

J. **Mineral Resources**

There would be less than significant impacts to existing areas of the City identified as containing aggregate resources. There are no ongoing mining operations in the City and there would be no changes to land use, policies or procedures that would affect the management of the portion of the Livingston-Graham site within the City of Arcadia. Therefore, implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in cumulative impacts related to the loss of availability of regionally or locally important mineral resource. (EIR p. 4.10-5.)

K. **Noise**

Future development in the City and the surrounding area would add new mobile and stationary noise sources, resulting in increased noise levels. The analysis of buildout of the proposed General Plan Update includes cumulative traffic volumes in the region by 2035. Thus, noise impacts associated with the proposed General Plan Update accounts for cumulative noise impacts, which were determined using the daily 2035 with-project traffic volumes, as calculated in the City of Arcadia General Plan EIR Traffic Study. (EIR p. 4.11-30.)

The results of the short-term noise level measurements are presented in Table 4.11-6. As shown, the existing ambient Leq noise levels ranged from 51.9 dBA Leq to 69.9 dBA Leq. The highest noise levels were measured in areas adjacent to the I-210 Freeway and major City roads such as Foothill Boulevard, Campus Avenue, Duarte Road, Michillinda Avenue, Huntington Drive, Live Oak Avenue, Colorado Street, and Baldwin Avenue. Noise levels in the City currently are illustrated in Tables 4.11-6 and 4.11-7. The existing ambient Leq noise levels ranged from 51.9 dBA Leq to 69.9 dBA Leq. The highest noise levels were measured in areas adjacent to the I-210 Freeway and major City roads, such as Foothill Boulevard, Campus Avenue, Duarte Road, Michillinda Avenue, Huntington Drive, Live Oak Avenue, Colorado Street, and Baldwin Avenue. (EIR p. 4.11-30.)

Off-site cumulative noise impacts project increases in noise levels over existing conditions with buildout of the City under the proposed General Plan Update and other developments in the San Gabriel Valley subregion. Thus, the analysis of traffic-related noise impacts presented above accounts for cumulative traffic from future growth assumed in the SCAG traffic model, as well as development projects in the City of Arcadia. (EIR p. 4.11-30.)

While none of the roadway segments would experience a noise increase that exceeds 3.0 dB over existing noise levels, the Year 2035 noise levels would range from 62.2 to 87.3 dBA CNEL 100 feet from the street centerline. Thus, any noise level increase would contribute to existing high noise levels that would impact existing or future sensitive noise receptors along major roadways. Thus, while traffic noise increases would be less than the 3 dBA, existing violations of City noise standards would be exacerbated, and the cumulative off-site traffic noise impact would be significant. (EIR pp. 4.11-30 to 31.)

L. Population, Housing, and Employment

Increases in the population, housing, and employment base of the San Gabriel Valley are expected over time due to in-migration and birth. Future growth and development in the City of Arcadia and in the San Gabriel Valley would lead to the development of new homes, the creation of new jobs, and the increase in the resident population of the City and the rest of the valley. SCAG estimates there could be as many as 2,338,062 persons, 685,034 households, and 890,626 jobs throughout the San Gabriel Valley subregion by 2035 (SCAG 2008). This would include the City's buildout consisting of 22,535 housing units with 61,995 residents and an employment base of 29,753 jobs. (EIR p. 4.12-19.)

The increase in population itself is not expected to be a significant cumulative adverse impact as long as there is housing that can adequately accommodate the population and there are goods and services available to meet residents' needs. The cumulative increase in population in the San Gabriel Valley would be accompanied by an increase in housing stock as projected by SCAG. Thus, housing would be available for the future population. Whether this housing is adequate will depend on the rate of housing development and the success of housing programs in the various cities and communities in the valley. (EIR p. 4.12-19.)

The RHNA identifies the existing and future housing need for each city and county in the region, and State law requires each city and county to provide adequate sites to accommodate future needs and offer programs to meet existing housing needs. For the 2006–2014 planning period, the City of Arcadia is expected to provide capacity for 2,149 units to meet its future needs, with the San Gabriel Valley expected to accommodate 42,478 new housing units. Implementation of the programs in the Housing Elements of each city and the County is expected to meet the housing needs of existing and future residents. Regular updates of the Housing Elements of cities and counties (SC 4.12-4) would identify adequate sites for housing development to meet growth projections. Demand for commercial goods and services are expected to be met by existing businesses and new business ventures that serve the marketplace. This may include businesses not just in Arcadia but in adjacent cities and counties as well. (EIR p. 4.12-19.)

Public service demand by future residents is expected to be met by various public service providers in the San Gabriel Valley, including the City of Arcadia. This is discussed in Section 4.13 of this EIR. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (EIR p. 4.12-19.)

Redevelopment projects that occur on developed or underutilized lots may involve some displacement of local housing stock or population. However, the City's vacant housing stock and the Valley's vacant housing stock are expected to provide sufficient alternative accommodation for displaced households and residents, and significant displacement is not anticipated in the County. Compliance with State regulations regarding fair compensation and relocation assistance for the displacement caused by public and redevelopment projects would reduce cumulative displacement

impacts to less than significant levels. No significant cumulative adverse impacts on population, housing, or employment would occur with the General Plan Update and future growth and development in the San Gabriel Valley. (EIR p. 4.12-19.)

M. Public Services

Future growth and development within the San Gabriel Valley would generate increased demand for public services from various service agencies. While increases in demand would occur on other public service agencies that do not serve the City, future development pursuant to the General Plan Update would not add to the service demands on those agencies that do not serve the City or its SOI. Thus, the cumulative analysis for public services considers the service area of the respective providers and adjacent service agencies, as they may be affected by services provided in the City. As identified in this section, the proposed General Plan Update would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to public services, and no mitigation is required. (EIR p. 4.13-23.)

