alamitos police station is experiencing some age-related infrastructure issues and lacks adequate space for efficient operations and workflow. Any significant increases in the Los Alamitos Police Department's staffing level could not be accommodated within the existing station (Mattern 2014).

Until Rossmoor is incorporated into the City of Los Alamitos, staffing levels for police services in Los Alamitos would continue to be established by the Los Alamitos Police Department, and staffing levels for police services in Rossmoor would continue to be established by the Sheriff's Department. If Rossmoor were incorporated into the City of Los Alamitos, the Los Alamitos Police Department would provide police services to Rossmoor. Consequently, additional staffing, equipment, and facilities in the Los Alamitos Police Department would be necessary to ensure the same level of service to the residents and businesses of the City and Rossmoor. Buildout of the General Plan Update includes buildout of the SOI, resulting in an increase in demand for police protection services within the City and SOI.

Public safety in Los Alamitos, including police protection services, is paid for from the City's General Fund. General Fund revenues are collected from property, sales, and utility users' taxes. There is no direct fiscal mechanism that ensures that funding for police services would grow exactly proportional to an increased need for police services resulting from population growth in the City. However, revenue sources that contribute to funding the City's General Fund would be expected to grow in rough proportion to any increase in residential units and/or businesses in Los Alamitos. The revenue
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generated by existing land uses within the City and SOI (if incorporated) and new growth in the City and SOI would be used to supply the Los Alamitos Police Department with additional police officers, professional staff, equipment, etc., as they see fit.

As noted by the Los Alamitos Police Department, realistic changes in the current policing facilities and personnel are anticipated to occur more than five years into the future (Mattern 2014). Furthermore, policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan Update require that police protection services reflect the growing needs of residents. In particular, Policy 2.2 of the Public Facilities and Safety Element requires that the City prioritize enforcement activities to minimize existing and prevent future public safety hot spots.

The need for additional structures and personnel would be financed through the City’s General Fund, and the impacts of General Plan Update on police services would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in adverse physical impacts on police services and facilities.

**Finding:** Implementation of policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan Update and additional funding financed through the City’s General Fund would reduce impacts on police services to less than significant.

**Impact 5.9-3:** The proposed project would generate approximately 373 new students who would impact the school enrollment capacities of area schools; however, payment of SB 50 development impact fees would provide funding for the financing of new school facilities.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9.3, Public Services, and in particular, starting on page 5.9-18 of the DEIR.

Buildout of the General Plan Update, which includes buildout of the SOI, would allow up to 532 additional dwelling units in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor. Los Alamitos Unified School District (LAUSD) assesses its needs based on a student generation factor of 0.7 student per dwelling unit.1

The increase in the number of new residential units (8,735) that would be accommodated under the General Plan Update would result in 373 additional students in the City and Rossmoor. Future student population in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor at buildout of the General Plan Update would be approximately 10,288 students. LAUSD’s current student enrollment is 9,915 students, of which 4,353 (44 percent) are in elementary school, 2,335 (24 percent) are in middle school, and 3,227 (32 percent) are in high school. Applying this same percentage breakdown, it is anticipated that of the 373 additional students, 164 would attend elementary school, 90 would attend middle school, and 119 would attend high school.

New development in the City and SOI in accordance with the General Plan Update would require payments in the form of development impact fees to LAUSD under Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) for the construction of new schools. Development impact fees currently charged by LAUSD are (Ecelevia 2014):

---

1 The student generation rate of 0.7 students per unit (K–12) was based on the statewide average Student Yield Factors used by the California Department of Education, Office of Public School Construction (2008).
• Residential: $1.65/square foot
• Commercial: $0.27/square foot

Impact fees levied by LAUSD are set within the limits of SB 50. This funding program was established by the legislature to constitute “full and complete mitigation of the impacts” on the provision of adequate school facilities (Government Code § 65995[h]). SB 50 establishes two potential limits for school districts, depending on the availability of new school construction funding from the state and the particular needs of the individual school districts. SB 50 also relieves jurisdictions from having the authority of denying approval of a legislative or adjudicative action under CEQA in reference to real estate development based on the inadequacy of school facilities.

Finding: Although project buildout would result in an increase of 373 students, payment of impact fees in compliance with SB 50 would reduce the impacts to an acceptable level. Therefore, impacts on school facilities and services resulting from buildout of the General Plan Update are less than significant.

Impact 5.9-4: The proposed project would generate additional demand for library services as a result of an increase in population in the City and Rossmoor, but would not significantly impact the service needs for the local libraries.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9.4, Public Services, and in particular, starting on page 5.9-22 of the DEIR.

At buildout, Los Alamitos and Rossmoor are projected to have a population of approximately 23,003 residents, 1,385 residents over existing conditions. Using the Orange County Public Library’s (OCPL) standard service ratios (0.2 square foot per capita for library space, 1.3 volumes per capita for library collections, and a circulation per capita of 4.5), the additional 1,385 residents that would be generated under the General Plan Update would require 277 square feet of library space, 1,800 volumes of collection, and an annual circulation of 6,323 volumes (Cowell 2014). At buildout of the General Plan Update and based on the existing capacity and number of volumes, the Los Alamitos-Rossmoor Library would have in excess of 5,255 square feet of library space, 35,762 volumes of collection, and 67,327 volumes in circulation. Even with the potential population buildout, the Los Alamitos-Rossmoor Library would exceed OCPL’s standard of 0.2 square foot, 1.3 volumes per capita and 4.5 circulation per capita. Therefore, there would be no need for future library facilities with buildout of the General Plan Update.

Additionally, residents of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, including future residents generated by land uses allowed under the proposed project, have access to all branches of the OCPL system, including those within the neighboring communities of Seal Beach, Cypress, and Garden Grove. Implementation of policies and implementation actions of the proposed General Plan Update would also ensure that the City and the OCPL provide library services that meet local needs.

Furthermore, current funding of new library facilities in the OCPL system requires the beneficiary municipality—in this case, the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor—to fund new or expanded facilities and requires preparation of a library funding/service plan for new library facilities to determine if OCPL has the ability to fund staffing, operation, and maintenance needs of the library facilities (Cowell 2014). Revenue sources that contribute to funding the City’s General Fund, including property and sales taxes, would be expected to grow in rough proportion to any increase in residential...
units and/or businesses in Los Alamitos. These tax revenues could be used to fund future expansion of the Los Alamitos-Rossmoor Library and/or additional materials and resources, should they be needed.

**Finding:** The Los Alamitos-Rossmoor Library has adequate library facilities, volumes per capita, and circulations per capita for the project population at buildout of the General Plan Update. Impacts would be less than significant.

8. **Recreation**

**Impact 5.10-1:** The proposed project would generate demand for 61.86 acres of parkland under the City's current parkland standard; but future demand for parks would be met by existing park facilities under the City's parkland standard.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.10, Recreation, and in particular, starting on page 5.10-10 of the DEIR.

The City and Rossmoor currently provide 317.49 acres of park and recreation facilities in Los Alamitos and 35.05 acres of park and recreational facilities in Rossmoor, for a total of 389.02 acres of park and recreational facilities in the City and SOL. Of this, 18.03 acres of parkland and 26.93 acres of recreational space are in special use and school facilities that are owned, operated, or under contract by the City for public use. As part of the 317.49 acres in Los Alamitos, an additional 269.55 acres of recreational space (48.0 acres outside the golf course) is on land outside the City control or contract, but is available for public use.

The current standard for providing local recreational facilities is 2.5 acres per 1,000 people (Los Alamitos Municipal Code Chapter 16.17). At General Plan buildout the demand in the City of Los Alamitos would be 54.05 acres of parkland and recreation facilities for Los Alamitos residents. If Rossmoor were to be annexed to the City of Los Alamitos, the resulting demand for park and recreational facilities would be 61.86 acres. Based on the City's existing park standard, the proposed project would generate demand for 7.05 additional parkland acres in the City and 0.77 additional parkland acres in Rossmoor, for a total increase in park demand of 7.82 acres. The City and Rossmoor have a total of 93.49 acres of parks and recreational facilities available, and total demand under the City's current standard is 61.86 acres. Therefore, the park needs of the additional growth identified by the General Plan Update would be accommodated by the existing parkland in the City and Rossmoor.

Furthermore, new development would be required to provide park facilities onsite or pay in-lieu fees to fund new park space and recreational facilities if it is tied to a subdivision in the City in accordance with the City's Municipal Code Chapter 16.17. The availability of these new facilities would prevent accelerated physical deterioration of existing facilities. There are also a number of other recreational amenities to serve proposed residents. Consequently, no significant impact would occur.

**Finding:** The City and Rossmoor would provide more acres of parks and recreational facilities than required under the current standard of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents at buildout of the General Plan

---

2 An additional 2.98 acres of recreational space is also provided through a private school (St. Hedwig) and typically reserved for its students and families; however, this is not included as part of the City's park and recreational facilities that serve the public.
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Update. Further, compliance with the City's municipal code would ensure park facilities are provided if tied to a future subdivision. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact 5.10-2:** Buildout of the General Plan Update would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, but no significant adverse physical effect on the environment would occur.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.10, Recreation, and in particular, starting on page 5.10-12 of the DEIR.

The General Plan Update guides growth and development within the City and is not a development project. New and/or expanded facilities may be constructed to satisfy the park dedication requirement per Municipal Code Chapter 16.17. Development and operation of new recreational facilities may have an adverse physical effect on the environment, including impacts relating to air quality, biological resources, lighting, noise, and traffic. Development of new recreational facilities and associated impacts are addressed throughout the EIR as part of the buildout analysis. Environmental impacts associated with construction and/or expansion of recreational facilities in accordance with the proposed Land Use Plan are addressed separately in the DEIR sections for air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise. Existing parkland, the generation of parkland in-lieu fees from residential development resulting from subdivisions, and General Plan policies aimed at fulfilling local needs for recreational opportunities would together ensure that future residents of Los Alamitos would have adequate access to parks and recreational facilities under the proposed project. Goals, policies, and actions in the General Plan, along with existing federal, state, and local regulations, would mitigate potential adverse impacts to the environment that may result from the construction and/or expansion of parks, recreational facilities, and trails pursuant to buildout of the proposed Land Use Plan. Consequently, the General Plan Update would not result in significant impacts relating to new or expanded recreational facilities. Furthermore, buildout of the General Plan Update would not cause substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Finding:** Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations, including the City's municipal code and policies in the General Plan Update, would ensure future park and recreational facilities do not significantly affect the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

9. Transportation and Traffic

**Impact 5.11-2:** Project-related trip generation in combination with existing and proposed cumulative development would not result in designated road and/or highways exceeding the congestion management agency service standards.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.11, Transportation and Traffic, and in particular, starting on page 5.11-30 of the DEIR.

The Orange County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) designates standards at CMP intersections, and requires that all intersections operate at level of service (LOS) E or better. Katella Avenue at the I-605 northbound ramps falls under the jurisdiction of Los Alamitos and is designated a CMP location. Katella Avenue is also identified on the CMP highway system, although there are no specific CMP requirements for roadway segment assessment. Since Los Alamitos has proposed a stricter...
LOS requirement than the CMP (LOS D), the LOS standard for the City was used to evaluate all study locations, including the CMP intersection of Katella Avenue at the I-605 northbound ramps. As shown in Table 5.11-5 of the DEIR, the intersection of Katella Avenue and the I-605 northbound ramps is not projected to exceed the CMP threshold of LOS E at General Plan buildout.

**Finding:** The intersection of Katella Avenue and I-605 northbound ramps would not exceed the CMP threshold of LOS E or the City's threshold of LOS D at buildout of the General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

**Impact 5.11-3:** The General Plan Update includes policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.11, *Transportation and Traffic,* and in particular, starting on page 5.11-37 of the DEIR.

The Mobility and Circulation Element policies support public transit, bicycle improvements, and improvements to the pedestrian facilities by closing gaps in the network, expanding the network, and coordinating with regional agencies. The element focuses on targeted minor changes in select locations that will increase mobility, access, and safety in the City. These include new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, raised colored and textured intersections, traffic-calming measures, and pedestrian bridges. A notable exception to the general lack of circulation changes under the General Plan Update is the redesign of Los Alamitos Boulevard. Consistent with concepts explored in the Commercial Corridors Plan, the Mobility and Circulation Element proposes that the roadway be narrowed to create a more walkable downtown environment. Policies in the General Plan seek to redesign Los Alamitos Boulevard north of Katella Avenue to maintain four through-lanes and turning movements at intersections while converting the remaining surplus space into an expanded parkway. Curb extensions would be installed at intersections to reduce crossing distance. The complete streets network would accommodate all users of the system, and the City’s complete streets network is based on the type of user. Specifically, Policies 1.1, 1.2, and 1.5 of the Mobility and Circulation Element address the needs of all users of the City’s transportation network.

The City's network is broken into three types of facilities—pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit. The proposed General Plan Update would support plans and programs for alternative transportation, as follows:

**Bicycle Routes**

Future bike routes and bike lanes are proposed on major arterials and collectors throughout Los Alamitos, according to the OCTA Commuter Bikeways Strategic Plan. This plan identifies current bicycle facilities throughout the City and provides policy and implementation strategies for enhancing the networks. The plans are intended to be cohesive and integrated—a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle system. The City proposes to enhance the bicycle network by providing additional on- and off-street bike lanes. In addition, several policies are included in the proposed General Plan to enhance bicycle connectivity (Policies 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, and 5.6).

**Pedestrian Facilities**

In order to reduce congestion at major intersections and increase safety and access for the community’s schoolchildren, the Mobility and Circulation Element includes pedestrian bridges across
the City's major arterial roadways to connect schools with residential neighborhoods. The pedestrian bridges would increase safety and reduce congestion. In addition, Policies 4.2 through 4.6, 1.1 through 1.2, 3.1 through 3.3, and 4.1 enhance pedestrian connectivity.

**Public Transit**

Public transportation in the City of Los Alamitos consists of public bus service operated by OCTA. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would promote the use of alternative transportation modes. Policies 4.2, 4.7, and 4.8 promote the use of public transit.

**Finding:** Policies in the Mobility and Circulation Element would support public transit, bicycle improvements, and pedestrian facilities by closing gaps in the network, expanding the network, and coordinating with regional agencies. Additionally, these policies support implementation of complete streets, through a layered network approach, consistent with the state's Complete Streets Act. Therefore, they are consistent with the existing adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

### 10. Utilities and Service Systems

**Impact 5.12-1:** Buildout of the General Plan Update would generate an increase in wastewater, but additional generation could be adequately treated by the Orange County Sanitation District's existing wastewater treatment facilities.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12.1, Utilities and Service Systems, and in particular, starting on page 5.12-8 of the DEIR.

Assuming that 70 percent of water use is indoor use and that 100 percent of that water is discharged into sewers, wastewater generation in the City and Rossmoor at General Plan buildout would be approximately 2.4 million gallons per day. Wastewater generation would increase by 134,583 gallons per day compared to existing conditions.

**Wastewater Treatment Capacity Impacts**

The existing residual capacity at Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) Reclamation Plant No. 2, which treats wastewater from the City and SOI, is about 65 million gallons per day, far greater than the forecast net increase in wastewater generation due to the General Plan Update buildout (OCSD 2013). Wastewater generation by the General Plan Update buildout would not require OCSD to build new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Sewer Impacts**

Substantial intensification of land uses under the General Plan Update may require installation of new or expanded sewer laterals and installation of new or expanded sewer mains. Sewer mains are generally within roadways; thus, installation of new or expanded sewer mains would involve disturbance of soil that has been previously disturbed for construction of roadways and installation of existing utilities. Construction-related impacts from installation of sewer laterals and/or sewer mains would be part of the impacts of buildout of the entire General Plan Update analyzed throughout Chapter 5 of the DEIR. New development would be required to ensure that sufficient sewer capacity is available. No significant impacts would occur.
Finding: Buildout of the General Plan Update would not exceed existing wastewater treatment capacities and would not require new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.12-2: The General Plan Update would increase water demand by 192,262 gallons per day; however, the Golden State Water Company’s water supply and delivery systems are adequate to meet the water demands of project in addition to its other service obligations.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12.2, Utilities and Service Systems, and in particular, starting on page 5.12-19 of the DEIR.

Forecast Water Demand by General Plan Buildout

Water demand is estimated using the water demand Senate Bill 7 (SBX7-7) rates identified in Golden State Water Company’s (GSWC) 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The General Plan Update would result in an increase in 192,262 gallons per day or 215 acre-feet per year (afy). The forecast net increase in water demands due to General Plan buildout is well within the forecast increase in GSWC water supplies from 2015 to 2035 (1,043 afy) (GSWC 2011). Though California currently faces very severe drought conditions, GWSC forecasts that it will have adequate water supplies to meet demands in single-dry-year and multiple-dry-year conditions from 2015 through 2035. Water demand due to General Plan buildout would not require GSWC to obtain new or increased water supplies, and impacts would be less than significant.

Water Treatment Facilities

The three water treatment facilities of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) that supply water to GSWC have total capacity of 1.79 billion gallons per day, vastly greater than the projected net increase in water demands due to General Plan Update buildout. Water demands resulting from General Plan Update buildout in addition to demand from growth within the GSWC service area would not require construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities even when other water users are taken into account, since the water treatment capacity is nearly 10,000 times the net increase in project water demands for Los Alamitos.

