

FINDINGS OF FACTS
SAN DIMAS DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2022110018)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Project Summary	8
3. Environmental Review and Public Participation	12
4. Findings Regarding Project Environmental Effects Determined to Have No Effect on the Environment, or Have a Less Than Significant impact on the Environment	13
5. Findings Regarding Project Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant with Mitigation.....	27
6. Findings Regarding Project Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable.....	35
7. Findings Regarding Alternatives.....	41
8. Findings Regarding Growth Inducing Impacts.....	47

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code Section 21081, and the Guidelines for Implementation for the California Environmental Quality Act, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15091 ("State CEQA Guidelines"), require that a public agency consider the environmental impacts of a project before a project is approved and make specific findings. Public Resources Code Section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The statute states the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Public Resources Code Section 21002 goes on to state "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, Findings, specifically provides as follows:

(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 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 or 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 subdivision (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 materials 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.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, Statement of Overriding Considerations, further provides as follows:

- (a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
- (b) Where 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. This 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, the findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental,

social, legal, and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565 (Goleta II).) The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410; 417 (*City of Del Mar*); *Sierra Club v. City of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 [court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on applicant's project objectives]; see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (CNPSJ ["an alternative 'may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record'"] (quoting Kostka & Zischke, *Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act* [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (Kostka), § 17.39, p. 825); *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (*Bay-Delta*) ["[i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary project objectives"; "a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal"].) Moreover, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar, supra*, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; see also *CNPS, supra*, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001 ["an alternative that 'is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint' may be rejected as infeasible"] [quoting *Kostka, supra*, § 17.29, p. 824]; *San Diego Citizenry Group v. City of San Diego* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.)

For purposes of these findings (including the table described below), the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is "avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed]," these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been "avoided" (i.e., reduced to a less than significant level).

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the

project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving ... any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (Goleta II, supra, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.) The EIR for the San Dimas Downtown Specific Plan Project (Project) concluded the Project will create a significant and unavoidable impacts; thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

These findings constitute the City of San Dimas' (City's) best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, the City hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the City adopts a resolution approving the Project.

In addition, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project and is being approved by the Board of Supervisors by the same Resolution that has adopted these findings. The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Final MMRP is attached to and incorporated into the environmental document approval resolution and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") and the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the San Dimas Downtown Specific Plan Project Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2022110018), as well as other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the Regional Planning Commission of the City of San Dimas ("City") in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency hereby finds, determines, and declares the following Findings and Facts, in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code.

These Findings set forth the environmental basis for the discretionary actions to be undertaken by the City for the development of the Project. These actions include the approval of the following for the San Dimas Downtown Specific Plan Project:

- General Plan Amendment
- Zone Change

- Municipal Code Text Amendment

These actions are collectively referred to herein as the Project.

Document Format

These Findings are organized as follows:

- (1) Section 1 provides an introduction to these Findings.
- (2) Section 2 provides a summary of the Project, overview of the discretionary actions required for approval of the Project, and a statement of the Project's objectives.
- (3) Section 3 provides a summary of environmental review related to the Project and a summary of public participation in the environmental review for the Project.
- (4) Section 4 sets forth findings regarding the potential impact areas identified in the EIR for which the City has determined that there is no impact or the impact is less than significant. Because there is either no or a less than significant impact, no mitigation is required.
- (5) Section 5 sets forth findings regarding potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR that the City has determined can be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance and implementation, all of the mitigation measures will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project and adopted as conditions of the Project by the Lead Agency. Where potentially significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level through mitigation, these findings specify how those impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level.
- (6) Section 6 sets forth findings regarding those significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR that will or may result from the Project and which the City has determined will remain significant and unavoidable, despite the identification and incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures.
- (7) Section 7 sets forth findings regarding alternatives to the Project.
- (8) Section 8 contains findings regarding growth-inducing impacts.

Custodian and Location of Records

The San Dimas Downtown Specific Plan Project Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2022110018) consists of:

1. Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and Appendices A through P, dated June 2024; and
2. Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) dated September 2024.

The following findings of fact are based in part on the information contained in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, (together, the EIR) for the Project, as well as additional facts found in the complete record of proceedings. The EIR is hereby incorporated by reference and is available for review during normal business hours at the City of San Dimas, Planning Division, 245 East Bonita Avenue, San Dimas, California 91773.