1. Fire Protection and Emergency. For fire protection services, the Arcadia Fire Department provides automatic aid to the County of Los Angeles and the Cities of Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena, South Pasadena, Alhambra, Monrovia, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and San Marino (Verdugo Fire Communications 2009). Mutual aid agreements are in place with the Los Angeles County and Sierra Madre Fire Departments, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Angeles National Forest for fire protection of the hillside and brush areas at the northern end of the City. Thus, future development in the City of Arcadia, Los Angeles County, and the nearby Cities of Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena, South Pasadena, Alhambra, Monrovia, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, San Marino, and Sierra Madre would increase the population and introduce structures that would create a demand for fire protection and emergency services. This cumulative demand for fire protection services would require additional personnel and resources at individual agencies to provide the same level of service and maintain existing response times. (EIR p. 4.13-24.)

Individual developments are required to comply with pertinent provisions of the California Fire Code to prevent the creation of fire hazards, to promote fire safety, and to facilitate emergency response. The individual fire agencies also regularly review their services and the needed increases in staffing, fire stations, and equipment, as necessary, to keep response times acceptable and to adequately serve their service areas. Plan reviews of proposed development projects by the individual fire departments would: (1) prevent the creation of fire safety hazards by development; (2) require fire prevention measures to be incorporated into individual projects; and (3) facilitate fire emergency response by providing adequate access and fire alarm systems. Compliance with these existing regulations would avoid potential significant cumulative adverse impacts on fire protection service levels. (EIR p. 4.13-24.)

2. Police Protection and Law Enforcement Services. For police protection and law enforcement services, the City of Arcadia and 15 cities in the San Gabriel Valley are part of an automatic aid area (Area D) where law enforcement agencies provide as-needed day-to-day support for service calls. Thus, future development in the City of Arcadia and in the cities in the San Gabriel Valley would increase the population and introduce structures that would create a demand for police protection and law enforcement services in the Valley. This cumulative demand for police protection services would require additional personnel and resources at individual agencies to provide the same level of service and maintain existing response times. (EIR p. 4.13-24.)

Annual evaluation of police protection services by the City of Arcadia and the County would determine the adequacy of police protection and law enforcement services and the resources necessary to meet the public safety needs of the individual communities. Individual development projects are also subject to review by the police departments to determine ways to reduce the potential for crime incidence and demand for police protection and law enforcement services. The citywide evaluations and project-specific reviews are expected to reduce demand and provide the necessary police services to the area and prevent any significant cumulative adverse impacts on police protection and law enforcement service levels. (EIR p. 4.13-24.)

3. School Services. For school services, the cumulative impacts of future residential development pursuant to the General Plan Update would occur within the service boundaries of the school districts that serve the City and its SOI. These include:

- Arcadia Unified School District (K–12);
- El Monte Union High School District (9–12);
- El Monte City School District (K–8);
- Monrovia Unified School District (K–12);
- Pasadena Unified School District (K–12); and
- Temple City Unified School District (K–12).

The increase in housing development in the service areas of these school districts would lead to increases in the student population requiring school services. Future development would have to pay the mandated school impact fees to provide funds for facility and service improvements at the various school districts. Payment of these fees would serve as full mitigation of development impacts, and therefore, there would not be any significant cumulative impacts on school services. (EIR pp. 4.13-24 to 25.)

4. Library Services. For library services, the cumulative impacts of future development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would occur within the service boundaries of the Arcadia Public Library (City of Arcadia) and the County

Library System (County of Los Angeles). The increase in the resident populations of the City and of the County would lead to increases in the demand for library services. Additional library materials, space and personnel may be needed at the Arcadia Public Library and at the libraries of the County Library System to adequately serve future cumulative demand. (EIR p. 4.13-25.)

Since the demand for library services that would be generated at buildout of the City would be met by the Arcadia Public Library, future development in the City is not expected to have an adverse impact on County library services. Also, the County charges development fees to fund future library service expansion. Thus, the General Plan Update would not contribute to the cumulative demand for library services in the County. Impacts would be less than significant. (EIR p. 4.13-25.)

5. Other Public Facilities. Other public facilities required by future development would be confined to City services. Payment of permit processing fees and utility service fees and implementation of relevant goals, policies, and implementation actions in the General Plan Update would prevent the creation of cumulative impacts related to other public facilities. (EIR p. 4.13-25.)

N. Parks and Recreation

Future residential development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update and development projects in areas surrounding the City would contribute to the cumulative need for more recreational open space and park facilities within the City. The analysis of cumulative impacts to parks and recreation considers buildout of the City and growth and development in the San Gabriel Valley through year 2035. (EIR p. 4.14-13.)

Typically, parkland requirements are a function of expected demand and are typically related to the number of residential dwelling units created by projects. Pursuant to Section 66477 of the California Government Code (or Quimby Act), the City of Arcadia requires payment of a Park Facilities Impact Fee for the provision of parks and recreational facilities to new residential developments. Adjacent cities (e.g., Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Temple City, and El Monte) and the County of Los Angeles have also adopted Quimby Act ordinances that require the payment of fees or the dedication of parkland to meet the demand for parks and recreational facilities generated by each residential development. (EIR p. 4.14-13.)

Consistent with these regulations, developers of individual projects would pay park fees, dedicate open space lands for park and recreation development, and/or provide on-site recreational facilities to meet the demand for parks and recreational facilities generated by each development. Thus, residential developments in and around the City of Arcadia would provide parks and recreational facilities to meet their demands. (EIR p. 4.14-13.)

As previously discussed, the construction and operation of new parkland facilities within and adjacent to the City would result in short-term and long-term environmental impacts. Individual park projects would be subject to separate CEQA review once development plans are identified. (EIR p. 4.14-13.)