Water Conveyance

General Plan Update buildout would involve substantial land use intensification on only a handful of parcels. Substantial intensification of land uses would probably require installation of new or expanded water laterals and could require installation of new or expanded water mains. Water mains are generally within roadways; thus, installation of new or expanded water mains would involve disturbance of soil that has been previously disturbed for construction of roadways and installation of existing utilities. Construction-related impacts from installation of water laterals and/or water mains would be part of the impacts of buildout of the entire General Plan Update analyzed throughout Chapter 5 of the DEIR. New development would be required to ensure that sufficient water facilities are available to meet the City and Fire Code requirements. No significant impacts would occur.

Finding: Buildout of the General Plan Update would not exceed existing water treatment capacities. Any new or expanded water conveyance facilities would be required to meet City and Fire Code requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.
Impact 5.12-3: New development under the General Plan Update would be required to ensure that the storm drainage systems would retain any increase in stormwater flow onsite and would be adequate to serve the drainage requirements of the proposed project.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12.3, Utilities and Service Systems, and in particular, starting on page 5.12-25 of the DEIR.

The General Plan Update would involve land use intensification on a handful of parcels, which could increase stormwater flow to the City's drainage system. Localized flooding has occurred at several locations throughout the City, including areas along Portal Drive, Cherry Street, and Serpentine Drive; at low points along Katella Avenue; and along Kempton Drive in the southern portion of the City. This flooding is due primarily to streets with limited slope and an insufficient number of catch basins and inlets. In addition, a significant portion of the existing storm drain system was designed and implemented under older, less stringent flood control design standards. Recent storms have resulted in minimal damage to property and no loss of life, indicating that the existing system provides a minimal level of protection. To upgrade the entire system to the current design standards is cost prohibitive, and improvements made after 1996 have incorporated the updated design standards and would continue to be implemented with County of Orange design standards. The General Plan Update includes policies under the Public Facilities and Safety Element to ensure that no significant impacts would occur (Policy 1.3 and 1.4).

Incremental intensification could occur through small projects (e.g., adding a second dwelling unit or expanding a storefront) in some locations in the City. The net increases in impervious areas and runoff would be minor compared to the total existing impervious area and amount of runoff. General Plan Update buildout could require replacement of undersized storm drain inlets in a few locations near parcels where land use would be substantially intensified. Replacement storm drain inlets would be installed in the sides of roadways or in parking lots. In addition, new development would be required to retain the increase in stormwater flows onsite to ensure that there would be no net increase in stormwater flows to the City's existing drainage system. No significant impact would occur.

Finding: Policies under the General Plan Update and existing regulations would ensure impacts to the City's existing drainage system are less than significant.

Impact 5.12-4: The General Plan Update would result in an increase in 3,723 tons per year of solid waste disposal; however, solid waste haulers and landfills would be able to accommodate project-generated solid waste while complying with related solid waste regulations.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12.4, Utilities and Service Systems, and in particular, starting on page 5.12-33 of the DEIR.

Buildout of the General Plan Update would result in an increase of 3,723 tons of solid waste per year (approximately 10.2 tons per day). The two landfills accepting the great majority of landfilled solid waste from Los Alamitos have total remaining capacity of over 243,500,000 cubic yards—over 182,600,000 tons—and combined residual daily disposal capacity of over 9,400 tons per day (CalRecycle 2014a and 2014b). The estimated closing dates of the landfills are 2053 and 2021. The
County of Orange is required to maintain 15 years’ identified disposal capacity, or have a plan to transform or divert its waste, pursuant to Assembly Bill 939. Thus, while General Plan buildout could occur after 2053, the County would be required to have 15 years’ identified disposal capacity after that date. There is adequate landfill capacity in the region for solid waste that would be generated by the General Plan Update buildout, and impacts would be less than significant.

Furthermore, new development projects approved by the City of Los Alamitos pursuant to the General Plan Update would contain storage areas for recyclable materials in conformance with City Municipal Code Section 17.16.110 and California Public Resources Code Sections 42900 et seq. Solid waste diversion programs in the City would continue operating.

Finding: Solid waste generated at buildout of the proposed project would not exceed the capacities of landfills serving the City and SOI. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.12-5: The General Plan Update would result in an increase in natural gas use and electricity use; however, additional demand would be accommodated by Southern California Edison and the Southern California Gas Company.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12.5, Utilities and Service Systems, and in particular, starting on page 5.12-37 of the DEIR.

Electricity

The General Plan Update buildout is estimated to result in an increase in electricity use of approximately 33.1 million kilowatt hours per year in the City and Rossmoor. Southern California Edison (SCE) is forecast to have adequate electricity supplies to meet demands resulting from General Plan Update buildout. Buildout of the General Plan Update would not require SCE to obtain additional electricity supplies beyond its currently forecast supplies.

Natural Gas

The General Plan Update buildout is estimated to result in an increase in natural gas use in the City and Rossmoor of approximately 569,928 therms per year. Existing Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas) supplies are vastly greater than the forecast net increase in natural gas demands resulting from General Plan Update buildout. SoCal Gas would have sufficient natural gas supplies to meet the net increase in natural gas demands due to General Plan Update buildout, and impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: Buildout of the proposed project would result in an increase in electricity and natural gas use, but will be accommodated by SCE and SoCal Gas. Impacts would be less than significant.

D. Findings on Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significant

The following summary describes impacts of the proposed project that, without mitigation, would result in significant adverse impacts. Upon implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the EIR, these impacts would be considered less than significant.
1. Air Quality

Impact 5.2-5: Placement of new sensitive receptors near major sources of toxic air contaminants in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor could expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, and in particular, starting on page 5.2-24 of the DEIR.

Because placement of sensitive land uses falls outside the California Air Resource Board’s (CARB) jurisdiction, CARB developed and approved the Air Quality and Land Use Handbooks: A Community Health Perspective (2005) to address the siting of sensitive land uses in the vicinity of freeways, distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, chrome-plating facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline-dispensing facilities. This guidance document was developed to assess compatibility and associated health risks when placing sensitive receptors near existing pollution sources. CARB’s recommendations were based on a compilation of studies that evaluated data on the adverse health effects of proximity to air pollution sources. The key observation in these studies is that proximity to air pollution sources substantially increases both exposure and the potential for adverse health effects. There are three carcinogenic toxic air contaminants that constitute the majority of the known health risks from motor vehicle traffic: diesel particulate matter (diesel PM) from trucks and benzene and 1,3 butadiene from passenger vehicles. Potential sources of toxic air contaminants in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor include stationary sources permitted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), located primarily in the northeastern portion of the City, and Interstates 605 and 405, which have more than 100,000 average daily traffic volumes and are within 1,000 feet of sensitive land uses in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.

Other near roadway pollutants include ultrafine particulates (UFPs), which are toxic and have health impacts. UFPs are emitted from almost every fuel combustion process, including diesel, gasoline, and jet engines, as well as external combustion processes such as wood burning. Consequently, there is growing concern that people living in close proximity to highly trafficked roadways and other sources of combustion-related pollutants (e.g., airports and rail yards) may be exposed to significant levels of UFPs and other air toxics. Implementation of Policy 4.2 in the Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element would ensure that review of air quality compatibility would be conducted when siting receptors near major sources. However, placement of sensitive receptors proximate to the sources above is considered a potentially significant impact of the project.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

2-3 Applicants for sensitive land uses within the following distances as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, from these facilities:

- Industrial facilities within 1000 feet
- Distribution centers (40 or more trucks per day) within 1,000 feet
- High volume roadways (100,000 or more vehicles per day) within 1,000 feet
- Dry cleaners using perchloroethylene within 500 feet
- Gasoline dispensing facilities within 300 feet

Applicants shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Los Alamitos prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the applicable air quality management district. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 6 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06) or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to:

- Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Los Alamitos that there are operational limitations.
- Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters.

Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City of Los Alamitos.

Goals and policies are included in the project that would reduce concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and air toxics generated by new development. Mitigation Measure 2-3 would ensure that placement of sensitive receptors near major sources of air pollution would achieve the incremental risk thresholds established by SCAQMD, and impacts would be less than significant.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 5.2-6:</th>
<th>Industrial land uses associated with the project could create objectionable odors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, *Air Quality*, and in particular, starting on page 5.2-26 of the DEIR.
Nuisance odors from land uses in the South Coast Air Basin are regulated under SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance. Major sources of odors include wastewater treatment plants, chemical manufacturing facilities, food processing facilities, agricultural operations, and waste facilities (e.g., landfills, transfer stations, compost facilities).

There are two types of odor impacts: 1) siting sensitive receptors near nuisance odors, and 2) siting new sources of nuisance odors near sensitive receptors. The project designates residential areas and industrial areas of the City and SOI to prevent potential mixing of incompatible land use types. SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, requires abatement of any nuisance generated by an odor complaint. Because existing sources of odors are required to comply with SCAQMD’s Rule 402, impacts to siting of new sensitive land uses would be less than significant.

Future environmental review could be required for industrial projects listed in Rule 402 to ensure that sensitive land uses are not exposed to nuisance odors. SCAQMD Rule 402 requires abatement of any nuisance generating an odor complaint. Typical abatement includes passing air through a drying agent followed by two successive beds of activated carbon to generate odor-free air. Facilities listed in Rule 402 would need to consider measures to reduce odors as part of their CEQA review. Odor impacts could be significant for new projects that have the potential to generate odors within the odor screening distances.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

2-4 If it is determined during project-level environmental review that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan may be required, subject to City’s regulations. Facilities that have the potential to generate nuisance odors include but are not limited to:

- Wastewater treatment plants
- Composting, greenwaste, or recycling facilities
- Fiberglass manufacturing facilities
- Painting/coating operations
- Large-capacity coffee roasters
- Food-processing facilities

If an odor management plan is determined to be required through CEQA review, the City of Los Alamitos shall require the project applicant to submit the plan prior to approval to ensure compliance with the applicable Air Quality Management District’s Rule 402, for nuisance odors. If applicable, the Odor Management Plan shall identify the Best Available Control Technologies for Toxics (T-BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at the industrial facility. T-BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall
Implementation of Mitigation Measure 2-4 would ensure that odor impacts are minimized and facilities would comply with SCAQMD Rule 402. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

2. Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 5.3-1:</th>
<th>Future development in the City that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update could impact historic resources.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, Cultural Resources, and in particular, starting on page 5.3-13 of the DEIR.

The following describes impacts to state and local historic resources within the City and Rossmoor. There are no historic resources in the City that are eligible for listing on the National Register.

State-Designated Historic Resources

Based on the cultural resources records search conducted for the General Plan Update, there are 2 state-designated historic sites and 30 state-designated historic buildings in the City and Rossmoor. All of these state-designated historic resources are on the Los Alamitos JFTB. The California State Historic Preservation Office has determined that the two state-designated historic sites and the 30 state-designated historic buildings are ineligible for listing (Status code 6Z) on the National Register of Historic Places (Cogstone 2014). The City has no jurisdiction or land use authority on this U.S. military installation. No changes are proposed to the land use designations of the Los Alamitos JFTB under the General Plan Update, and no development is forecast to occur that would affect these state-designated historic resources. Therefore, the 2 state-listed historic sites and 30 state-listed historic buildings on the Los Alamitos JFTB would not be affected by implementation of the General Plan Update.

Local Historic Resources

Based on the Los Alamitos Historical Society listings, there are nine local historic resources in the City limits. These may warrant special local planning consideration and may be eligible for Mills Act contracts, should the City establish a Mills Act property tax abatement program. Such a program would require the development of an ordinance establishing procedures for property owners to enter into an agreement with the City to preserve their historic properties.

Additionally, as noted above, no structures within the City have a local landmark designation per Chapter 17.22 (Local Landmarks) of the City's Municipal Code. Therefore, no such local landmarks occur within the City.
Conclusion

Historical resources are protected by a wide variety of state policies and regulations enumerated under the California Public Resources Code. The Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element of the General Plan Update also has policies that specifically address sensitive known and potential historical resources and their protection, including Policies 3.4 through 3.7. Known or future historic sites or resources listed in the national, California, or local registers maintained by the City would be protected through local ordinances, the General Plan Update policies, and state and federal regulations restricting alteration, relocation, and demolition of historical resources. Compliance with proposed General Plan Update policies and state and federal regulations would ensure that land use changes allowed under the General Plan Update would not result in adverse impacts to identified historic resources.

However, identified historic structures and sites that are potentially eligible for future historic resources listing may be vulnerable to development activities accompanying infill, redevelopment, or revitalization that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update. In addition, other buildings or structures that could meet the National Register of Historic Places criteria upon reaching 50 years of age might be impacted by development or redevelopment activity that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update. Therefore, significant impacts on historical resources could occur as a result of future development that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

3-1 Applicants for future development projects with intact extant building(s) more than 45 years old shall provide a historic resource technical study to the City of Los Alamitos. The historic resources technical study shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian meeting Secretary of the Interior Standards. The study shall evaluate the significance and data potential of the resource in accordance with these standards. If the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852), mitigation shall be identified within the technical study that ensures the value of the historic resource is maintained.

Compliance with proposed General Plan Update policies and state and federal regulations restricting alteration, relocation, and demolition of historic resources and implementation of Mitigation Measure 3-1 would ensure that land use changes allowed under the General Plan Update would reduce the potential impacts to historic resources to a level that is less than significant.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.
Impact 5.3-2:  Future development in the City that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update could impact known and unknown archeological and/or paleontological resources.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, Cultural Resources, and in particular, starting on page 5.3-15 of the DEIR.

Grading and construction activities of undeveloped areas or redevelopment that requires more intensive soil excavation than in the past could potentially cause the disturbance of archeological, paleontological, or Native American resources. Therefore, future development that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update could potentially unearth previously unrecorded resources.

The City is almost completely built out and is in a highly developed, urban area of Orange County; there are only three acres of vacant land in the City. Based on the paleontological and archeological records search, no known or significant paleontological or archeological resources have been identified within the boundaries of the City or Rossmoor (Cogstone 2014). However, such resources may occur, although the area of their distribution is not known. For example, the uppermost layers of the younger Quaternary deposits that comprise the City and Rossmoor typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils; however, the older Quaternary deposits are known to bear significant vertebrate fossils. Additionally, fossil vertebrate localities near of the City and Rossmoor from the older Quaternary deposits have produced specimens including rays, sharks, bony fish, turtle, birds, sea otter, camels, dog, gopher, horse, and mammoth (Cogstone 2014). Further, six prehistoric shell midden sites are close to the City and Rossmoor.

Archaeological sites are protected by a wide variety of state policies and regulations, enumerated under the California Public Resources Code. Cultural and paleontological resources are also recognized as nonrenewable and therefore receive protection under the California Public Resources Code and CEQA. Review and protection of archaeological and paleontological resources are also afforded by CEQA for individual development projects that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update, subject to discretionary actions that are implemented in accordance with the land use plan of the General Plan Update.

Long-term implementation of the General Plan Update could allow development (e.g., infill development, redevelopment, and revitalization/restoration), including grading, of unknown sensitive areas. Grading and construction activities of undeveloped areas or redevelopment that requires more intensive soil excavation than in the past could potentially cause the disturbance of archeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, future development that would be accommodated by the General Plan Update could potentially unearth previously unknown/unrecorded archeological or paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR and are applicable to the proposed project.

3-2 Applicants for future development projects that require grading of undisturbed soil in areas of known or inferred archeological resources, prehistoric or historic, shall provide a
technical cultural resources assessment to the City of Los Alamitos prior to the issuance of grading permits. The cultural resources assessment shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist to assess the cultural and historical significance of any known archaeological resources on or next to each respective development site, and to assess the sensitivity of sites for buried archaeological resources. On properties where resources are identified, or that are determined to be moderately to highly sensitive for buried archaeological resources, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified cultural preservation expert. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:

a. An archaeologist shall be retained for the development project and shall be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities.

b. Should any cultural/scientific resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Community Development Director concurs in writing that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources.

c. Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by an Orange County Certified Professional Archaeologist. If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies; submit materials to the California State University, Fullerton; and provide a comprehensive final report including appropriate records for the California Department of Parks and Recreation (Building, Structure, and Object Record; Archaeological Site Record; or District Record, as applicable).

Applicants for future development projects that require excavation greater than five feet below the current ground surface in undisturbed sediments with a moderate or higher fossil yield potential shall provide a technical paleontological assessment prepared by a qualified paleontologist assessing the sensitivity of sites for buried paleontological resources to the City of Los Alamitos prior to issuance of grading permits. If resources are known or reasonably anticipated, the assessment shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified paleontologist. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:

a. A paleontologist shall be retained for the project and shall be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities.

b. Should any potentially significant fossil resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Community Development Director concurs in writing that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources.

c. Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by an Orange County Certified Professional Paleontologist. If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies; submit materials to the California State
Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3-2 and 3-3 would reduce the potential impacts to archeological and paleontological resources to a level that is less than significant.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

E. Findings on Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The following summary describes the unavoidable impacts of the proposed project where mitigation measures were found to be infeasible or would not lessen impacts to less than significant. The following impacts would remain significant and unavoidable:

1. Air Quality

| Impact 5.2-1: | Buildout of the project would generate slightly more growth than the existing General Plan; therefore, the project would be inconsistent with SCAQMD's air quality management plans. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, and in particular, starting on page 5.2-16 of the DEIR.

