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1. Introduction

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Revised Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (California Administrative Code Section 15000 et seq.).

According to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132, the FEIR shall consist of:

(a) The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or a revision of the Draft;
(b) Comments and recommendations received on the DEIR either verbatim or in summary;
(c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies comments on the DEIR;
(d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and
(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

This document contains responses to comments received on the DEIR for the Los Alamitos General Plan Update during the public review period, which began August 7, 2014, and closed September 22, 2014. Additionally, responses to comments received after the close of the public review period are also included in this FEIR. This document has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and represents the independent judgment of the Lead Agency. This document and the circulated DEIR comprise the FEIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132.

1.2 FORMAT OF THE FEIR

This document is organized as follows:

Section 1, Introduction. This section describes CEQA requirements and content of this FEIR.

Section 2, Response to Comments. This section provides a list of agencies and interested persons commenting on the DEIR; copies of comment letters received during the public review period, and individual responses to written comments. To facilitate review of the responses, each comment letter has been reproduced and assigned a number (A1 through A7 for letters received from agencies and organizations, and P1 for the letter received from the property owner). Individual comments have been numbered for each letter and the letter is followed by responses with references to the corresponding comment number.
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Section 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR. This section contains revisions to the DEIR text and figures as a result of the comments received by agencies and interested persons as described in Section 2, and/or errors and omissions discovered subsequent to release of the DEIR for public review.

The responses to comments contain material and revisions that will be added to the text of the FEIR. City of Los Alamitos staff has reviewed this material and determined that none of this material constitutes the type of significant new information that requires recirculation of the DEIR for further public comment under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. None of this new material indicates that the project will result in a significant new environmental impact not previously disclosed in the DEIR. Additionally, none of this material indicates that there would be a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact that will not be mitigated, or that there would be any of the other circumstances requiring recirculation described in Section 15088.5.

1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (a) outlines parameters for submitting comments, and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of DEIRs should be “on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible. …CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (c) further advises, “Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.” Section 15204 (d) also states, “Each responsible agency and trustee agency shall focus its comments on environmental information germane to that agency’s statutory responsibility.” Section 15204 (e) states, “This section shall not be used to restrict the ability of reviewers to comment on the general adequacy of a document or of the lead agency to reject comments not focused as recommended by this section.”

In accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, copies of the written responses to public agencies will be forwarded to those agencies at least 10 days prior to certifying the environmental impact report. The responses will be forwarded with copies of this FEIR, as permitted by CEQA, and will conform to the legal standards established for response to comments on DEIRs.
2. Response to Comments

Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the Lead Agency (City of Los Alamitos) to evaluate comments on environmental issues received from public agencies and interested parties who reviewed the DEIR and prepare written responses.

This section provides all written responses received on the DEIR and the City of Los Alamitos’ responses to each comment.

Comment letters and specific comments are given letters and numbers for reference purposes. Where sections of the DEIR are excerpted in this document, the sections are shown indented. Changes to the DEIR text are shown in underlined text for additions and strikeout for deletions.

The following is a list of agencies and persons that submitted comments on the DEIR during the public review period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Reference</th>
<th>Commenting Person/Agency</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Maureen El Harake, California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>September 22, 2014</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Douglas Hawkins, City of Cypress</td>
<td>September 22, 2014</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Harvey R. Gobas, PSOMAS, on behalf of the Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District</td>
<td>September 22, 2014</td>
<td>2-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Daisy Covarrubias, Orange County Sanitation District</td>
<td>September 23, 2014</td>
<td>2-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Michelle Hernandez, Orange County Fire Authority responding to a request from the California Department of Forestry Fire Protection</td>
<td>September 25, 2014</td>
<td>2-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Scott Morgan, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research</td>
<td>September 25, 2014</td>
<td>2-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Larre Brommer, Orange County Public Works</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
<td>2-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Armando Torrez, The Gas Company</td>
<td>November 12, 2014</td>
<td>2-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>James Benenson III and Clement Benenson, Arrowhead Products</td>
<td>September 22, 2014</td>
<td>2-43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Response to Comments

LETTER A1 – California Department of Transportation (1 page)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 12
3347 MICHELSON DRIVE, SUITE 100
IRVINE, CA 92612-8994
PHONE (949) 724-2000
FAX (949) 724-2019
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

September 15, 2014

Steven Mendoza
City of Los Alamitos
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, Ca 90720

File: IGR/CEQA
SCH#: 2013121055
Log #: 3604B
SR-22

Dear Mr. Mendoza:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Los Alamitos General Plan Update. The General Plan Update is intended to provide guidance for long term growth, maintenance, and preservation in the City and Rossmoor over the next 20-plus years. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update would result in a potential buildout total of 8,755 residential units, 23,003 people, 8,811,442 square feet of nonresidential development, and 18,430 jobs in the City and unincorporated community of Rossmoor. The nearest State route to the project site is SR-22.

The Department of Transportation (Department) is a commenting agency on this project and has no comment at this time. However, in the event of any activity in the Department’s right-of-way, an encroachment permit will be required.

Please continue to keep us informed of this project and any future developments that could potentially impact State transportation facilities. If you have any questions or need to contact us, please do not hesitate to call Miya Edmonson at (949) 724-2228.

Sincerely,

MAUREEN EL HARAKE
Branch Chief, Regional-Community-Transit Planning
District 12

C: Scott Morgan, Office of Planning and Research
Eduardo Amezcue, P.E., T.E., MSCE, MSFA

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and quality."
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A1-1 The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is a commenting agency for the General Plan Update. Future projects that occur within the Caltrans right-of-way would be required to coordinate with Caltrans for the required encroachment permits. Per Caltrans’ request, the City will notify Caltrans of future development projects that could potentially impact State transportation facilities.
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LETTER A2 – City of Cypress (4 pages)

CITY of CYPRESS

5275 Orange Avenue, Cypress, California 90630

Phone 714-229-6700 www.ci.cypress.ca.us

September 22, 2014

Mr. Steve Mendoza
Community Development Director
City of Los Alamitos
3181 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720-5600

Subject: Response to Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Los Alamitos 2014 General Plan Update

Dear Mr. Mendoza:

The City of Cypress appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Notice of Availability for the Los Alamitos 2014 General Plan Update and Draft EIR. The following comments identify the City’s concerns and recommendations regarding the proposed General Plan and DEIR.

General Plan Land Use Element:

1. The proposed land use plan would allow for more intense land uses along Katella Avenue due to the creation of a Mixed Use designation and additional area designated for retail uses. The additional retail employment would replace office and industrial employment through changes from Professional Office and Planned Industrial to Retail Business designations along Katella Avenue. However, the potential impacts on the City of Cypress, from the additional retail and multi-family residential uses, is not addressed in the DEIR. A discussion of the anticipated impacts on the City of Cypress, from the new retail development should be added to both the Mobility and Circulation and Land Use Elements of the DEIR.

2. The DEIR does not mention the potential future re-use of the Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB). It is recommended that text be added to the General Plan that in the event the JFTB ever ceases to operate as a military installation, the future development of the property be subject to review by surrounding cities.

General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element:

1. Pages 2 and 12, and Figure 5 – The text and graphics indicate that Ball Road, Bloomfield Street, and Cerritos Avenue are all currently designated as truck routes. However, these streets are not currently shown in the Los Alamitos General Plan as existing truck routes.
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Mr. Steve Mendoza  
September 22, 2014  
Page 2

2. Page 20, Table 2 – The daily traffic volume thresholds are indicated for Major, Primary, and Secondary street classifications. Why weren’t the thresholds for Smart Streets included?

3. Page 23, Table 4 – The table excludes the Lexington Drive roadway segment between Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue. The City of Cypress believes that this roadway segment should be included in the table.

4. Page 24, Forecast Roadway Performance Section - The last paragraph indicates that the degradation of performance at key intersections is due primarily to growth in regional traffic and that the localized growth of Rossmoor and the City associated with the General Plan build-out will not significantly contribute to the performance failure of the intersections and roadways. The City of Cypress believes that growth associated with build-out of the General Plan in both Los Alamitos and Rossmoor would contribute to the further degradation of the key intersections and should be noted as such in the General Plan.

5. Page 2 – The paragraph at the top of the page states that modeling Los Alamitos Boulevard as a four-lane street north of Katella Avenue improved the performance of the intersection at Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue because as a four-lane facility it would not attract as much regional traffic as a six-lane facility. The City of Cypress believes that reducing the number of lanes would not result in increased performance or a reduction in regional traffic for that street segment. An explanation should be provided which clarifies how performance would increase and regional traffic would decrease from the reduction in the number of lanes from six lanes to four lanes.

6. Page 29 – The first paragraph indicates that traffic volumes on Los Alamitos Boulevard decrease to 24-30,000 trips per day north of Katella Avenue. Is there current traffic volume documentation which indicates this number of daily trips or is this an estimate? In addition, at the end of the same paragraph it states that the projected volume in 2035 is not expected to exceed 26-30,000 trips per day. This suggests that “regional” traffic would have no impact on this street segment over the next 20 years, which seems unlikely.

7. Page 29 – The third paragraph states that vehicles on Los Alamitos Boulevard “travel much faster than the posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour”. This would suggest that the speed limit for the street is lower than the 85th percentile and should be increased to reflect actual speeds for that street section.

8. Page 35 – At the end of the second paragraph under the heading of Proposed Class 1 Bike Paths, it discusses the potential use of drainage channels, including the Carbon Creek Channel, for a Class 1 bike path. This issue has been previously discussed with the County and Cypress residents who expressed their
2. Response to Comments

Mr. Steve Mendoza
September 22, 2014
Page 3

strong opposition to the addition of a bike lane along the existing channel. The objections were due to the current elevation of the access roadway located on both sides of the channel and the privacy impacts which would occur for those properties which are adjacent to the channel. Therefore, Cypress does not see the Carbon Creek Channel as a viable option for a Class I bike lane.