With implementation of the Standard Conditions discussed in the applicable sections within Section 4.0 of this EIR, as well as the General Plan Update goals and policies, less than significant impacts from the development of future parkland are anticipated. Adjacent jurisdictions have similar requirements and policies. Since individual development projects would mitigate their incremental demand for parks and recreational facilities, no significant cumulative impacts would result from future development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update. (EIR p. 4.14-13.)

The development of new parks and recreational facilities to meet the demand of future growth and development in the San Gabriel Valley would not result in cumulative environmental impacts. Since the Valley is largely built out, these projects are not expected to represent a significant amount of new development and construction in the Valley. These projects would be subject to separate CEQA review once specific development plans are identified. Since new parks developed under the General Plan Update would have less than significant impacts, the Update's cumulative contribution to impacts related to parks and recreation is also considered less than significant. (EIR p. 4.14-13.)

O. Transportation

Traffic issues are generally regional in nature, with drivers and travelers commuting throughout the Southern California region to places of employment and residence. Thus, cumulative traffic impacts are evaluated based on impacts to the roadway transportation network that serves the region. The SCAG 2008 RTP model used in assessing traffic impacts accounts for background growth in traffic volumes and increases in vehicle trips due to growth and development outside the City. (EIR p. 4.15-33.)

Future development pursuant to the General Plan Update, public and infrastructure projects, and future growth and development in the rest of the region would increase the number of vehicle trips to, through, and from the City and within the region. Traffic congestion is expected to increase on freeways and major roadways if no changes to the existing transportation network are made. Some vehicle trips would be confined to the City (short trips), while other trips would travel outside the City to surrounding cities and urban centers, and would affect the regional transportation system. (EIR p. 4.15-33.)

Based on regional traffic forecasts, SCAG has identified regional transportation improvements to meet the transportation and circulation needs of the region in its RTP and RTIP. Additional freeway travel lanes, expanded transit services, rapid bus transit expansion, high-speed rail service, dedicated truck lanes, and other projects are planned and accounted for in the travel forecasts. Planned local roadway improvements

and implementation of the City's ITS Master Plan has also been incorporated into the model to project future traffic volumes. (EIR p. 4.15-34.)

Significant adverse impacts would occur on three roadway segments in the City. Thus, buildout of the City and projected growth in the region would have cumulative adverse impacts on traffic and street system capacity. (EIR p. 4.15-34.)

Implementation of the RTP would mitigate significant adverse impacts on major roadways and freeways in the region. Compliance with pertinent Standard Conditions would prevent adverse impacts on alternative transportation systems and air traffic patterns, and would not create traffic hazards or lead to inadequate parking capacity or emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant. (EIR p. 4.15-34.)

P. Utilities and Service Systems

Growth and development within the San Gabriel Valley would generate increased demand for utility services from various service agencies. While increases in utility demands would occur on agencies that do not serve the City, future development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update and public and infrastructure projects would not add to the service demands of these outside agencies. At the same time, cumulative impacts on regional utility providers would account for growth and development within the larger region, rather than just the San Gabriel Valley. Thus, the cumulative analysis for impacts on utility services considers the service area of the respective providers and adjacent service agencies, as they may be affected by services to be provided within the City and its SOI. (EIR p. 4.16-35.)

1. **Water Supply and Infrastructure.** Water services in the City are provided by the City, Sunny Slope Water Company, East Pasadena Water Company, the CAWC, the SGVWC, and the GSWC. Future development pursuant to the General Plan Update and public and infrastructure projects within the service areas of these companies would lead to an increase in demand for water services. Each water company is expected to provide service as projected in their individual UWMPs, which outline the agency's water supplies, projected 20-year demands, water supplies to meet demands, and programs to reduce water demands during periods of drought. Regular updates of these UWMPs would allow each water agency to effectively plan for future demand and supply availability. (EIR p. 4.16-36.)

Due to decreasing availability of imported water sources and in compliance with SBX7_7, it is anticipated that reductions in water use and greater use of recycled water and alternative sources would occur in the region. Since groundwater pumping in the project area is regulated by the Main San Gabriel Master Watermaster and the Raymond Basin Management Board, no significant adverse impacts on groundwater supplies are expected. This means that alternative water sources would be explored or aggressive water conservation measures implemented to meet future demands. Management of the local groundwater basins and compliance with water conservation measures is expected to prevent any significant cumulative adverse impacts related to water services. (EIR p. 4.16-36.)

2. **Wastewater Treatment and Infrastructure.** Cumulative impacts on sewer services would occur within the service area of the LACSD, which serves the City. Future growth and development in the region would generate additional sewage and wastewater that would require treatment at the WRPs of the LACSD. The LACSD has indicated that the design capacities of their treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecasts of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Expansion of LACSD facilities must be sized and service phased consistent with the forecasts for the Counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. Thus, available capacity in the LACSD facilities will be limited to levels associated with growth identified by SCAG. The LACSD has indicated they will provide services to the levels legally permitted and constrained by the SCAG forecasts (LACSD 2009). Thus, future growth and development in the region, as anticipated by SCAG projections, can be served by the LACSD. Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.12, Population and Housing, the buildout of the General Plan Update would not conflict with SCAG growth projections. No significant cumulative adverse impacts on sewer services are expected. (EIR p. 4.16-36.)

3. **Solid Waste.** Solid waste collection services are provided on demand by private haulers, and cumulative impacts on their services from future development pursuant to the General Plan Update, public and infrastructure projects in the City, and growth and development within the San Gabriel Valley are not expected to result in adverse impacts on solid waste collection services. Available landfill capacity is expected to decrease over time with future growth and development in the San Gabriel Valley. Waste reduction and recycling programs and regulations are expected to reduce this demand and extend the life of existing landfills. (EIR p. 4.16-36.)