CEQA requires that general plans be evaluated for consistency with the air quality management plan(s). A consistency determination plays an important role in local agency project review by linking local planning and individual projects to the air quality management plan(s).

SCAQMD considers a project consistent with the air quality management plan if it is consistent with the existing land use plan. Zoning changes, specific plans, general plan amendments, and similar land use plan changes that do not increase dwelling unit density, vehicle trips, or vehicle miles traveled are deemed to not exceed this threshold (SCAQMD 1993). The 2012 RTP/SCS is partially based on the existing General Plan land use designations in the County of Orange and the City of Los Alamitos. The horizon year for the 2012 RTP/SCS is 2035. Buildout of the project would result in less population but more employment for the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor than the Current General Plan, resulting in a slight increase in service population and VMT.

Although individual development projects would be consistent with the control measures/regulations identified in SCAQMD's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), the project would generate slightly more growth for the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor than the Current General Plan. Thus, the project would not be consistent with the AQMP because buildout of the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor under the project would exceed the forecasts in the air quality attainment plans. Consequently, the project would cumulatively contribute to the existing nonattainment designations in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) because these emissions are not
included in the current regional emissions inventory for the SoCAB. The project would be considered inconsistent with the SCAQMD’s AQMP, resulting in a significant impact in this regard.

**Mitigation Measure:**

Mitigation measures incorporated into future development projects and adherence to the project policies for operation and construction phases described under Impacts 5.2-2 and 5.2-3 and related GHG mitigation measures would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the project (i.e., Mitigation Measures 2-1 and 4-1). Goals and policies in the project would facilitate continued City participation/cooperation with SCAQMD and SCAG to achieve regional air quality improvement goals, promote energy conservation design and development techniques, encourage alternative transportation modes, and implement transportation demand management strategies. However, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts associated with inconsistency with the AQMP due to the magnitude of growth and associated emissions that would be generated by the buildout of the City of Los Alamitos and SOI in accordance with the project.

**Finding:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

**Impact 5.2-2:** Construction activities associated with the project would generate a substantial increase in short-term criteria air pollutant emissions that exceeds the threshold criteria and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, and in particular, starting on page 5.2-17 of the DEIR.

Construction activities associated with development that would be accommodated by the project would occur over the buildout horizon (post-2035) of the project and cause short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. The primary source of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and sulfur oxides (SOx) emissions is the operation of construction equipment. The primary sources of particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) emissions are activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction, building demolition and construction, and off-road vehicle exhaust.
The primary source of volatile organic carbon (VOC) emissions is the application of architectural coating and off-gas emissions associated with asphalt paving.

Information regarding specific development projects, soil types, and the locations of receptors would be needed in order to quantify the level of impact associated with construction activity. Due to the scale of development activity associated with theoretical buildout of the project, emissions would likely exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds and therefore, in accordance with the SCAMQD methodology, would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for ozone \( (O_3) \) and fine inhalable particulate matter \( (PM_{2.5}) \) under the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS), nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS, and nonattainment for coarse inhalable particulate matter \( (PM_{10}) \) under the California AAQS (CARB 2014a). Emissions of VOC and NO\(_x\) are precursors to the formation of \( O_3 \). In addition, NO\(_x\) is a precursor to the formation of particulate matter \( (PM_{10} \text{ and } PM_{2.5}) \). Therefore, the project would cumulatively contribute to the existing nonattainment designations of the SoCAB.

Air quality emissions related to construction must be addressed on a project-by-project basis. For this broad-based General Plan Update, it is not possible to determine whether the scale and phasing of individual projects would result in the exceedance of SCAQMD's short-term regional or localized construction emissions thresholds. In addition to regulatory measures (e.g., new source review, permit to operate, rules for fugitive dust control, and CARB's airborne toxic control measures), mitigation may include extension of construction schedules and/or use of special equipment.

Because of the likely scale and extent of construction activities pursuant to the future development that would be accommodated by the project, at least some projects would likely continue to exceed the relevant SCAQMD thresholds. Consequently, construction-related air quality impacts associated with development in accordance with the project are deemed significant.

**Mitigation Measure:**

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

2-1 If, during subsequent project-level environmental review, construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Los Alamitos shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures as identified in the CEQA document prepared for the project to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. Mitigation measures that may be identified during the environmental review include but are not limited to:

- Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower.

---

1 CARB approved the SCAQMD's request to redesignate the SoCAB from serious nonattainment for \( PM_{10} \) to attainment for \( PM_{10} \) under the national AAQS on March 25, 2010, because the SoCAB has not violated federal 24-hour \( PM_{10} \) standards during the period from 2004 to 2007. In June 2013, the EPA approved the State of California's request to redesignate the South Coast \( PM_{10} \) nonattainment area to attainment of the \( PM_{10} \) National AAQS, effective on July 26, 2013.
- Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards.
- Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.
- Water all active construction areas at least three times daily, or as often as needed to control dust emissions. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).
- Pave, apply water three times daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible), or as often as needed, all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site to control dust.
- Sweep public streets daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) in the vicinity of the project site, or as often as needed, to keep streets free of visible soil material.
- Hydroleed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- Enclose, cover, water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Construction activities associated with the buildout of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions that would exceed SCQMD's regional significance thresholds and would contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB and to known health effects from poor air quality, including worsening of bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema; a decrease in lung function; premature death of people with heart or lung disease; nonfatal heart attacks; irregular heartbeat; and increased respiratory symptoms. Goals and policies included in the project and Mitigation Measure 2-1 would reduce air pollutant emissions. However, due to the magnitude of emissions generated by future construction activities associated with the buildout of the project, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts below SCQMD's thresholds.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other
considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.2-3: Long-term operation of the project would generate a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the threshold criteria and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, and in particular, starting on page 5.2-18 of the DEIR.

New development under the proposed project would increase air pollutant emissions in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor and contribute to the overall emissions inventory in the SoCAB. The increase in criteria air pollutant emissions for the full buildout scenario is based on the difference between existing land uses and land uses associated with buildout of the project. Buildout of the project is not linked to any development timeframe.

Buildout of the project would generate long-term emissions that exceed the daily SCAQMD thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for O3 and PM2.5 under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS, and nonattainment for PM10 under the California AAQS. Emissions of VOC and NOx are precursors to the formation of O3. In addition, NOx is a precursor to the formation of particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Therefore, the project would cumulatively contribute to the existing nonattainment designations of the SoCAB.

Criteria air pollutants generated throughout the lifetime of the project would exceed the significance thresholds of SCAQMD and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Implementation of project policies in the Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element; Mobility and Circulation Element; and Housing Element would reduce impacts to the extent feasible. However, because cumulative development within Los Alamitos and Rossmoor would exceed the regional significance thresholds, the project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the SoCAB until the attainment standards are met. Operational-related air quality impacts associated with future development that would be accommodated by the project are significant.

Mitigation Measure:

Goals and policies are included in the project that would reduce air pollutant emissions. In addition, mitigation measures identified for GHG emissions impacts would also reduce the proposed project’s operational phase criteria air pollutant emissions impacts. However, due to the magnitude of
emissions generated by the buildout of residential, office, commercial, industrial, and warehousing land uses in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce operational impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.2-4: Buildout of the project could result in new source sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or toxic air contaminants proximate to existing or planned sensitive receptors.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, Air Quality, and in particular, starting on page 5.2-22 of the DEIR.

Operation of new land uses, consistent with the land use plan of the project, would generate new sources of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs).

CO Hotspots

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm. At the time of the 1993 SCAQMD Handbook, the SoCAB was designated nonattainment under the California AAQS and National AAQS for CO. With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations in the SoCAB and in the state have steadily declined. In 2007, the SCAQMD was designated in attainment for CO under both the California AAQS and National AAQS.5 Furthermore, under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2011). Buildout of the General Plan Update would not produce

---

5 As identified in SCAQMD's 2003 AQMP and the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide, peak carbon monoxide concentrations in the SoCAB were the result of unusual meteorological and topographical conditions and not of congestion at a particular intersection.
the volume of traffic required to generate a CO hotspot. Therefore, impacts from CO hotspots are considered less than significant.

**Localized Significance Thresholds**

Due to the scale of development activity associated with theoretical buildout of the project, emissions could exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds and therefore, in accordance with the SCAQMD methodology, may result in significant localized impacts. Air quality emissions would be addressed on a project-by-project basis. For this broad-based General Plan Update, it is not possible to determine whether the scale and phasing of individual projects would result in the exceedance of localized emissions thresholds and therefore contribute to health impacts. Nevertheless, because of the likely scale of future development that would be accommodated by the project, at least some projects would likely exceed the AAQS and associated health-based impacts, including worsening of bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema; decrease in lung function; premature death of people with heart or lung disease; nonfatal heart attacks; irregular heartbeat; and increased respiratory symptoms.

**Toxic Air Contaminants**

Operation of new land uses, consistent with the project, could also generate new sources of TACs within the City of Los Alamitos and SOI from various industrial and commercial processes (e.g., manufacturing, dry cleaning). Land uses that have the potential to generate substantial stationary sources of emissions that would require a permit from SCAQMD include industrial land uses, such as chemical processing facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline-dispensing facilities. In the City of Los Alamitos, operators of certain types of facilities must submit emissions inventories. The Air Toxics Program categorizes each facility as being high, intermediate, and low priority based on the potency, toxicity, quantity, and volume of its emissions. If the risks are above established levels, facilities are required to notify surrounding populations and to develop and implement a risk reduction plan.

In addition to stationary/area sources of TACs, truck operations could generate a substantial amount of diesel particulate matter emissions from off-road equipment use and truck idling. New land uses in the City of Los Alamitos that generate trucks trips (including trucks with transport refrigeration units) could generate an increase in diesel particulate matter that would contribute to cancer and noncancer health risks in the SoCAB. These new land uses could be near existing sensitive receptors within the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.

Stationary sources of emissions would be controlled by SCAQMD through permitting and would be subject to further study and health risk assessment prior to the issuance of any necessary air quality permits under SCAQMD’s New Source Review. Because the nature of those emissions cannot be determined at this time and they are subject to further regulation and permitting, they will not be addressed further in this analysis but are considered a potentially significant impact of the project. Furthermore, operation of new sources of emissions near existing or planned sensitive receptors is also considered a potentially significant impact of the project.

**Mitigation Measure:**

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.
New industrial or warehousing land uses that: 1) have the potential to generate 40 or more diesel trucks per day; and 2) are located within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Los Alamitos prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the applicable air quality management district. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), particulate matter concentrations would exceed 2.5 μg/m³, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs) are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling onsite or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project.

Review of projects by SCAQMD for permitted sources of air toxics (e.g., industrial facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline dispensing facilities) would ensure health risks are minimized. Mitigation Measure 2-2 would ensure mobile sources of TACs not covered under SCAQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review. Development of individual projects would be required to achieve the incremental risk thresholds established by SCAQMD, and TACs would be less than significant.

However, localized emissions of criteria air pollutants could exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds because of the scale of development activity associated with buildout of the project. For this broad-based General Plan Update, it is not possible to determine whether the scale and phasing of individual projects would result in the exceedance of the localized emissions thresholds and contribute to known health effects, including worsening of bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema; a decrease in lung function; premature death of people with heart or lung disease; nonfatal heart attacks; irregular heartbeat; and increased respiratory symptoms. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAQMD methodology, Impact 5.2-4 would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of
these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

2. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

| Impact 5.4-2: Federal, state, and local GHG reduction plans are necessary to achieve the long-term GHG reduction targets of Executive Order S-03-05. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and in particular, starting on page 5.4-17 of the DEIR.

The following plans have been adopted and are applicable for development in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.

CARB Scoping Plan

Since adoption of the 2008 Scoping Plan, state agencies have adopted GHG reduction programs and the legislature has passed additional legislation to achieve the GHG reduction targets. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and changes in the corporate average fuel economy standards (e.g., Pavley 1 and 2017–2025 corporate average fuel economy standards). In addition, electricity use assumes projects in the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor would be required to adhere to the programs and regulations identified by the Scoping Plan and implemented by state, regional, and local agencies to achieve the statewide GHG reduction goals of AB 32. Consequently, the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with the adopted regulations or programs outlined in the Scoping Plan. However, for the purpose of this environmental assessment, the community GHG inventory and forecast for the City was also compared to the long-term GHG reduction goals of the state to provide a conservative assessment of the targets requested of local governments by CARB.

Buildout of the General Plan Update would result in fewer emissions than currently generated in the City; however, the overall goal in the state is to achieve an 80 percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2050. In 2014, CARB adopted an update to the Scoping Plan. As identified in the update, as California continues to build its climate policy framework, there is a need for local government climate action planning to adopt mid- and long-term reduction targets that are consistent with scientific assessments and the statewide goal of reducing emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. CARB identifies that local government reduction targets should chart a reduction trajectory that is consistent with or exceeds the trajectory created by statewide goals (CARB 2014b).

Table 5.4-6, Statewide Trajectory to Achieve Interim Goal under Executive Order S-03-05, in the DEIR estimates a goal for 2035 that would place the state and Los Alamitos on track to achieve the long-term emissions reduction goals of Executive Order S-03-05. To place Los Alamitos on a similar trajectory, the City and SOI would need to reduce GHG emissions by 120,495 MTCO₂e to achieve 155,738 MTCO₂e in 2035. They would require assistance from additional federal and state programs and regulations to achieve the long-term GHG emissions goal. Due to the magnitude of emissions reductions required statewide to achieve an interim target consistent with Executive Order S-03-05,
such an achievement is unlikely for the majority of jurisdictions in California without additional federal and state programs and regulations. The Scoping Plan Update assessed programs to achieve the 2020 target for the state, but at this time, no additional GHG reductions programs are available that achieve the post-2020 target. The California Council on Science and Technology determined that the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology (CCST 2012). Impacts from GHG emissions in the City of Los Alamitos would be significant in the absence of federal, state, and local plans to achieve the long-term GHG reduction targets for the state.

**SCAG’s 2012–2035 RTP/SCS**

SCAG’s RTP/SCS is a regional growth management strategy that targets per capita GHG reduction from passenger vehicles and light duty trucks in the Southern California region. It incorporates the Orange County Transportation Authority’s SCS. The 2012–2035 RTP/SCS also incorporates local land use projections and circulation networks in the cities’ and counties’ general plans. The projected regional development pattern—including the location of land uses and residential densities in local general plans—when integrated with the proposed regional transportation network in the 2012–2035 RTP/SCS, would reduce per capita vehicular travel-related GHG emissions and achieve the subregional GHG reduction per capita targets for the SCAG region, which are an 8 percent per capita reduction from 2005 GHG emission levels by 2020 and a 13 percent per capita reduction from 2005 GHG emission levels by 2035. According to a consistency analysis, the General Plan Update would not conflict with SCAG’s 2012–2035 RTP/SCS or the Orange County subregional SCS plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Consequently, the impacts from consistency with SCAG’s 2012–2035 RTP/SCS and the Orange County subregional SCS are less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure:**

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

4-1 The City of Los Alamitos shall include the following actions in the City’s Implementation Plan to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the long-term state GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S-03-05.

- Work with local and regional agencies to install appropriate recharging stations to support the use of electric vehicles. Work with developers to install recharging stations at appropriate activity and employment centers to support electric vehicle use.

- Conduct energy audits on all City facilities and incorporate cost-effective measures to increase energy efficiency.

- Public education on energy conservation. Coordinate with local utilities to provide energy conservation information to the public.

- Promote energy-efficient design features such as appropriate site orientation, renewable energy systems, use of lighter color roofing and building materials, and passive ventilation and cooling techniques.

- Seek grants and other outside funding for energy efficiency improvements to public or private facilities and structures.
• Work with the Los Alamitos Unified School District, the City of Seal Beach, and Rossmoor to obtain grant funding, conduct planning, and construct new and improved existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities to provide safe routes to schools.

• Remove barriers that discourage active pedestrian and bicycle routes. Expand facilities and amenities that encourage active routes, such as increasing the number of Class II bike lanes along potential school routes, particularly those that parallel Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue.

• Create and implement a pedestrian and bicycle master plan to identify improvements, timing, and funding mechanisms.

• Identify funding and design options for bicycle and pedestrian signage along bicycle routes, in the downtown, and at key trailheads or connection points, with an emphasis on connections to schools and the downtown. Bicycle signage should be consistent with signs of neighboring jurisdictions, yet distinct for Los Alamitos.

• Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions on improving connections to existing and planning future bicycle and pedestrian trails.

• Work with OCTA and local businesses to enhance bus stops in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.

• Coordinate with OCTA on its Long Range Transportation Plan to design bus rapid transit service and stop locations along Katella Avenue.