9. Page 39 – The third paragraph discusses the option of a Pedestrian Scramble as an intersection improvement at Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue. Due to its potential impact on signal timing on Katella Avenue, it is suggested that this option be deleted.

10. Page 44 – Action item 1.4 states that signal coordination on arterials should be improved, where feasible, in conjunction with neighboring jurisdictions. It is suggested that “where feasible” be removed from this section.

11. Page 45 – Under the section titled “Implementation”, Action item 2.1, Road Diets, indicates that roadway widths should be minimized on local streets to discourage through traffic. However, it does not indicate where these Road Diets would be utilized or implemented.

12. Page 47 – Under the section titled “Implementation”, Action item 4.4 includes Pedestrian Scrambles, as a new design option for crossing large intersections. As indicated in comment No. 9 above, it is suggested that this option be deleted.

13. The Level of Service (LOS) intersection calculations noted at several locations within the document were taken from four different traffic studies conducted over a six year period (2009-2013). Therefore, the calculations do not represent an accurate depiction of existing traffic levels and updated calculations should be conducted.

14. The Level of Service (LOS) roadway segment calculations noted at several locations within the document were taken from three different traffic studies which were conducted over a three year period (2010-2012). These studies do not represent an accurate depiction of existing traffic levels and updated calculations should be conducted.

DEIR – Transportation and Traffic

1. The DEIR exempts intersection/roadway segments that need improvements due to existing right-of-way constraints. Has the City of Los Alamitos explored modifications to any of those intersections or street sections with the current property owners?

2. Page 5.11-6 – In the last line of the last paragraph, “Cerritos Avenue” should be changed to “Ball Road”.

A2-11
A2-12
A2-13
A2-14
A2-15
A2-16
A2-17
A2-18
A2-19
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Mr. Steve Mendoza
September 22, 2014
Page 4

3. Page 5.11-9 – The dates of the traffic studies referenced in the second paragraph under Existing Traffic Conditions are not consistent with what is referenced in the tables contained in the General Plan.

4. Page 5.11-28 – Table 5.11-6 indicates that traffic volume on Los Alamitos Boulevard, between Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue, will only increase by three vehicles over the next 20 years. This seems highly unlikely given the potential for an increase in regional traffic over the next 20 years. What factors were considered to reach this conclusion?

The City would like to thank you again for the opportunity to review the DEIR. If you have any questions regarding this letter, you may contact me at (714) 229-6727, or for questions related to traffic please contact the City’s traffic engineer, Keith Carter, at (714) 229-6750.

On a side note, the City of Cypress is interested in working with the City of Los Alamitos in the near future to address access issues for those properties located adjacent to Katella Avenue.

Sincerely,

Douglas Hawkins
Planning Manager
Community Development Department

cc: City Council
Peter Grant, City Manager
Doug Dancs, P.E., Director of Public Works/City Engineer and Acting Director of Community Development
A2. Response to Comments

Douglas Hawkins, Planning Manager, Community Development Department, City of Cypress, dated September 22, 2014, received September 22, 2014.

A2-1 Responses to comments provided by the City of Cypress are identified in Comments A2-2 through A2-21 below.

A2-2 As discussed in Section 4.4 of the DEIR, in most cases, the potential for cumulative impacts is contiguous with the City and sphere of influence (SOI) boundary. Cumulative impacts that have the potential for impacts beyond the City boundary (e.g., traffic, air quality, noise) have been addressed through cumulative growth in the City and region. Regional growth outside Los Alamitos has accounted for traffic, air quality, and noise impacts through use of the Orange County Transportation Authority’s (OCTA) countywide travel demand model, which is a model that uses regional growth projections to calculate future traffic volumes. The growth projections adopted by the City and surrounding area are used for the cumulative impact analyses of this DEIR. The area of potential affect for each environmental topic is described in the Chapter 5 subsections of the EIR. Some environmental topical areas such as cultural resources, aesthetics, geology and soils, etc. are more localized and would not have impacts outside the City boundaries. However, other environmental topic areas, such as traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, etc., could have an area of affect that extends beyond the City’s boundaries. Where necessary, the DEIR evaluates potential environmental impacts that may occur outside of the City’s boundary, as discussed below.

For population and housing impacts, growth from General Plan buildout and overall growth in the North Orange County region, including the City of Cypress, is discussed in DEIR Section 5.12, Population and Housing. Land use decisions outside of the City of Los Alamitos are under the control of other jurisdictions: Orange County and the cities of Seal Beach, Cypress, Anaheim, Stanton, and Westminster. Likewise, impacts to public services and utilities and service systems are based on the public agency’s affected area of service (e.g., Los Alamitos Unified School District, Orange County Fire Authority, Los Alamitos Police Department, etc.).

Cumulative growth outside the City is considered for traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions through use of the countywide Orange County Traffic Analysis Model (OCTAM) (see also Section 5.11, Transportation and Traffic).

Air quality impacts extend significantly further than the City of Los Alamitos’ boundaries and are based on emissions within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). Likewise, greenhouse gas emissions impacts are based on impacts generated within the State of California.

Traffic impacts are based on the traffic study area boundary as detailed on page 5.11-25. As identified above, traffic impacts are based on OCTAM’s regional transportation model, which includes regional growth and growth from neighboring jurisdictions. In
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In addition, four intersections were evaluated within the traffic study area that share a boundary with the City of Cypress including, Bloomfield Street at Ball Road, Bloomfield Street at Cerritos Avenue, Lexington Drive at Katella Avenue and Walker Street and Katella Avenue. Katella Avenue is designated on the Orange County Transportation Authority’s (OCTA) Congestion Management Program (CMP) as an Arterial Highway. Development projects that trigger the CMP threshold are required to prepare a traffic study and would be required to evaluate impacts based on the respective jurisdictions LOS standards. The City of Los Alamitos requires, as a Standard Condition of approval, that development projects that require a traffic study mitigate their fair share of impacts, including impacts in the City of Cypress. Furthermore, one of the required elements of OCTA’s CMP is a program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on regional transportation systems, including an estimate of the costs associated with mitigating those impacts. It should be noted that on Katella Avenue traffic volumes generated by the proposed project represent an increasingly smaller proportion of total traffic farther east of Katella Avenue. Given that no significant intersections impacts were identified east of the intersection of Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard, it can generally be ascertained that the proposed project would not cumulatively contribute to deficient intersections within the City of Cypress on Katella Avenue.

Noise impacts from stationary sources and from construction activities are generally confined to the localized area of impact where the sources originate. However, traffic-related noise generated by an increase in vehicle trips contributes to the ambient noise environment. The DEIR did not identify a significant long-term traffic noise impact. In general traffic volumes would need to double in order to generate an audible increase (3 decibels [dBA]) in noise levels. Similar to traffic, City of Los Alamitos related traffic; and as such, traffic-related noise, represents an increasingly smaller proportion of total traffic farther east of Katella Avenue and given the magnitude of traffic on Katella would not represent an audible increase in noise levels.

Furthermore, CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1)(B) identifies that environmental effects of a general plan project are inherently cumulative in nature. Consequently, the EIR appropriately evaluates environmental impacts based on the applicable area of affect boundary.

The General Plan identifies the Los Alamitos JFTB and “Community & Institutional/JFTB.” As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, the City has no jurisdiction or land use authority on the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB). Furthermore, the Los Alamitos JFTB is not currently on the base closure list.

It should be noted that base closure is regulated under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 regulate the transfer and disposal of US military installation closed during the base
2. Response to Comments

realignment and closure (BRAC) process. If the military installation is deemed “surplus” to the needs of the federal government the redevelopment planning process includes formation of a local redevelopment authority to create a local redevelopment plan. The local redevelopment authority includes various interested representatives of the community affected by the BRAC actions.

A2-4 Truck routes are identified through City Resolution 1496. The General Plan Update circulated with the EIR and posted on the City’s website during the DEIR public review period currently identifies these segments as “Designated Truck Routes” in the text but incorrectly identifies them on General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element, Figure 5, Truck Routes. Figure 5 shows Bloomfield Street between Cerritos Avenue and Ball Road as a truck route. This is not a truck route and Figure 5 will be revised in the General Plan.

A2-5 Requested revisions to the General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element, Table 2, Maximum Daily Roadway Capacities, will be reviewed and will be modified in the General Plan, as necessary. However, the General Plan Update circulated with the EIR and posted on the City’s website during the DEIR public review period currently shows a level of service (LOS) E threshold for 6 lane divided roadways as 60,000 vehicles per day and a LOS E threshold for 8 lane divided roadways as 72,000 vehicles per day. Therefore, no revisions to the General Plan are necessary.