As discussed earlier, the LACSD has indicated that they are pursuing additional landfill capacity for the County through the use of a waste-by-rail system. This system is expected to begin operations by 2011/2012, with the Puente Hills Intermodal Facility in the City of Industry to be used for loading and unloading of rail-ready containers for the transport of wastes to the Mesquite Regional Landfill in Imperial County (LACSD 2009a). The Mesquite Regional Landfill is estimated to provide approximately 100 years of disposal capacity (LACSD 2007). Thus, cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal facilities are expected to be less than significant. (EIR pp. 4.16-36 to 37.)

4. **Electricity, Natural Gas, and Communication Infrastructure.** SCE, Sempra Utilities, AT&T, Time Warner, and Champion Broadband are private companies that provide services on demand. Thus, no significant cumulative adverse impacts on their services are expected. Service connections to existing facilities would need to be coordinated with individual utility agencies. Additionally, all projects are required to comply with State and local regulations related to energy conservation. The General Plan Update also contains goals and policies that promote energy conservation. Thus, no significant cumulative adverse impacts related to electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications systems would occur. (EIR p. 4.16-37.)

Q. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The assessment of GHGs is inherently cumulative because global warming is a global phenomenon. Therefore, the analysis of GHG Emissions above in Section IV of this Resolution describes the cumulative impact of the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts would be cumulatively significant. (EIR p. 4.17-24.)

SECTION VI
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE
ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Future development that would be allowed by the General Plan Update and public and infrastructure projects in the City would require the long-term commitment of natural resources. Implementation of the project would require the long-term commitment of natural resources and land. Development over time would result in the commitment of land resources for residential, commercial, mixed-use, office, industrial, and transportation uses, as well as new and upgraded utilities. (EIR p. 6-1.)

Over the long term, new development would require the commitment and reduction of nonrenewable and slowly renewable resources, including petroleum fuels and natural gas (for vehicle emissions, construction, lighting, heating, and cooling of structures) and lumber, sand/gravel, steel, copper, lead, and other metals (for use in building construction, roadways, and infrastructure). Other resources that are slow to renew and/or recover from environmental stressors would also be impacted by long-term implementation of the General Plan (e.g., air quality through the combustion of fossil fuels and production of greenhouse gases, and water supply through the increased potable water demands for drinking, cooking, cleaning, landscaping, and general maintenance needs). (EIR p. 6-2.)

SECTION VII
FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Pursuant to Sections 15126(d) and 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, this section is provided to examine ways in which the proposed 2010 General Plan Update could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional development, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. To address this issue, potential growth-inducing effects are examined through analysis of the following questions:

1. Would this project remove obstacles to growth (e.g., through the construction or extension of major infrastructure facilities that do not presently exist in the project area or through changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development)?
2. Would this project result in the need to expand one or more public services to maintain desired levels of service?

3. Would this project encourage or facilitate economic effects that could result in other activities that could significantly affect the environment?
4. Would approval of this project involve some precedent-setting action that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

It should be noted that growth-inducing effects are not necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. This issue is presented to provide additional information on ways in which this Project could contribute to significant changes in the environment beyond the direct consequences of implementing the proposed 2010 General Plan Update.

1. **Would the project remove obstacles to growth (e.g., through the construction or extension of major infrastructure facilities that do not presently exist in the project area, or through changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development)?**

The proposed 2010 General Plan Update would involve buildout of the City of Arcadia. Since the City is largely developed with urban and suburban land uses, the roadway and utility infrastructure systems are largely in place and would not require extension to serve future development pursuant to the 2010 General Plan Update. Extension of sewer lines would provide sewer service to future development at the northern end of the City. However, this extension would not serve other nearby areas that may be induced to develop. No growth-inducing impact related to the extension of infrastructure is expected with the 2010 General Plan Update. (EIR p. 6-2.)

The Land Use Policy Map that is proposed as part of the 2010 General Plan Update includes changes in existing land use designations within several areas of the City, with the broad goal of promoting investment in these areas. However, the majority of existing land uses in the City would be preserved, and no new development is expected in these other areas. Instead, the proposed General Plan Update seeks to induce growth in the City by encouraging future development within focus areas deemed appropriate for additional density. As summarized above, significant adverse impacts would be avoided or reduced through compliance with the existing regulations, Standard Conditions, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures. Significant unavoidable adverse impacts would remain on Air Quality, Noise, Traffic, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. (EIR p. 6-2 to 6-3.)

The 2010 General Plan Update does not propose any changes to existing land use designations within the Sphere of Influence (SOI); however, the existing designations could eventually lead to the redevelopment of some areas to different land uses or higher densities. The General Plan Update does not change the development potential of its SOI. Additionally, no change in development potential is proposed at the northern end of the City, Santa Anita Park, Westfield Regional Mall, and the majority of the City's residential neighborhoods. The General Plan Update is not expected to

induce development in areas outside the City and its SOI since the City, through the Arcadia General Plan, has no jurisdiction over these adjacent areas.

For these reasons, the City Council hereby finds that amount and type of future growth that would occur under the proposed General Plan Update would not be significant. All future development pursuant to the General Plan Update would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Subsequent environmental review would further refine the analysis of potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures needed for individual developments. (EIR p. 6-5.)

2. Would the project result in the need to expand one or more public services to maintain desired levels of service?

Increased demand for public services would occur with future development pursuant to the General Plan Update. The Arcadia Fire Department has indicated that new personnel are needed to serve demand for fire protection services at buildout of the City. The Arcadia Police Department has indicated that additional sworn and non-sworn officers are needed to serve future development. The General Plan Update includes implementation actions to review fire and police protection services regularly and the development of a Multi-Department Training Facility for the needs of the Fire, Police, and Public Works Departments. (EIR p. 6-3.)