• Explore the use of parking meters along public streets and on City-owned lots, especially in the downtown.

• Identify opportunities for bicycle parking in the downtown, including the conversion of single parallel parking spaces along smaller side streets into on-street or curb-adjacent bicycle parking. Bike racks should serve as functional public art and can reflect the types of businesses or uses.

Mitigation Measure 4-1 would ensure that the City continues to implement actions that reduce GHG emissions from buildout of the General Plan Update. However, additional federal and state measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals under Executive Order S-03-05, which identified a goal to reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050. At this time, there is no plan past 2020 that achieves the long-term GHG reduction goal established under S-03-05. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology (CCST 2012). Since no additional federal or state measures are currently available that would ensure that the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor could achieve an interim post-2020 target, Impact 5.4-2 would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.
The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

3. Noise

| Impact 5.7-3: | Construction activities associated with the proposed project could create a substantial short-term increase in groundborne vibration. |

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, Noise, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-25 of the DEIR.

Long-Term Operational Vibration Impacts

Caltrans has studied the effects of propagation of vehicle vibration on sensitive land uses and notes that “heavy trucks, and quite frequently buses, generate the highest earthborne vibrations of normal traffic.” Caltrans further notes that the highest traffic-generated vibrations are along freeways and state routes. Typically, trucks do not generate high levels of vibration because they travel on rubber wheels and do not have vertical movement, which generates ground vibration. Because there are no major transportation-related vibration sources in the City, such as commuter and freight rail, any potential for significant long-term vibration impacts is less than significant.

The use of heavy equipment associated with heavy industrial operations such as mining and concrete plants can create elevated vibration levels in their immediate proximity. Though land uses within the proposed Planned Industrial would likely permit the heaviest industrial operations, they would not be immediately adjacent to any sensitive uses. In addition, no major vibration sources, such as mining and blasting activities, would occur in these areas. Vibration from heavy machinery dissipates rapidly with distance; therefore, no significant operational vibration impacts to sensitive uses would occur.

Construction Vibration Impacts

Construction operations can generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures and equipment. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor building construction. Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches levels that can damage structures, but it can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to the construction site.

Vibration generated by construction equipment has the potential to be substantial. Vibration impacts may occur from construction equipment associated with development in accordance with the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Update. Depending on the use of equipment and distance to the nearest receptors, the use of heavy equipment during construction would have the potential to cause annoyance and architectural damage at nearby uses. This could be a potentially significant impact.
Construction related to projects with the implementation of the General Plan could result in a potentially significant vibration impact.

**Mitigation Measure:**

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

7-1 Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities—such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers—within 200 feet of sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration-intensive impacts may occur. If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving).

The proposed project could create elevated levels of groundborne vibration and groundborne noise during construction activities. Mitigation Measure 7-1 would reduce these vibration impacts to the extent feasible. However, because of distance and other site conditions that may render its implementation infeasible or ineffective for future projects in the City, Mitigation Measure 7-1 would not guarantee that vibration impacts construction of projects would be reduced to less than significant levels. Consequently, Impact 5.7-3 would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

**Finding:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

**Impact 5.7-4:** Construction activities associated with the proposed project could create a substantial short-term increase in noise levels in the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, Noise, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-26 of the DEIR.
Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in construction of new residential, commercial, and industrial uses throughout the City. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction. First, the transport of workers and movement of materials to and from the site could incrementally increase noise levels along local access roads. The second type of short-term noise impact is related to demolition, site preparation, grading, and/or physical construction. Construction is performed in distinct steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics.

Construction equipment generates high levels of noise, with maximums ranging from 71 dBA to 101 dBA. Construction of individual developments associated with buildout of the proposed land use plan could temporarily increase the ambient noise environment and could have the potential to affect noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of a project. Pursuant to Los Alamitos Municipal Code, Section 17.24.020(D), construction-related activities between 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Saturday, are exempt from the stationary source noise standards of the City. Construction activities that occur outside of these permitted hours must comply with the stationary source noise standards.

Significant noise impacts may occur from operation of heavy earthmoving equipment and truck haul that would occur with construction of individual development projects. Construction noise levels are dependent upon the specific locations, site plans, and construction details of individual projects, which have not yet been developed. Construction would be localized and would occur intermittently for varying periods of time. Because specific project-level information is not available at this time, it is not possible to quantify the construction noise impacts at specific sensitive receptors. Construction of individual developments associated with implementation of the General Plan Update could temporarily increase the ambient noise environment in the vicinity of each individual project. Construction of future projects would be limited to between 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Saturday to comply with the City’s Municipal Code Section 17.24.020(D), which exempts construction-related noise between these hours. Development projects would be subject to environmental review, and specific mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce noise impacts during construction. Even with the limitation in construction noise hours, construction of projects may have the potential to generate substantial noise increases for prolonged periods of time, causing disturbance and annoyance at nearby uses. Construction from projects related to implementation of the General Plan could result in a potentially significant noise impact.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measure was included in the DEIR and the FEIR and is applicable to the proposed project.

7-2 Applicants for new development projects within 500 feet of sensitive receptors shall implement the following best management practices to reduce construction noise levels:

- Require that construction vehicles and equipment (fixed or mobile) be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
- Restrict haul routes and construction-related traffic
- Place stock piling and/or vehicle-staging areas as far as practical from residential uses.
• Replace audible backup warning devices with strobe lights or other warning devices during evening construction activity to the extent permitted by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

• Reduce nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five minutes.

• Consider the installation of temporary sound barriers for construction activities that are adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive structures, depending on length of construction, type of equipment used, and proximity to noise-sensitive uses.

Construction activities would result in temporary noise increases in the vicinity of sensitive land uses. Mitigation Measure 7-2 would reduce noise impacts associated with construction activities to the extent feasible. However, because of distance, source to receiver geometry, and other site conditions that may render its implementation infeasible or ineffective for future projects in the City, Mitigation Measure 7-2 would not guarantee that construction noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Consequently, Impact 5.7-4 would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Los Alamitos hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

4. Transportation and Traffic

Impact 5.11-1: Buildout of the City of Los Alamitos plus cumulative growth in the region would generate an increase in traffic volumes that would impact levels of service at local area intersections and roadway segments.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.11, Transportation and Traffic, and in particular, starting on page 5.11-25 of the DEIR.

The proposed roadway circulation network for the General Plan Update includes the following classifications:

• Smart Street. A Smart Street is designated a six- to eight-lane divided roadway with a maximum right-of-way width of 122 feet. The Smart Street classification is estimated to have a design
capacity of 72,000 vehicles per day in the eight-lane configuration and 60,000 vehicles per day in the six-lane configuration.

- **Major Arterial.** A major arterial is designated a six-lane divided roadway, with a typical right-of-way width of 120 feet. A major arterial is designed to accommodate a maximum of 54,000 daily vehicle trips.

- **Primary Arterial.** A primary arterial is designated a four-lane divided roadway with a typical right-of-way width of 100 to 120 feet. A primary arterial is designed to accommodate a maximum of 36,000 daily vehicle trips.

- **Secondary Arterial.** A secondary arterial is designated a four-lane undivided roadway with a typical right-of-way width of 80 feet. A secondary arterial is designed to accommodate a maximum of 24,000 daily vehicle trips.

**General Plan Buildout Intersection LOS**

The LOS was calculated for key study intersections with the future intersection lane configurations to evaluate General Plan Update traffic conditions. LOS D is the maximum acceptable level of congestion at any intersection in the City of Los Alamitos.

The results of the intersection assessment indicate that three of the study intersections would not operate within acceptable LOS standards during at least one peak hour:

- Los Alamitos Boulevard at Katella Avenue: LOS E during the AM peak hour
- Bloomfield Street at Cerritos Avenue: LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS E in the PM peak hour
- Wallingsford Road/Walnut Street at Katella Avenue: LOS F in the AM peak hour

The proposed intersection improvements required to meet acceptable LOS standards would be difficult to achieve due to right-of-way constraints at the intersections of Los Alamitos Boulevard at Katella Avenue, Bloomfield Street at Cerritos Avenue, and Wallingsford Road/Walnut Street at Katella Avenue. Consequently, implementation of the General Plan and expected increases in regional traffic growth would result in a significant impact at these three intersections.

**General Plan Buildout Roadway Segment LOS**

The LOS was calculated for key roadway segments in the City's regional roadway system to evaluate General Plan Update traffic conditions. According to the City's recommended circulation policies, LOS D is the minimum acceptable level of congestion on a daily basis for any classified roadway.

The results of the roadway assessment indicate that all of the roadways in the City are forecast to operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of the following roadway segments:

- Katella Avenue
  - Between I-605 and Los Alamitos Boulevard: LOS F
• Between Los Alamitos Boulevard and Bloomfield Street: LOS F
• Between Bloomfield Street and Lexington Drive: LOS E
• Between Lexington Drive and Walker Street: LOS E

- Cerritos Avenue
  • Between I-605 and Los Alamitos Boulevard: LOS E

The improvements required to meet acceptable LOS standards on the roadway segments may be difficult to achieve due to right-of-way constraints along Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue. Consequently, implementation of the General Plan Update and expected increases in regional traffic growth would result in a significant impact to the roadway segments identified above.

Summary

Three intersections and two roadways in the City would exceed the City’s LOS standards. The Mobility and Circulation Element includes Policies 1.4 (Level of service) and 1.7 (Fair share of improvements) to ensure efficient use of the City’s circulation network. Policy 1.4 of the General Plan Update identifies these three intersections and two roadways as “exempt,” but based on the current General Plan, the City’s current standard of LOS D for these segments, and their elevated levels of congestion, impacts would be significant.

Mitigation Measure:

Intersections

The Transportation Study (see Appendix G to the DEIR) identifies several improvements to intersections. However, sufficient right-of-way is not available to implement the necessary mitigation. Furthermore, the General Plan Update identifies the need for a balanced multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets. Policy 1.4 of the General Plan Update strives to strike a balance with all users of the transportation network. Given the policy desires of the City and constraints at these intersections, additional improvements are considered infeasible, and these improvements were considered but rejected.

For the intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue to operate at an acceptable level, an additional eastbound through-lane along Katella Avenue would be needed. Given the right-of-way constraints at this location, the improvement is considered infeasible.

- For the intersection of Bloomfield Street and Cerritos Avenue to operate at an acceptable level, an additional westbound left-turn lane and westbound right-turn lane would be required along Cerritos Avenue. The improvements would require additional right-of-way along the School District property frontage. Given the right-of-way constraints at this location, the improvement is considered infeasible.

- For the intersection of Wallingsford Road/Walnut Street and Katella Avenue to operate at an acceptable level, the northbound approach of Wallingsford Road would need to be widened, and an additional eastbound through-lane is required along Katella Avenue. However, given the right-of-way constraints on the northbound and eastbound approaches, these improvements are considered infeasible.
Roadway Segments

The Transportation Study (see Appendix G to the DEIR) identifies several improvements to the segments. Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue are built out, and the required right-of-way to achieve acceptable operations is not readily available. Given the constraints at these two roadways, additional improvements are considered infeasible, and these improvements were considered but rejected.

Policy 1.4 of the General Plan Update identifies these intersections and roadways as “exempt.” Once the General Plan Update is adopted, these intersections and roadways would be exempt from the City’s LOS D standard. However, based on the current General Plan and the City’s current standards for these intersections and roadways, Impact 5.11-1 would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding:

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 DEIR.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

F. Findings on Revisions to General Plan Update and Need for Recirculation

CEQA requires that a lead agency recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review, but before certification. “Information” includes changes in the project. Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies, amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

New information is not considered significant unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect, that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” includes a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;

- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted;
• A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it; or

• The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

• The changes to the Project include the following:

  o Change of land use map to reflect the proper boundaries of the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan Boundary – this change is a clarification of the existing boundaries and makes an insignificant modification. It does not add any additional information.

  o Addition to the Growth Management Element to add a new Goal and policies to address compatibility with the Airport Environments Land Use Plans of the JFTB and for Heliports. This additional language does not amount to a change of the project as the policies merely mimic those already found in the Public Facilities and Safety Elements, but provide more detail relating to the AELUP documents. The policies would not create the severity of any previously identified environmental impacts described in the EIR.

  o Refinement of the definition the Mixed Use (MU) land use designation to clarify the preference for specific land uses.

• Changes to the Final Land Use Plan consisting of the following:

  o Leaving the properties as Planned Industrial instead of changing to Public and Institutional (Opportunity Site 2B);

  o Leaving the properties on the south side of Katella Avenue as Professional Office instead of changing to Retail Business (Opportunity Site 5);

  o Changing the land use designation of 3562 Howard Avenue (APN #222-093-07) from Multi-Family Residential (R3) to Mixed Use (MU) (Opportunity Site 6);

  o Leaving the Arrowhead Property as Planned Industrial but adding a Retail Overlay instead of changing to Retail Business (Opportunity Site 10).

These changes to the final recommended Land Use Plan consist of a gradation between the Project and the No Project Alternative. As described in the information provided by PlaceWorks and independently analyzed by the City Council, these potential changes to the Land Use Plan do not substantially increase the magnitude of existing environmental impacts.

With the proposed changes, and assuming that the Arrowhead Property changes to retail use at General Plan buildout, the revised project will result in: no changes to dwelling units or population; a decrease of 4,886 daily vehicle trips (-24%); and an increase of 176 jobs which results in a (1%) increase in total employment and a (1%) increase in jobs-to housing ratio.
With the proposed changes, and assuming that the Arrowhead Property remains in industrial use during this General Plan buildout as the property owners have indicated, the revised project will result in: no changes to dwelling units or population; a decrease of 14,294 daily vehicle trips (-70%); and a decrease of 244 jobs which results in a (1%) decrease in total employment and a (1%) decrease in jobs-to-housing ratio.

These changes would help reduce, but not eliminate, the significant and unavoidable impacts to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise and Transportation and Traffic as shown in the analysis by PlaceWorks and would not create any significant new information. Even if the Arrowhead Property were to become retail, there still would not be any new significant impacts.

- Revisions to the Draft EIR as outlined in the Final EIR volume dated October 2014 which changes merely clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications to the Draft EIR. These changes do not add any significant new information.

Based on the above, the City Council determines that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

G. Findings on Project Alternatives and Planning Commission Recommended Changes

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. As discussed above, the EIR identified significant impacts in a number of categories. The following impacts could be mitigated below a level of significance: certain air impacts; cultural resources; and recreation. The following impacts cannot be mitigated below a level of significance: certain air impacts; greenhouse gas emissions; noise; transportation and traffic. Traffic impacts identified in Section 5.11, Transportation and Traffic, of the DEIR, are primarily associated with cumulative growth identified in the Orange County Transportation Analysis Model. Even without the additional growth identified in the General Plan, the three intersections and two roadways identified as failing in Impact 5.11-1 would continue to operate at a deficient level of service because the impact is related to cumulative growth rather than the proposed project. Likewise, the significant impact identified for GHG emissions under Impact 5.4-2 would continue to occur because the state has set a goal to reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels, which requires substantial changes in the sources of energy and new technologies that are not yet available.

With the exception of the Los Alamitos JFTB, over which the City has no land use authority, the City of Los Alamitos is primarily built out and there are relatively few remaining vacant parcels. Consequently, the land use changes associated with the proposed project focus on the three vacant parcels and select parcels that have the potential for redevelopment. In the community of Rossmoor, there are no changes proposed to the current land use designations, and the increase in development potential in Rossmoor is based solely on the secondary units allowed by state law.

The EIR looked at three alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce some, if not all, of the impacts.

1. No Project/Current General Plan Alternative

In the No Project/Current General Plan Alternative, the General Plan Update would not be implemented by the City. The current General Plan would remain in effect. Overall, land use
designations are similar between the current General Plan and the proposed General Plan Update. However, the proposed land use plan would allow for more intense land uses along Katella through creation of a Mixed Use designation. Some additional retail employment would replace office and industrial employment through changes from Professional Office and Planned Industrial to Retail Business designations along Katella Avenue.

Additionally, the Mixed Use designation would create the opportunity for new residential on the upper floors of mixed use buildings around the intersection of Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard. A few parcels designated for Planned Industrial near the intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard and Cerritos Avenue would be converted to Multi Family Residential. The current General Plan, however, includes an assumption of roughly 850 housing units on the portion of the Los Alamitos JFTB designated for Multi-Family Residential. These housing units are not projected under the proposed General Plan Update.

Under the No Project/Current General Plan Alternative, these changes would not occur. As a result, the current General Plan allows for more residential growth and less employment growth.

**Conclusion:**

Impacts of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project for aesthetics, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, and utilities and service systems. Impacts of this alternative would be slightly reduced compared to those of the proposed project for air quality, GHG emissions, population and housing, and traffic. This alternative would slightly increase public services and recreational impacts compared to those of the proposed project because of the increased population and dwelling units. This alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project to less than significant.