A2-6 Table 4, Existing (2013) Roadway Segment Volume and Level of Service, in the Mobility and Circulation Element doesn’t currently reference a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio for Lexington drive between Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue. However, the OCTAM model was used to evaluate impacts of the proposed project and includes data for this segment. The raw OCTAM travel demand forecasts estimates that daily traffic volumes with the General Plan would accommodate 7,000 average daily trips (ADT) on Lexington Drive between Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue. Currently, this segment of Lexington Drive is a two-lane facility. However, Lexington Drive is classified as a Secondary Arterial in the General Plan (see Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, and also Appendix A, which shows revised Figure 5.11-1 and Figure 5.11-5 in the EIR, which correctly identifies Lexington Drive as a Secondary Arterial). Secondary Arterials are planned as a four-lane roadway and can accommodate up to 22,000 vehicles per day and still maintain an LOS D, which is substantially lower than the estimated 7,000 ADT at General Plan buildout along this segment. If the Arrowhead Products site is redeveloped as retail, the City would require the Applicant to dedicate the right-of-way required to ensure buildout of this roadway under the City’s roadway classification as a Secondary Arterial in order to accommodate two travel lanes in each direction on Lexington Drive. Consequently, this segment would operate at LOS A with implementation of the General Plan.
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A2-7 During the development of the General Plan Update, Fehr & Peers completed a select link assessment utilizing the OCTAM model. A select link shows the models estimate of where traffic origins and destinations are for traffic on a select roadway segment. Appendix B identifies the select link assessment that was completed on Los Alamitos Boulevard, just north of Katella Avenue. The results show that, although some trips are destined for Los Alamitos and/or Rossmoor, most of the trips on this segment of roadway are due to regional traffic. Based on the low percentage of City traffic growth compared to regional traffic growth, the traffic study has identified that City traffic represent a small proportion of impacts. Consequently, the comment identified in the General Plan is representative of traffic operations in the area.

A2-8 See also response to Comment A2-7, the select link assessment modeled with OCTAM provided in Appendix B identifies that a substantial portion of the traffic on Los Alamitos Boulevard is due to regional traffic. The General Plan Update identifies Los Alamitos Boulevard north of Katella Avenue as a Primary Arterial. Consequently, the City proposes to maintain the roadway as a four lane facility and implement streetscape improvements to provide better pedestrian and bicycle accessibility to this area, which would have the effect of reducing travel speeds. The OCTAM is sensitive to the number of travel lanes as well as travel speeds. Consequently, retaining Los Alamitos Boulevard as a four lane roadway will not attract as many trips as if Los Alamitos would designate this segment as a six-lane roadway. Additionally, the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and Metro are planning improvements to the freeway system in this area, including Interstate 605 (I-605) and Interstate 405 (I-405). The corresponding results of slowing speeds on Los Alamitos Boulevard and regional improvements would decrease demand and would improve operations in this area.

A2-9 The traffic volumes summarized by the Commenter are consistent with the traffic volumes in Tables 4 and 6 of the General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element which are based on forecasting from the OCTAM travel demand model. See also response to Comment A2-8 regarding why increases in regional traffic in this area will not substantially increase travel on this facility.

A2-10 The General Plan states that the extra-wide roadway width encourages cars and trucks to travel much faster than the posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour. This statement was included in the General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element based on public input received during the General Plan process. The Commenter refers to a threshold of 85th percentile, however, this requires a speed study to ascertain, which was not conducted as part of the General Plan. In addition, the General Plan does not state that the average speed is in excess of the speed limit. Since, the language could be interpreted to imply that, the text is revised as follows in the General Plan, “In addition to a daunting crossing distance, the extra-wide roadway encourages cars and trucks to travel faster.”
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This statement is supported directly by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).¹

A2-11 The proposed Class I facility identified in the General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element would run between and connect the Coyote Creek bicycle path and an existing Class II bicycle facility along Bloomfield Street. This alignment runs along the Los Alamitos High School and facilitates connections to McAuliffe Middle School and Los Alamitos Elementary School. The City strives to reduce the reliance on vehicles for children to safely travel to schools. The proposed facility would only run within the City of Los Alamitos and would not extend into Cypress or any unincorporated County areas.

A2-12 As stated in the Element, Pedestrian Scramble phases can be a solution to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, but can be detrimental to auto travel along corridors as it can disrupt signal timing. If the City were to consider this type of improvement, a detailed assessment would be completed to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the improvement.

A2-13 Action items have been removed from the General Plan. Should they be implemented as projects, they would be analyzed.

A2-14 Action items have been removed from the General Plan. Should they be implemented as projects, they would be analyzed.

A2-15 Action items have been removed from the General Plan. Should they be implemented as projects, they would be analyzed.

A2-16 In many cities throughout California, traffic counts remained consistent or declined with the economic downturn between 2008 and 2012. This is reflected when reviewing the Orange County CMP and the monitoring that occurs at the only CMP-designated intersection in the City, the I-605 northbound ramps at Katella Avenue. In 2009, the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio was reported at 0.44 in the AM peak hour and 0.65 in the PM peak hour. For the 2013 CMP monitoring, the same intersection was reported to have a V/C ratio of 0.35 and 0.54 during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. This supports the fact that congestion has generally remained the same or declined during the economic recession and use of the referenced traffic counts for this long-range planning effort are appropriate.

A2-17 See response to Comment A2-16, congestion has generally remained the same or declined during the economic recession and use of the referenced traffic counts for this long-range planning effort are appropriate.

The General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element reflects the policies of the City of Los Alamitos. The City’s Mobility and Circulation Element policies balance the City’s transportation desires with the fiscal impacts of maintaining the City’s transportation system. The City’s Mobility and Circulation Element also integrates policies for Complete Streets in accordance with Assembly Bill 1358, the Complete Streets Act (2008), which requires that the City’s transportation system meet the needs of all users/modes of travel including walking, biking, car travel, and transit. Mobility and Circulation Element Policy 1.4 identifies that there are certain conditions, which if met, would indicate that it is more desirable to allow for congested traffic conditions. These conditions include (A.) a desire to prioritize pedestrians and/or bicyclists over vehicles, (B.) if insufficient right-of-way (ROW) exists, and/or (C.) if the intersection or roadway is considered built out. Policy 1.4 identifies the following roadways and intersections that are exempt from LOS D:

- Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard intersection
- Katella Avenue and Walnut Street/Wallingsford Road intersection
- Bloomfield Street and Cerritos Avenue intersection
- Katella Avenue (between Interstate 605 and Walker Street)
- Cerritos Avenue (between Interstate 605 and Los Alamitos Boulevard)

The intersections above meet one or all three of these conditions; and therefore, are identified in Policy 1.4 as being exempt from the LOS D standard. In each of these cases the ROW abuts the property line. Along each of the four legs there are either buildings and/or parking adjacent to the curb. Therefore, to maintain LOS D would require demolition of existing structures and/or elimination of parking. While it may be possible to acquire additional ROW in the future at the time development is proposed, no discussions with the potentially affected property owners have occurred at this time. From a general plan policy perspective, it is not desirable to have the City require dedication of the necessary ROW and loss of property to decrease automobile delay (to reduce the amount of time a person has to sit in a car at an intersection), while increasing the maintenance costs for these facilities. It should be noted that Senate Bill 743 (2013) requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to LOS for evaluating transportation impacts. Under OPR’s current proposal, delay would no longer be classified as an impact on the environment. While this General Plan Update is moving forward prior to the revisions to the CEQA Guidelines that will redefine traffic impacts, SB 743 highlights that the other transportation priorities, including alternative modes of travel to the automobile and fiscal constraints can be weighted more heavily when rejecting transportation improvements that would only benefit one mode of travel at the expense of other policy considerations of the City.
2. Response to Comments

A2-19 The Commenter is referring to previous Comment A2-4 where the General Plan showed a figure that the truck route extended from Katella Avenue to Ball Street. While the figure was incorrect in the General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element, the text was correct (see response to Comment A2-4). The text in the DEIR thus also correctly describes the truck route along Bloomfield Street, which extends only to Cerritos Avenue, per the City’s Resolution 1496. Consequently, the statement in the DEIR that Bloomfield Street is a designated truck route between Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue does not require any modifications.

A2-20 The dates cited in the DEIR are the correct dates cited in the May 15, 2014 traffic study. The existing intersection traffic counts were compiled from a variety of sources, including: traffic counts conducted by Fehr and Peers in September 2012, the June 2011 Los Alamitos Boulevard Corridor Traffic Study, the June 2010 Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis, and the 2013 Orange County CMP. The General Plan Mobility and Circulation Element will be revised to reflect the correct reference dates.

A2-21 See response to Comment A2-8 and 2-9 regarding why increases in regional traffic in this area will not substantially increase travel on this facility.

A2-22 The City will coordinate with the City of Cypress and the City’s traffic engineer if questions regarding the City of Cypress’s comments arise.

A2-23 The City of Los Alamitos will coordinate with the City of Cypress on future projects adjacent to Katella Avenue.
2. Response to Comments
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LETTER A3– Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District (1 page)

From: Harvey Gobas [mailto:hgobas@psomas.com]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2014 4:10 PM
To: Steven Mendoza
Cc: Susan Bell (sewerdistrict@aol.com); Mains Torres; Mike Swan
Subject: RLAASD Comments on DEIR for the City’s General Plan Update

Good Afternoon Mr. Mendoza

As District Engineer for the Rossmoor Los Alamitos Area Sewer District (RLAASD) and the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) for the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Update, I would like to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the City’s General Plan Update, with particular focus on Section 5.12.1 (Wastewater Treatment and Collection). The comments below follow:

1. The information presented for the RLAASD appears to be generally accurate.

2. The information presented for the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) trunk lines and Westside Lift Station serving RLAASD also appears generally accurate; however, any information pertaining to OCSD should be confirmed directly with that agency. Information regarding OCSD’s treatment system should also be confirmed directly with OCSD.

3. Page 5-12.2 makes reference to three adjacent sewer systems (El Dorado Park Estates East and Bungalows, Country Square and Parkwood). For clarity, you may wish to consider depicting these three areas on Figure 5.12.2 Sewer Plan.

4. Figure 5.12-2 refers to “Parcels Served by Long Beach Water District.” Please note there is a typo in the spelling of “serviced” (it should be “served”). Please also note, the reference should be to Long Beach Water “Department” (not “District”).

5. While not a part of the DEIR, it should also be noted that the Draft General Plan Update dated July 2014 incorrectly states the name of the RLAASD as “Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Sewer District” (the word “Area” is missing). Similarly, there are a number of misstated acronyms throughout that document (RLASD instead of the correct reference to RLAASD).