The AUSD has indicated that it will need to prepare a detailed analysis for school facility needs as development occurs in the City. The Arcadia Library has indicated that as the City approaches buildout, they expect that a close examination of library space with regard to service delivery methods would need to be undertaken. Demand for parks would be met by park development with future residential development and City projects to meet existing demands. The impacts of public and infrastructure projects that would be needed to serve the City at buildout are analyzed in this EIR. (EIR p. 6-3.)

Since no specific development project would accompany the General Plan Update, and future development would occur according to property owner discretion, increased demand for public services would not immediately require expansion of existing service levels. The General Plan Update contains goals and policies that call for the provision of adequate public services to existing and future developments in the City. It also includes implementation actions to reduce demand for public services. Thus, City services would serve demand, rather than induce growth. (EIR p. 6-3.)

Future needs to expand public services through additional equipment and personnel would not have a direct environmental impact. No new fire stations, police stations, schools, libraries, or other public facilities are proposed as part of the General Plan Update. However, a Multi-Department Training Facility is proposed, which has been considered as a public project in the City that is analyzed in this EIR. Thus, the City Council hereby finds that the General Plan Update would not have significant growth-inducing consequences with respect to public services. (EIR pp. 6-3 to 4.)

3. Would the project encourage or facilitate economic effects that could result in other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

The General Plan Update includes an Economic Development Element that seeks to maintain the economic stability of the City through the retention of existing businesses; attraction of businesses and economic opportunities; revitalization of downtown; and recycling of existing uses within specific areas of the City. The goals and policies of this Element will not directly result in economic effects or lead to economic activities that may affect the environment. Rather, it is through future development under the General Plan Update that the goals of the Economic Development Element for Downtown revitalization, redevelopment, business retention, and new business development would be realized. The policies would serve as guidance in the City's decision-making process and daily operations, but would not include activities that may significantly affect the environment. The implementation actions related to Economic Development are City-sponsored activities to attract businesses, explore the creation of a Downtown business improvement district, update the economic analyses, hold marketing events, coordinate with the development community, and partner with stakeholders that would not have any direct environmental impacts. The impacts of redevelopment activities are addressed as part of public and infrastructure projects in the City. (EIR p. 6-4.)

The indirect effects associated with future development include the creation of short-term construction jobs and long-term jobs and the increase in the resident population of the City. These would generate additional demands for commercial goods and services in the project area, which would present business opportunities for new shopping, entertainment, employment, home improvement, maintenance, and other non-residential developments. This would, in turn, encourage new businesses and/or the expansion of existing businesses that address these economic needs. The proposed Land Use Policy Map in the General Plan Update would accommodate commercial and industrial developments to meet this demand. The analysis in this EIR includes the potential environmental impacts of non-residential development that may occur under the proposed Land Use Policy Map. (EIR p. 6-4.)

Existing and future commercial and industrial uses near the City are also expected to meet the demand for goods and services generated by future residents and employees in the City. These developments would be subject to review and approval by the city or county with jurisdiction over the site, and would include the necessary environmental clearance in accordance with the CEQA. Environmental review for individual projects would avoid or reduce potentially significant adverse impacts that may occur, in accordance with CEQA. Public utility and service providers would also need to determine if the additional growth associated with individual projects can be accommodated by existing or planned infrastructure improvements and public services and utility agencies' capabilities to provide services. This review and approval of individual developments by public agencies and service providers would allow the provision of adequate services and infrastructure to serve future developments and that no land use conflicts are created. Mitigation measures, Standard Conditions, and

conditions of approval imposed on development projects in the area are expected to avoid or reduce environmental impacts, which may be indirectly attributed to the General Plan Update or future development pursuant to the General Plan Update and public and infrastructure projects in the City. Thus, the City Council hereby finds that growth-inducing impacts of the General Plan Update are not expected to result in significant adverse effects on the environment. (EIR p. 6-4.)

4. Would approval of the project involve some precedent-setting action that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment?

The proposed Land Use Policy Map includes changes in existing land use designations within focus areas of the City, promoting the transition of these areas to higher density residential uses and/or mixed-use developments. Thus, the proposed General Plan Update seeks to induce growth by encouraging new development within specific areas deemed appropriate for more diverse and/or dense development. (EIR p. 6-5.)

Changes to the City's Zoning Regulations are proposed to accommodate the development allowed under the proposed Land Use Policy Map through consistent land use and zoning designations. However, like the General Plan Update, the change would not be accompanied by a specific development proposal or construction activity that may result in environmental impacts. (EIR p. 6-5.)

While a number of policies in the General Plan Update call for revisions or additional regulations, these regulations are expected to reduce the environmental impacts of future development or to meet the demands and needs for adequate housing, infrastructure, and public services at buildout of the City. Mitigation measures have been identified in Section IV above to provide for the impacts of future development pursuant to the General Plan Update and public and infrastructure projects in the City to be reduced or avoided after compliance with the standard conditions. (EIR p. 6-5.)

The environmental impacts of future development pursuant to the General Plan Update have been analyzed in this EIR, but individual projects would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, although the General Plan Update may have growth-inducing impacts, the City Council hereby finds that the Standard Conditions, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures that have been included in this EIR to reduce environmental impacts to less than significant levels. Also, subsequent environmental review would further refine the analysis of potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures needed for individual developments and prevent significant adverse impacts on the environment from future development and public infrastructure projects. (EIR p. 6-5.)

SECTION VIII
FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. Background

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to consider and discuss alternatives to the proposed actions. Subsection (a) states:

- (a) An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Subsection 15126.6(b) states the purpose of the alternatives analysis:

- (b) Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

In Subsection 15126.6(c), the State CEQA Guidelines describe the selection process for a range of reasonable alternatives:

- (c) The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the

factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are:(i) failure to meet most of the basic Project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The range of alternatives required is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project. Alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project.