This alternative would not provide a comprehensive update to the City’s General Plan consistent with California Government Code Sections 65300 et seq. This alternative would not revise the City’s General Plan pursuant to various state requirements for General Plans—for instance, Assembly Bill 1358, the Complete Streets Act of 2008. In addition, while this alternative would meet some of the objectives, it would not meet the project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project. The proposed General Plan Update would change the roadway configuration of Los Alamitos north of Katella Avenue to create a more pedestrian-friendly downtown. Consequently, this alternative would not meet the project objectives to create an attractive pedestrian-friendly downtown, introduce pedestrian bridges, maximize retail opportunities along Katella Avenue, relocate City hall, or establish centralized parking options.

**Finding:**

This alternative is rejected because it would not accomplish the goals and it would not eliminate the significant impacts, even though it could slightly reduce them in areas relating to air and greenhouse gas impacts. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the FEIR.
2. Arrowhead Products Site Alternative

In the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative, the General Plan Update would be the same except for the 28-acre Arrowhead Products site would remain as industrial instead of being changed to retail uses. Industrial land uses generate less traffic than retail uses, and no changes from existing conditions would occur for this parcel. Consequently, this alternative would reduce traffic, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts of the proposed project, although the impacts would still remain significant. This alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative in the EIR.

Conclusion:

Impacts of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project for aesthetics, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. Impacts of this alternative would be slightly reduced compared to those of the proposed project for air quality, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, and traffic. This alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project to less than significant.

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives but would not meet the objective to maximize retail opportunities along Katella Avenue to the same extent as the proposed project and thus fails to realize one of the primary objectives of the General Plan Update.

Finding:

This alternative is rejected because it would not accomplish a primary goal of allowing the Arrowhead Property on Katella to be used for retail uses and it would not eliminate the significant impacts, even though it could slightly reduce them. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative for the reasons identified in the FEIR. This alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts of the project to a less than significant level and would not meet at least one of the basic objectives for the proposed project.

3. Increased Residential Land Use Alternative

In the Increased Residential Land Use Alternative, the General Plan Update would be the same except for 13 acres fronting Katella just east of Interstate 605 (I-605). Approximately 3 acres of the site are currently occupied by public use properties (City Hall, Police Department, City Yard, Chamber of Commerce, and the Community Center) and the western 10 acres are occupied by SuperMedia.

Under the proposed project, these parcels are proposed to be designated for commercial/retail land use. Under this alternative, the land use plan would designate this site for multifamily residential use (assumed 22 units per acre) to increase the amount of residential land uses and improve the job-housing balance in the City. Improving the jobs-housing balance can reduce VMT and traffic congestion and associated traffic, air quality, and GHG emissions impacts of the proposed project.

Conclusion:

Impacts of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project for aesthetics, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, and utilities and service systems. Impacts of this alternative would be slightly reduced compared to those of the proposed project for
air quality, GHG emissions, population and housing, and traffic. This alternative would slightly increase public services and recreational impacts compared to those of the proposed project. This alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project to less than significant.

This alternative would meet the project objectives but would not meet the objective to maximize retail opportunities along Katella Avenue to the same extent as the proposed project.

Finding:

This alternative is rejected because it would not accomplish the goals and it would not eliminate the significant impacts, even though it could slightly reduce them. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative for the reasons identified in the FEIR. This alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts of the project to a less than significant level and would not meet at least one of the basic objectives for the proposed project.

4. Planning Commission Changes – Recommended Land Use Pattern

The changes recommended by the Planning Commission would result in the following changes to the proposed General Plan Update: the Post Office and School District properties in Opportunity Site 2B would remain as Planned Industrial; the 17 properties on the south side of Katella in Opportunity Site 5 would remain as Professional Office; changing the land use designation of 3562 Howard Avenue (APN #222-093-07) from Multi-Family Residential (R3) to Mixed Use (MU) in Opportunity Site 6; and the Arrowhead Property in Opportunity Site 10 would remain as Planned Industrial, but would receive a Retail Overlay allowing the eventual conversion to retail uses.

Conclusion:

Assuming that the Arrowhead Property remains in industrial use, as has been indicated by the property owners, this land use pattern is environmentally superior to any of the alternatives that were analyzed in the EIR. Assuming the Arrowhead Property were to convert to retail use, the land use pattern is still environmentally superior to the project as analyzed.

Finding:

Although even this land use pattern would not eliminate all of the significant impacts, it is the chosen project as it is likely to have the least amount of environmental impacts based on the fact that Arrowhead Products, which has been in the City for approximately 60 years, has indicated that it plans on remaining in the City in this location and does not desire to convert the property to retail. However, the Retail Overlay provides the ability to convert this property to retail uses should there be a change in economic climate.
Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and the Guidelines Section 15093, the City of Los Alamitos has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the following unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the proposed project and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to these impacts: (1) air quality, (2) greenhouse gas emissions, (3) noise, and (4) transportation/traffic. The City also has examined alternatives to the proposed project, as well as the recommended project by the Planning Commission, which includes the change in land use patterns to Opportunity Site 2B, Site 5 south of Katella, a parcel in Site 6, and Site 10. None of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR both meets the project objectives and is environmentally preferable to the project, as recommended by the Planning Commission.

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

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other 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 of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable." When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(b) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of 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.

A. BACKGROUND

CEQA requires decision makers to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” (State CEQA Guidelines § 15093[a]). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (State CEQA Guidelines § 15093[b]). The agency’s statement is referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The following sections provide a description of each of the project’s significant and unavoidable adverse impacts and the justification for adopting a statement of overriding considerations.
B. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The following adverse impacts of the proposed project are considered significant, unavoidable, and adverse based on the DEIR, FEIR, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and the findings discussed in Section II, Findings and Facts, of this document and although are lessened, still remain with the Planning Commission's Recommended Land Use Pattern.

Air Quality

- **Impact 5.2-1.** Buildout of the project would generate less population but more employment growth and slightly more vehicle miles traveled than the Current General Plan; therefore, the project would be inconsistent with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Mitigation measures incorporated into future development projects and adherence to the project policies for operation and construction phases described in Impacts 5.2-2 and 5.2-3 would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the project. Goals and policies included in the project would facilitate continued City participation/cooperation with SCAQMD and Southern California Association of Governments to achieve regional air quality improvement goals, promote energy conservation design and development techniques, encourage alternative transportation modes, and implement transportation demand management strategies. However, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts associated with inconsistency with the air quality management plan due to the magnitude of growth and associated emissions that would be generated by the buildout of the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor in accordance with the project. Impact 5.2-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact 5.2-2.** Construction activities associated with the buildout of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions that would exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and would contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). Goals and policies are included in the project that would reduce air pollutant emissions. However, due to the magnitude of emissions generated by future construction activities associated with the buildout of the project, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds. Impact 5.2-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact 5.2-3.** Buildout of the proposed land use plan would generate additional vehicle trips and area sources of criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and would contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Goals and policies are included in the project that would reduce air pollutant emissions. However, due to the magnitude of emissions generated by the buildout of the project, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds. Impact 5.2-3 would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact 5.2-4.** Localized emissions of criteria air pollutants could exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds because of the scale of development activity associated with theoretical buildout of the project. For this broad-based General Plan Update, it is not possible to determine whether the scale and phasing of individual projects would result in the exceedance of localized emissions thresholds. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAQMD methodology, Impact 5.2-4 would remain significant and unavoidable.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact 5.4-2.** Although the 2014 Scoping Plan Update assessed programs to achieve the 2020 targets for the state, no additional GHG reductions programs have been outlined that get the state to the post-2020 targets identified in Executive Order S-03-05, which are an 80 percent reduction in 1990 emissions by 2050. Mitigation Measure 4-1 would ensure that the City continues to implement actions that reduce GHG emissions from buildout of the General Plan. However, additional federal and state measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions to meet the long-term goals under Executive Order S-03-05. According to the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advance in technology (CCST 2012). Since no additional federal or state measures are currently available for post-2020 that would ensure that the City of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor could achieve an interim target, Impact 5.4-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise

- **Impact 5.7-3.** The proposed project could create elevated levels of groundborne vibration and groundborne noise during construction activities. Mitigation Measure 7-1 would reduce vibration impacts associated with construction activities to the extent feasible. However, distance and other site conditions may render implementation of the mitigation measure infeasible or ineffective for future projects, and Mitigation Measure 7-1 would not guarantee that vibration impacts construction of projects would be reduced to less than significant levels. Impact 5.7-3 would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact 5.7-4.** Construction activities would result in temporary noise increases in the vicinity of sensitive land uses. Mitigation Measure 7-2 would reduce noise impacts associated with construction activities to the extent feasible. However, distance, source to receiver geometry, and other site conditions may render implementation of the mitigation measure infeasible or ineffective for future projects, and Mitigation Measure 7-2 would not guarantee that construction noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Impact 5.7-4 would be significant and unavoidable.

Transportation and Traffic

- **Impact 5.11-1.** Three intersections and two roadways in the City would exceed the City’s LOS standards, and mitigation measures are considered infeasible due to right-of-way constraints. Policy 1.4 of the General Plan Update identifies these intersections and roadways as “exempt.” Once the General Plan Update is adopted, these intersections and roadways would be exempt from the City’s LOS D standard. However, based on the current General Plan and the City’s current standards for these intersections and roadways, Impact 5.11-1 would be significant and unavoidable.

C. CONSIDERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed project, the City of Los Alamitos has determined that the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts
identified above are considered “acceptable” due to the following specific considerations, which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

**Implements the Objectives Established for the Project**

The proposed project implements the follow objectives:

- Maintain high levels of safety and service
- Create an attractive and pedestrian-friendly downtown
- Introduce pedestrian bridges
- Maximize retail opportunities along Katella Avenue
- Relocate City Hall
- Offer incentives to preserve and attract business
- Improve the look and identity of the City
- Provide consistent and effective code enforcement
- Maintain a good relationship with the Los Alamitos Unified School District
- Create more open space, parks, trails, community gardens, and recreation areas
- Evaluate annexation carefully
- Establish centralized parking options
- Enhance cultural uses and historical preservation

**Implements AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act**

Various elements of the General Plan Update contain policies that help the City implement AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act, including

- **Policy 1.1 Multimodal network** - The City shall plan, design, operate, and maintain the transportation network to promote safe and convenient travel for all users: pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, freight, and motorists.

- **Policy 1.2 Transportation decisions** - Decisions should balance the comfort, convenience, and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists of all ages and abilities.

- **Policy 1.3 Downtown connectivity** - Downtown Los Alamitos shall be safely and comfortably accessible by car, by bike, or on foot while maintaining Los Alamitos Boulevard as a four-lane facility with sufficient space for turning movements and queuing space for school access.

- **Policy 1.6 Access Management** - Minimize access points and curb cuts along arterials and within 200 feet of an intersection to improve traffic flow and safety. Eliminate and/or consolidate driveways when new development occurs or when traffic operation or safety warrants.

- **Policy 1.7 Fair share of improvements** - Require new development to pay a fair share of needed transportation improvements based on a project’s impacts to the multi-modal transportation network.
• Policy 2.1 Traffic calming - Discourage cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods through the application of traffic calming measures.

• Policy 3.1 Commuting to school - Maximize the number of students walking, biking, and riding the bus to and from school.

• Policy 3.2 Active trips - Establish, maintain, and improve bicycle and pedestrian systems to promote active trips to schools and parks.

• Policy 3.3 Pedestrian bridges - Invest in the construction of pedestrian bridges at key intersections near schools to enhance safety and reduce congestion.

• Policy 4.1 Walkable downtown - Create pedestrian-friendly business districts by expanding and improving spaces for walking along and crossing business districts.

• Policy 4.2 Site design - Require physical designs for new development that provide convenience and security to pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.

• Policy 4.3 Intersections - Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and bicycle crossings at intersections.

• Policy 4.4 Bicycle and pedestrian trails - Convert railroad rights-of-way, former rights-of-way, alleyways, and areas along storm drain channels into pedestrian and bicycle trails.

• Policy 4.5 Regional connections - Connect bicycle and pedestrian trails to local and regional trails in adjacent jurisdictions.

• Policy 4.6 Bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding - Provide bicycle and pedestrian network wayfinding and information through signs, street markings, or other technologies.

• Policy 4.7 Transit stops - Improve and maintain safe, clean, comfortable, well-lit, and rider-friendly transit stops that are well-marked and visible to motorists.

• Policy 4.8 Bus rapid transit - Plan for bus rapid transit along Katella Avenue, with an emphasis for service to the Los Alamitos Medical Center and Downtown Los Alamitos.

• Policy 5.5 Automobile parking demand - Reduce automobile parking demand by improving public transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility.

• Policy 5.6 Bicycle parking - Encourage safe, secure, attractive, and convenient bicycle parking, especially in the downtown and at schools.

• Policy 5.7 Motorcycle and scooter parking - Encourage businesses to provide parking spaces specifically designed for motorcycles and motorized scooters.
Achieves Consistency with SCAG’s 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) Goals

In addition to the transportation policies above, the following General Plan Update goals and policies are directed toward enhancing and implementing SCAG’s RTP/SCS goals related to transit, transportation and mobility, and environmental health:

Land Use Element

- **Policy 2.7 Quality of life uses** - Maintain, improve, and expand uses that define and enhance the City’s quality of life, including parks, trails, open spaces, and public facilities.

- **Policy 5.4 Flood control facilities** - The City strongly supports the use of flood control facilities as public trails throughout Los Alamitos.

Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element

- **Policy 2.2 Connectivity and image** - Improve existing and establish new trails along flood control facilities to link neighborhoods and public uses, augment local and regional bicycle systems, enhance the City’s image, and attract recreational cyclists and other visitors to the towncenter.

- **Policy 4.1 Land use and transportation** - Reduce greenhouse gas and other local pollutant emissions through mixed-use and transit-oriented development and well-designed transit, pedestrian, and bicycle systems.

- **Policy 4.5 Energy and water conservation** - Encourage new development and substantial rehabilitation projects to exceed energy and water conservation and reduction standards set in the City’s zoning ordinance and the California Building Code.

- **Policy 4.9 Renewable Energy** - Promote the use of renewable energy sources to serve public and private sector development.

Mobility and Circulation Element

- **Policy 2.2 Joint Forces Training Base** - Coordinate with JFTB administration to provide additional vehicular access points from major arterials to minimize travel through residential areas.

- **Policy 2.3 Truck routes** - Plan and designate truck routes that minimize truck traffic through or near residential areas.

Growth Management Element

- **Policy 1.3 Governmental collaboration** - Proactively collaborate with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure that infrastructure and public services are provided in a timely and high-quality manner.

- **Policy 1.4 Joint Forces Training Base** - Maintain proactive communications with the Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB) regarding processes, operations, or projects in the City or at the
JFTB that have the potential to impact the City of Los Alamitos, its residents, its businesses, or base operations.

- **Policy 2.2 New development** - New development shall pay its share of the costs associated with local and regional traffic mitigation.

- **Policy 2.4 Orange County Congestion Management Plan** - Maintain consistency with the County of Orange Congestion Management Plan and Master Plan of Arterial Highways pursuant to the requirement of state law to continue to receive its share of State gasoline sales tax revenues.

**Promotes the City's Economic Vision**

The General Plan Update addresses the location, timing, and type of development within the City, Rossmoor, and areas adjacent to the City to ensure that the City's economic vision can be accomplished, which is:

We envision our local economy as a valued resource that provides a stable and resilient tax base to support the public facilities and services that contribute positively to the quality of life in Los Alamitos. We recognize and capitalize on our city's role as a jobs engine in the regional economy. We implement public policies and invest public resources to maintain Los Alamitos's appeal as a business location and to attract continued private investment, but we do not sacrifice our quality of life for the sake of economic growth.

The General Plan Update supports the City's economic vision by including economic strategies that reflect the changing condition, including development of strategic plans. Policies from the Economic Development Element of the proposed General Plan that support the City's economic vision include:

- **Policy 1.1 Fiscal decision making** - Incorporate short-term and long-term economic and fiscal implications of proposed actions into decision-making.

- **Policy 1.2 Fiscal disclosures** - Identify and disclose potential fiscal impacts, including direct and indirect costs, as part of land use or development applications requiring City Council action.

- **Policy 1.3 Ongoing funding** - Identify and disclose if and how a program or project will be continued upon cessation of city funding or support when the City establishes, renews, or funds a program or project lasting more than one fiscal year.

- **Policy 1.4 Retail and lodging amendments** - General plan amendments changing from a land use designation that permits retail uses or lodging uses to a land use designation that does not allow retail or lodging uses should consider use of a development agreement or other legally enforceable obligation on the property owner(s) that requires the subject property generate the same or a better fiscal balance for the city as it would have generated with a retail or lodging use.

- **Policy 1.5 Office and industrial amendments** - General plan amendments changing from a land use designation that permits office or industrial uses to a designation that does not permit
office or industrial land uses should consider use of a development agreement or other legally enforceable obligation on the property owner(s) that requires the subject property generate the same or better fiscal balance for the city as it would have generated with an office or industrial use.

- **Policy 1.6 Fiscal mitigation** - Require a fiscal impact analysis and mitigation of any negative fiscal impacts for any requested general plan amendment.

- **Policy 1.7 Budgeting** - Require City departments to submit an annual budget request free from reliance on one-time revenues (except for specific grant-funded projects) and unsustainable revenue and deficit spending.

