CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE NORWALK TRANSIT VILLAGE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

State Clearinghouse No. 2022070103

I. BACKGROUND

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

The lead agency is responsible for the adequacy and objectivity of the EIR. The City of Norwalk, as lead agency, has subjected the Draft EIR and Final EIR to the agency's own review and analysis.

A. PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Norwalk (City) is located in the southeastern portion of Los Angeles County. Surrounding cities include Santa Fe Springs to the north, the City of La Mirada to the east, the City of Cerritos to the south, and the City of Downey to the west.

The project site is generally situated between Imperial Highway to the north, Zimmerman Park and the Union Pacific Railroad to the east, and Bloomfield Avenue to the west. The project site (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 8045-008-902) is located within a predominantly residential area, with a residential townhome community to the north (Norwalk Manor); a 9.4-acre public park (Zimmerman Park) to the east; single-family residential units, a senior residential community, and a hospital (Norwalk Community Hospital) to the south; and single-family residential units to the west, across Bloomfield Avenue. Surrounding urban development includes a mix of commercial, residential, and institutional uses. Regional access to the site is provided via Interstate 5 (I-5). Local access is provided via Imperial Highway and Bloomfield Avenue. Additionally, transit access is available for the project site via the Norwalk-Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station, located approximately 0.2 miles north of the project site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes the Norwalk Transit Village Specific Plan (Specific Plan) and Tentative Tract Map to allow the demolition of the former CYA facility and construction of a mixed-use transit-oriented community with a mix of retail, hospitality, multi-family residential uses, and park/open space land uses. The proposed Specific Plan would establish development guidelines and standards that would be used to regulate basic planning and development concepts for future development within the project site.
The proposed Specific Plan would allow the following within eight Planning Areas:

- A new neighborhood commercial center encompassing approximately 3.06 acres of the site. The commercial center (approximately 66,647 square feet of building area) would be situated in the westerly portion of the project adjacent to Bloomfield Avenue. The neighborhood commercial center would include non-residential uses at a maximum floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of 0.5, as well as an approximately 150-key hotel. The 0.5 FAR excludes the hotel use.

- Residential blocks would allow up to 770 residential units (at a density that ranges between 20 to 85 dwelling units per acre [du/ac]) that would consist of the following:
  - A mix of multi-family units, apartments, and townhomes;
  - At least 40 percent of the total number of residential units in the project as affordable, compliant with the Surplus Land Act exemption per California Government Code Section 37364; and
  - Each residential block would be permitted to contain up to 3,500 square feet of ground floor ancillary commercial uses allowing a maximum of 13,500 square feet of ancillary commercial/quasi-civic uses such as childcare and community services in total for the project.
    - The ancillary commercial uses allowed within the residential blocks is in addition to the non-residential commercial uses allowed in Planning Area 1
- Open space would be provided through a combination of common and private, active and passive recreation areas, including a 1.56-acre park and 2.06 acres of linear parks; the 2.06 acres would be comprised of a 1.53-acre linear park and a 0.28-acre contiguous dog run.
- A 0.25-acre pump station is conceptually located in the northeast portion of Planning Area 8.

Norwalk Transit Village Specific Plan

The Norwalk Transit Village Specific Plan (Specific Plan) would guide the development of a mixed-use transit-oriented development at the project site with a mix of office/retail, multi-family residential uses, and park land uses. Transit-oriented development is a compact, walkable, high-density mixed-use residential and commercial area located within 0.25- to 0.5-miles of a transit station, incorporating features to encourage transit use throughout the day such as a mix of uses, high-quality pedestrian and bicycle access, narrow streets, and reduced parking requirements. The proposed Specific Plan includes land use types such as residential, restaurant, hotel, and ground floor active commercial/quasi-public spaces and would prioritize transit access.

The Specific Plan is intended to provide an orderly and efficient development of the project site, in accordance with the provisions of the *City of Norwalk General Plan* (General Plan). The Specific Plan would serve both planning and regulatory functions including land use regulations, circulation patterns, public facilities/infrastructure, and development standards. All future development within the Specific Plan would be subject to compliance with the Specific Plan regulations, as well as other applicable Norwalk Municipal Code (Municipal Code) regulations.

Land Use Plan and Development Standards

To support the connectivity between the project site, the Metrolink Station, City Hall, and Zimmerman Park, a mix of land uses have been incorporated into the plan to create a vibrant project that is cohesive with and benefits the existing neighborhood. The proposed mixed-use concept features market rate and affordable high-density housing, both rental and for-sale, an approximately 150-key hotel, commercial uses (e.g., restaurants), and open spaces (e.g., parks, trails) in eight Planning Areas. The following land use designations would be established by the proposed Specific Plan:

- **Mixed Use High Density Residential (MU-H)** – The Norwalk Transit Village would primarily consist of high density, transit oriented residential uses at a density that ranges between 20 to 85 du/ac with a maximum of 770 residential units for the entire Specific Plan area. This includes market-rate and affordable multi-family dwellings, including apartments, stacked flats, townhomes, and similar building configurations. Single-family and two-family dwellings are not permitted in this district. To achieve a vibrant public realm and support a walkable neighborhood, up to 3,500 square feet of active commercial uses are permitted on the ground floor level of developments within each Planning Area.

- **Mixed Use Commercial (MU-C)** – The Norwalk Transit Village would provide neighborhood-serving commercial uses, such as restaurants and businesses that provide goods and services that people would frequently use to take care of their personal and household needs. Examples include small grocery stores/markets, eating and drinking establishments, dry cleaners, and hospitality uses. No residential uses are permitted in this district.
- **Open Space (O)** – A publicly accessible network of parks and linear parks/greenways would run through the Norwalk Transit Village site and connect it to Zimmerman Park. A variety of community and wellness-oriented amenities that promote health, social, and mental well-being would be distributed throughout the open space network. Examples of those amenities may include a tot lot with play structures, shade structures, walking trails, par course or fitness equipment, community gathering areas, community gardens, outdoor seating, dog runs, etc.

The Land Use Plan has been organized by Planning Areas (PAs) for the purpose of land use planning. As noted above, the proposed Specific Plan encompasses eight PAs. These PAs identify the anticipated build out assumptions for the proposed project by land use designation. The proposed Specific Plan Section 2.5, *Permitted Uses*, identifies permitted uses within each land use designation.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project objectives are outlined below:

- Provide up to 770 new market rate and affordable housing opportunities that would assist the City of Norwalk in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) obligation.
- Provide a mix of residential, commercial, and open space uses to serve the community.
- Create a Transit-Oriented community with pedestrian and bicycle connections to the nearby Metrolink Station.
- Require at least 40 percent of the residential units to be affordable to low and very low-income households.
- Establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, and health and wellness-focused amenities.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR (dated February 2024); clarification of modifications to the proposed project since the Draft EIR; written comments received during the Draft EIR public review period; written responses to those comments; an Errata; and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (State Clearinghouse No. 2022070103) (hereinafter referred to collectively as the Final EIR). In conformance with CEQA and the *CEQA Guidelines*, the City conducted an extensive environmental review of the proposed project. The following is a summary of the City's environmental review process:

- Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15082, as amended, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to public agencies and members of the public who had requested such notice for a 30-day period. The NOP was submitted to the State Clearinghouse and posted at the Los Angeles Clerk's office on July 08, 2022, with the 30-day review period beginning on July 08, 2022 and ending on August 8, 2022. Copies of the NOP were made available for public review at the City of Norwalk Community Development Department, Norwalk Library, and Alondra Library.

- A public scoping meeting was held on July 21, 2022 at the City Council Chambers.

- A Draft EIR was prepared and distributed for a 45-day public review period beginning February 2, 2024 through March 18, 2024. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was announced in the local newspaper, submitted to the State Clearinghouse, sent to public agencies and interested persons and organizations, and posted at the Los Angeles County Clerk's office on February 2, 2024. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available for public review at the City of Norwalk Community Development Department, Norwalk Library, and on the City's website. Additional appendices to the Draft EIR Appendix files were made available on February 5, 2024. As such, the public review period was extended to March 20, 2024, and an updated NOA was posted with the Los Angeles County Clerk's office on February 5, 2024, sent to public agencies and interested persons and organizations, and submitted to the State Clearinghouse. The updated NOA was also posted at the project site from February 5, 2024 through March 20, 2024.

- A Final EIR was prepared, which included comment letters received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comment letters, an errata, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The Final EIR was released for a 10-day agency review period prior to certification of the Final EIR.

- Public hearings on the proposed project were held, including one Norwalk Planning Commission hearing on July 10, 2024 and one Norwalk City Council hearing on _____.

D. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

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

- The Draft EIR and the Final EIR for the proposed project;

- All written comment letters submitted by agencies, organizations, or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR;

- All responses to written comment letters submitted by agencies, organizations, or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR;

- All clarifications and modifications to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), all of which do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document and are not considered to result in any new or substantially greater significant impacts as compared to those identified in the Draft EIR;

- All written and verbal public testimony presented during noticed public hearing(s) for the proposed project;

- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;

- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the Final EIR;

- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;

- The Resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council in connection with the proposed project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein;

- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to Federal, State, and local laws and regulations; and

- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings.

E. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings for the City's actions related to the Norwalk Transit Village are located at the City of Norwalk Community Development Department, 12700 Norwalk Boulevard, Norwalk, CA 90650. The City's Director of Community Development is the custodian of the record of proceedings for the Final EIR. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings are, and at all relevant times have been and will be, available upon request at the offices of the City of Norwalk Community Development Department. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(e).

F. INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT AND FINDING

The City selected and retained Michael Baker International (Michael Baker) to prepare the EIR. Michael Baker prepared the EIR under the supervision and direction of the City. All findings set forth herein are based on substantial evidence in the record, as indicated, with respect to each specific finding.

Finding:

The City has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3) in retaining its own environmental consultant and directing the consultant in the preparation of the EIR. The City has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR and finds that the report reflects the independent judgment of the City.

The City Council has considered all the evidence presented in its consideration of the proposed project and the EIR, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR, written and oral evidence presented at hearings on the project, and written evidence submitted to the City by individuals, organizations, agencies, and other entities. On the basis of such evidence, the City Council finds that with respect to each environmental impact identified in the review process, the impact: (1) is less than significant and would not require mitigation, (2) is potentially significant but would be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of identified mitigation measures, or (3) would be significant and not fully mitigatable but would be, to the extent feasible, lessened by implementation of identified mitigation measures.

The EIR also identifies certain significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened. Prior to approving this project, the City Council also adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations which finds, based on specific reasons and substantial evidence in the record (as specified in Section III, *Statement of Overriding Considerations*), that certain identified economic, social, or other benefits of the proposed project outweigh such unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

II. FINDINGS AND FACTS

The City of Norwalk, as lead agency, is required under CEQA to make written findings concerning each alternative and each significant environmental impact identified in the Draft EIR and Final EIR.

Specifically, regarding findings, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091 provides:

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

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

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

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

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

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

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

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

The "changes or alterations" referred to in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(1) may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15370, including:

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

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

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

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

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

A. Format

This section summarizes the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, describes how these impacts are to be mitigated, and discusses various alternatives to the proposed project, which were developed in an effort to reduce the remaining significant environmental impacts.

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

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

- **Section C, Findings on Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significant,** presents potentially significant impacts of the proposed project that were identified in the Final EIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that would reduce such impacts to less than significant levels, and the rationales for the findings.

- **Section D, Findings on Significant Unavoidable Impacts**, presents potentially significant impacts of the proposed project that were identified in the Final EIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that would reduce impacts, the findings for significant unavoidable impacts, and the rationales for the findings.

- **Section E, Findings on Recirculation,** presents the reasoning as to why recirculation is not required under *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5.

- **Section F, Findings on Project Alternatives,** presents alternatives to the project and evaluates them in relation to the findings set forth in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(3), which allows a public agency to approve a project that would result in one or more significant environmental effects if the project alternatives are found to be infeasible because of specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations. This section also identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

B. FINDINGS ON IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Consistent with *CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15126.2 and 15128, the EIR focused its analysis on potentially significant impacts and limited discussion of other impacts for which it can be seen with certainty there is no potential for significant adverse environmental effects. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091 does not require specific findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as "no impact" or as a "less than significant impact."

Finding:

The City finds that based on substantial evidence in the record, the following potential impacts, to the extent they result from the proposed project, would be less than significant, or would have no impact, and would not require mitigation.

1. Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista.

Project implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.

Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Implementation of the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The project combined with other cumulative projects would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

The project combined with other cumulative projects would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Project implementation would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).

Project implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Implementation of the project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

3. Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard.

The proposed project would not result exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The proposed project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Implementation of the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Short-term construction activities associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects, would not result in increased air pollutant emission impacts or expose sensitive receptors to increased pollutant concentrations.

Implementation of the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in increased impacts pertaining to operational air emissions.

Implementation of the proposed project and related projects would not result in cumulatively considerable carbon monoxide hotspot impacts.

4. Biological Resources

Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on State or Federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Implementation of the project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

5. Cultural Resources

The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5.

Project implementation would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

6. Energy

The project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

The project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Implementation of the project and other cumulative projects would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

7. Geology and Soils

This project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault.

Project implementation would not expose people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.

Project implementation would not expose people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

The project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk, injury, or death involving landslides.

Project implementation would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

The project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

A sewer system is available for disposal of project generated wastewater and, as such, no impacts would result from having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The project is located outside of an airport land use plan and is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or within two miles of a public airport and, as such, would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through impairing or interfering with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan.

Project implementation would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

The project combined with other related projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable hazards to the public or environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The project, combined with other related projects, would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

Project implementation would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site.

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: Impede or redirect flood flows.

The project is not located in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, and as such, would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.

The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site.

The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, would not create or contribute runoff water which could exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

11. Land Use and Relevant Planning

The project would not physically divide an established community.

The project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The proposed project, combined with other related projects, would not conflict with land use plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

12. Mineral Resources

Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State.

Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

13. Noise

The project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

The project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or where such a plan has been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Construction-related activities within the project area would not result in significant cumulatively considerable temporary noise impacts to nearby noise sensitive receivers.

The proposed project would not result in a significant cumulatively considerable increase in operational mobile noise or long-term stationary ambient noise levels.

Project implementation would not result in significant cumulatively considerable vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receptors and structures.

14. Population and Housing

The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The proposed project, combined with other related projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to substantial unplanned population growth.

15. Public Services

Project implementation would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Schools.

Project implementation would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks.

Project implementation would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Other public facilities.

The project, combined with other cumulative projects, would not create increased demand for school services that would cause significant environmental impacts.

The project combined with other cumulative projects would not create increased demand for parks that would cause significant environmental impacts.

The project combined with other cumulative projects would not create increased demand for other public facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

16. Recreation

Project implementation would not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

Project implementation would not include recreational facilities, or the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which could have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

The project combined with other cumulative projects would not create increased demand for parks and recreational facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts.

17. Transportation

Project implementation would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Project implementation would not conflict or be inconsistent with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Project implementation would not substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

The project, combined with other related projects, would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

The project, combined with other related projects, would not conflict nor be inconsistent with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

18. Utilities and Service Systems

The project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

The project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

The project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

The project would comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The project, combined with other cumulative projects, would not create increased demand for water facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

The project, combined with other cumulative projects, would not create increased demand for wastewater facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

The project, combined with other cumulative projects, would not create increased demand for stormwater drainage facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

The project, combined with other cumulative projects, would not create increased demand for solid waste generation that would cause significant environmental impacts.

The project combined with other cumulative projects would not create increased demand for dry utilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

19. Wildfire

Project implementation would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Due to slope, prevailing winds, or other factors, project implementation would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Project implementation would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

C. FINDINGS ON IMPACTS MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The following summary describes the potential impacts of the proposed project that, without mitigation, would result in significant adverse impacts. Upon implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, these potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

1. Cultural Resources

CUL-2 The project could cause a significant impact to an archaeological resource on-site.

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.3, *Tribal and Cultural Resources*, and in particular, starting on page 5.3-20 of the Draft EIR.

Results from the *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Correctional Youth Authority Project* (Cultural Assessment), prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) and dated June 2021 (refer to Draft EIR Appendix 11.3, *Cultural Resources Assessment*), indicate that the project site does not contain known archaeological resources. However, the site could contain previously undiscovered archaeological resources. The proposed earthwork would involve approximately 35,252 cubic yards of cut and approximately 2,348 cubic yards of fill, necessitating

approximately 60,510 cubic yards of soil to be imported. Given the developed nature of the site, artificial fill would be encountered at a maximum depth of five feet below existing ground surface. Quaternary young alluvial fan deposits extend from five feet to depths of up to 75 feet below the ground surface; refer to Draft EIR Appendix 11.4, *Geotechnical Reports*. As mentioned above, the project proposes site grading/excavation activities that would exceed depths of fill materials (between approximately 5 to 15 feet bgs). As such, project excavation could encounter native soils (depths greater than five feet bgs), which have the potential to support unknown buried archaeological resources.

In the unlikely event that archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would require all project construction efforts to halt until an archaeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or site pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, and impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50-feet of the find should be halted and the project Applicant, or their designee, shall retain an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) immediately to evaluate the find. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted as mandated by law. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for California Register of Historical Resources eligibility. The treatment plan shall be reviewed and approved by the qualified archaeologist.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE **The project, combined with other related cumulative projects, could cause cumulatively considerable impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, or tribal cultural resources.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.3, *Tribal and Cultural Resources*, and in particular, starting on page 5.3-22 of the Draft EIR.

Draft EIR Table 4-1, *Cumulative Projects List,* identifies the related projects and other possible development in the area determined as having the potential to interact with the project to the extent that a significant cumulative effect may occur. Project-related impacts to historical, archeological, and tribal cultural resources have been determined to be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1. Future cumulative projects would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine the extent of potential impacts to site-specific historical, archaeological, and/or tribal cultural resources. Related projects would be required to adhere to State and Federal regulations, as well as project-specific mitigation measures.

As discussed under Impact Statements CUL-1 through CUL-4, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce potentially significant project impacts to historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels. Thus, the project's less than significant impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50-feet of the find should be halted and the project Applicant, or their designee, shall retain an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) immediately to evaluate the find. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted as mandated by law. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for California Register of Historical Resources eligibility. The treatment plan shall be reviewed and approved by the qualified archaeologist.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

2. Geology and Soils

GEO-5 Project implementation could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.4, *Geology and Soils*, and in particular, starting on page 5.4-15 of the Draft EIR.

The project site contains Holocene age undissected alluvial deposits comprised of varying proportions of sand, gravel, silt, and clay. The project site sediments less than 20 feet below the modern surface are assigned a low potential for fossils (PFYC 2), and sediments more than 20 feet below the modern surface are assigned moderate potential for fossils (PFYC 3). Therefore, the potential for significant fossil discoveries in shallow soils at the project site is anticipated to be low; however, deposits greater than 20 feet below the modern surface would have a moderate potential for fossils.