However, when significant impacts can be mitigated by the adoption of mitigation measures, the lead agency has no obligation to consider the feasibility of alternatives with respect to that impact in its findings, even if the alternative would mitigate the impact to a greater degree than the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731; Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403; Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521.) The City has adopted mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR. However, impacts on Air Quality, Noise, Transportation and GHG Emissions would remain significant.

The proposed General Plan Update seeks to achieve the following key objectives, which are based on the City’s Guiding Principles for future decision-making:

- To establish a balance and mix of land uses that promote economic growth and maintain a high quality of life for Arcadia residents. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a balanced, integrated, multi-modal circulation system, which includes streets, sidewalks, bikeways, and trails, that is efficient and safe and that connects neighborhoods to jobs, shopping, services, parks, and open space areas. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To preserve the City’s identity as a “Community of Homes” by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain a commitment to working with the school district to achieve mutually beneficial goals. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To embrace and celebrate the cultural diversity of Arcadia through the promotion of activities and programs that strengthen the community bonds. (EIR p. 3-32.)

- To affirm the City's commitment to environmental sustainability by taking actions that work toward achieving regional environmental quality goals, providing local government support, encouraging partnerships, and fostering innovation in sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To provide high-quality services that generate a source of civic pride and bring the community together. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and development of diverse housing that meets people's needs in all stages of their lives. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a healthy economy with a diversified employment and fiscal base that is accessible to local residents and responsive to local needs, while providing a balance of regional serving businesses that attract additional regional income. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain and enhance special places and features that contribute to the City's character, such as Santa Anita Park, the Los Angeles County Arboretum and Botanical Garden, a vibrant Downtown, the urban forest, attractive streetscapes, diverse parks, historic buildings and places, and nearby mountain views. (EIR p. 3-32.)

There are two types of alternatives evaluated in the EIR. First are the alternatives that were considered but were rejected from further consideration. Reasons for elimination included failure to meet basic project objectives, infeasibility, or inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(c).) Those alternatives were:

- Alternative Site
- Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan
- Reduced Residential Density Alternative

(EIR pp. 5-3 to 4.) Second are the alternatives that were considered in detail. Those alternatives are:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Development
- Alternative 2: No Project/Existing General Plan
- Alternative 3: Reduced Commercial Alternative
- Alternative 4: Expanded Downtown Focus Area

(EIR p. 5-3.) A complete discussion for alternatives that were considered in detail is provided below.

B. Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Consideration

In determining an appropriate range of alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR, a number of possible alternatives were initially considered and rejected. Alternatives

were rejected because either they could not accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project, would not have resulted in a reduction of potentially significant impacts, or were considered infeasible. The specific reason for not selecting each of the rejected alternatives are described below.

1. Alternative Site

Alternative Site. The State CEQA Guidelines require consideration of an alternative that examines the proposed Project on a different site. (State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(2)(A); EIR p. 5-3.)

Finding. For the reasons set forth below in the Supporting Explanation, the City Council rejects the Alternative Site Alternative because (1) it is infeasible and (2) because the Alternative Site Alternative does not meet most of the Project objectives. Each of the stated grounds for rejecting the Alternative Site Alternative is independently sufficient to justify rejection of this alternative. Consequently, the City Council finds that it was not required to analyze the Alternative site Alternative in further detail in the EIR. (EIR pp. 5-3 to 4.)

Supporting Explanation. In the case of the proposed Project, moving the Project to an alternative site is not feasible because the General Plan Update is a comprehensive update of the entire plan for the entire City. Because the goals, policies and implementation actions, as well as the Land Use Policy Map, Roadway Plan, and other plans in the proposed General Plan Update, are specific to and encompass the entirety of the City of Arcadia and its Sphere of Influence, an alternative site where the City has no jurisdiction is not feasible. Therefore, further analysis of an alternative site in this EIR is not required. (EIR pp. 5-3 to 4.)

Siting the Project at an alternative site would be inconsistent with all of the Project objectives, which seek to enhance the City's planning vision:

- To establish a balance and mix of land uses that promote economic growth and maintain a high quality of life for Arcadia residents. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a balanced, integrated, multi-modal circulation system, which includes streets, sidewalks, bikeways, and trails, that is efficient and safe and that connects neighborhoods to jobs, shopping, services, parks, and open space areas. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To preserve the City's identity as a "Community of Homes" by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain a commitment to working with the school district to achieve mutually beneficial goals. (EIR p. 3-32.)

- To embrace and celebrate the cultural diversity of Arcadia through the promotion of activities and programs that strengthen the community bonds. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To affirm the City's commitment to environmental sustainability by taking actions that work toward achieving regional environmental quality goals, providing local government support, encouraging partnerships, and fostering innovation in sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To provide high-quality services that generate a source of civic pride and bring the community together. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and development of diverse housing that meets people's needs in all stages of their lives. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a healthy economy with a diversified employment and fiscal base that is accessible to local residents and responsive to local needs, while providing a balance of regional serving businesses that attract additional regional income. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain and enhance special places and features that contribute to the City's character, such as Santa Anita Park, the Los Angeles County Arboretum and Botanical Garden, a vibrant Downtown, the urban forest, attractive streetscapes, diverse parks, historic buildings and places, and nearby mountain views. (EIR p. 3-32.)

The basic purpose of the Project is to update the City's General Plan, which covers the entire City. Consideration of the General Plan Update in a different jurisdiction or only in some portions of the City would not address the City's desire to update its vision for the new planning horizon. Therefore, the Alternative Site Alternative was rejected from further consideration. (EIR p. 5-3 to 5-4.)

2. Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan

Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan. This alternative included ten focus areas where future development would be separated into Mixed Use, Commercial, and Public designations with three designations for each land use; increases in allowable density for High Density Residential areas; expanded Mixed Use areas; and redesignation of Commercial/Industrial areas. (EIR p. 5-4.)

Finding. For the reasons set forth below in the Supporting Explanation, the City Council rejects the Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan because (1) it is infeasible and (2) because the Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan does not meet most of the Project objectives. Each of the stated grounds for rejecting the Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan Alternative is independently sufficient to justify rejection of this alternative. Consequently, the City Council finds that it was not required to analyze the Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan Alternative in further detail in the EIR. (EIR p. 5-4.)

Supporting Explanation. Implementation of the Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan would be infeasible because this alternative is too aggressive and results in greater environmental impacts than the proposed Project. The Planning Commission and City Council considered this Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan Alternative and found that it would result in greater environmental impacts than the proposed Land Use Policy Map presented in the proposed General Plan Update. (EIR p. 5-4.)

The following Project objectives would not be achieved under the Expanded Mixed Use Land Use Plan:

- To establish a balance and mix of land uses that promote economic growth and maintain a high quality of life for Arcadia residents. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To preserve the City's identity as a "Community of Homes" by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To affirm the City's commitment to environmental sustainability by taking actions that work toward achieving regional environmental quality goals, providing local government support, encouraging partnerships, and fostering innovation in sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To provide high-quality services that generate a source of civic pride and bring the community together. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and development of diverse housing that meets people's needs in all stages of their lives. (EIR p. 3-32.)

Therefore, the Alternative Site Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

3. Reduced Residential Density Alternative

Reduced Residential Density Alternative. This alternative considers a reduction in the maximum residential density that would be allowed in the Downtown Mixed Use area and the Mixed Use areas along Live Oak Avenue and First Avenue. (EIR p. 5-4.)

Finding. For the reasons set forth below in the Supporting Explanation, the City Council rejects the Reduced Residential Density Alternative because (1) it is infeasible and (2) because the Reduced Residential Density Alternative does not meet most of the Project objectives. Each of the stated grounds for rejecting the Reduced Residential Density Alternative is independently sufficient to justify rejection of this alternative. Consequently, the City Council finds that it was not required to analyze the Reduced Residential Density Alternative in further detail in the EIR. (EIR p. 5-4.)

Supporting Explanation. Implementation of the Reduced Residential Density Alternative would be infeasible because it would prohibit the City from meeting its future

housing needs under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. A General Plan that could not accommodate the future housing needs of the City would not meet State requirements, would result in reduced housing opportunities, and would not meet the housing goals of the City as contained in the proposed Housing Element. In addition, this alternative would effectively reduce the buildout capacity of the City in terms of housing stock and residential population. (EIR p. 5-4.)

Moreover, the following Project objectives would not be achieved under the Reduced Residential Density Alternative:

- To preserve the City's identity as a "Community of Homes" by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and development of diverse housing that meets people's needs in all stages of their lives. (EIR p. 3-32.)

Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further consideration. (EIR p. 5-4.)

C. Alternatives Considered in Detail in the EIR

The following Project Alternatives were considered in detail in the EIR. These alternatives are rejected for various reasons as set forth below.

1. Alternative 1: No Project/No Development

No Project/No Development Alternative. This alternative assumes that no development would occur in the City and existing land uses and environmental conditions would remain as is indefinitely. This assumes that the city would not allow any new development project in the City of Arcadia, except for the replacement of existing land uses with the same type and size of land uses. Under this alternative, vacant lands will remain undeveloped. (EIR p. 5-5.)

Finding: Based upon the Supporting Explanation below, the City Council rejects the No Project/No Development Alternative because (1) it would be infeasible and (2) would not meet any of the Project objectives. (EIR p. 5-5 to 5-8.) Each of the stated grounds for rejecting the No Project/No Development Alternative is independently sufficient to justify rejection of this alternative.

Supporting Explanation: Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would be infeasible because of individual property rights. That is, property owners on vacant lands have the right to an economic use of their property, which this alternative would prevent. This alternative could only be implemented if the City bought out vacant lands and designated them as open space for permanent preservation. (EIR p. 5-5.)

This alternative would not meet any of the following Project objectives for the comprehensive update of the General Plan:

- To establish a balance and mix of land uses that promote economic growth and maintain a high quality of life for Arcadia residents. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a balanced, integrated, multi-modal circulation system, which includes streets, sidewalks, bikeways, and trails, that is efficient and safe and that connects neighborhoods to jobs, shopping, services, parks, and open space areas. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To preserve the City's identity as a "Community of Homes" by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain a commitment to working with the school district to achieve mutually beneficial goals. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To embrace and celebrate the cultural diversity of Arcadia through the promotion of activities and programs that strengthen the community bonds. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To affirm the City's commitment to environmental sustainability by taking actions that work toward achieving regional environmental quality goals, providing local government support, encouraging partnerships, and fostering innovation in sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To provide high-quality services that generate a source of civic pride and bring the community together. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and development of diverse housing that meets people's needs in all stages of their lives. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a healthy economy with a diversified employment and fiscal base that is accessible to local residents and responsive to local needs, while providing a balance of regional serving businesses that attract additional regional income. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain and enhance special places and features that contribute to the City's character, such as Santa Anita Park, the Los Angeles County Arboretum and Botanical Garden, a vibrant Downtown, the urban forest, attractive streetscapes, diverse parks, historic buildings and places, and nearby mountain views. (EIR p. 3-32.)

(EIR p. 5-8.) Moreover, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not incorporate new goals and policies to address the needs of the existing resident population nor address current regional issues on GHG emission reductions and sustainability. (EIR p. 5-8.) Therefore, the City Council hereby rejects the No Project/No Development Alternative. (EIR p. 5-5 to 5-8.)