- **Policy 2.1 Employment-generating uses** - Maintain the integrity of office, industrial, and medical overlay areas and protect these areas from encroachment by other uses.

- **Policy 2.2 Effective land use regulation** - Ensure that development standards, use regulations, and the permitting process (especially discretionary permitting), are streamlined and effective, yet maintain protections for the community's quality of life.

- **Policy 2.3 Promote well-paying jobs** - Prioritize municipal decisions, initiatives, investments, and development approvals that support the retention and expansion of well-paying jobs in Los Alamitos.

- **Policy 2.4 Workforce development**. Help existing businesses communicate their workforce needs to the Orange County Workforce Investment Board, the North Orange County Community College District, the Los Alamitos Unified School District, and other educational and workforce development organizations.

- **Policy 2.5 Economic development marketing** - Collaborate with regional economic development partners, such as the Los Alamitos Chamber of Commerce and the Orange County Business Council, to market Los Alamitos to potential new businesses.

- **Policy 2.6 Medical services** - Capitalize on the City's role as a regional medical services hub by promoting and encouraging the intensification of medical offices in areas assigned with the Medical Overlay designation.

- **Policy 3.1 Town center** - Prioritize municipal decisions, initiatives, investments, and development approvals that contribute to the vision of a town center as an amenity-rich, multi-modal, and mixed-use district that is a unique regional destination and that emphasizes experience-oriented shopping.

- **Policy 3.2 Business development** - Collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce, the Orange County Small Business Development Center, and other economic development partners to improve access by Los Alamitos small businesses and independent retailers to business development services.
Policy 3.3 Quality retail environments - Require new, redeveloped, and revitalized retail centers to provide street furniture, shading, pedestrian circulation, and gathering spaces that enhance the experience of shopping.

Policy 3.4 Parking districts - Support voluntary efforts by commercial property owners to establish parking management districts (or other tools) to facilitate shared parking solutions and encourage pedestrian-oriented mixed-use buildings.

Policy 3.5 Public-private partnerships - Prioritize municipal initiatives and investments in areas in which private sector businesses and property owners are voluntarily providing private funding through special financing districts (such as assessment districts and business improvement districts).

Policy 3.6 Diversification - Prioritize municipal initiatives, investments, and development approvals that bring businesses in economic sectors not currently represented in Los Alamitos.

Policy 4.1 Economic development responsibility - Promote an ethos in which economic development is the responsibility of each elected official, appointed official, and City employee.

Policy 4.2 Economic development training - As financial resources are available, invest in economic development training for staff, elected and appointed officials, and key community stakeholders.

Policy 4.3 Business visitation - Establish and maintain an annual business visitation program that engages the owners and managers of businesses operating in Los Alamitos.

Policy 4.4 Economic development strategy - Adopt and regularly update a comprehensive economic development strategy, either as a stand-alone plan or as part of a broader City-wide strategic plan.

Policy 4.5 Economic development partners - Collaborate effectively with regional economic development partners to achieve specific measurable goals for Los Alamitos.

Redevelops Los Alamitos Boulevard/Katella Avenue Area into a Pedestrian-Friendly Downtown

The proposed General Plan Update would change the roadway configuration of Los Alamitos north of Katella Avenue to create a more pedestrian-friendly downtown by introducing pedestrian bridges, increasing retail opportunities along Katella Avenue, relocating City Hall, and establishing centralized parking options.

Improves Quality of Life and Physical Environment

Although development in Los Alamitos would have significant impacts on the environment (such as those on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation), a number of the policies found in the General Plan would reduce these impacts on the environment and promote more environmentally sustainable development in Los Alamitos. These types of policies include those that:
Create attractive, safe, and walkable communities

- **Policy LU 1.1 - Town center.** Promote the development of a unique town center around Los Alamitos Boulevard, with spaces designed for community celebrations and events.

- **Policy LU 1.2 - Public investment.** Invest in public improvements to transform Los Alamitos Boulevard into an attractive and pedestrian-friendly street.

- **Policy LU 1.5 - Outdoor dining.** Encourage existing and new restaurants to incorporate outdoor dining along Los Alamitos Boulevard.

- **Policy LU 1.6 - Public Art.** Encourage the incorporation of art in public and private spaces that celebrates the community's history and imagines a greater future.

- **Policy LU 3.3 - Pedestrian improvements.** Upgrade rights-of-way in areas designated as Limited Industrial and Medical Overlay to create safe and attractive pedestrian environments.

- **Policy MC 1.3 - Downtown connectivity.** Downtown Los Alamitos shall be safely and comfortably accessible by car, by bike, or on foot while maintaining Los Alamitos Boulevard as a four-lane facility with sufficient space for turning movements and queuing space for school access.

- **Policy MC 2.1 - Traffic calming.** Discourage cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods through the application of traffic-calming measures.

- **Policy MC 3.3 - Pedestrian bridges.** Invest in the construction of pedestrian bridges at key intersections near schools to enhance safety and reduce congestion.

- **Policy MC 4.1 - Walkable business districts.** Create pedestrian-friendly business districts by expanding and improving spaces for walking along and crossing business corridors.

Promote efficient energy use

- **Policy OSRe 4.9 - Renewable Energy.** Promote the use of renewable energy sources to serve public and private sector development.

Encourage the wise use of water

- **Policy OSRC 4.6 - Irrigation.** Encourage the use of water-efficient irrigation systems and reclaimed water for irrigation.

- **Policy PFS 1.1 - Water quality and supply.** Work with Golden State Water Company to maintain high water quality and ensure adequate water supply for personal use, landscaping, and fire protection.

- **Policy PFS 1.2 - Sewer system.** Work with the Rossmoor Los Alamitos Sewer District to maintain adequate and efficient sewage waste disposal services.

Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions
• **Policy OSRC 4.1 - Land use and transportation.** Reduce greenhouse gas and other local pollutant emissions through mixed-use and transit-oriented development and well-designed transit, pedestrian, and bicycle systems.

• **Policy OSRC 4.2 - Sensitive Land Uses.** Discourage the future siting of sensitive land uses within the distances defined by the California Air Resources Board without sufficient mitigation.

• **Policy OSRC 4. - Regional air quality.** Support regional efforts to reduce particulate matter and collaborate with other agencies to improve air quality at the emission source.

- Manage the roadway network and encourage use of alternative transportation

• **Policy OSRC 4.4 - Low and zero emission vehicles.** Support development of private and public parking infrastructure facilitating the use of alternative fuel vehicles.

• **Policy MC 1.1 - Multimodal network.** The City shall plan, design, operate, and maintain the transportation network to promote safe and convenient travel for all users: pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, freight, and motorists.

• **Policy MC 1.5 - Multimodal LOS.** Monitor the evolution of multimodal level of service (MMLOS) standards. The City may adopt MMLOS standards when appropriate.

• **Policy MC 4.6 - Bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding.** Provide bicycle and pedestrian network wayfinding and information through signs, street markings, or other technologies.

• **Policy MC 4.7 - Transit stops.** Improve and maintain safe, clean, comfortable, well-lit, and rider-friendly transit stops that are well marked and visible to motorists.

• **Policy MC 4.8 - Bus rapid transit.** Plan for bus rapid transit along Katella Avenue, with an emphasis for service to the Los Alamitos Medical Center and Downtown Los Alamitos.

- Ensure noise compatibility for noise-sensitive uses

• **Policy PFS 4.1 - Land use compatibility.** Approve development and require mitigation measures to ensure existing and future land use compatibility as shown in the City’s Noise Ordinance, the Land Use and Noise Compatibility Matrix, the State Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, and the Airport Environments Land Use Plan for the JFTB.

• **Policy PFS 4.2 - New residential.** When new residential development is proposed adjacent to land designated for industrial or commercial uses, require the proposed development to assess potential noise impacts and fund feasible noise-related mitigation measures.

• **Policy PFS 4.3 - Control sound at the source.** Prioritize noise mitigation measures to control sound at the source over buffers, soundwalls, and other perimeter measures.

• **Policy PFS 4.4 - Noise impacts.** Minimize or eliminate persistent, periodic, or impulsive noise impacts of business operations.
- **Policy PFS 4.6 - Aircraft noise.** Work with the JFTB and Long Beach Airport to minimize the noise impact of small aircraft and helicopters on residential neighborhoods.

- Facilitate the preservation of open space and critical habitats for endangered resources and natural communities.

- **Policy OSRC 2.1 - Multipurpose open space.** Maximize the use of public utility easements, flood control channels, school grounds, and other quasi-public areas for recreational uses and playfields.

- **Policy OSRC 2.2 - Connectivity and image.** Improve existing and establish new trails along flood control facilities to link neighborhoods and public uses, augment local and regional bicycle systems, enhance the City’s image, and attract recreational cyclists and other visitors to the town center.

- **Policy OSRC 4.8 - Stormwater management.** Encourage the use of low impact development techniques that retain or mimic natural features for stormwater management.

- Preserve natural, historic, and cultural resources as key features of Los Alamitos.

- **Policy OSRC 3.1 - Native plants.** Require the use of native and climate-appropriate plant species, and prohibit the use of plant species known to be invasive.

- **Policy OSRC 3.2 - Urban forest.** Maintain and enhance a diverse and healthy urban forest on public and private lands. Incorporate and preserve mature and specimen trees at key gateways, landmarks, and public facilities.

- **Policy OSRC 3.4 - National and state historic resources.** Preserve historical sites and buildings of state or national significance in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation.

- **Policy OSRC 3.5 - Local historic resources.** Encourage property owners to maintain the historic integrity of the site by (listed in order of preference): preservation, adaptive reuse, or memorialization.

- **Policy OSRC 3.6 - St. Isidore.** Support the preservation and repurposing of St. Isidore Historical Plaza as a business or community facility, preserving the chapel as the key historical element.

**Other Considerations**

There are unavoidable, significant impacts in four categories: air, greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic.

- If the City does not update the General Plan there are still significant impacts relating to air, greenhouse gas, construction noise and traffic. Even without any growth in the City, which is not a realistic scenario, the significant impacts relating to air, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic will occur simply due to regional growth.

- Impacts relating to construction noise are temporary in nature.
D. CONCLUSION

The City Council of Los Alamitos has balanced the project's benefits, as revised by the Planning Commission, against the significant unavoidable impacts. The City Council finds that the project's benefits of updating the current General Plan (which was adopted in 1990 with some significant updates in 2000) outweigh the project's significant unavoidable impacts, and those impacts, therefore, are considered acceptable in light of the project's benefits. The City Council finds that each of the benefits described above is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the project notwithstanding the project's significant unavoidable impacts. The City Council additionally finds that the fact that these significant impact would occur, even under the existing General Plan, further weighs in favor of adopting an updated General Plan that better meets the City's needs and complies with legal requirements.
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1. Introduction

1.1 PURPOSE OF MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring Program has been developed to provide a vehicle by which to monitor mitigation measures and conditions of approval outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), State Clearinghouse No. 2013121055. The Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared in conformance with Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and the City of Los Alamitos Monitoring Requirements. Section 21081.6 states:

(a) When making findings required by paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 21081 or when adopting a mitigated negative declaration pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 21080, the following requirements shall apply:

1. The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of a responsible agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead or responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.

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

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Los Alamitos is on the northwestern boundary of Orange County, approximately 23 miles (driving distance) south of downtown Los Angeles. The City is surrounded by highly urbanized areas of Orange and Los Angeles Counties and abuts or is near the cities of Long Beach, Seal Beach, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, and Garden Grove. Interstate 605 (I-605) runs north–south along the City's western boundary. No other interstate or state route crosses the City's boundaries. However, I-405 travels northwest to southeast around the City's southern boundary, and State Route 22 (SR-22) travels east–west approximately 0.4 miles south of the City, providing regional access to Los Alamitos. The City's sphere of influence (SOI) encompasses the unincorporated community of Rossmoor on the southwest side of the City.
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The City encompasses approximately 2,619 acres, and its SOI extends to the 982-acre unincorporated community of Rossmoor. Approximately 50 percent of the City's total land area is occupied by the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB), and the remaining area is developed with urban uses. Part of the Coyote Creek and Carbon Creek channels, approximately 45 acres, flow through the City and into the San Gabriel River farther south along the City's western boundary.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is an update to the City of Los Alamitos General Plan. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update is intended to provide guidance for long term growth, maintenance, and preservation in the City over the next 20-plus years. As stated above, the General Plan Update also includes the community of Rossmoor as part of the City's SOI to understand future demands for services and implications for growth in Rossmoor and the City. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update addresses the required elements and one optional element: Land Use; Economic Development; Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation; Mobility and Circulation; Housing; Public Facilities and Safety; and Growth Management.

The proposed land use plan would allow for up to a total of 23,003 residents, 18,430 jobs, 8,735 dwelling units, and 8,881,442 nonresidential square feet of development under the General Plan Update. The theoretical buildout was based largely on the assumption that the majority of the City and Rossmoor would not change. Some incremental intensification was assumed through small projects (e.g., adding a second dwelling unit or expanding a storefront). A handful of parcels were identified as areas where more substantial change could occur. For those parcels, the City created a set of projections and estimated the amount of development that could occur between now and General Plan buildout. In addition, the proposed General Plan Update identifies the Los Alamitos JFTB as Community & Institutional/JFTB. However, it should be noted that while the Los Alamitos JFTB is within the City's municipal boundary, the City has no jurisdiction or land use authority on this U.S. military installation.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1.4.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant

Impacts to the following resources were identified as less than significant. Impacts to resources marked with an asterisk (*) were identified in the Initial Study; the remainder were identified in the DEIR.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forest Resources*
- Biological Resources *
- Geology and Soils*
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality*
- Land Use and Planning
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- Mineral Resources *
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

1.4.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts That Can Be Mitigated, Avoided, or Substantially Lessened

The DEIR concluded that the proposed project could result in one or more potentially significant impacts in the following topic areas:

- Cultural Resources

However, the DEIR also found that these impacts would be reduced, avoided, or substantially lessened through the implementation of mitigation measures, which are listed in Table 3-1.

1.4.3 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

The following impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of required mitigation, as identified in the DEIR:

- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic
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2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

2.1 CATEGORIZED MITIGATION MEASURES/MATRIX

Project-specific mitigation measures have been categorized in matrix format, as shown in Table 2-1. The matrix identifies the environmental factor, specific mitigation measures, schedule, and responsible monitor. The mitigation matrix will serve as the basis for scheduling the implementation of, and compliance with, all mitigation measures.
2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements
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5.2 AIR QUALITY

If, during subsequent project-level environmental review, construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Los Alamitos shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures as identified in the CEQA document prepared for the project to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. Mitigation measures that may be identified during the environmental review include but are not limited to:

- Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower.
- Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer’s standards.
- Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.
- Water all active construction areas at least three times daily, or as often as needed to control dust emissions. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).
- Pave, apply water three times daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible), or as often as needed, all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site to control dust.</td>
<td>Project applicants of new industrial or warehousing land uses</td>
<td>Prior to future discretionary project approval for industrial/warehousing</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Planning Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sweep public streets daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) in the vicinity of the project site, or as often as needed, to keep streets free of visible soil material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enclose, cover, water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-2 New industrial or warehousing land uses that: 1) have the potential to generate 40 or more diesel trucks per day and 2) are located within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g. residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Los Alamitos prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the applicable air quality management district. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), particulate matter concentrations would exceed 2.5 μg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs) are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling onsite or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project.
Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Applicants for sensitive land uses within the following distances as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, from these facilities: * Industrial facilities within 1000 feet * Distribution centers (40 or more trucks per day) within 1,000 feet * Major transportation projects (50,000 or more vehicles per day) within 1,000 feet * Dry cleaners using perchloroethylene within 500 feet * Gasoline dispensing facilities within 300 feet</td>
<td>Project applicants of sensitive land uses</td>
<td>Prior to future discretionary project approval</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Planning Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Los Alamitos prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the applicable Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 6 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06) or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to: * Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Los Alamitos that there are operational limitations. * Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters. * Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the...
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Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City of Los Alamitos.</td>
<td>Project applicants of projects with potential to emit nuisance odors</td>
<td>Prior to future discretionary project approval</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Planning Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>If it is determined during project-level environmental review that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan may be required, subject to City's regulations. Facilities that have the potential to generate nuisance odors include but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wastewater treatment plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composting, greenwaste, or recycling facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fiberglass manufacturing facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Painting/coating operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large-capacity coffee roasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food-processing facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an odor management plan is determined to be required through CEQA review, the City of Los Alamitos shall require the project applicant to submit the plan prior to approval to ensure compliance with the applicable Air Quality Management District's Rule 402, for nuisance odors. If applicable, the Odor Management Plan shall identify the Best Available Control Technologies for Toxics (T-BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at the industrial facility. T-BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3-1 Applicants for future development projects with intact extant building(s) more than 45 years old shall provide a historic resource technical study to the City of Los Alamitos. The historic resource technical study shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian meeting Secretary of the Interior Standards. The study shall evaluate the significance and data potential of the resource in accordance with |

| Project applicants of projects with intact extant building(s) more than 45 years old, and qualified architectural historian | Prior to future discretionary project approval | City of Los Alamitos Planning Division |
2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2 Applicants for future development projects that require grading of undisturbed soil in areas of known or inferred archaeological resources, prehistoric or historic, shall provide a technical cultural resources assessment to the City of Los Alamitos prior to the issuance of grading permits. The cultural resources assessment shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist to assess the cultural and historical significance of any known archaeological resources on or next to each respective development site, and assessing the sensitivity of sites for buried archaeological resources. On properties where resources are identified, or that are determined to be moderately to highly sensitive for buried archaeological resources, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified cultural preservation expert. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project applicants of development projects in areas of known or inferred archaeological resources, and qualified archaeologists retained by those projects</td>
<td>Prior to future discretionary project approval</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Planning Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

### Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3-3 Applicants for future development projects that require excavation greater than five feet below the current ground surface in undisturbed sediments with a moderate or higher fossil yield potential shall provide a technical paleontological assessment prepared by a qualified paleontologist assessing the sensitivity of sites for buried paleontological resources to the City of Los Alamitos prior to issuance of grading permits. If resources are known or reasonably anticipated, the assessment shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified paleontologist. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:  
  a. A paleontologist shall be retained for the project and shall be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities.  
  b. Should any potentially significant fossil resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Community Development Director concurs in writing that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources.  
  c. Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by an Orange County Certified Professional Paleontologist. If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies; submit materials to the California State University, Fullerton; and provide a comprehensive final report, including catalog with museum numbers. | Project applicants of development projects that require excavation as specified in Mitigation Measure 3-3 and qualified paleontologist retained by those projects | Prior to future discretionary project approval | City of Los Alamitos Planning Division |
Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Community Development/Public Works Director</td>
<td>During update of City's Implementation Plan</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Community Development/Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Los Alamitos shall include the following actions in the City's Implementation Plan to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the long-term State GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S 03 06.