The project site has been previously disturbed and is developed with institutional uses. Based on the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Norwalk Transit Village* (Geotechnical Investigation) prepared by Leighton and Associates, Inc., dated June 17, 2021 (refer to Draft EIR Appendix 11.4, *Geotechnical Investigation*), artificial fill material is present on-site to a depth of approximately five feet bgs. The project is anticipated to disturb soils as deep as 15 feet bgs. The field borings that revealed Holocene-age alluvial soil reached a maximum depth of 51.5 feet bgs. Sediments with Holocene components, such as those found at the project site, are known to

produce fossils starting at approximately 24 feet bgs. Therefore, it is unlikely that ground disturbing activities resulting from the proposed project would destroy unique paleontological resources. However, in the event of discovery of paleontological resources, impacts may be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would be required should potential paleontological resources be encountered during grading activities. Work within 50 feet of a potential find would be required to halt and a paleontological monitor would be required to evaluate the find to determine the potential significance of such a discovery. Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would require the discovery, if determined significant, to be offered to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County with a corresponding Paleontological Monitoring Report which describes the project's paleontological mitigation monitoring efforts. This action would ensure the project would adequately evaluate and mitigate for potential paleontological resources on-site. Compliance with Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-3 would reduce potential paleontological resource impacts associated with the project to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures:

GEO-1 If unanticipated fossil discoveries are made, all work must halt within 50 feet until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the find. Work may resume immediately outside of the 50-foot radius.

GEO-2 If the discoveries are determined to be significant, full-time paleontological monitoring shall be recommended for the remainder of ground disturbance for the project. Paleontological monitoring shall entail the visual inspection of excavated or graded areas and trench sidewalls. In the event a paleontological resource is discovered, the monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert the construction equipment around the find until it is assessed for scientific significance and collected, if warranted. Monitoring efforts may be reduced or eliminated at the discretion of the project paleontologist.

GEO-3 Upon completion of fieldwork, all significant fossils collected shall be prepared in a properly equipped paleontology laboratory to a point ready for curation. Following laboratory work, all fossil specimens shall be identified to the most specific taxonomic level possible, cataloged, analyzed, and offered to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County for permanent curation and storage. At the conclusion of laboratory work and museum curation, a final Paleontological Monitoring Report shall be prepared describing the results of the paleontological mitigation monitoring efforts associated with the project. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods, an overview of the project area geology and paleontology, a list of taxa recovered, an analysis of fossils recovered and their scientific significance, and recommendations. A copy of the report shall also be submitted to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE	**The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving geology and soils and could impact unknown paleontological resources.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.4, *Geology and Soils*, and in particular, starting on page 5.4-16 of the Draft EIR.

Cumulative projects identified in Draft EIR Table 4-1, *Cumulative Projects List*, would be located within proximity to similar fault zones as the proposed project. However, the intensity of the seismic ground shaking would vary by site based on earthquake magnitude, distance to epicenter, and geology of the area between the epicenter and the cumulative site. Additionally, potential paleontological resource impacts associated with the development of each cumulative project would be specific to each site. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing Federal, State, and local regulations (including the California Building Code (CBC) and Municipal Code Chapter 15.04) and project-specific mitigation measures related to geologic hazards on a project-by-project basis.

As concluded above, geologic and seismic hazards associated with the proposed project would be reduced to less than significant levels following conformance with established regulatory requirements, including the CBC, Municipal Code, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements, and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403. Additionally, compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 15.04 would ensure project design and construction plans incorporate recommended design features in the project's Geotechnical Investigation, and Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3 would ensure that potential impacts to unknown paleontological resources on-site, if encountered, are reduced to less than significant levels. As such, with compliance with the recommended mitigations, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in this regard.

Mitigation Measure:

GEO-1 If unanticipated fossil discoveries are made, all work must halt within 50 feet until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the find. Work may resume immediately outside of the 50-foot radius.

GEO-2 If the discoveries are determined to be significant, full-time paleontological monitoring shall be recommended for the remainder of ground disturbance for the project. Paleontological monitoring shall entail the visual inspection of excavated or graded areas and trench sidewalls. In the event a paleontological resource is discovered, the monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert the construction equipment around the find until it is assessed for scientific significance and collected, if warranted. Monitoring efforts may be reduced or eliminated at the discretion of the project paleontologist.

GEO-3 Upon completion of fieldwork, all significant fossils collected shall be prepared in a properly equipped paleontology laboratory to a point ready for curation. Following laboratory work, all fossil specimens shall be identified to the most specific taxonomic level possible, cataloged, analyzed, and offered to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County for permanent curation and storage. At the conclusion of laboratory work and museum curation, a final Paleontological Monitoring Report shall be prepared describing the results of the paleontological mitigation monitoring efforts associated with the project. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods, an overview of the project area geology and paleontology, a list of taxa recovered, an analysis of fossils recovered and their scientific significance, and recommendations. A copy of the report shall also be submitted to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of

the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

3. Public Services

PSR-1	**Project implementation could result in the need for additional fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.**

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.13, *Public Services/Recreation*, and in particular, starting on page 5.13-9 of the Draft EIR.

CONSTRUCTION

The project would not result in the need for the construction of any new or physically altered fire protection facilities. Construction activities associated with the project could temporarily result in an incrementally increased demand for Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) fire protection services. However, all construction activities would be subject to compliance with applicable State and local regulations in place to reduce risk of construction-related fire (i.e., requirements for emergency access, hazardous material handling, and fire protection systems; project-specific fire and safety requirements may be added during building and fire plan check with LACFD). The project would be required to comply with mitigation measure TRA-1 pertaining to implementation of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to ensure emergency access is maintained. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with Municipal Code Chapter 15.08, *California Building Code*, which adopts by reference the CBC standards regarding site access requirements and fire safety precautions. With compliance with State and local regulations and Mitigation Measure TRA-1, construction-related impacts to fire protection services from the project would be less than significant in this regard.

As discussed in Draft EIR Section 5.7, *Transportation*, Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require the project Applicant to implement a Construction Management Plan (CMP), which would minimize potential impacts to emergency access along Bloomfield Avenue and Shoemaker Avenue) on the local circulation system. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require the construction contractor to coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures would not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1, and compliance with State and local regulations, construction-related impacts to fire protection services from the project would be less than significant in this regard.

OPERATIONS

The project would be designed in accordance with Municipal Code Chapter 15.04, *California Building Code*, as well as Municipal Code Chapter 15.08, *California Fire Code*, which adopts by reference the 2022 edition of the California Fire Code. The California Fire Code includes fire safety-related building standards for construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and hydrants. Further, in conformance with General Plan Public Safety Element,

the proposed project would be required to consult with the LACFD and Norwalk Sheriff Station or any other emergency response agency during the review of development projects or land use entitlement applications. LACFD's Land Development Unit would review all building plans for the proposed project during the building permit plan check to ensure that there is sufficient access and water system requirements are met, and that the proposed project meets all applicable building code requirements—including automatic sprinkler systems, fire extinguishers, and fire alarms. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan goal to ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services.

Domestic water would be used for fire suppression and provided by Golden State Water Company (GSWC). The project would require construction of new, on-site water distribution lines to serve the new buildings and facilities of the proposed project; refer to Draft EIR Exhibits 3-7 and 3-8 in Draft EIR Section 3, *Project Description*. New 12-inch domestic water lines would be installed concurrently with street improvements. Water connections to buildings for potable and fire protection purposes would be made prior to certificate of occupancy.

As discussed in Draft EIR Section 5.12, *Population and Housing*, the project would not induce significant unplanned population growth. Therefore, although the proposed project is expected to increase demand for LACFD services, the demand would not be substantial or result in the need for additional fire protection facilities, and would not adversely impact service ratios, response times, or other LACFD performance standards. Additionally, the increase in demand for LACFD services would not require the construction of new fire protection facilities or expansion of existing fire protection facilities. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact in this regard.

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.

- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.
- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.
- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

PSR-2 Project implementation could result in the need for additional police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Police protection.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.13, *Public Services/Recreation*, and in particular, starting on page 5.13-11 of the Draft EIR.

CONSTRUCTION

The project would not result in the need for the construction of any new or physically altered police protection facilities. The proposed project would be reviewed by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) during the plan check process for the proposed project before construction. The project site would be fenced during the construction phase, and construction site access would be limited to authorized personnel. Further, the project would be required to comply with mitigation measure TRA-1 pertaining to implementation of a CMP to ensure emergency access is maintained. Therefore, construction activities would not substantially impact police response times. Construction activities would also be subject to compliance with applicable State and local regulations to reduce impacts to police protection services, including Municipal Code Chapter 15.04 (adopts by reference the 2022 CBC), which includes site access requirements and other relevant safety precautions. As such construction-related impacts concerning police protection services would be less than significant, as the project would not result in the need for the construction of any new or physically altered police protection facilities during construction.

OPERATIONS

Project implementation would result in additional demands on existing Norwalk Sheriff Station services, including the City's Department of Public Safety, as well as the level of service required by the LASD's Metrolink Bureau (MTB). Project buildout would result in the construction of up to 770 dwelling units, which has the potential to introduce up to 2,764 additional residents to the City. As a transit-oriented development, the project also has the potential to increase Metrolink ridership. However, as discussed in Draft EIR Section 5.12, *Population and Housing*, the project would not induce significant unplanned population growth.