2. Alternative 2: No Project/Existing General Plan

No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative considers the comparative environmental impacts of the continued implementation of the current General Plan through the year 2035, the buildout year of the proposed General Plan Update. This alternative assumes the current General Plan would remain as the adopted long-range planning policy document for the City of Arcadia, with future development occurring pursuant to the City's current General Plan goals and policies and Land Use Map. Buildout under this alternative (the City's current General Plan) is estimated at 22,128 units in the City and its SOI, with 60,940 residents and over 12.2 million square feet of non-residential development. This development capacity would lead to 2,443 fewer dwelling units, 6,656 fewer residents, and 2.4 million square feet of non-residential development less than the development capacity of the proposed Project. (EIR p. 5-9.)

Finding: Based upon the Supporting Explanation below, the City Council rejects the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative because (1) it would have greater impacts than the proposed Project in some resource areas and (2) it would not meet the Project objectives. (EIR pp. 5-9 to 13.) Each of the stated grounds for rejecting the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is independently sufficient to justify rejection of this alternative.

Supporting Explanation: Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would have greater impacts on biological resources because the public designation of open space under the current General Plan would not prevent future development on these areas. (EIR p. 5-13.) Moreover, this alternative would also lead to significant and unavoidable adverse pollutant emission, noise, traffic, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts. (EIR p. 5-12.)

In addition, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not meet the following Project objectives:

- To promote a balanced, integrated, multi-modal circulation system, which includes streets, sidewalks, bikeways, and trails, that is efficient and safe and that connects neighborhoods to jobs, shopping, services, parks, and open space areas. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To preserve the City's identity as a "Community of Homes" by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)

- To maintain a commitment to working with the school district to achieve mutually beneficial goals. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To affirm the City's commitment to environmental sustainability by taking actions that work toward achieving regional environmental quality goals, providing local government support, encouraging partnerships, and fostering innovation in sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and development of diverse housing that meets people's needs in all stages of their lives. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain and enhance special places and features that contribute to the City's character, such as Santa Anita Park, the Los Angeles County Arboretum and Botanical Garden, a vibrant Downtown, the urban forest, attractive streetscapes, diverse parks, historic buildings and places, and nearby mountain views. (EIR p. 3-32.)

Therefore, the City Council hereby rejects the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. (EIR pp. 5.9 to 12.)

3. Alternative 3: Reduced Commercial Alternative

Reduced Commercial Alternative. This alternative decreases the allowable FAR in the Commercial areas within the Downtown overlay from 1.0 to 0.50, except on Huntington Drive between Santa Anita Avenue and Second Avenue. This may also be accomplished by the elimination of the Downtown overlay for areas west of Santa Anita Avenue and along Santa Anita Avenue, except for the parcels at the intersection of Huntington Drive and Santa Anita Avenue. This alternative would include the retention of the same allowable residential densities in the City's residential areas, Downtown Mixed Use, and Mixed Use areas as the proposed Land Use Policy Map. Commercial, Regional Commercial, and Industrial areas would be allowed to develop at a maximum FAR 0.5 and Public Facilities, Open Space - Outdoor Recreation, and Open Space - Resource Protection would also be designated as in the proposed General Plan Update.

Finding: Based upon the Supporting Explanation below, the City Council rejects the Reduced Commercial Development Alternative because (1) it would not result in a reduction in potentially significant environmental impacts and (2) would not meet the Project objectives. (EIR p. 5-13 to 5-17.) Each of the stated grounds for rejecting the Reduced Commercial Alternative is independently sufficient to justify rejection of this alternative.

Supporting Explanation: Implementation of the Reduced Commercial Alternative would not result in a reduction in potentially significant environmental impacts when compared to the proposed Project. The Reduced Commercial Alternative would still contribute to existing air quality and noise violations, traffic congestion, and GHG emissions, which would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Reduced

Commercial Alternative would have the same significant unavoidable impacts as the proposed Project. (EIR p. 5-17.)

In addition, this alternative does not represent the mix of land uses and development that the residents, stakeholders, City staff, and leaders envisioned at buildout of the City and its SOI. It would not encourage redevelopment and revitalization of the downtown area and near the proposed Gold Line station. Consequently, the Reduced Commercial Alternative would not achieve the following Project objectives:

- To establish a balance and mix of land uses that promote economic growth and maintain a high quality of life for Arcadia residents. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a balanced, integrated, multi-modal circulation system, which includes streets, sidewalks, bikeways, and trails, that is efficient and safe and that connects neighborhoods to jobs, shopping, services, parks, and open space areas. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To preserve the City's identity as a "Community of Homes" by protecting and preserving the character and quality of its neighborhoods by requiring harmonious design, careful planning, and the integration of sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To affirm the City's commitment to environmental sustainability by taking actions that work toward achieving regional environmental quality goals, providing local government support, encouraging partnerships, and fostering innovation in sustainable principles. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To promote a healthy economy with a diversified employment and fiscal base that is accessible to local residents and responsive to local needs, while providing a balance of regional serving businesses that attract additional regional income. (EIR p. 3-32.)
- To maintain and enhance special places and features that contribute to the City's character, such as Santa Anita Park, the Los Angeles County Arboretum and Botanical Garden, a vibrant Downtown, the urban forest, attractive streetscapes, diverse parks, historic buildings and places, and nearby mountain views. (EIR p. 3-32.)

(EIR p. 5-17.) Therefore, the City Council hereby rejects the Reduced Commercial Alternative. (EIR p. 5-17.)

4. Alternative 4: Expanded Downtown Focus Area

Expanded Downtown Focus Area Alternative. This alternative would still preserve existing residential areas in the City, as well as promote the transition of existing land uses in the same eight focus areas but expands the Downtown Mixed Use