Thank you for the opportunity to review this DEIR and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Harvey R. Gobas, PE, ENV SP
PSOMAS | Balancing the Natural and Built Environment
Vice President
Water and Wastewater Infrastructure
714.481.7992 | cell 562.618.3181
www.Psomas.com
2. Response to Comments
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2. Response to Comments


A3-1 The Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District (R/LAASD) has identified that the information in the DEIR is generally accurate and no response is necessary.

A3-2 Future development projects within the City will be required to coordinate with the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) regarding OCSD’s facilities. OCSD has separately commented on the DEIR (see responses to Comment A4-1).

A3-3 At the request of the Commenter, Figure 5.12-2 has been amended in the FEIR to show the El Dorado Park Estates East and Bungalows, the County Square, and the Parkwood sewer system locations (see Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR).

A3-4 At the request of the Commenter Figure 5.12-2 has been revised to state “Parcels Served by the Long Beach Water Department” (see Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR).

A3-5 The R/LAASD comments on the General Plan Element regarding the R/LAASD acronym and name are noted and will be corrected in the finalized General Plan.
2. Response to Comments
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LETTER A4 – Orange County Sanitation District (1 page)

September 23, 2014

Steven Mendoza, Community Development Director
City of Los Alamitos
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Los Alamitos General Plan Update

Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Los Alamitos General Plan Update. The proposed project intends to provide guidance for long-term growth, maintenance, and preservation in Los Alamitos (City).

Please note the following comments in the Final EIR for the project:

Per OCSD Strategic Plan Update (2008) and Facilities Master Plan (2009), a portion of the Los Alamitos Sub-trunk Sewer located in Denny Street and Westside Relief Interceptor located in Katella Avenue is capacity deficient and has been identified as a future project. The project is in the initial scoping phase; however, in addition to the increased pipeline capacity, the project will most likely also consist of rehabilitation of the Western Relief Interceptor as mentioned in section 5.12.1.1. Future developments may impact the capacity issue so please ensure OCSD is kept informed of that type of activity, so we can accurately upsize our trunk lines.

Coordinating efforts between the City and OCSD is imperative to ensure the success of our projects. Please contact me for any questions or additional information needed. I can be reached at 714-593-7119 or via e-mail at dcovarrubias@ocsd.com

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document.

Daisy Covarrubias, MPA
Senior Staff Analyst

DC:sa
EDMS: 003997177/1.8g

We protect public health and the environment by providing effective wastewater collection, treatment, and recycling.
2. Response to Comments
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A4. Response to Comments from Daisy Covarrubias, MPA, Senior Staff Analyst, Orange County Sanitation District, dated September 23, 2014, received September 23, 2014.

A4-1 The Orange County Sanitation District's (OCSD) comment regarding the current deficiency for the OCSD facility within Katella Avenue and plans to increase the pipeline capacity are noted. Individual projects that have the potential to impact OCSD facilities are required to pay Capital Facilities Fee Charges to OCSD to fund regional sewer improvements. Future development projects that have the potential to impact OCSD's facilities will be required to coordinate with OCSD to ensure sufficient sewer capacity and payment of Capital Facilities Fee Charges.
2. Response to Comments
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LETTER A5 – California Department of Forestry Fire Protection/Orange County Fire Authority (1 page)
2. Response to Comments
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A5. **Response to Comments from Michelle Hernandez, Management Analyst, Orange County Fire Authority, submitted to the California Department of Forestry Fire Protection, dated on August 12, 2014, received September 25, 2014.**

A5-1 The California Fire Authority (OCFA) has responded to a request from the California Department of Forestry Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) on determining the appropriate level of CAL FIRE involvement. According to OCFA there are no major impacts to fire service. The City of Los Alamitos is not within a local responsibility area (LRA) with wildlands or an urban interface.
2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.
LETTER A6 – Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (2 pages)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR’S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

September 23, 2014

Dear Steven Mendoza,

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on September 22, 2014, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21194(e) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.”

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street, P.O. Box 3044  Sacramento, California 95812-3044  
(916) 445-0613  FAX (916) 323-3018  www.opcr.ca.gov
2. Response to Comments

**Document Details Report**

**State Clearinghouse Data Base**

**SCH#** 2013121055

**Project Title** Los Alamitos General Plan Update

**Lead Agency** City of Los Alamitos

**Type** EIR Draft EIR

**Description** The proposed project is an update to the City of Los Alamitos General Plan. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update is intended to shape development in the City and the unincorporated community of Rossmoor over the next 20-plus years. The Los Alamitos General Plan Update involves a revision of the current General Plan into the following: six required elements and two optional elements: Land Use Element, Circulation and Transportation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation Element, Safety Element, Noise Element, Economic Development Element, and Growth Management Element. The General Plan Update would result in a total of 8,753 residential units, a population of 23,003 people, 8,681,442 sf of non-residential development, and 18,430 jobs in the City and unincorporated community of Rossmoor.

**Lead Agency Contact**

- **Name** Steven Mendoza
- **Agency** City of Los Alamitos
- **Phone** (562) 431-3638 x300
- **Email**
- **Address** 3101 Katella Avenue
- **City** City of Los Alamitos
- **State** CA
- **Zip** 90720

**Project Location**

- **County** Orange
- **City** Los Alamitos
- **Region**
- **Lat/Long** 33° 49' 11" N / 118° 4' 21" W
- **Cross Streets** Citywide
- **Parcel No.** Various
- **Township**

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways** Hwy 20
- **Airports** Long Beach, Los Al AAF
- **Railways** UP RR
- **Waterways** San Gabriel River, Coyote Creek
- **Schools** Various
- **Land Use** Various

**Project Issues** Air Quality; Archaeological History; Noise; Population; Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Supply; Lenduse; Cumulative Effects

**Reviewing Agencies** Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Cal Fire; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Office of Emergency Services, California; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 12; Department of Housing and Community Development; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 8; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission

**Date Received** 08/07/2014  
**Start of Review** 08/07/2014  
**End of Review** 09/22/2014

---

Page 2-32  
PlaceWorks
A6. Response to Comments from Scott Morgan, Director, Governor's Officer of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, dated September 23, 2014, received September 25, 2014.

A6-1 The comment states that the City of Los Alamitos has complied with State Clearinghouse requirements for public review of the DEIR for the proposed project. The attachment is the listing of the DEIR in the State Clearinghouse data base. No response is needed.
LETTER A7 – Orange County Public Works (1 page)

September 18, 2014

Mr. Steven Mendoza, Community Development Director
City of Los Alamitos
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, California 90720

SUBJECT: Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Update:

Dear Mr. Mendoza:

The County of Orange has reviewed the Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Update located in City of Los Alamitos and has no comments at this time. We would like to be advised of any further developments on the project. Please continue to keep us on the distribution list for future notifications related to this project.

Sincerely,

Laree Brommer, Manager
OC Public Works Service Area/Planning Services
300 North Flower Street
Santa Ana, California 92702-4048
Laree.brommer@ocpw.ocgov.com

Lb/yj

A7-1
2. Response to Comments
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A7. Response to Comments from Laree Brommer, Manager, Orange County Public Works Service Area/Planning Services, dated September 18, 2014, received September 30, 2014.

A7-1 The Orange County Public Works has been placed on the City’s distribution list and will be advised of future developments regarding the General Plan Update.
2. Response to Comments
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LETTER A8 – The Gas Company (1 page)

November 12, 2014
City of Los Alamitos
3191 Katella Ave
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Attn: Steven Mendoza

Subject: Environmental Impact Report for Los Alamitos General Plan Update

Thank you for providing the opportunity to respond to this EIR Document. We are pleased to inform you that Southern California Gas Company has facilities in the area where the aforementioned project is proposed. Gas service to the project can be provided from an existing gas main located in various locations. The service will be in accordance with the Company’s policies and extension rules on file with the California Public Utilities Commission when the contractual arrangements are made.

This letter is not a contractual commitment to serve the proposed project but is only provided as an informational service. The availability of natural gas service is based on conditions of gas supply and regulatory agencies. As a Public Utility, Southern California Gas Company is under the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission. Our ability to serve can also be affected by actions of federal regulatory agencies. Should these agencies take any action which affect gas supply or the conditions under which service is available, gas service will be provided in accordance with the revised conditions.

This letter is also provided without considering any conditions or non-utility laws and regulations (such as environmental regulations), which could affect construction of a main and/or service line extension (i.e., if hazardous wastes were encountered in the process of installing the line). The regulations can only be determined around the time contractual arrangements are made and construction has begun.

Estimates of gas usage for residential and non-residential projects are developed on an individual basis and are obtained from the Commercial-Industrial/Residential Market Services Staff by calling (800) 427-2080 (Commercial/Industrial Customers) (800) 427-2200 (Residential Customers). We have developed several programs, which are available upon request to provide assistance in selecting the most energy efficient appliances or systems for a particular project. If you desire further information on any of our energy conservation programs, please contact this office for assistance.

Sincerely,

Armando Torrez
Planning Supervisor
Southeast Region - Anaheim Planning & Engineering
2. Response to Comments
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A8-1 The comment is a general letter stating that The Gas Company has facilities in the City and gas service would be provided in accordance with The Gas Company's policies. No response is needed.
2. Response to Comments
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LETTER P1 – James Benenson III and Clement Benenson (1 page)

Benenson Family Office
8203 Brecksbridge Road, Suite 100
Brecksville, Ohio 44141-1316
+1.440.838.4700 Fax +1.440.838.4702

September 22, 2014

Steven Mendoza
City of Los Alamitos
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Re: Comments on the General Plan Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Mendoza:

Our family controls Arrowhead Products located at 4411 Katella Avenue and the 28 acres ("Property") on which it is situated. The City’s current General Plan designates our Property for Industrial use. As described in the Draft Land Use Element of the proposed General Plan, Arrowhead Products is a manufacturing business for the aerospace industry and “the City supports its continued operation and success.” Arrowhead has been operating in the City for a number of years, and our plans are to continue our operations at our Property.