Development of the proposed project would include several design features and security measures that would reduce the opportunity for criminal activity to occur onsite, which meet the goals of Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design (CPTED) as referenced by LASD. For example, the Specific Plan would include a detailed safety, lighting, and signage lighting plan that would be approved by the Director of Community Development prior to issuance of a building permit; the plan would discuss strategies for avoiding spillover lighting and to ensure pedestrian safety. Lighting for uncovered parking areas, vehicular access ways, and walkways would be required. Further, in conformance with General Plan Public Safety Element, the proposed project would be required to consult with the LACFD and LASD/Norwalk Sheriff Station or any other emergency response agency during the review of development projects or land use entitlement applications. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan goal to ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services.

The Norwalk Sheriff Station indicated that there are no definitive plans to replace or expand the existing facility. As of Fiscal Year 2022-23, response times are well within City and industry standards and the law enforcement budget has received a 3.9-million-dollar increase, which has funded additional Special Assignment Deputies and a Motor Deputy. It is expected that this budget increase would help mitigate the impacts of population growth. Additionally, it is expected that continued aid provided by the City's Department of Public Safety would further accommodate any increases in demand resulting from the proposed project.

The proposed project would be required to pay all applicable development and law enforcement mitigation fees. Additionally, the proposed project would generate a new source of property taxes and Measure P sales taxes for the City of Norwalk, which could be used, in part, to fund sheriff protection services. Compliance with relevant legislations and the General Plan would ensure the project's additional demand for police protection services do not adversely impact the Norwalk Sheriff Station's continued ability to meet its established response times and police staffing levels. As such, operational impacts concerning police protection services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans

for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.
- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.
- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.
- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.
- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE	**The project combined with other cumulative projects could create increased demand for fire protection services that could create significant environmental impacts.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.13, *Public Services/Recreation*, and in particular, starting on page 5.13-15 of the Draft EIR.

Cumulative development projects within the LACFD's service area in City would have the potential to result in the need for additional LACFD resources (i.e., additional staffing, equipment, expanded/new facilities). However, cumulative projects would be subject to all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations in place for fire protection and emergency services. Development occurring within the City would be required to demonstrate compliance with all applicable regulations, including the Municipal Code Chapter 15.08 (adopts by reference the 2022 edition of the California Fire Code) requirements regarding construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and hydrants. In conformance with the General Plan Public Safety Element, the City would consult with the LACFD and LASD or any other emergency response agency during the review of development

projects or land use entitlement applications. Cumulative projects would be reviewed by the City and the LACFD to determine specific fire requirements (e.g., fire hydrant spacing, sprinkler requirements in certain types of construction, safe vehicular access for evacuation or response, and ensuring the development does not negatively impact response times) applicable to the specific development and to ensure compliance with all applicable requirements as discussed.

As concluded in Impact Statement PSR-1, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to fire protection services. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would minimize potential impacts to emergency access on the local circulation system during construction. Further, the proposed project would conform with the applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations in place for fire protection and emergency services as detailed above. As such, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to fire protection services. Impacts in this regard would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.

- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.

- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.

- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction

contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE	**The project combined with other cumulative projects could create increased demand for police protection services that could create significant environmental impacts.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Section 5.13, *Public Services/Recreation*, and in particular, starting on page 5.13-16 of the Draft EIR.

Cumulative development in the LASD's service area within the City has the potential to result in the need for additional resources (i.e., additional staffing, equipment, expanded/new facilities). However, cumulative development would be subject to all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations in place for police services. Site-specific development would be reviewed by the City and the LASD to determine specific safety requirements applicable to the individual development proposals and to ensure compliance with these requirements under the Municipal Code Chapter 15.04 (adopts by reference the 2022 CBC), which includes site access requirements and other relevant safety precautions. In conformance with the General Plan Public Safety Element, the City would consult with the LACFD and LASD or any other emergency response agency during the review of development projects or land use entitlement applications. Similar to the proposed project, each development project is expected to integrate design concepts to reduce the potential of unwanted activity on their respective sites and comply with applicable regulatory requirements related to security and safety during construction and operation.

As concluded in PSR-2, the proposed project is not anticipated to involve significant impacts to police protection services, as the project would not induce substantial population growth. Additionally, Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would minimize potential impacts to emergency access on the local circulation system during construction. Further, the proposed project would conform with the applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations in place for police protection services as detailed above. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to police protection services. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.

- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.

- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.

- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

4. Transportation

TRA-4 Project implementation could result in inadequate emergency access.

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Result in inadequate emergency access.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.7, *Transportation*, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-13 of the Draft EIR.

CONSTRUCTION

The Los Angeles County Public Works Department identifies the Santa Ana Freeway, Imperial Highway, and Norwalk Boulevard as disaster routes within the project vicinity. Construction activities associated with the project would generate traffic as a result of construction equipment being transported to and from the site, and vehicular traffic from construction workers, export of construction debris, and delivery of materials to the site. Staging areas for construction equipment and materials storage would be established on-site. The construction activities would include demolition, site preparation, grading/excavation, trenching, building construction, and paving. Proposed improvements also include right-of-way improvements along Bloomfield Avenue and Shoemaker Avenue, as well as at Zimmerman Park.

Construction-related trips associated with trucks and employees traveling to and from the site in the morning and afternoon, as well as off-site right-of-way improvements along Bloomfield Avenue and Shoemaker Avenue, may result in some minor temporary and short-term traffic delays as a result of partial lane closures and/or construction-related vehicles traveling along Bloomfield Avenue. Based on the TIA, the highest amount of daily traffic expected during construction is estimated to be 1,378 vehicles; it should be noted that this represents a conservative estimate that would only occur for a short duration of the overall construction process.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require a Construction Management Plan (CMP), which would minimize potential impacts to emergency access along Bloomfield Avenue and Shoemaker Avenue) on the local circulation system. Per Mitigation Measure TRA-1, all construction vehicles would carry the required hauling permits and would use the most direct route via the project site to nearby freeways. The exact haul routes would be confirmed with the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works prior to approval. Construction may require temporary closures of vehicle lanes and/or sidewalks. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require the construction contractor to coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures would not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access. In addition, Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would ensure traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers are present during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools to ensure safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students. Overall, construction-related traffic impacts would be short-term and temporary and implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would ensure construction-related project impacts are less than significant.

OPERATIONS

The project would be required to comply with LACFD requirements for emergency access. Additionally, the project would include a Promenade/Fire Lane along the eastern boundary of the project site that would ensure adequate emergency access for LACFD to proposed structures. All future development within the project area would be subject to compliance with the existing regulations specified in the CFC, California Building Code, International Fire Code, the Municipal Code, and other applicable life and safety requirements. Site plans for the proposed project would subject to review by the City to ensure that adequate emergency access or emergency response would be provided. Additionally, the project site plans would be subject to review by LACFD for compliance with fire and emergency access standards and requirements. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the

Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.

- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.

- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.

- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures are feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE	**Future development, combine with other related projects, could substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment, and result in cumulative impacts.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.7, *Transportation*, and in particular, starting on page 5.7-17 of the Draft EIR.

Cumulative projects could result in an increase in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. However, cumulative projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis through the development review process of the City of Norwalk to determine the appropriate land use permit for authorizing their use and the conditions for their establishment and operation. The development review would ensure that safe access and circulation to and within the development area would be provided. Additionally, access to development sites would be required to comply with all applicable Municipal Code and City design standards and would be reviewed by the City and the LACFD to ensure that inadequate design features or incompatible uses do not occur as development occurs.

The proposed project would involve the development of a mixed-use transit-oriented community. These uses are typical of an urban area, such as the City of Norwalk, and do not represent an incompatible use. The project would be required to implement a CMP during construction (Mitigation Measure TRA-1). New development would incorporate safety design features, including a detailed safety, lighting, and signage lighting plan that would be required to be submitted and approved by the Director of Community Development, prior to issuance of a building permit per the proposed Specific Plan. The proposed roadways and intersections would be required to be designed in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan as well as the Municipal Code, Chapter 15.08, which would prevent sharp curves and dangerous intersections and ensure emergency vehicle accessibility. As such, the proposed project would not significantly contribute to a cumulative impact involving inadequate design features or incompatible uses. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant with compliance with recommended mitigation.

Mitigation Measure:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.

- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.

- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.

- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures are feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE	**Future development, combined with other related projects, could result in inadequate emergency access.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.7, *Transportation,* and in particular, starting on page 5.7-17 of the Draft EIR.

Cumulative projects could result in inadequate emergency access in the area. However, future projects would be required to comply with the City's development review process on a case-by-case basis, including review for compliance with the Municipal Code pertaining to maintaining/providing emergency access. New developments would also be required to comply with all applicable fire and building codes and ordinances for construction and access to the site during both construction and operational phases. Individual projects would be reviewed by the City Engineer and LACFD to determine the specific fire requirements applicable to the specific development and to ensure compliance with these requirements. This would ensure that new developments would provide adequate emergency access to and from each site. Further, the City and LACFD would review any modifications to existing roadways to ensure that adequate emergency access or emergency response would be maintained. Emergency response and evacuation procedures would be coordinated through the City in coordination with the LACFD and Caltrans.

The project would be required to implement a CMP during construction (Mitigation Measure TRA-1). Future on-site development would also be required to comply with LACFD requirements for emergency access, and include a Promenade/Fire Lane along the eastern boundary of the project site. Site plans for the proposed project would subject to review by the City to ensure that adequate emergency access or emergency response would be provided. Additionally, the project site plans would be subject to review by LACFD for compliance with fire and emergency access standards and requirements. Therefore, with compliance with State, regional, and local standards and regulations, the project would not significantly contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact regarding emergency access. As such, with compliance with recommended mitigation, impacts in this regard would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of any grading and/or demolition permits, whichever occurs first, the construction contractor shall prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted for review and approval by the City of Norwalk Director of Public Works. The requirement for a CMP shall be incorporated into the project specifications and subject to verification by the Director of Public Works prior to final plan approval. The CMP shall include, at a minimum, the following measures, which shall be implemented during all construction activities:

- Meet the standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as well as City of Norwalk requirements. The CMP shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the Director of Public Works for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, and any work that would require temporary lane closures. The plan shall be developed according to the MUTCD (latest edition) guidelines, including plans for traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers to assist with pedestrians and traffic.