- Work with local and regional agencies to install appropriate recharging stations to support the use of electric vehicles. Work with developers to install recharging stations at appropriate activity and employment centers to support electric vehicle use.
- Conduct energy audits on all City facilities and incorporate cost-effective measures to increase energy efficiency.
- Public education on energy conservation. Coordinate with local utilities to provide energy conservation information to the public.
- Promote energy-efficient design features such as appropriate site orientation, renewable energy systems, use of lighter color roofing and building materials, and passive ventilation and cooling techniques.
- Seek grants and other outside funding for energy efficiency improvements to public or private facilities and structures.
- Work with the Los Alamitos Unified School District, the City of Seal Beach, and Rossmoor to obtain grant funding, conduct planning, and construct new and improved existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities to provide safe routes to schools.
- Remove barriers that discourage active pedestrian and bicycle routes. Expand facilities and amenities that encourage active routes, such as increasing the number of Class II bike lanes along potential school routes, particularly those that parallel Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue.
- Create and implement a pedestrian and bicycle master plan to identify improvements, timing, and funding mechanisms.
- Identify funding and design options for bicycle and pedestrian signage along bicycle routes, in the downtown, and at key trailheads or connection points, with an emphasis on connections.
2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to schools and the downtown. Bicycle signage should be consistent with signs of neighboring jurisdictions, yet distinct for Los Alamitos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions on improving connections to existing and planning future bicycle and pedestrian trails.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with OCTA and local businesses to enhance bus stops in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with OCTA on its Long Range Transportation Plan to design bus rapid transit service and stop locations along Katella Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the use of parking meters along public streets and on City-owned lots, especially in the downtown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities for bicycle parking in the downtown, including the conversion of single parallel parking spaces along smaller side streets into on-street or curb-adjacent bicycle parking. Bike racks should serve as functional public art and can reflect the types of businesses or uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 NOISE

7-1 Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, within 200 feet of sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration-intensive impacts may occur. If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving, etc.). Project applicants of development projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, within 200 feet of sensitive receptors, and noise consultants for these projects. Prior to future discretionary approvals and during construction. City of Los Alamitos Planning Division.

7-2 Applicants for new development projects within 500 feet of sensitive receptors shall implement the following best management practices to reduce construction noise levels: Project applicants for projects within 500 feet of sensitive receptors. Prior and during construction of future projects. City of Los Alamitos Planning Division.

- Require that construction vehicles and equipment (fixed or mobile) be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
- Restrict haul routes and construction-related traffic.
Table 2-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place stock piling and/or vehicle-staging areas as far as practical from residential homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace backup audible warning devices with backup strobe lights or other warning devices during evening construction activity to the extent permitted by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the installation of temporary sound barriers for construction activities that occur adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive structures, depending on length of construction, type of equipment used, and proximity to noise-sensitive uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements
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3. Report Preparation

3.1 LIST OF PREPARERS

City of Los Alamitos
Steven Mendoza, Community Development Director

PlaceWorks
Nicole Vermilion, Associate Principal
Frances Ho, Project Planner
RESOLUTION NO. PC 14-32

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF THE 2014 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, INCLUDING LAND USE DESIGNATION CHANGES.

WHEREAS, the City of Los Alamitos (the "City") desires to comprehensively update the Los Alamitos General Plan to respond to changing conditions in the City, region and around the globe, as well as to revisit the long term sustainability of the City in the future (hereinafter sometimes referred to as either the "Project" or the "General Plan Update"); and,

WHEREAS, in the Fall of 2010, the City elected to update the City’s General Plan in accordance with Government Code Section 65300 et seq.; and,

WHEREAS, in June 2011, the City elected to retain The Planning Center/Placeworks to initiate the public process to discuss, plan, and prepare an updated General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the City and The Planning Center/Placeworks conducted an enhanced public outreach exercise that resulted in Los Alamitos residents communicating their vision for the City; reviewed the existing land uses in the City; identified areas that should be protected and areas that could upgrade over time; discussed needed Citywide improvements; proposed various programs and measures to implement Citywide goals; and recommended refreshed changes to the goals, policies, approaches and strategies contained in the 1990 Los Alamitos General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the City and The Planning Center/Placeworks has been drafting a General Plan to strengthen its economic position, reaffirm its policy foundation and vision, and comprehensively evaluate several issues of Citywide importance. These issues include the inclusion of Rossmoor into the City’s sphere of influence, a plan for the City’s commercial corridors and downtown, the recent adoption of the Medical Center Specific Plan, and the need to explore economic development opportunities in a built-out environment; and,

WHEREAS, The City has hosted a series of Joint Commission meetings with three of its Commissions: Planning; Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Arts; and Traffic. These joint meetings updated the Commissioners on the progress of the General Plan Update effort and enable Staff to properly incorporate shared visions into a future report to the City Council. Moreover, these joint meetings provided an unprecedented opportunity for the three primary Commissions to talk about the General Plan Update collectively and share concerns of other Commissioners, helping to clarify and unify opinions, reactions, and concerns; and,
WHEREAS, a draft Los Alamitos General Plan Update 2014 was developed, an updated copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk and incorporated herein by this reference, has been prepared to address the seven mandated elements plus two additional elements: Economic Element and Growth Management Element; and,

WHEREAS, the 2014 General Plan is intended to guide growth and development in the City through 2035, which includes the City, its sphere of influence (SOI); and,

WHEREAS, the 2014 General Plan revises the current land use map and updates the following General Plan elements:

- Land Use Element
- Circulation and Transportation Element
- Open Space and Recreation Element
- Conservation Element
- Safety Element
- Noise Element
- Housing Element (updated in 2013, not included in General Plan Update)
- Economic Development Element
- Growth Management Element

WHEREAS, the 2014 General Plan will guide growth and development (e.g., infill development, redevelopment, and revitalization/restoration) in the Plan Area by designating land uses in the proposed land use map and through implementation of updated goals and policies; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing on October 13, 2014, to consider the 2014 General Plan Update; and,

WHEREAS, at the October 13, 2014 meeting the Planning Commission began review of the ten Opportunity Sites that were identified for possible land use changes; and,

WHEREAS, the October 13, 2014 public hearing was continued to November 10, 2014 at which time the Planning Commission continued review of the Opportunity Sites and consideration of the General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2014 the Orange County Airport Land Use Commission (“ALUC”) held a meeting to determine consistency of the Los Alamitos General Plan Update with the Airport Environments Land Use Plan (“AELUP”) for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB) and for the AELUP for Heliports; and,

WHEREAS, the ALUC recommended that the City of Los Alamitos incorporate additional policies into their General Plan to ensure consistency with the AELUPs and additional goals and policies have been added to the Growth Management Element to reflect the ALUC’s consistency determination; and,
WHEREAS, the public hearing was closed on November 10, 2014 and Staff was directed to bring back resolutions reflecting the recommended changes made to the Land Use Element; and,

WHEREAS, on December 8, 2014 the Planning Commission was presented with two resolutions for adoption which Staff believed embodied the direction of the Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, on December 8, 2014 the Planning Commission raised questions regarding the boundaries of Opportunity Site 6 south of Katella Avenue and whether the land use should be changed to Mixed Use or just have a Mixed Use Overlay designation placed over it; and,

WHEREAS, a new public hearing was noticed for January 12, 2015 for those properties south of Katella Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, on January 12, 2015 the Planning Commission indicated that it wished for the definition of the Mixed Use designation to require retail businesses on the ground floor along Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard in Opportunity Site 6; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission’s new direction required a new noticed public hearing which was noticed on January 28, 2015, for all properties in Opportunity Site 6 with the hearing to be held on February 9, 2015; and,

WHEREAS, on February 9, 2015 the Planning Commission indicated that it decided against the designation to require retail businesses on the ground floor along Katella and Los Alamitos Boulevard in definition of the Mixed Use designation for Opportunity Site 6; and,

WHEREAS, on February 9, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed the record of proceedings, including the Staff reports and other written records presented to, or otherwise made available to, the Planning Commission on this matter, and considered all oral comments made during the public hearings; and,

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the Planning Commission has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including the Draft General Plan and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. That the Planning Commission held public hearings as detailed above on this General Plan Update Project, at which time staff presented the details of
the proposed Project and the Planning Commission received oral and/or written testimony from the public regarding the General Plan Update and the Draft EIR; and,

SECTION 2. Prior to adopting this Resolution, pursuant to Sections 21065 and 21067 of the Public Resources Code, and Sections 15367 and 15378 of the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, § 15000 et seq.), the Commission, adopted Resolution No. 14-31 recommending that the Los Alamitos City Council adopt the Program Environmental Impact Report No. 2013121055, as well as the findings and statement of overriding considerations required by CEQA, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

SECTION 3. Based on the Draft General Plan, public comments and the entire record before the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Los Alamitos approve the General Plan Update, dated December, 2014, attached hereto as Exhibit A, including the definition of Mixed Use as set forth therein. This General Plan Update includes the following recommendations for the land use designations for the ten opportunity sites listed below that were determined to merit consideration for a new land use designation as well as correcting a mapping error on the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan boundary and adding a goal and policies to ensure consistency with the AELUPs as finalized in final Land Use Plan (Exhibit B).

### Site 1- Changing Industrial to Multi Family Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Church Site</td>
<td>242-222-13</td>
<td>3311 Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Collins Backhoe</td>
<td>242-222-11</td>
<td>3342 Cerritos Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass Family LLC</td>
<td>242-222-06</td>
<td>3370 Cerritos Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Commission Recommendation:** Concur with proposed change.

### Site 2A - Restrict Commercial Recreation to New Limited Industrial Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>242-243-04</td>
<td>3620 Briggeman Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severson Group</td>
<td>242-245-02</td>
<td>3601 Serpentine Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Avenue Holdings</td>
<td>242-242-68</td>
<td>10712 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Avenue Holdings</td>
<td>242-242-67</td>
<td>10712 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Avenue Holdings</td>
<td>242-242-69</td>
<td>10714 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganahl Lumber</td>
<td>242-244-13</td>
<td>10722 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganahl Lumber</td>
<td>242-244-14</td>
<td>10742 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Commission Recommendation:** Concur with proposed change.

### Site 2B- Post Office/LAUSD Yard - Change from Planned Industrial to Community & Institutional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Post Office</td>
<td>242-242-65</td>
<td>10650 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Commission Recommendation: Leave land use designation as Planned Industrial. This recommendation is based on the concerns raised by the Los Alamitos Unified School District ("LAUSD") and upon the fact that the operations taking place on the LAUSD's property are industrial in nature. It was further determined that the property belonging to the Post Office should also remain Planned Industrial.

Site 3 – Vacant/Center Plaza – Leave as Retail Business

Planning Commission Recommendation: Concur with leaving property designated as Retail Business.

Site 4 - Old Town East – Limited Multi-Family Residential - Expanding Category to Permit Live/Work Within the Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayman</td>
<td>242-182-25</td>
<td>10782 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>242-182-01</td>
<td>10772 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Leon</td>
<td>242-182-03</td>
<td>10792 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalos</td>
<td>242-182-04</td>
<td>10802 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estanislao Aguilar</td>
<td>242-182-05</td>
<td>10812 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>242-182-07</td>
<td>10834 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelita Mariscal</td>
<td>242-182-20</td>
<td>10842 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelita Marisca</td>
<td>242-182-19</td>
<td>10852 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninh</td>
<td>242-182-18</td>
<td>10771 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senanayake</td>
<td>242-182-17</td>
<td>10781 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHugh</td>
<td>242-182-16</td>
<td>10791 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>242-182-24</td>
<td>10801 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>242-182-14</td>
<td>10811 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>242-182-13</td>
<td>10813 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>242-182-22</td>
<td>10821 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>242-182-21</td>
<td>10831 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikami</td>
<td>242-182-23</td>
<td>10841 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng</td>
<td>242-182-09</td>
<td>10851 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>242-183-20</td>
<td>10772 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>242-183-02</td>
<td>10792 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narahara</td>
<td>242-183-03</td>
<td>10700 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regec</td>
<td>242-183-04</td>
<td>10812 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanikian</td>
<td>242-183-05</td>
<td>10822 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najera</td>
<td>242-183-06</td>
<td>10832 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>242-183-07</td>
<td>10842 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeres</td>
<td>242-183-08</td>
<td>3661 Florista Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>242-183-19</td>
<td>3692 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>242-183-18</td>
<td>10781 Cherry Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jetton/Miller Properties  242-183-24  10791 Cherry Street
Jetton/Miller Properties  242-183-23  10801 Cherry Street
Jetton/Miller Properties  242-183-25  10821 Cherry Street
Cherry Trust  242-183-11  10832 Cherry Street
Tran  242-183-10  10845 Cherry Street
Jun  242-183-09  3693 Florista Street

Planning Commission recommendation: Concur with proposed change.

Site 5 - Permitting Medical Business as Primary Uses Around the Medical Campus in Planned Industrial Through a New Medical Overlay Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Wilson Staples LLC</td>
<td>242-163-04</td>
<td>3722 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broberson</td>
<td>242-163-03</td>
<td>3762 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden State Water</td>
<td>242-163-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wilson Staples LLC</td>
<td>242-161-04</td>
<td>3721 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wilson Staples LLC</td>
<td>242-161-03</td>
<td>3751 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durnin</td>
<td>242-161-02</td>
<td>3781 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wilson Staples LLC</td>
<td>242-161-05</td>
<td>3821 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wilson Staples LLC</td>
<td>242-161-06</td>
<td>3801 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solt Catalina LLC</td>
<td>242-151-18</td>
<td>3831 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solt Catalina LLC</td>
<td>242-151-17</td>
<td>3841 Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Street</td>
<td>242-151-16</td>
<td>Kyle Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>242-151-15</td>
<td>10842 Kyle Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td>242-151-22</td>
<td>10852 Kyle Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavel</td>
<td>242-151-02</td>
<td>10831 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leek</td>
<td>242-151-03</td>
<td>10841 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td>242-151-04</td>
<td>10851 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>242-151-05</td>
<td>10861 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieto</td>
<td>242-151-21</td>
<td>10871 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weese</td>
<td>242-151-08</td>
<td>10911 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurber LLC</td>
<td>242-152-11</td>
<td>10941 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt Holdings LLC</td>
<td>242-152-18</td>
<td>10961 Bloomfield Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission recommendation: Concur with proposed change.

Site 5 – Property on South Side of Katella - Changing from Professional Office to Retail Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>222-101-01</td>
<td>3662 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td>222-101-02</td>
<td>3682 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duwong</td>
<td>222-101-03</td>
<td>3692 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertran</td>
<td>222-101-33</td>
<td>3700 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeMara Group</td>
<td>222-101-05</td>
<td>3720 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWC Properties</td>
<td>222-101-39</td>
<td>3742 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Commission Recommendation: Leave properties on the south side of Katella Avenue designated as Professional Office. After consideration of the public testimony from the property owners, the Planning Commission determined that the properties should remain Professional Office. The Planning Commission also determined that the use of the property for medical office across from the hospital was a logical use of the property.