The Draft Land Use Element proposes to designate the Property for Retail Business which could be developed if, as the Draft states, “the company ever decides to move locations or change its business.” While we appreciate the City’s interest in anticipating a land use that would take advantage of our location along Katella Avenue, at this time, we would like to request that the City retain an industrial land use designation for our Property. We are supportive of the City’s goals to maximize retail along Katella (see Goal 2, Policy 2.3 at Land Use Element page 23). Retail may be considered in the future, but at this time, retaining the industrial land use designation would be more appropriate for Arrowhead’s operations.

The purpose of this letter is to request that as you finalize the Draft Land Use Element, the land use designation for our Property be changed to "Planned Industrial" in the final draft of the Land Use Element that is presented to the City Planning Commission and City Council for approval. The Planned Industrial land use designation will allow us to continue our operations consistent with the General Plan.

We support the City’s efforts to update its General Plan and the opportunity provide these comments and our requested change to you for your consideration.

James Benenson III Clement Benenson
2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

P1-1 | The 28-acre Arrowhead Products site is located at 4411 Katella Avenue. The EIR evaluated potential environmental impacts associated with conversion of the Arrowhead Products site from Planned Industrial to Retail Business. The DEIR identified that buildout of the Land Use Plan would generate additional vehicle trips and associated transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts. The DEIR evaluated a range of alternatives that would reduce potential environmental impacts. One of the alternatives evaluated in the DEIR was the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative. As identified in Chapter 7 of the DEIR, under this alternative, the Arrowhead Products site would remain Planned Industrial. As stated in Chapter 7, “Industrial land uses generate less traffic than retail uses, and no changes from existing conditions would occur for this parcel. Consequently, this alternative was chosen because it would reduce traffic, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts of the proposed project.” Fehr and Peers, the traffic engineer for the proposed project conducted a trip evaluation for the Planned Industrial and the Retail Business uses on the 28-acre site using standard Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) trip generation rates. At buildout, the existing Planned Industrial use would generate 1,835 average daily trips while the Retail Business would generate 11,243 average daily trips. Consequently, this alternative would generate at least 9,000 fewer trips than the proposed Project. As identified in the DEIR, this alternative would have the same or slightly less environmental impacts compared to the proposed project evaluated in the DEIR. For these reasons, the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

Since the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative would generate at least 9,000 fewer trips and would reduce environmental impacts, including transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise, below what was analyzed in the EIR, the City of Los Alamitos, if so desired, could adopt the proposed project with the requested change to the Arrowhead Products site to Planned Industrial without any additional environmental review.

Arrowhead Products request to remain Planned Industrial will be forwarded to decision-makers for their consideration.

---

2 Buildout assumptions for the Arrowhead Products site are based on the Current General Plan Alternative, which identified a 10 percent increase in building square footage on the 28-acre site. The buildout assumptions for the Retail Business are based on the proposed project, which assumes the site will be primarily retail.
2. Response to Comments

This page intentionally left blank.
3. **Revisions to the Draft EIR**

3.1 **INTRODUCTION**

This section contains revisions to the DEIR based upon (1) additional or revised information required to prepare a response to a specific comment; (2) applicable updated information that was not available at the time of DEIR publication; and/or (3) typographical errors. This section also includes additional mitigation measures to fully respond to commenter concerns as well as provide additional clarification to mitigation requirements included in the DEIR.

None of the revisions to the DEIR require recirculation of the document. Recirculation is only required when significant new information is added. Information is not 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 or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect. Recirculation is not required where the new information merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications. (CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5.) As explained below, none of the changes adds any new significant information and recirculation is not required.

Changes made to the DEIR are identified here in **strikeout text** to indicate deletions and in **underlined text** to signify additions.

In addition, on Monday November 10, 2014, during the public hearing on the General Plan Update, the Los Alamitos Planning Commission recommended changes to Proposed Land Use Plan. Appendix D of this FEIR includes an evaluation of the environmental effects from the recommended changes identified by the City of Los Alamitos Planning Commission during the Planning Commission hearing. As identified in Appendix D, the recommended changes to the land use plan are not significant new information that requires recirculation of the DEIR for further public comment under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The recommended changes to the land use plan would not result in new significant environment impacts. Additionally, the recommended changes to the land use plan would not substantially increase the magnitude of existing environmental impacts described in the DEIR, and there would not be any other circumstances requiring recirculation described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The recommended changes to the land use plan described below are variations on what has already been presented as they fall between the impacts discussed of the proposed project and the impacts discussed in the No Project Alternative; and therefore, represent insignificant modifications to the DEIR.
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

3.2 DEIR REVISIONS IN RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS AND TECHNICAL REVISIONS

The following text has been revised in response to comments received on the DEIR.

Page 1-11, Chapter 1, Executive Summary, Table 1-1, Land Use Designations. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to refine the definition the Mixed Use (MU) land use designation to clarify the preference for specific land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation and Density / Intensity Range</th>
<th>Description of Typical Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Vertical or horizontal mix of commercial, office, and/or residential uses on the same parcel. Retail is preferred on the ground floor. Office uses and attached single family and multiple family housing should be above the ground floor. Stand-alone (not mixed-use) commercial, office, and public/quasi-public uses are also permitted. For parcels that front Los Alamitos Boulevard or Katella Avenue, the ground floor is required to consist of those uses permitted or conditionally permitted in the General Commercial Zoning District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1-15, Chapter 1, Executive Summary, Figure 1-3, Existing Land Use. Minor technical corrections have been made to Figure 1-3 to reflect a parcel that contains both residential and office.

See Appendix A for revisions to Figure 1-3.

Page 1-17, Chapter 1, Executive Summary, Figure 1-4, Proposed Land Use Plan. Minor technical corrections have been made to Figure 1-3 to reflect the proper boundaries of the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan Boundary and changes to the Final Land Use Plan described in the Environmental Impacts of the Planning Commission’s Recommended Changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan Memorandum (see Appendix D).

See Appendix A for revisions to Figure 1-4.

Page 3-9, Chapter 3, Project Description, Figure 3-3, Existing Land Use. Minor technical corrections have been made to Figure 1-3 to reflect a parcel that contains both residential and office.

See Appendix A for revisions to Figure 3-3.
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 3-15, Chapter 3, Project Description, Table 3-2, Land Use Designations. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to refine the definition the Mixed Use (MU) land use designation to clarify the preference for specific land uses.

Table 3-2 Land Use Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation and Density / Intensity Range</th>
<th>Description of Typical Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Max FAR 2.0 30 du/ac</td>
<td>Vertical or horizontal mix of commercial, office, and/or residential uses on the same parcel. Retail is preferred on the ground floor. Office uses and attached single-family and multiple-family housing should be above the ground floor. Stand-alone (not mixed-use) commercial, office, and public/quasi-public uses are also permitted. For parcels that front Los Alamitos Boulevard or Katella Avenue, the ground floor is required to consist of those uses permitted or conditionally permitted in the General Commercial Zoning District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 3-19, Chapter 3, Project Description, Figure 3-5, Proposed Land Use Plan. Minor technical corrections have been made to Figure 1-3 to reflect the proper boundaries of the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan Boundary and changes to the Final Land Use Plan described in the Environmental Impacts of the Planning Commission’s Recommended Changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan Memorandum (see Appendix D).

See Appendix A for revisions to Figure 3-5.

Page 3-23, Chapter 3, Project Description, Table 3-4, Proposed City of Los Alamitos General Plan Policies. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect changes to Economic Development Element Policy 1.4 and Policy 1.5.

Table 3-4 Proposed City of Los Alamitos General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.4</td>
<td>Retail and lodging amendments. General plan amendments changing from a land use designation that permits retail or lodging uses to a land use designation that does not allow retail or lodging uses should consider use of only be approved in conjunction with 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 a retail or lodging use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.5</td>
<td>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 only be approved in conjunction with 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 3-29, Chapter 3, *Project Description*, Table 3-4, *Proposed City of Los Alamitos General Plan Policies*. The following additional policies have been added to the EIR to reflect the request by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB). Appendix C to this FEIR identifies that inclusion of these additional policies. The additional policies mimic Policy 3.1 that is already provided in the Public Facilities and Safety Element as Policy 4.1. The policies provide more detail and would help ensure consistency of the General Plan Update with the two Airport Environ Land Use Plan (AELUP) documents.

| Table 3-4 Proposed City of Los Alamitos General Plan Policies |
|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Policy 3.1    | Growth Management Element       |
|               | 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 Environ Land Use Plan (AELUP) for the JFTB |
| Policy 3.2    | Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77. Do not approve buildings and structures that would penetrate Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 Imaginary Obstruction Surfaces for JFTB, Los Alamitos unless found consistent by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Additionally, in accordance with FAR Part 77, required applicants proposing buildings or structures that penetrate the 100:1 Notification Surface to file a Form 7460-1 Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with FAA and provide a copy of the FAA determination to the City and the ALUC for Orange County. |
| Policy 3.3    | Structures above 200 feet. For development projects that include structures higher than 200 feet above existing grade, the City shall inform the ALUC and submit materials to the ALUC for review. Proposed projects that would exceed a height of 200 feet above existing grade shall be required to file Form 7460-1 with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). |
| Policy 3.4    | Heliport/helistop approval and requirements. Approve the development of a heliport or helistop only if it complies with the AELUP for Heliports. Ensure that each applicant seeking a conditional use permit or similar approval for the construction or operation of a heliport or helistop complies fully with the state permit procedure provided by law and with all conditions of approval imposed or recommended by the FAA, by Orange County ALUC, and by Caltrans/Division of Aeronautics. This requirement shall be in addition to all other City development requirements |
| Policy 3.5    | New residential units. Do not approve the construction of new residential units within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour for the JFTB. |
| Policy 3.6    | JFTB noise contours. Require the use of JFTB noise contours to ensure new development is compatible with the noise environment |
| Policy 3.7    | Deed disclosure notice. Provide notice of airport in the vicinity where residential development is being proposed within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contours for the JFTB. Require that the following language be included as part of the Deed Disclosure Notice: |

**NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY**

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 5.1-10, Section 5.1, Aesthetics. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect how the City applies the Commercial Corridors Plan.