- Identify traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation, including the necessary traffic controls to allow for construction-related traffic to efficiently enter and exit the site and maintain emergency access to the site and surrounding area.

- Should project construction activities require temporary vehicle lane and/or sidewalk closures, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Director of Public Works regarding timing and duration of proposed temporary lane and/or sidewalk closures to ensure the closures do not impact operations of adjacent uses or emergency access.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles must utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the project.

- Should project construction activities occur during general drop-off and pick-up hours for nearby schools, traffic signs, traffic cone arrangements, and flaggers shall assist with ensuring continued vehicular access and safe pedestrian access along the project frontage for students.

- Require the construction contractor to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt, as a result of its operations. The construction contractor shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the Director of Public Works, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures are feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

5. Tribal Cultural Resources

CUL-3 The project could cause a significant impact to a tribal cultural resource.

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.3, *Tribal and Cultural Resources*, and in particular, starting on page 5.3-21 of the Draft EIR.

The City has sent letters inviting tribes to consult on the project per Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18 on July 11, 2022. However, no responses from Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) individuals or tribal organizations were received.

Based on the records search, literature review, field survey results, highly disturbed nature of the project site, and tribal consultation results, the City has determined that there is low potential for unknown tribal cultural resources to be discovered on-site during site disturbance activities. However, excavation activities may encounter native soils which has the potential to support unknown tribal cultural resources. In the unlikely event that tribal cultural resources are encountered during project construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would require all project construction efforts to halt until an archaeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would ensure that appropriate protocols are in place in the event unknown cultural resources, including archaeological and tribal cultural resources, are discovered during ground-disturbing activities. As such, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50-feet of the find should be halted and the project Applicant, or their designee, shall retain an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) immediately to evaluate the find. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted as mandated by law. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for California Register of Historical Resources eligibility. The treatment plan shall be reviewed and approved by the qualified archaeologist.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

CUMULATIVE	**The project, combined with other related cumulative projects, could cause cumulatively considerable impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, or tribal cultural resources.**

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is included in Draft EIR Section 5.3, *Tribal and Cultural Resources*, and in particular, starting on page 5.3-22 of the Draft EIR.

Draft EIR Table 4-1, *Cumulative Projects List,* identifies the related projects and other possible development in the area determined as having the potential to interact with the project to the extent that a significant cumulative effect may occur. Project-related impacts to historical, archeological, and tribal cultural resources have been determined to be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1. Future cumulative projects would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine the extent of potential impacts to site-specific historical, archaeological, and/or tribal cultural resources. Related projects would be required to adhere to State and Federal regulations, as well as project-specific mitigation measures.

Based on the records search, literature review, field survey results, highly disturbed nature of the project site, and tribal consultation results, the City has determined that there is low potential for unknown tribal cultural resources to be discovered on-site during site disturbance activities. However, excavation activities may encounter native soils which has the potential to support unknown tribal cultural resources. In the unlikely event that tribal cultural resources are encountered during project construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would require all project construction efforts to halt until an archaeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would ensure that appropriate protocols are in place in the event unknown cultural resources, including archaeological and tribal cultural resources, are discovered during ground-disturbing activities. As such, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce potentially significant project impacts to historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels. Thus, the project's less than significant impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50-feet of the find should be halted and the project Applicant, or their designee, shall retain an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) immediately to evaluate the find. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted as mandated by law. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for California Register of Historical Resources eligibility. The treatment plan shall be reviewed and approved by the qualified archaeologist.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. Upon implementation of the required mitigation, the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The City of Norwalk hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

D. FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

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

GHG-1 Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project would have a significant impact on global climate change.

Applicable Threshold of Significance: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Level of Significance: Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is identified in Draft EIR Section 5.9, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and in particular, starting on page 5.9-13 of the Draft EIR.

The project involves demolishing the existing California Youth Authority (CYA) facility and developing a mixed-use transit-oriented community with a mix of retail/hospitality, multi-family residential uses, and park land uses. The proposed project-related GHG emissions would include emissions from direct and indirect sources. The proposed project would result in direct and indirect emissions of CO_2, N_2O, and CH_4, and would not result in other GHGs that would facilitate a meaningful analysis. Therefore, this analysis focuses on these three forms of GHG emissions. Direct project-related GHG emissions include emissions from construction activities, area sources, mobile sources, and refrigerants, while indirect sources include emissions from electricity and natural gas consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation. CalEEMod was used to calculate project-related GHG emissions. Under existing conditions, a nominal portion of the project site is being used for temporary DSH satellite facility operations. As a conservative analysis, emissions from existing uses on-site were not modeled or deducted from project-generated emissions.

CalEEMod relies upon trip data provided in *Norwalk Transit Village Transportation Impact Analysis* (Transportation Impact Analysis) prepared by Michael Baker International, dated March 8, 2023, and project-specific land use data to calculate emissions. Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, *Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, presents the estimated proposed project's CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O emissions. It should be noted that these estimates represent gross emissions for the project and do not include emissions generated by current on-site uses. CalEEMod outputs are contained within Draft EIR Appendix 11.7, *Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Energy Data*.

Direct Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases

Construction Emissions

Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the project (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operation emissions.[1] As shown in Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, the proposed project would result in 153.17 $MTCO_2e$ per year when amortized over 30 years (or a total of 4,595.17 $MTCO_2e$ in 30 years).

Area Source

Area source emissions were calculated using CalEEMod and project-specific land use data. Project-related area sources include exhaust emissions from landscape maintenance equipment, such as lawnmowers,

[1] The project lifetime is based on the standard 30-year assumption of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold*, October 2008).

shedders/grinders, blowers, trimmers, chain saws, and hedge trimmers used to maintain the landscaping of the site. As noted in Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, the proposed project would result in 184.99 $MTCO_2e$ per year of area source GHG emissions.

Mobile Source

According to the Transportation Impact Analysis, the proposed project would generate an increase of 7,455 daily trips, 653 a.m. peak hour trips, and 771 p.m. peak hour trips. Based on the proposed project-generated daily vehicle trips, the proposed project would result in an increase of approximately 8,331.07 $MTCO_2e$ per year of mobile source-generated GHG emissions; refer to Draft EIR Table 5.9-1. As shown in Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, the predominant source of the proposed project GHG emissions would come from mobile emissions. The project would be required to use fuel sources that comply with the CARB LCFS, which would reduce fuel reducing carbon intensity 18 percent by 2030, up from 10 percent in 2020. It should be noted that neither the lead agency, nor the project applicant has authority to control the rates of GHG emissions from vehicles that would travel to and from the proposed project.

Refrigerant

Refrigerants are substances used in equipment for air conditioning and refrigeration. Most of the refrigerants used today are HFCs or blends thereof, which can have high global warming potentials (GWP) values. All equipment that uses refrigerants has a charge size (i.e., quantity of refrigerant the equipment contains), and an operational refrigerant leak rate, and each refrigerant has a GWP that is specific to that refrigerant. CalEEMod quantifies refrigerant emissions from leaks during regular operation and routine servicing over the equipment lifetime, and then derives average annual emissions from the lifetime estimate. As noted in Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, the proposed project would result in 57.34 $MTCO_2e$ per year of GHG emissions from refrigerants.

Indirect Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases

Energy Consumption

Energy consumption emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model and project specific land use data. On-site electricity and natural gas would be provided by Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas (SoCal Gas), respectively. As shown in Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, the project would indirectly result in 2,537.21 $MTCO_2e$/year GHG emissions due to energy consumption.

Solid Waste

Solid waste emissions associated with operations of the project were calculated using the CalEEMod model and project-specific land use data. Per AB 341, the project would be required to reduce, recycle, or compost at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated. Therefore, a 50 percent reduction in solid waste was modeled in the CalEEMod. Draft EIR Table 5.9-1 shows the project's operational solid waste emissions, which would result in 114.87 $MTCO_2e$/year.

Water Demand

The Golden State Water Company (GSWC) would be the main water supply provider to the proposed project. Central Basin Municipal Water District provides reclaimed water to the general area as well. The project's water supply would be provided by local surface water, groundwater, as well as recycled water sources. The project would result in 122.02 $MTCO_2e$/year, refer to Draft EIR Table 5.9-1.

Total Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases

As shown in Draft EIR Table 5.9-1, the total amount of project related operational GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources combined would be 11,500.67 $MTCO_2e$ per year. The City has not adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing impacts related to GHG emissions, while the SCAQMD has recommended

an interim screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year for all non-industrial projects which is conservatively used for purposes of this analysis. As such, impacts in this regard would be significant and unavoidable.

CONCLUSION

The primary source of project-related emissions would be from mobile-source emissions generated by the project-related vehicle trips, followed by energy sector emissions and water demand sector emissions. The proposed project has development standards and design features that contribute to reducing GHG emissions. The project would redevelop the infill project site with a mixed-use transit-oriented community with a mix of office/retail, multi-family residential uses, and park land uses. The project is in proximity to the Norwalk-Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station, which is approximately 0.2- to 0.5-miles northeast of the project site. Further, the project site is located within a pedestrian-oriented area and would include pedestrian and bicycle connection to the nearby Metrolink station. The project site is in an urbanized area and within walking and biking distance to existing commercial and neighborhood-serving retail uses. The project would include a new neighborhood commercial center that would provide restaurants and businesses that provide goods and services that people would frequently use to take care of their personal and household needs. The project would also provide bicycle parking spaces in accordance with CALGreen Code. The proposed project would include operational emission reductions in compliance with Assembly Bill 341 (at least 50 percent of solid waste generated to be reduced, recycled, or composted). In addition, SCAQMD Rule 445 (gaseous-fueled fireplaces and stoves only; no wood burning devices) were applied to the proposed project CalEEMod run.

Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-4 would require 1) the installation of electric-vehicle-capable charging spaces in the non-residential development to meet the voluntary standards of California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen); 2) to the extent feasible, that the new residential buildings be primarily electric, meaning that electricity is the primary source of energy for water heating; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) (i.e., space-heating and space cooling); cooking; and clothes-drying; 3) exterior electric receptacles to support the use of electric landscape equipment; and 4) light color roofing and building materials to minimize heat-island effect. With implementation of requiring all electricity for residential heating/cooling, cooking, water heating, and other appliances (Mitigation Measure GHG-1), GHG emissions would be slightly reduced, but would continue to exceed the SCAQMD Working Group threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr as a result of mobile-source emissions generated by the nonresidential and residential land uses. As shown, emissions would continue to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year. the project would incorporate features to encourage transit use throughout the day such as a mix of uses, high-quality pedestrian and bicycle access, narrow streets, and reduced parking requirements. The Norwalk Transit Village Specific Plan would also develop Class II and III bike lanes. Pedestrian circulation would be provided throughout the project area via walkways and linear parks, as well as pedestrian crossings. The project would include features promote alternative transportation methods, such as landscaped parkways, pedestrian walkways, bus transit stops, street furniture, and widened pedestrian zones, and electric vehicle charging station. These design features would minimize GHG emissions during operation. The majority of the emissions come from mobile sources, which primarily depend on the prerogative of future residents/employees/visitors with regard to their preferred method of transportation. In addition, fuel efficiency and emission standards are regulated at the State level, and these regulations are becoming more stringent over the years to reduce mobile source emissions. However, as the individual preferences and Statewide regulations are beyond the control of the project applicant and City, it is not feasible to reduce the emissions to below the threshold. Consequently, despite implementation of GHG-1 through GHG-4, project-related GHG impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

GHG-1 The project applicant shall design and build <u>future development</u> ~~all multi-family residential units~~ to meet/include the following<u>, as applicable, per the discretion of the City of Norwalk Planning Division or their designee</u>:

Non-Residential Development:

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.1, Planning and Design, as outlined under Sections A5.106.5.1.1~~2~~ and A5.106.5.1.3 of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code for Designated Parking for Clean Air Vehicles.

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.1, Planning and Design, as outlined under Section A5.106.5.3.1~~2~~ of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code for Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging.

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.2, Energy Efficiency, as outlined under Section A5.203.1.2.1~~2~~ of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code.

- ~~Tier 2 requirements for~~ Division A5.211, Renewable Energy, of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code.

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.3, Water Efficiency and Conservation, as outlined under Section A5.303.2.3.1~~2~~ of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code.

Residential Development

- No wood-burning or gas-powered fireplaces shall be installed in any of the dwelling units.

- All buildings to the extent feasible, shall be electric, meaning that electricity is the primary source of energy for water heating; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) (i.e., space-heating and space cooling); cooking; and clothes-drying.

- All major appliances provided/installed (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers and dryers, and water heaters) shall be electric-powered EnergyStar-certified or of equivalent energy efficiency, where applicable.

Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects within the project site, the project applicant shall provide documentation (e.g., building plans, site plans) to the City of Norwalk Planning Division to verify implementation of the applicable design requirements specified in this mitigation measure. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall verify implementation of these design requirements.

GHG-2 The project developer shall design the non-residential portion of the project to:

- Provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. At minimum, the number of EV charging stations shall equal the Tier 1~~2~~ Nonresidential Voluntary Measures of the California Green Building Standards Code.

- Provide parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles. At minimum, the number of preferential parking spaces shall equal to the Tier 1~~2~~ Nonresidential Voluntary Measures of the California Green Building Standards.

Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects on the project site, the project developer shall provide documentation (e.g., site plans) to the City of Norwalk Planning Division to verify implementation of the of the applicable design requirements specified in this

mitigation measure. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall verify implementation of these design requirements.

GHG-3 Exterior electric receptacles on nonresidential buildings shall be provided for charging or powering electric landscaping equipment.

GHG-4 The project shall use light color roofing and building materials to minimize heat-island effect and reduce lighting, heating, and cooling needs.

Finding:

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

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

CUMULATIVE **Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project and other related cumulative projects could have a significant cumulative impact on global climate change or could conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation.**

Level of Significance: Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is identified in Draft EIR Section 5.9, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and in particular, starting on page 5.9-24 of the Draft EIR.

Project-related GHG emissions are not confined to a particular air basin; instead, GHG emissions are dispersed worldwide. No single project is large enough to result in a measurable increase in global concentrations of GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts identified under Impact Statement GHG-1 are not project-specific impacts to global climate change, but the proposed project's contribution to this cumulative impact. GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts, and there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective. As such, significant direct impacts associated with the project also serve as the project's cumulative impact. As analyzed in Impact Statements GHG-1 of the Draft EIR, the project would have significant and unavoidable impacts. Thus, the project would cumulatively contribute to GHG impacts and impacts in this regard would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

GHG-1 The project applicant shall design and build future development ~~all multi-family residential units~~ to meet/include the following, as applicable, per the discretion of the City of Norwalk Planning Division or their designee:

Non-Residential Development:

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.1, Planning and Design, as outlined under Sections A5.106.5.1.1~~2~~ and A5.106.5.1.3 of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code for Designated Parking for Clean Air Vehicles.

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.1, Planning and Design, as outlined under Section A5.106.5.3.1~~2~~ of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code for Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging.

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.2, Energy Efficiency, as outlined under Section A5.203.1.2.1~~2~~ of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code.

- ~~Tier 2 requirements for~~ Division A5.211, Renewable Energy, of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code.

- Tier 1~~2~~ requirements for Division A5.3, Water Efficiency and Conservation, as outlined under Section A5.303.2.3.1~~2~~ of Appendix A5, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the 2022 California Green Building Standards Code.

Residential Development:

- No wood-burning or gas-powered fireplaces shall be installed in any of the dwelling units.

- All buildings to the extent feasible, shall be electric, meaning that electricity is the primary source of energy for water heating; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) (i.e., space-heating and space cooling); cooking; and clothes-drying.

- All major appliances provided/installed (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers and dryers, and water heaters) shall be electric-powered EnergyStar-certified or of equivalent energy efficiency, where applicable.

Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects within the project site, the project applicant shall provide documentation (e.g., building plans, site plans) to the City of Norwalk Planning Division to verify implementation of the applicable design requirements specified in this mitigation measure. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall verify implementation of these design requirements.

GHG-2 The project developer shall design the non-residential portion of the project to:

- Provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. At minimum, the number of EV charging stations shall equal the Tier 1~~2~~ Nonresidential Voluntary Measures of the California Green Building Standards Code.

- Provide parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles. At minimum, the number of preferential parking spaces shall equal to the Tier 1~~2~~ Nonresidential Voluntary Measures of the California Green Building Standards.

Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects on the project site, the project developer shall provide documentation (e.g., site plans) to the City of Norwalk Planning Division to verify implementation of the of the applicable design requirements specified in this

mitigation measure. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall verify implementation of these design requirements.

GHG-3 Exterior electric receptacles on nonresidential buildings shall be provided for charging or powering electric landscaping equipment.

GHG-4 The project shall use light color roofing and building materials to minimize heat-island effect and reduce lighting, heating, and cooling needs.

Finding:

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

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

E. FINDINGS ON RECIRCULATION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a) requires a lead agency to "recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term 'information' can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR 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 of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement."

Comment letters received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comment letters provided in the Final EIR do not identify any significant new information requiring recirculation. As a result, pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5, a recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

F. FINDINGS ON PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. As discussed above, upon compliance with existing regulations and mitigation measures, project implementation would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts with the exception of GHG emission. The project would generate an increase in GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment despite implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-4.

The Draft EIR analyzed three alternatives to the proposed project that could avoid or substantially lessen the project's potentially significant impacts.

1. "No Project" Alternative

The "No Project" Alternative assumes existing conditions remain as is and the proposed project does not proceed. The proposed Specific Plan would not be adopted, and the transit-oriented development would not occur. As detailed in Draft EIR Section 3.3, *Project Background and History*, the property is currently owned by DGS who is leasing the property to the California Department of State Hospitals (DSH) on a month-to-month basis for hospital use. Thus, this alternative assumes DSH continues to utilize the facility on an as-needed basis. The existing structures on-site would remain and no new development would occur.

Conclusion:

The No Project/No Development Alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, noise, population and housing, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and services systems. Weighing the tradeoffs between the proposed project and the No Project/No Development Alternative in regard to aesthetics, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, and transportation, this alternative would result in similar impacts. Impacts related to hydrology and water quality, public services, and recreation would be greater. Last, this alternative would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

The "No Project" Alternative would not achieve any of the project's basic objectives. No new development would occur; therefore, this alternative would not provide any market rate or affordable housing onsite and would not assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation. This alternative would not develop residential, commercial, hospitality, or open space uses to serve the community. A transit-oriented community would not be created and pedestrian and bicycle connections would not be constructed to connect to the nearby Metrolink Station. This alternative would not achieve this objective. No affordable to low and very low-income households would be afforded. Last, this alternative would not establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, or health and wellness-focused amenities.