Site 6 - Town Center Area – Changing from Retail Business to Mixed Use, Including the Definition of Mixed Use that Provides a Flexible/Mandatory Requirement Regarding Retail Business on Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poe</td>
<td>242-203-01</td>
<td>10862 Chestnut Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>242-203-02</td>
<td>10876 Chestnut Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernandez</td>
<td>242-203-07</td>
<td>10909 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Katella LLC</td>
<td>242-203-08</td>
<td>3401 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolau</td>
<td>242-203-26</td>
<td>10861 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernandez</td>
<td>242-203-28</td>
<td>10877 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolau</td>
<td>242-203-23</td>
<td>10931 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesora</td>
<td>242-203-09</td>
<td>10961 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afshani NSPS LTD</td>
<td>242-171-08</td>
<td>10900 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying</td>
<td>242-171-02</td>
<td>10956 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afshani NSPS LTD</td>
<td>242-172-01</td>
<td>10900 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Parking Lot</td>
<td>242-172-02</td>
<td>10902 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>242-172-03</td>
<td>10932 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>242-172-04</td>
<td>10932 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Bank</td>
<td>242-172-16</td>
<td>10942 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>242-172-14</td>
<td>3612 Florista Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Life</td>
<td>242-172-15</td>
<td>3622 Florista Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Life</td>
<td>242-172-13</td>
<td>10811 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Life</td>
<td>242-172-12</td>
<td>10895 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbina</td>
<td>242-172-11</td>
<td>10901 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa</td>
<td>242-172-17</td>
<td>10911 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>242-172-09</td>
<td>10935 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Isidore</td>
<td>242-172-08</td>
<td>10941 Reagan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10961 Reagan Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>222-091-22</td>
<td>3502 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>222-091-05</td>
<td>3532 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>222-091-20</td>
<td>3562 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerschultz</td>
<td>222-091-21</td>
<td>3636 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>222-091-07</td>
<td>11062 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Jewelry</td>
<td>222-091-08</td>
<td>11072 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quan</td>
<td>222-091-09</td>
<td>3531 Green Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Brothers LLC</td>
<td>222-092-09</td>
<td>11102 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Lotus</td>
<td>222-092-10</td>
<td>11110 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Las Bldg</td>
<td>222-092-11</td>
<td>11122 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>222-092-12</td>
<td>11142 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Lotus</td>
<td>222-092-07</td>
<td>3532 Green Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Las Bldg</td>
<td>222-092-24</td>
<td>11122 Los Alamitos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3611 Farquhar Investments</td>
<td>222-092-23</td>
<td>3552 Green Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>222-092-13</td>
<td>11130 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benfanti</td>
<td>222-092-14</td>
<td>3561 Howard Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>222-093-07</td>
<td>3562 Howard Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn</td>
<td>222-093-11</td>
<td>11162 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Investments, LP</td>
<td>222-093-12</td>
<td>11182 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabtai</td>
<td>222-093-13</td>
<td>11232 Los Alamitos Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Street Partners</td>
<td>222-093-24</td>
<td>3532 Howard Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabtai</td>
<td>222-093-14</td>
<td>3535 Farquhar Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farquhar Investment Group</td>
<td>222-093-15</td>
<td>3551 Farquhar Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farquhar Investment Group</td>
<td>222-093-16</td>
<td>3571 Farquhar Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Commission Recommendation:** Concur with proposed change.

**Site 7 - Supermedia Site/City Hall/Sewer – Changing from Professional Office and Community & Institutional to Retail Business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supermedia Site</td>
<td>242-212-09</td>
<td>3131 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>242-212-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>242-212-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>242-212-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District</td>
<td>242-212-13 &amp; 12</td>
<td>3231 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Commission Recommendation:** Concur with proposed change.

**Site 8 – Flood Control Reuse - Remain as Open Area**

**Planning Commission Recommendation:** Concur with leaving property as Open Area.
Site 9 – Former Base Housing - Change from Multi Family Residential 20-30 DU/Acre to Community & Institutional

Planning Commission Recommendation: Concur with proposed change.

Site 10 - Arrowhead Products Changing from Planned Industrial to Retail Overlay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>241-241-09</td>
<td>4411 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>241-241-10</td>
<td>4411 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>241-241-11</td>
<td>4411 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>241-241-08</td>
<td>4411 Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendation: Leave property as Planned Industrial, but add a Retail Overlay. This recommendation is based on the need to retain the Planned industrial designation for Arrowhead Products which is one of the City’s top employers and has been a presence in the City for more than 60 years. Additionally, Arrowhead Products provides high-paying jobs for skilled workers. Testimony was also received from Arrowhead and its representative that they do not plan on changing the use of their property and have been informed by market professionals that it would be difficult to use the two northern undeveloped parcels for retail uses based on the site configuration of the entire 28 acre property. The Planning Commission feels that it is necessary to retain the Planned Industrial designation to allow Arrowhead Products the ability to expand its business as necessary and make use of the undeveloped parcels. However, the Planning Commission also believes that retail uses could be appropriate along Katella Avenue and wishes to streamline the ability to develop the property for retail uses should the opportunity arise.

SECTION 4. The Planning Commission makes the following findings regarding the 2014 Los Alamitos General Plan Update (“Update”):

A. The Update constitutes a comprehensive, long-term document capable of guiding the future development of the City;

B. The Update meets all the requirements for such plans as contained in the Planning and Zoning Law and other laws;

C. The Update has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Zoning Law;

D. The recommendations set forth in Section 3 above are not detrimental to, and are in the best interest of, the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

SECTION 5. The recitals are true and correct and are incorporated by reference herein.
SECTION 6. The Planning Commission hereby directs that these recommendations be immediately transmitted to the City Council for consideration.

SECTION 7. The Planning Commission finds that all available documentation is available within the Community Development Department at the City of Los Alamitos, 3191 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos, CA 90720. The custodian of records is the Community Development Director.

SECTION 8. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the City Council, and to any person requesting a copy of the same.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 9th day of February, 2015.

______________________________
John Riley, Chairman

ATTEST:

______________________________
Steven Mendoza, Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Lisa Kranitz, Assistant City Attorney

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF ORANGE  ) ss
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS  )

I, Steven Mendoza, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Los Alamitos, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 9th day of February, 2015, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSENT: 
ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Steven Mendoza, Secretary
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Figure 3 Land Use Plan

Residential
- Single Family Res. 1-4 DU/AC
- Condominium/Multi-Family Res. 5-20 DU/AC
- Multi Family Res. 20-30 DU/AC

Commercial and Employment
- Retail Business
- Professional Office
- Light Industrial
- Heavy Industrial
- Medical Overlay
- Retail Overlay

Special Use
- Mixed Use

Specific Plan
- Community & Institutional
- Community & Institutional/FFD
- Open Space
- Environmental Overlay

Rossman
- Suburban Residential
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Other City Boundaries

Note:
- Rossman is within the City ED
- It also remains within B, under the jurisdiction of the County of Orange. Accordingly, the Land Use Plan shows the County's jurisdiction over the City of Rossman.
Table 2-04
Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for
Commercial / Industrial Zoning Districts (see Parking Requirements, Chapter 17.26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>Specific Use Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted use</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional use permit required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use not allowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary use permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGRICULTURE AND OPEN SPACE**

| Agriculture, exclusive of livestock            |     |     | CUP |

**BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL USES**

| Banks/financial institutions (without drive-through facilities) | P   | P   |     |
| Offices, administrative or professional            | P   | P   | C   |
| Offices, incidental to an allowed primary use       | P   | P   | P   |
| Public utility commercial office                    | P   | P/CUP | P |

**EATING AND DRINKING**

| Bars/nightclubs                                  | CUP | CUP | CUP |
| Employee's cafeteria/coffee shop                 |     |     | P   |
| Restaurants, with drive-through facilities       | CUP | CUP | CUP |
| Restaurants, full service                         | P   | P   | CUP |
| Restaurants, take-out                             | P   | P   | CUP |
| Restaurants, with outside seating areas           | CUP | CUP |     |

**EDUCATION, PUBLIC ASSEMBLY AND RECREATION**

| Adult entertainment businesses                   |     |     | P   | 17.48 |
| Amusement and recreation establishments, indoor   | CUP | CUP | CUP |     |
| Amusement and recreation establishments, outdoor  |     |     | CUP |     |
| Arcades                                         | CUP | CUP |     | 17.38.060 |
| Auditoriums, meeting halls, and theaters          | CUP |     |     |     |
| Health/fitness facilities/spas                   |     | CUP |     |     |
| Industrial training center                       |     |     | P   |     |
| Libraries and reading rooms                      | P   |     |     |     |
| Live entertainment, incidental to an allowed use  | CUP | CUP |     |     |
| Museums                                         |     | P   |     |     |
Table 2-04
Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for
Commercial/Industrial Zoning Districts (see Parking Requirements, Chapter 17.26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Permitted use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Conditional use permit required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Use not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUP</td>
<td>Temporary use permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>Specific Use Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor commercial recreation facilities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious facilities</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, commercial - small</td>
<td>P(1)</td>
<td>P(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, commercial - large</td>
<td>CUP(2)</td>
<td>CUP(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURING, AND PROCESSING USES**

| Aircraft and related aircraft accessories manufacturing | — | — | P |
| Carpet cleaning and dyeing plants | — | — | P |
| Ceramics manufacturing | — | — | P |
| Clothing manufacturing | — | — | P |
| Contractor's storage yards—new materials only | — | — | CUP(4) |
| Construction equipment rental/sales, with incidental repair and service | — | — | CUP |
| Cutlery and handtools manufacturing | — | — | P |
| Food products manufacturing | — | — | P(1) |
| Frozen food locker | — | — | P |
| Furniture and fixtures manufacturing, cabinet shops, and woodworking shops (wholesale only) | — | — | P |
| Hazardous waste facility, off-site | — | — | CUP 17.36 |
| Ice and cold storage plant | — | — | P |
| Laboratories | — | — | P |
| Biological and x-ray | P | P(5) | P |
| Medical and dental | P | P(5) | P |
| Film processing | — | — | P |
| Laundries and dry cleaning plants | — | P | P |
| Machine shop | — | — | P |
| Metal plating | — | — | P |
| Metal working, light fabrication | — | — | P |
| Motor vehicle/transportation equipment manufacturing and | — | — | P |
Table 2-04
Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for Commercial / Industrial Zoning Districts (see Parking Requirements, Chapter 17.26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>Specific Use Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint mixing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper product fabrication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic products fabrication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground bulk storage of petroleum or gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholstery shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesaling &amp; distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENTIAL USES

| CARETAKER OR EMPLOYEE HOUSING                  |     |     | P   |
| Emergency shelters—up to 20 beds             | CUP |     | P   | 17.38.170                      |
| Emergency shelters—more than 20 beds          | CUP |     | CUP | 17.38.170                      |
| Mixed-use projects, residential and commercial|     | CUP |     |                                  |
| Residential care facilities                   | CUP |     |     |                                  |
| Senior residential housing projects           | CUP | CUP |     | 17.38.160                      |
| Single room occupancy unit                    |     |     | CUP | 17.38.180                      |
| Supportive housing                            | CUP |     |     |                                  |
| Transitional housing                          | CUP |     |     |                                  |

RETAIL TRADE (4)
### Table 2-04

**Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for**

*Commercial / Industrial Zoning Districts (see Parking Requirements, Chapter 17.26)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>Specific Use Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic beverage sales, on- or off-site consumption, in conjunction with an allowed use</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic beverage sales, off-site consumption</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiques, art, collectibles, and gifts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and art supplies stores</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries, retail</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries, retail and wholesale</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book, stationery, newspaper, and magazine stores (2)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material yard (new materials)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectionery shops</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience store/mini-mart</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-in and drive-thru sales</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical supply stores</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer's market</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florists</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas/fueling stations</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift shops, specialty shops</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery stores/food markets</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware stores</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry stores</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber yards, planing mills excluded</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical equipment and supplies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle parts stores, incidental installation and repair</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle parts stores, no installation or repair on-site</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle sales, leasing, and rental with or without incidental servicing</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supply stores</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor retail sales and activities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor retail sales, temporary</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-04
Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for
Commercial / Industrial Zoning Districts (see Parking Requirements, Chapter 17.26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>Specific Use Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawn shops</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet stores</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies, drug stores (13)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant nurseries</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales, general</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondhand/consignment shops</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse retail store (big box retail)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal hospital – small animal</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooming services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call centers</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-cashing services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child day care centers</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying, printing, and mailing services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-thru establishments</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry cleaning establishments – no on-site processing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortunetelling/palm reading/psychic reading</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/motels</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet cafés</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry (commercial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE</td>
<td>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</td>
<td>Specific Use Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage establishment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services (state-licensed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics and offices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended care facilities</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities, therapy and rehabilitation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, including convalescent</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuaries</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car washes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impound yards – no dismantling or wrecking</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair incidental to motor vehicle sales, leasing, and rental</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service station</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving companies, storage allowed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photofinishing shops</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography studios</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing services</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property maintenance service</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair services, excluding motor vehicles</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service facilities</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal storage facility</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agencies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and disc rental services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-04
Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for
Commercial / Industrial Zoning Districts (see Parking Requirements, Chapter 17.26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIRED BY ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>Specific Use Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Permit Required by Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antennas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios—motion picture, radio, or television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle and freight terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless communications facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>CUP</th>
<th>CUP</th>
<th>CUP</th>
<th>Permit Required by Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary uses/activities</td>
<td>TUP</td>
<td>TUP</td>
<td>TUP</td>
<td>17.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility facilities, public</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>17.16.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Twenty (20) students or fewer per class, and two thousand five hundred (2,500) square feet or less in net structure area.
(2) Twenty (20) students or more per class, or greater than two thousand five hundred (2,500) in net building area.
(3) Excluding those uses that are regulated under Section 17.48 (Adult Zoning Regulations).
(4) CUP required for retail sales or service establishments that operate between the hours of ten p.m. to six a.m., in the C-O and C-G zoning districts.
(5) On properties with non-arterial street frontage, CUP on properties with arterial street frontage.
(6) In multi-story structures, offices may occupy up to one hundred (100) percent of the gross floor area in the second and higher stories, and up to fifteen (15) percent of the ground floor upon verification of the square footage by the director. In single-story structures located in shopping centers, up to fifteen (15) percent of the gross floor area of the center is allowed for office uses upon verification of the square footage by the director.
(7) Excluding fish and meat products, sauerkraut, vinegar, yeast and the rendering or refining of fats and oils.
(8) Incidental to an allowed industrial use.
(9) No boiling process employed, no aboveground tank farm or surface storage is allowed except above surface thinner storage — which cannot exceed two hundred (200) gallons.
(10) All storage of supplies and equipment shall be within a structure or enclosed area.
Provided that no rubber is melted, that an internal mixer is used and that the residue is collected in compliance with applicable law.

Located at least three hundred (300) feet away from R-1 (Single-Family Residential), R-2 (Limited Multiple-Family Residential), R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential), and C-F (Community Facilities) Zoning Districts.

Commission shall make additional finding that this use is primarily dependent upon activities generated by the industrial uses allowed in the P-M zoning district.

Located at least three hundred (300) feet from any residential or community facilities zoning districts.

All operations are conducted completely within a masonry structure.

Provided that outdoor storage uses are entirely and effectively sight-screened from adjacent public rights-of-way or private property by masonry walls (limited to a maximum height of eight feet), building walls, or view-obscuring landscaping.

Storage and activities shall be conducted within an enclosed structure or an area enclosed by solid, decorative masonry walls with solid gates not less than six feet in height. Walls and gates shall be maintained in a sound and aesthetically pleasing fashion. Vehicles shall be screened from public view and shall not be stacked higher than the block wall. Vehicles may not be stored outside the enclosed yard area. Storage areas shall be paved and landscaped in compliance with applicable standards.

Provided for employees of the primary use. CC&Rs may be required limiting adjacent uses in the same complex to those that are compatible with a (child) day care center.

Dwelling, single where used exclusively by a caretaker or superintendent of an allowed industrial use and their family.

Nonmedical office shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of each Planned Light Industrial Zoned (P-M) parcel.

Excludes medical office.
To: Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Steven A. Mendoza, Community Development/Public Works Director

Subject: Planning Commission Meeting Dates

Summary: During the January Commission Meeting, the Commission agendized a report on changing the Planning Commission meeting dates.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Planning Commission discuss changing the meeting dates and direct Staff accordingly.

Background

During the January meeting, the Commission agendized a report on changing the Planning Commission meeting dates. The date of the Commission meetings can be set by the Commission as dictated in Chapter 2.44.120 of the City’s municipal code as indicated below.

2.44.120 Meetings.
A. Regular Meetings. The commission shall meet in regular session at least once a month at a time and place selected by vote of its members.
B. Special Meetings. The council, the chairman or any four members of the commission shall have the authority to call special meetings of the commission. (Ord. 554 § 1 (b), 1992; Ord. 157 § 11, 1968)

Discussion

The Commission is interested in moving the meetings from Mondays as indicated during an earlier conversation. During this discussion, it will be important to take into consideration the availability of: Commissioner’s, Council Chamber, and the Assistant City Attorney. The table below reflects the availability of the City Council Chamber for which we can hold the meetings. The shaded area of the table represents availability of the 3rd or 4th Wednesday of each month. Thursdays are also available to the Commissioners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cable Commission</td>
<td>Recreation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Traffic Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City Attorney has indicated that Tuesday's are not possible and that Thursday is sometimes a problem.