… Because the site is entirely within the plan area of the City’s Commercial Corridors Plan, the City would review plans with the design guidelines in that plan would apply to future uses on the Arrowhead Products site. Compliance with these guidelines would ensure that development on the site is sensitive to its surrounding content and is of high-quality design.

Page 5.1-10, Section 5.1, Aesthetics. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect how the City applies the Commercial Corridors Plan.

The existing buildings would likely be replaced with numerous buildings in a different layout and featuring a different architectural style. However, the site is entirely within the plan area of the City’s Commercial Corridors Plan. Design guidelines and that plan would apply to all future uses on the site. Compliance with those guidelines applying the concepts found in this Plan would ensure that development on the site is sensitive to its surrounding context and is of high-quality design.

Page 5.1-12, Section 5.1, Aesthetics. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect how the City applies the Commercial Corridors Plan.

The City currently maintains four small monument signs at the ends of both corridors that welcome people into Los Alamitos. In addition to increasing safety and reducing congestion, pedestrian bridges would offer opportunities for larger, elevated signage to mark a clear transition into and out of the City. Consistent with the Commercial Corridors Plan, future pedestrian bridges and accompanying signage constructed pursuant to the General Plan Update would be reviewed with the design guidelines within the Commercial Corridors Plan to ensure that the design required to be designed to reflect the character of the City and the neighborhoods they connect.

Page 5.1-13, Section 5.1, Aesthetics. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect the changes identified above in how the City applies the Commercial Corridors Plan.

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 exiting residential neighborhoods, including Rossmoor. Furthermore, compliance with proposed General Plan policies related to design quality and design guidelines in the Commercial Corridors Plan would ensure that new development pursuant to the General Plan Update would not degrade the community’s existing visual character or quality. Additionally, applying the concepts set forth in the Commercial Corridors Plan, new development can be
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

guided to develop projects that would not degrade the environment. Therefore, Impact 5.1-1 would be less than significant.

Page 5.2-31, Section 5.2, Air Quality. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect that Mitigation Measures specified in Section 5.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, also reduce criteria air pollutant impacts of the project.

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 below and related GHG mitigation measures would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the project (i.e., Mitigation Measure 2-1 and 4-1).

Page 5.9-13, Section 5.9, Public Services. The following minor technical correction has been made to the EIR to reflect the correct increase in population and employment analyzed in the EIR.

Buildout is anticipated to result in an approximate total of 1,395 new residents and 3,722 additional employees in the City and SOI compared to existing conditions.

Page 5.10-2, Section 5.10, Recreation. The following minor technical corrections have been made to Table 5.10, Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities, to reflect corrected information per the City of Los Alamitos Recreation and Community Services Director.

| Los Alamitos Community Center and Youth Center | Special Use Facility | 1.69 | • 11,000+ sf of meeting and activity rooms, as well as kitchen facilities
| | | | • Gymnasium
| Oak Middle School | School Field | 11.90 | • Subject to long-term facilities/joint-use agreement between the City and LAUSD
| | | | • Grass area, lighted playing fields, lighted outdoor basketball courts, gymnasium, lighted track, restrooms

Page 5.10-7, Section 5.10, Recreation. The following minor technical correction has been made to provide clarifications per the City of Los Alamitos Recreation and Community Services Director.

School Facilities

Another source of recreational open space within the City of Los Alamitos is the playgrounds and athletic fields at public schools. Schools are accessible to residential neighborhoods and are generally improved with recreational facilities for school-aged children. Schools provide play fields and playground equipment that neighborhood residents may use during off-school hours. School facilities with joint-use agreements can be rented by the hour. In addition, non-joint use facilities can be rented by the hour through the District.
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

The City also participates in the sharing of recreational areas through a joint-use agreement between the City of Los Alamitos and the Los Alamitos Unified School District (LAUSD). These agreements are secured for public use for the specified time periods:

- **USA Water Polo National Training Center**: November 19, 1998, to February 29, 2016
- **LAUSD**: Master Agreement: September 7, 2010, to September 6, 2015 November 19, 2014 for five years (5-year renewal possible); also under this agreements are the McAuliffe Field; Oak Field; and Oak Middle School Basketball Courts, Restrooms, and Bike Path
- **Oak Middle School field**: September 14, 1978, to September 13, 2003
- **Oak Middle School gymnasium**: February 28, 1974, in perpetuity
- **McAuliffe Middle School field**: April 23, 2001, to June 30, 2011

The City also has a joint-use agreement with the Los Alamitos JFTB for the USA Water Polo National Training Center, which is secured for public use from November 19, 1998, to February 29, 2016.

Page 5.10-9, Section 5.10, *Recreation*. The following minor technical correction has been made to provide clarifications per the City of Los Alamitos Recreation and Community Services Director.

**Recreation Programs**

The City’s Recreation and Community Services Department offers a variety of recreation programs, activities, and classes to local residents, listed below. The *Los Alamitos Recreation & Community Services Activities Guide* is a quarterly publication of the City that contains the schedule of all classes, tours, trips, and activities offered through the Recreation and Community Services Department, as well as news about Los Alamitos events, activities, and businesses. These programs, events, and classes are offered in Los Alamitos:

- **Youth and Adult Classes.** These classes include a variety of dance, physical fitness, and personal enrichment activities, are self-supported through user fees, and are offered to meet the needs and interests of Los Alamitos residents.

- **Senior Programs and Excursions.** These programs include low impact fitness classes and activities to encourage socialization between older adults, include day and overnight trips are coordinated by the Los Alamitos Senior Club, which occasionally. The Recreation Division also partners with travel providers to offer extended trips.

---

3 The agreement with LAUSD is currently in negotiations, and new individual joint-use agreements are anticipated be in place by the end of 2014. These agreements would cover the McAuliffe Middle School field and the Oak Middle School field, gymnasium, restrooms, and bike path.
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

- **Low-Cost Summer Day Camp.** Camp is offered for ten weeks each summer, two weeks during schools’ Winter Break and one week during schools’ Spring Break, and provides the opportunity for full-week or single-day enrollment.

- **Summer Aquatic Programs.** Swim lessons for youth and adults are offered from beginning to advanced levels at the Los Alamitos Community Center pool, which is located at the Los Alamitos JFTB.

- **Youth Sports Leagues and Excursions.** Youth sports leagues vary from season to season, but include summer youth basketball and baseball and fall youth basketball; youth excursions to local attractions and beaches are offered in the summer.

- **Park and Field Use.** Use of City parks and school athletic fields by individuals and by local nonprofit organizations are coordinated by the Community Services Department.

- **Facility Rentals.** Facility rentals for banquets and meetings are available at four separate facilities.

The City also has a joint-use agreement with the Los Alamitos JFTB for the USA Water Polo National Training Center, which is secured for public use from November 19, 1998, to February 29, 2016.

---

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 SOI. 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.

---

See Appendix A for revisions to Figure 5.11-1 and Figure 5.11-5.
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 5.12-5, Section 5.12, *Utilities and Service Systems*, Figure 5.12-2, *Sewer Plan*. Minor technical corrections have been made to Figure 5.12-2 based on comments made by the Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District (see Response to Comment A3-3 and A3-4).

See Appendix A for revisions to Figure 5.12-2
3. Revisions to the Draft EIR
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4. Qualifications of Persons Preparing the FEIR

PLACEWORKS

William Halligan, Esq.
Principal, Environmental Services

- BA University of California, Irvine, Social Ecology, 1988
- JD, Chapman University School of Law, 1999

Nicole Vermilion
Associate Principal

- BA Environmental Studies and BS Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Santa Cruz, 2002
- MURP, University of California, Irvine, 2005

Colin Drukker
Associate Principal

- Education Abroad Program, Urban Planning, University of New South Wales (Sydney, Australia), 1998
- BA, Urban Studies & Planning, University of California, San Diego, 1999
- MURP, University of California, Irvine, 2001
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1. Executive Summary

Figure 1-3 Existing Land Use

- Single Family Residential
- Multi-Family Residential
- Mobile Home Residential
- General Office
- Business Park
- Medical Office
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Public/Quasi Public Facility
- Parks
- Water
- Vacant
- Other/Easement
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Other City Boundaries

Source: City of Los Alamitos, 2013
1. Executive Summary

Figure 1-4 Proposed Land Use Plan

Residential
- Single Family Res. 1-6 DU/Ac
- Limited Multi Family Res. 6-20 DU/Ac
- Multi Family Res. 20-30 DU/Ac

Commercial and Employment
- Retail Business
- Professional Office
- Planned Industrial
- Limited Industrial
- Medical Overlay
- Retail Overlay

Special Use
- Mixed Use
- Specific Plan
- Community & Institutional
- Community & Institutional/JFTB
- Open Area
- Easement Overlay