Finding:

This alternative is rejected because it would not accomplish any of the objectives of the proposed project. The findings of the proposed project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic, and other issues set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

2. Reduced Density Alternative

The "Reduced Density" Alternative would reduce the overall density allowed by the Norwalk Transit Village Specific Plan by 30 percent. The proposed buildings would be proportionately reduced. No hotel would be constructed as part of this alternative. All circulation improvements and utility improvements, proposed by the project, would remain the same. Draft EIR Table 7-1, *Proposed Project and Reduced Density Alternative Comparison*, shows a comparison between the "Reduced Density Alternative" and the proposed project. The "Reduced Density" Alternative would include 539 residential units, of which 40 percent would be affordable, 56,103 square feet of commercial uses, and 2.53 acres of park space; hotel use would not be developed. Similar to the proposed project, the "Reduced Density" Alternative would require a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Tentative Tract Map, and Development Agreement.

Conclusion:

The "Reduced Density" Alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of air quality, energy, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and services systems. Weighing the tradeoffs between the proposed project and the "Reduced Density" Alternative in regard to aesthetics, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, transportation, and tribal cultural resources, this alternative would result in similar impacts. Last, this alternative would reduce the projects significant and unavoidable impact related to greenhouse gas emissions. However, it is acknowledged that these emissions reductions would not be reduced to an insignificant level. Significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts for the "Reduced Density" Alternative would remain.

The "Reduced Density" Alternative would achieve the project's objectives, but not to the extent of the proposed project. This alternative would construct a transit-oriented development. 539 market rate and affordable housing opportunities would be provided, which would assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation, although not to the extent as the proposed project. Commercial uses would be afforded to serve the community. This alternative would still establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, and health and wellness-focused amenities. Although this alternative would provide 539 residential units with 40 percent reserved as affordable units, this alternative would not achieve the same number of affordable units as the project.

Finding:

This alternative is rejected because it would not accomplish any of the objectives of the proposed project. The findings of the proposed project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic, and other issues set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

3. All Residential Development Alternative

The General Plan identifies the project site as one of the City's Opportunity and Special Site Studies (Opportunity Site). An Opportunity Site is one that inhibits both a current issue and future opportunity for redevelopment into a more neighborhood- and City-serving space. The former CYA facility qualifies as an Opportunity Site, given its incompatibility with surrounding residential uses. The General Plan recommends that the site be redeveloped into a residential community, including common open space and recreational facilities, potentially under the governance of a Specific Plan. Given the site's proximity to existing transit, employment, and shopping, it is also recommended that circulation connectivity and alternative forms of mobility be considered to enhance the prospective residential community. As such, the "All Residential Development" Alternative assumes the entire Specific Plan area is developed into a residential community. The majority of the project site would be developed with single family residential uses, consistent with the R-1 zone. In order to accommodate the 40 percent affordable housing to meet the requirements of the Surplus Land Act exemption, the non-residential parcel (proposed by the project) located at the western portion of the project site would be developed with an affordable housing apartment building (140 units). Since no existing zoning could apply to PA1 for the 140 apartment units, the project would still require a Specific Plan and this portion of the project site would be identified as MU-H designation of the Norwalk Transit Center Specific Plan. All other circulation and utility improvements would be constructed similar to the proposed project.

Draft EIR Table 7-2, *Proposed Project and All Residential Development Alternative Comparison*, provides a general comparison of the proposed project to the "All Residential Development" Alternative. The "All Residential Development" Alternative would include 350 residential units, of which 40 percent would be affordable, and three acres of park space. Commercial and hotel uses would not be developed. Similar to the proposed project,

the "All Residential Development" Alternative would require a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Tentative Tract Map, and Development Agreement.

Conclusion:

The "All Residential Development" Alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of air quality, energy, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and services systems. Weighing the tradeoffs between the proposed project and the "All Residential Development" Alternative in regard to aesthetics, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, transportation, and tribal cultural resources, this alternative would result in similar impacts. Potential impacts from land use and planning would be greater. Last, this alternative would reduce the projects significant and unavoidable impact related to greenhouse gas emissions. However, it is acknowledged that these emissions reductions would not be reduced to an insignificant level. Significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts for the "All Residential Development" Alternative would remain.

The "All Residential Development" Alternative would achieve some, but not all, of the project's objectives. This alternative would provide 350 market rate and affordable housing opportunities, which would assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation, although not to the extent as the proposed project. Although this alternative would provide 350 residential units with 40 percent reserved as affordable units, this alternative would not achieve the same number of affordable units as the project. This alternative would still establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, and health and wellness-focused amenities. However, as no non-residential square footage would be constructed, this alternative would not develop a transit-oriented community. Last, this alternative would not develop commercial or hospitality uses to serve the community.

Finding:

This alternative is rejected because it would accomplish some, but not all, of the objectives of the proposed project. The findings of the proposed project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic, and other issues set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration. The City Council rejects the "All Residential Development" Alternative for the following reasons: (1) this alternative would not provide the same number of affordable housing units as the proposed project; (2) this alternative would not develop a transit-oriented community; and (3) this alternative would not develop commercial or hospitality uses to serve the community.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 7-3, *Comparison of Alternatives* of the Draft EIR, summarizes the comparative analysis presented above (i.e., the alternatives compared to the proposed project). Based on Table 7-3, the "No Project" Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as it would avoid or lessen most of the project's environmental impacts, including the project's significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions. According to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e), "if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Accordingly, both the "Reduced Density Alternative" and the "All Residential Development" Alternative are considered environmentally superior to the proposed project, since these alternatives reduce the projects significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions. However, it is acknowledged that these emissions reductions would not be reduced to an insignificant level. Significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts for both the "Reduced Density Alternative" and the "All Residential Development" Alternative would remain.

The "No Project" Alternative would not achieve any of the project's basic objectives. No new development would occur; therefore, this alternative would not provide any market rate or affordable housing onsite and would not assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation. This alternative would not develop residential, commercial, hospitality, or open space uses to serve the community. A transit-oriented community would not be created and pedestrian and bicycle connections would not be constructed to connect to the nearby Metrolink Station. This alternative would not achieve this objective. No affordable housing for low and very low-income households would be developed. Last, this alternative would not establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, or health and wellness-focused amenities.

The "Reduced Density" Alternative would achieve project's objectives, but not to the extent of the project. This alternative would construct a transit-oriented development. 539 market rate and affordable housing opportunities would be provided, which would assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation, although not to the extent as the proposed project. Commercial uses would be afforded to serve the community; however, no hospitality uses would be constructed. This alternative would still establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, and health and wellness-focused amenities. Although this alternative would provide 539 residential units with 40 percent reserved as affordable units, this alternative would not achieve the same number of affordable units as the project.

The "All Residential Development" Alternative would achieve some, but not all, of the project's objectives. This alternative would provide 350 market rate and affordable housing opportunities, which would assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation, although not to the extent as the proposed project. Although this alternative would provide 350 residential units with 40 percent reserved as affordable units, this alternative would not achieve the same number of affordable units as the project. This alternative would still establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, and health and wellness-focused amenities. However, as no non-residential square footage would be constructed, this alternative would not develop a transit-oriented community. Last, this alternative would not develop commercial or hospitality uses to serve the community.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093, the City of Norwalk has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the following significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. The City also has examined alternatives to the proposed project. Based on Draft EIR Table 7-3, the "No Project" Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as it would avoid or lessen most of the project's environmental impacts, including the project's significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions to less than significant levels. According to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e), "if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Accordingly, both the "Reduced Density Alternative" and the "All Residential Development" Alternative are considered environmentally superior to the proposed project, since these alternatives reduce the projects significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions. However, it is acknowledged that these emissions reductions would not be reduced to an insignificant level. Significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts for both the "Reduced Density Alternative" and the "All Residential Development" Alternative would remain.

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

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

(b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

A. BACKGROUND

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

The following sections provide a description of each of the project's significant and unavoidable adverse impacts and the justification for adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

B. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The following impacts of the proposed project are considered significant, unavoidable, and adverse based on the Draft EIR, Final EIR, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and the findings discussed in Section II, *Findings and Facts*, of this document.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact GHG-1:** The primary source of project-related emissions would be from mobile-source emissions generated by the project-related vehicle trips, followed by energy sector emissions and water demand sector emissions. The proposed project has development standards and design features that contribute to reducing GHG emissions. The project would redevelop the infill project site with a mixed-use transit-oriented community with a mix of office/retail, multi-family residential uses, and park land uses. The project is in proximity to the Norwalk-Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station, which is approximately 0.2- to 0.5-miles northeast of the project site. Further, the project site is located within a pedestrian-oriented area and would include pedestrian and bicycle connection to the nearby Metrolink station. The project site is in an urbanized area and within walking and biking distance to existing commercial and neighborhood-serving retail uses. The project would include a new neighborhood commercial center that would provide restaurants and businesses that provide goods and services that people would frequently use to take care of their personal and household needs. The project would also provide bicycle parking spaces in accordance with CALGreen Code. The proposed project would include operational emission reductions in compliance with Assembly Bill 341 (at least 50 percent of solid waste generated to be reduced, recycled, or composted). In addition, SCAQMD Rule 445 (gaseous-fueled fireplaces and stoves only; no wood burning devices) were applied to the proposed project CalEEMod run.

  Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-4 would require 1) the installation of electric-vehicle-capable charging spaces in the non-residential development to meet the voluntary standards of California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen); 2) to the extent feasible, that the new residential buildings be primarily electric, meaning that electricity is the primary source of energy for water heating; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) (i.e., space-heating and space cooling); cooking; and clothes-drying; 3) exterior electric receptacles to support the use of electric landscape equipment; and 4) light color roofing and building materials to minimize heat-island effect. With implementation of requiring all electricity for residential heating/cooling, cooking, water heating, and other appliances (Mitigation Measure GHG-1), GHG emissions would be slightly reduced, but would continue to exceed the SCAQMD Working Group threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr as a result of mobile-source emissions generated by the nonresidential and residential land uses. As shown, emissions would continue to exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year. the project would incorporate features to encourage transit use throughout the day such as a mix of uses, high-quality pedestrian and bicycle access, narrow streets, and reduced parking requirements. The Norwalk Transit Village Specific Plan would also develop Class II and III bike lanes. Pedestrian circulation would be provided throughout the project area via walkways and linear parks, as well as pedestrian crossings. The project would include features that promote alternative transportation methods, such as landscaped parkways, pedestrian walkways, bus transit stops, street furniture, and widened pedestrian zones, and electric vehicle charging stations. These design features would minimize GHG emissions during operation. The majority of the emissions come from mobile sources, which primarily depend on the prerogative of future residents/employees/visitors with regard to their preferred method of transportation. In addition, fuel efficiency and emission standards are regulated at the State level, and these regulations are becoming more stringent over the years to reduce mobile source emissions. However, as the individual preferences and Statewide regulations are beyond the control of the project applicant and City, it is not feasible to reduce the emissions to below the

threshold. Consequently, despite implementation of GHG-1 through GHG-4, project-related GHG impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable.

- **Cumulative Impact:** Project-related GHG emissions are not confined to a particular air basin; instead, GHG emissions are dispersed worldwide. No single project is large enough to result in a measurable increase in global concentrations of GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts identified under Impact Statement GHG-1 are not project-specific impacts to global climate change, but the proposed project's contribution to this cumulative impact. GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts, and there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective. As such, significant direct impacts associated with the project also serve as the project's cumulative impact. As analyzed in Impact Statement GHG-1 of the Draft EIR, the project would have significant and unavoidable impacts. Thus, the project would cumulatively contribute to GHG impacts and impacts in this regard would be significant and unavoidable.

C. CONSIDERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the lead agency to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits, including regionwide or Statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed project, the City has determined that the significant, unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts identified above are considered "acceptable" due to the following specific considerations, which outweigh the significant, unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Incorporates Mitigation Measures and Alternatives Analysis

The City finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to lessen project impacts; and furthermore, that the alternatives to the project are infeasible because while they have similar or less environmental impacts, they do not meet project objectives or provide benefits to the same extent as the proposed project, or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible when compared to the project, as described herein.

SOC-1: Contributes Towards Meeting the City's Housing Goals and RHNA Requirements

As recently recognized by the California Legislature, "California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions." (Gov. Code § 65589.5; *see also* Gov. Code §§ 65009 ["The Legislature finds and declares that there currently is a housing crisis in California and it is essential to reduce delays and restraints upon expeditiously completing housing projects"].) In order to alleviate that crisis, the Legislature has taken a number of steps to ensure that local jurisdictions accommodate their share of needed housing, including by requiring that cities adopt, and update according to a fixed schedule, the Housing Element portion of their General Plan, and submit said element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for review. (Gov. Code § 65585.) Among other things, the Housing Element is required to demonstrate how the city will meet its share of regional housing needs, known as its Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA"). (Gov. Code § 65583. If a city does not have adequate sites to accommodate its RHNA, it is required to rezone sites in order to meet its allocation. (*See* Gov. Code, § 65583(c)(1)(A); *see also* Gov. Code, § 65913.1 [requiring cities to "zone sufficient vacant land for residential use"].)

The *5th Cycle Final RHNA Allocation Plan* was adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Council on October 4, 2012, and covers the planning period from October 15, 2013, to October 15, 2021. The 6th RHNA cycle covers the housing element planning period from October 2021 through October 2029. The *6th Cycle Final RHNA Allocation Plan* was adopted by SCAG on March 4, 2021.

According to SCAG's *6th Cycle Final RHNA Allocation Plan*, the housing needs of the City of Norwalk for the 2021-2029 planning period are 5,034 housing units; refer to Draft EIR Table 5.12-4, *Norwalk 2021-2029 RHNA Allocation*. Draft EIR Table 5.12-4 summarizes the specific number of housing units per income category anticipated to be provided between 2021 and 2029. Given that the project would provide up to 770 housing units (at least 40 percent of the residential units to be affordable to low and very low-income households), the project would be a step towards meeting the City's affordable housing allocations and contribute towards the City's future housing goals.

SOC-2: Redevelops an Underutilized Property into a Mixed-Use Development

The project represents an opportunity for the City to provide a walkable transit-oriented community, located less than one quarter mile from the Norwalk-Santa Fe Spring Metrolink Station, that brings residents in closer proximity to existing and proposed commercial and open space uses within a single property. The project constitutes infill development that maximizes the beneficial and functional use of a site in an urban location that is presently underutilized for the community benefit. A mix of land uses within close proximity to one another in the project area would offer more active transportation opportunities (e.g., walking, bicycling, and transit use), thus encouraging alternative modes of travel and resulting in reduced vehicle trips and lengths. The project would establish a community with multi-modal transportation, walking trails, community connectivity, sustainable landscaping, health and wellness-focused amenities, and within proximity to job centers, such as downtown Los Angeles and Orange County.

SOC-3: Contribute Towards Economic Development

The proposed project is a mixed-use, transit-oriented community with approximately 80,147 square feet of commercial uses as well as a 150-key hotel. The proposed non-residential land uses are forecast to create approximately 254 new jobs through project buildout, based on an employment generation rate of one employee per 447 square feet of commercial use and one employee per 883 square feet of hotel use. The new commercial uses along with new employee spending within city limits will generate additional sales and use tax revenue or potentially $200,000 annually for the City. Additionally, the 150-key hotel would provide a 10% Transient Occupancy Tax, or potentially $500,000 annually, that would benefit the City's tax base. Once constructed, the proposed project will generate an estimated $173,143 annually in additional property tax revenues for the City.

SOC-4: Implements VMT Reduction Strategies

The Specific Plan would guide the implementation of a mixed-use transit-oriented development at the project site, located in close proximity to the Norwalk-Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station (approximately 0.2- to 0.5-miles northeast of the project site). The Specific Plan would incorporate features to encourage transit use, such as a mix of uses, high-quality pedestrian and bicycle access, narrow streets, and reduced parking requirements. The Specific Plan would serve both planning and regulatory functions including circulation patterns and development standards. The project would comply with relevant goals and objectives outlined in the City's Bicycle Master Plan. One of the goals of the Specific Plan is to reduce the reliance on single occupant passenger vehicles, and as such, the project site design aims to maximize pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity between the diverse uses within the Specific Plan Area and to the greater Norwalk area. The proposed project would construct Class II and III bike lanes on-site that would connect to the existing and future City-wide bicycle system.

SOC-5: Provides Open Space and Recreational Amenities in an Underserved Area

The project would allow development of on-site open space through a combination of common and private, active, and passive recreation areas, including a 1.56-acre park and 2.06 acres of linear parks; the 2.06 acres would be comprised of a 1.53-acre linear park and a 0.28-acre contiguous dog run. A publicly accessible network of parks and linear parks/greenways would run through the Norwalk Transit Village site and connect it to Zimmerman Park. A variety of community and wellness-oriented amenities that promote health, social, and mental well-being would be distributed throughout the open space network. Examples of those amenities may include a tot lot with play structures, shade structures, walking trails, par course or fitness equipment, community gathering areas, community gardens, outdoor seating, dog runs, etc. As such, the project would introduce new public open space and recreational amenities to the project area, which currently has minimal publicly accessible open space/recreational amenities.

SOC-6: Improves the Visual Character and Quality of the Project Area

The project site is currently developed with a former youth correctional facility, which is currently in a blighted condition. The proposed project, although a change to the existing visual quality of the site, would enhance the visual attributes of the project site and surrounding area by creating an attractive, well-designed mixed-use project with high quality details and design articulation, landscaping, and streetscaping. Provisions of the proposed project, including the Development Standards and Design Guidelines, would ensure design details of the proposed project are context-sensitive and of high quality in terms of materials and craftsmanship.

SOC-7: Fulfills Land Use Goals and Policies in the City's General Plan

The project fulfills the land use goals and policies contained in the adopted Norwalk General Plan by providing a mixed-use project consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The project would create a well-balanced community by careful land use and urban design, which provides for the housing, employment, social, economic, recreational, and service needs of its residents and which maintains and enhances a high quality of life; the project provides a range of well-integrated housing types which will serve the various needs of all the residents of the City.

SOC-8: Satisfies Government Code 11011.28 (Assembly Bill 518)

The project satisfies the stated purpose and intent of Government Code 11011.28 (Assembly Bill 518) in which the State Legislature authorized the sale of the project site to the City to provide housing to persons and families of low or moderate income. Specifically, the project would provide up to 770 housing units with at least 40 percent of the residential units to be affordable to low and very low-income households.

D. CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and the Guidelines Section 15093, the Norwalk City Council has balanced the project's benefits against the significant unavoidable project impacts. The City Council finds that the project's benefits of implementing the proposed Norwalk Transit Village Project outweigh the project's significant unavoidable impacts, and those impacts, therefore, are considered acceptable in light of the project's benefits. The City Council finds that each of the benefits described above is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the project notwithstanding the project's significant unavoidable impacts.