Rossmoor
- Suburban Residential
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Other City Boundaries

Note:
Rossmoor is within the City’s SOI but it also remains within & under the jurisdiction of the County of Orange. Accordingly, the Land Use Plan shows the County land use designation of Suburban Residential.
3. Project Description

Figure 3-3 Existing Land Use

- Single Family Residential
- Multi-Family Residential
- Mobile Home Residential
- General Office
- Business Park
- Medical Office
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Public/Quasi Public Facility
- Parks
- Vacant
- Other/Easement
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Other City Boundaries
3. Project Description

Figure 3-5 Proposed Land Use Plan

Residential
- Single Family Res. 1-6 DU/Ac
- Limited Multi Family Res. 6-20 DU/Ac
- Multi Family Res. 20-30 DU/Ac

Commercial and Employment
- Retail Business
- Professional Office
- Planned Industrial
- Limited Industrial
- Medical Overlay
- Retail Overlay

Special Use
- Mixed Use
- Specific Plan
- Community & Institutional
- Community & Institutional/JFTB
- Open Area
- Easement Overlay

Rossmoor
- Suburban Residential
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Other City Boundaries

Note:
Rossmoor is within the City’s SOI but it also remains within & under the jurisdiction of the County of Orange. Accordingly, the Land Use Plan shows the County land use designation of Suburban Residential.
5. Environmental Analysis

Figure 5.11-1 Current General Plan Roadway Classifications

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

Classification
- Smart Street, 6 Lane (122 ft. ROW)
- Major Arterial (120 ft. ROW)
- Primary Arterial (100 - 120 ft. ROW)
- Secondary Arterial (80 ft. ROW)
5. Environmental Analysis

Figure 5.11-5 Proposed General Plan
Roadway Classifications

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014
5. Environmental Analysis

Figure 5.12-2 Sewer Plan

- R/LAASD Boundary
- OCSD Trunk
- R/LAASD Sewer
- Parcels served by Long Beach Water Department
- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Other City Boundaries

Source: City of Los Alamitos, 2013
Appendix B.  Fehr & Peers Select Link Analysis
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Select Link Analysis – Los Alamitos Boulevard, North of Katella Avenue.

A select link analysis was conducted by Fehr & Peers using the Orange County Transportation Authority’s (OCTA) Orange County Traffic Analysis Model (OCTAM) for Los Alamitos Boulevard, just north of Katella Avenue. The purpose of the assessment was to see where traffic on the link travels to and the direction of travel. The thicker the red and blue lines, the heavier the traffic volume; with the thickest line being on the study segment itself (e.g. 100 percent of the traffic from that segment is on that segment). The graphic is particularly useful in determining how traffic disperses from this segment and can be tracked to its origin and destination. This graphic shows that many of the trips along the Los Alamitos Boulevard segment are destined for locations outside of the City of Los Alamitos, and that the segment is a bypass route from Interstate 605 (I-605) to the north to Interstate 405 (I-405) to the east or Seal Beach Boulevard to the south. This is likely due to congestion at the I-605/I-405 interchange and poor travel speeds associated with that congestion. Never-the-less, this does show that many trips on segments of roadway in the City of Los Alamitos are currently regional in nature.

Blue = Northbound. Red = Southbound.
Appendix

This page intentionally left blank.
Appendix C. Inclusion of Requested Airport Land Use Commission Policies
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The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for Orange County held a meeting on Thursday, October 16, 2014, to determine compliance of the Los Alamitos General Plan Update with the Airport Environ Land Use Plan (AELUP) for Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB) and for the AELUP for Heliports. ALUC staff recommended that the City of Los Alamitos incorporate additional policies into their General Plan to ensure consistency with the AELUPs. This memorandum identifies the potential environmental impacts from incorporating the additional policies compared to that identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

**Proposed Edits to the Growth Management Element**

The City of Los Alamitos has revised the Growth Management Element to include an additional Goal (Goal 3) and supporting policies (Policies 3.1 through 3.7), listed below.

**Goal 3:** Development that is consistent with the Airport Environ Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Base and Orange County Heliports.

**Policy 3.1. 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 Environ Land Use Plan (AELUP) for the JFTB.

**Policy 3.2. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77.** Do not approve buildings and structures that would penetrate Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 Imaginary Obstruction Surfaces for JFTB, Los Alamitos unless found consistent by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Additionally, in accordance with FAR Part 77, required applicants proposing buildings or structures that penetrate the 100:1 Notification Surface to file a Form 7460-1 Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with FAA and provide a copy of the FAA determination to the City and the ALUC for Orange County.
Policy 3.3. Structures above 200 feet. For development projects that include structures higher than 200 feet above existing grade, the City shall inform the ALUC and submit materials to the ALUC for review. Proposed projects that would exceed a height of 200 feet above existing grade shall be required to file Form 7460-1 with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Policy 3.4. Heliport/helistop approval and requirements. Approve the development of a heliport or helistop only if it complies with the AELUP for Heliports. Ensure that each applicant seeking a conditional use permit or similar approval for the construction or operation of a heliport or helistop complies fully with the state permit procedure provided by law and with all conditions of approval imposed or recommended by the FAA, by Orange County ALUC, and by Caltrans/Division of Aeronautics. This requirement shall be in addition to all other City development requirements.

Policy 3.5. New residential units. Do not approve the construction of new residential units within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour for the JFTB.

Policy 3.6. JFTB noise contours. Require the use of JFTB noise contours to ensure new development is compatible with the noise environment.

Policy 3.7. Deed disclosure notice. Provide notice of airport in the vicinity where residential development is being proposed within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contours for the JFTB. Require that the following language be included as part of the Deed Disclosure Notice:

NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

Potential Environmental Impacts

The additional policies listed above mimic Policy 3.1 that is already provided in the Public Facilities and Safety Element as Policy 4.1. They provide more detail and would help ensure consistency of the General Plan Update with the two AELUP documents.

The City of Los Alamitos has determined that none of the policies constitutes the type of significant new information that requires recirculation of the DEIR for further public comment under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The additional policies would not result in new significant environment impacts that were not previously disclosed in the DEIR.

Additionally, the new policies would not substantially increase the severity of a previously identified environmental impacts described in the DEIR, and there would not be any other circumstances requiring recirculation described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The additional policies identified above merely amplify existing policies and result in insignificant modifications in the DEIR. The City of Los Alamitos could, if is so desired, adopt the proposed project with the additional policies without any additional environmental review.
Appendix D. Environmental Impacts of the Planning Commission’s Recommended Changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 12, 2014
TO: City of Los Alamitos
ADDRESS: 3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, California 90720
CONTACT: Steven Mendoza, Community Development Director
FROM: William Halligan, Esq., Principal Environmental Services
Nicole Vermilion, Associate Principal
SUBJECT: Environmental impacts of the Planning Commission’s recommended changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan
PROJECT NUMBER: CLA-01

On Monday November 10, 2014, during the public hearing on the General Plan Update, the Los Alamitos Planning Commission recommended changes to Proposed Land Use Plan to the following sites:

» Site 2B – Post Office/Los Alamitos Unified School District (LAUSD) Yard
» Site 5 – 17 parcels on the south side of Katella Avenue
» Site 10 – Arrowhead Products site on Katella Avenue

This memorandum describes these changes and presents how the potential environmental impacts of these changes compare to those identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Proposed Land Use Plan, as currently presented.

To determine if the recommended land use changes result in changes in environmental impacts described in the DEIR, Fehr and Peers, the traffic consultant for the General Plan Update, evaluated changes in trip generation associated with the potential land use changes. Trip generation rates were based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 9th Edition of the Trip Generation Manual. PlaceWorks also evaluated changes in employment based on the employment generation factors used in the DEIR.

As described below, the City of Los Alamitos has reviewed this material and determined that the recommended changes to the land use plan are not significant new information that requires recirculation of the DEIR for further public comment under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The recommended changes to the land use plan would not result in new significant environment impacts.

Additionally, the recommended changes to the land use plan would not substantially increase the magnitude of existing environmental impacts described in the DEIR, and there would not be any other circumstances requiring recirculation described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The recommended changes to the land use plan described below are variations on what has already been presented as they fall between the impacts discussed of the proposed project and the impacts discussed in the No Project Alternative; and therefore, represent insignificant modifications to the DEIR. The City of Los Alamitos could, if is so desired, adopt the proposed project with the recommended changes to Site 2B, Site 5, and Site 10 without any additional environmental review.
SITE 2B – POST OFFICE/LAUSD YARD

During the November 10, 2014, Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Commission made a recommendation to leave the land use designation for the parcels in Site 2B as Planned Industrial. This recommendation is based on the concerns raised by LAUSD and based upon the fact that the operations taking place on the LAUSD’s property are industrial in nature. The Planning Commission also recommended that the property belonging to the Post Office should also remain Planned Industrial. The exhibit below for Site 2B identifies the changes to the current Land Use Plan that were evaluated in the DEIR.

» Community & Institutional (C&I). The DEIR evaluated buildout of the two parcels under the Community & Institutional land use designation. As proposed in the Draft Land Use Plan under the Community & Institutional land use designation, the site is projected to support approximately 38,100 square feet of building space. The employment and trip generation rates associated with community and institutional uses indicate that the area could support 38 employees and generate 762 total daily vehicle trips.

» Planned Industrial (PI). If the current Planned Industrial land use designation is retained, the parcels are projected to support the same 38,100 square feet of building space. While industrial uses are generally more employment intensive than community and institutional uses, the trip generation rate associated with industrial uses is much less intense than that for community and institutional uses. The calculations indicate that under a Planned Industrial designation, the area could support 60 employees and generate 266 total daily vehicle trips.
Retaining the Planned Industrial land use designation is projected to generate approximately 500 fewer trips than that evaluated in the DEIR (see Table 1). According to Fehr and Peers, retaining the Planned Industrial land use designation would create fewer potential impacts on traffic in the area due to the reduction in projected vehicle trips. As impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), and noise are tied directly to the number of vehicle trips, potential impacts for these categories would also be lessened compared to those identified in the DEIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed Project: Convert to Community &amp; Institutional</th>
<th>Change: Retain Planned Industrial</th>
<th>Difference From Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwelling Units</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>18,452</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-to-Housing Ratio</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2B Daily Trip Generation</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Planned Industrial land use designation could result in 22 more employees. As shown in Table 1, this would result in a slight (less than 1 percent) increase in the jobs-to-housing ratio and would slightly increase population and employment impacts. However, this difference is nominal and population and employment impacts would continue to be less than significant.

The changes identified would generate approximately 500 fewer trips and would reduce the majority environmental impacts, including transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise, below what was analyzed in the EIR. The City of Los Alamitos could, if is so desired, adopt the proposed project with the change to the aforementioned parcels in Site 2B without any additional environmental review.

SITE 5 – MEDICAL CENTER AREA

In crafting the Draft Land Use Plan, the Planning Commission identified an opportunity to maximize retail development along Katella Avenue and change the land use designation for parcels along the south side of Katella Avenue from Professional Office to Retail Business. The Planning Commission also sought to encourage medical and professional office development to move next to the Los Alamitos Medical Center through the introduction of a Medical Overlay north of the medical center.

However, during the October 13, 2014, Planning Commission hearing, property and business owners expressed a strong desire to retain the existing Professional Office land use designation for the parcels on the south side of Katella Avenue (parcel list below). On November 10, 2014, the Planning Commission made a recommendation to retain the Professional Office designation for these parcels.

- 222-041-14
- 222-041-15
- 222-101-01
- 222-101-02
- 222-101-03
- 222-101-05
- 222-101-06
- 222-101-07
- 222-101-08
- 222-101-09
- 222-101-11
- 222-101-12
- 222-101-13
- 222-101-32
- 222-101-33
- 222-111-40
- 222-111-44
Convert to Retail Business (RB). The DEIR evaluated buildout of the 17 parcels under the Retail Business land use designation. As proposed in the Draft Land Use Plan, under the Retail Business land use designation, the 17 parcels are projected to support approximately 231,017 square feet of building space. The employment and trip generation rates associated with retail businesses indicate that the area could support 770 employees and generate 8,401 total daily vehicle trips.

Retain Professional Office (PO). If the current Professional Office land use designation is retained, the parcels are projected to support the same estimate of 231,017 square feet of building space. Office uses generally employ more people per square foot of building space than do retail businesses, and the parcels would be projected to support more employees (924). However, the trip generation rate for office uses is less intense and indicates that the area could generate 4,011 total daily vehicle trips.

Retaining the Professional Office land use designation is projected to generate approximately 4,400 fewer trips than that evaluated in the DEIR (see Table 2). According to Fehr and Peers, retaining the Professional Office land use designation would create fewer potential impacts on traffic in the area due to the reduction in projected vehicle trips. As impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), and noise are tied directly to the number of vehicle trips, potential impacts for these categories would also be lessened compared to those identified in the DEIR.
Table 2. Planning Commission Recommended Changes to Site 5 Compared to the Proposed General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed Project: Convert to Retail Business Designation</th>
<th>Change: Retain Professional Office Designation</th>
<th>Difference From Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwelling Units</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>18,584</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-to-Housing Ratio</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5 Daily Trip Generation</td>
<td>8,401</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>-4,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Professional Office land use designation could result in 154 additional employees. As shown in Table 1, this would result in a nominal increase in the jobs-to-housing ratio and would nominally increase population and employment impacts. However, population and employment impacts would continue to be less than significant.

The changes identified would generate approximately 4,400 fewer trips and would reduce the majority environmental impacts, including transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise, below what was analyzed in the EIR. The City of Los Alamitos could, if so desired, adopt the proposed project with the change to the aforementioned parcels in Site 5 without any additional environmental review.
SITE 10 – ARROWHEAD PRODUCTS

The DEIR evaluated potential environmental impacts associated with conversion of the Arrowhead Products site from Planned Industrial to Retail Business. This exhibit below for Site 10 identifies the changes to the current Land Use Plan that were evaluated in the DEIR.

During public review of the DEIR the City of Los Alamitos received a comment letter from the property owners of the 28-acre Arrowhead Products site asking the City to retain the Planned Industrial designation. A representative of Arrowhead Products reiterated this desire at the October 13, 2014, Planning Commission hearing, but also said that they would accept the additional application of a Retail Overlay. On November 10, 2014, the Planning Commission made a recommendation to retain the Planned Industrial designation but to create a Retail Overlay on this site.

The recommended change to create a Retail Overlay and retain the Planned Industrial would allow development of Site 10 as either industrial or retail business land uses.

» Retail Business (RB) or Retail Overlay. As proposed in the Draft Land Use Plan under the Retail Business land use designation or with the recommended change to Retail Overlay, the site is projected to support approximately 263,311 square feet of building space. The employment and trip generation rates associated with retail businesses indicate that the area could support 1,020 employees and generate 11,243 total daily vehicle trips (see Table 3).
Planned Industrial (PI). If the current Planned Industrial land use designation is retained, the parcels are projected to support the same 263,311 square feet of building space. The trip and employment generation rates associated with industrial uses is less intense than those for retail businesses, and indicate that the area could support 600 employees and generate 1,835 total daily vehicle trips (see Table 3).

Table 3. Site 10 Retail Compared to a Planned Industrial Buildout Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Retail a</th>
<th>Planned Industrial b</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwelling Units</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>18,010</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-to-Housing Ratio</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 10 Daily Trip Generation</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>-9,408</td>
<td>-84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a This was evaluated as the proposed project in the DEIR as Retail Business and is the same under the recommended Retail Overlay.

b This change was also identified as the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative in the DEIR.

Industrial uses at the 28-acre Arrowhead Products site would generate approximately 9,400 fewer trips and 420 fewer jobs than the retail business uses. As identified in the response to comment in the Final EIR, one of the alternatives evaluated in the DEIR was the Arrowhead Products Site Alternative. Under this alternative, the Arrowhead Products site would remain designated for Planned Industrial. Industrial land uses generate less traffic than retail uses. Consequently, this land use configuration was selected as an alternative because it would reduce traffic, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts compared to the proposed project.

If ultimately developed with industrial uses, the Arrowhead Products site would generate fewer vehicle trips, and this change would also reduce potential transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts below what was analyzed in the EIR. Additionally, the decrease in jobs would slightly decrease population and employment impacts. However, if the site is redeveloped as retail business then impacts would be the same as identified in the EIR. The DEIR evaluated buildout of the site under the Retail Business land use designation; and consequently, evaluated the more intensive buildout scenario. Retaining the Planned Industrial land use designation and creating a Retail Overlay for the 28-acre Arrowhead Products site would not result in any changes to the DEIR because the site could develop as either retail business or as industrial.

Accordingly, the City of Los Alamitos could, if is so desired, adopt the proposed project with the requested change to the Arrowhead Products site to retain the Planned Industrial designation and create a Retail Overlay without any additional environmental review.

1 Buildout assumptions for the Arrowhead Products site are based on the current General Plan Alternative, which identified a 10 percent increase in building square footage on the 28-acre site.

2 The EIR considers only the number of jobs when evaluating potential environmental impacts. It does not distinguish between the pay or skill level associated with jobs based on land use designations.
SUMMARY

The Planning Commission’s recommendations would be projected to generate 4,886 fewer trips and reduce potential transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts below what was analyzed in the EIR. The changes would also result in 176 more employees and slightly increase potential population and employment impacts; however, impacts would remain less than significant. Therefore, the City of Los Alamitos could, if it is so desired, adopt the proposed project with the requested changes to Site 2B, Site 5, and Site 10 without any additional environmental review.

Table 4.  Planning Commission Recommended Changes Compared to Proposed General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Changes to Site 2B, Site 5 (south of Katella), and Site 10</th>
<th>Difference From Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwelling Units</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>18,606</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-to-Housing Ratio</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Trip Generation</td>
<td>20,406</td>
<td>15,520</td>
<td>-4,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* If ultimately developed with industrial uses, the Arrowhead Products site would generate approximately 9,400 fewer trips and 420 fewer jobs. Retaining the Planned Industrial land use designation and creating a Retail Overlay at the 28-acre Arrowhead Products site would not result in any changes to the DEIR because the site could develop as either retail business or as industrial.

The Planning Commission’s recommendations identified in the November, 2014, hearing would decrease potential transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, and noise impacts compared to the proposed project as analyzed in the EIR. While these potential impacts would be reduced under either or both changes, it is important to recognize that none are substantial enough to reduce impacts from “significant and unavoidable” to “less than significant”.

Table 5 shows a summary matrix of the environmental impacts for the Planning Commission’s recommended changes compared to that analyzed in the EIR for each environmental topic area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Proposed Project Impacts</th>
<th>Impacts Relative to the Proposed Project with Recommended Changes to Site 2B, Site 5, and Site 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>S/U</td>
<td>Less impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>LTS/M</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>S/U</td>
<td>Less impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>S/U</td>
<td>Slightly higher impact a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Slightly higher impact a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Traffic</td>
<td>S/U</td>
<td>Less impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
LTS: Less Than Significant; LTS/M: Less Than Significant with Mitigation; S/U: Significant and Unavoidable

a While the changes to Site 2B and Site 5 would nominally increase the jobs-to-housing balance, impacts would remain less than significant.