2.0 Project Summary

Project Location

The DTSP Project Area (“Project Area”) is located in the City of San Dimas (“City”) within Los Angeles County, California. The City is located along the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains and lies approximately 28 miles east/northeast of Downtown Los Angeles. The City is surrounded by the Cities of Glendora and Covina, and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County to the west, the City of La Verne and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County to the to the east, the San Gabriel Mountains range to the north, the City of Pomona to the southeast, and the City of Walnut to the southwest. The City is crossed by the 210 (Foothill), 57 (Orange), and 10 (San Bernardino) freeways.

The Project Area is centered along Bonita Avenue and is generally bounded by the 57 (Orange) freeway to the west, Gaffney Avenue to the east, First Street to the north, and Arrow Highway to the south. The Project Area includes San Dimas City Hall, located on Bonita Avenue, and a future transit station platform, located in the block bounded by Bonita Avenue, Arrow Highway, San Dimas Avenue and Walnut Avenue.

Project Description

The Downtown Specific Plan DTSP is intended to guide future development and use of land within the Project Area through the establishment of a planning and zoning framework for encouraging innovative, transit-oriented development in the greater downtown area while preserving the character of the historic commercial district. The Specific Plan proposes new housing, retail, employment, and hospitality uses within the Project Area, oriented around a new Metro “A” Line (formerly known as the “Gold”/“L” Line) passenger light rail and transit station to open in 2025.

The Specific Plan includes development standards, land use regulations, and design guidelines for both private development and the public realm to implement the vision outlined above, consistent with the City of San Dimas General Plan (“General Plan”) and the requirements for Specific Plans identified in Section 65450-65457 of the California Government Code and the San Dimas Municipal Code (SDMC). The DTSP would facilitate the development of a pedestrian and transit-oriented downtown district centered on the city’s existing historic main street and designed to complement the new Metro “A” Line Station.

Within the DTSP Project Area, the following land use areas and zoning designations are proposed to facilitate future development that is context-specific and that serves the Plan’s goals: Gateway Village West, oriented around the western gateway area of downtown; Gateway Village East, the transitional area spanning from the eastern entrance into downtown to the cluster of civic uses concentrated around the intersection of Bonita and Walnut Avenues; Transit Village, focused on station-adjacent parcels and

blocks; Town Core, centered on the traditional historic downtown; Public/Semi-Public, in which public and semi-public facilities are situated; and Open Space, which includes designated sites for outdoor recreation, educational, and public health and safety uses.

The Project creates a framework for future development within the Plan Area. The potential residential development is equivalent to 3,687 dwelling units. Development would not occur all at once. Though conceptual, this is considered a maximum development capacity used for analysis purposes. For purposes of analysis, the development potential identified is assumed to occur over a 20-year period.

Land Use

The DTSP would facilitate the development of a pedestrian and transit-oriented downtown district centered on the city's existing historic main street and designed to complement the new Metro "A" Line Station.

Within the DTSP Project Area, the following land use areas and zoning designations are proposed to facilitate future development that is context-specific and that serves the Plan's goals: Gateway Village West, oriented around the western gateway area of downtown; Gateway Village East, the transitional area spanning from the eastern entrance into downtown to the cluster of civic uses concentrated around the intersection of Bonita and Walnut Avenues; Transit Village, focused on station-adjacent parcels and blocks; Town Core, centered on the traditional historic downtown; Public/Semi-Public, in which public and semi-public facilities are situated; and Open Space, which includes designated sites for outdoor recreation, educational, and public health and safety uses.

The Gateway Village West area is where redevelopment is encouraged and would help bring more activity and vibrancy to the western gateway area of downtown. Building forms may be traditional mixed-use styles in design but are more likely to be horizontally mixed/blended uses allowing for different building types and forms. This would also offer flexibility and creativity in integrating residential and commercial uses within projects. Commercial and open space amenities would be required in new residential developments to serve the future residents and the community at large.

The Gateway Village East area marks the eastern entrance into the downtown area. A transitional area that spans from the eastern boundary of downtown towards the civic uses concentrated at the intersection of Bonita and Walnut Avenues, the Gateway Village East area contains both established uses, undeveloped land, and underutilized sites which present valuable development and redevelopment opportunities. As this area abuts established residential uses to the north and east, thoughtful and anticipatory development standards and design guidelines have been developed to ensure that new

development is compatible with existing surrounding uses. A variety of uses will be allowed within the area, including residential, commercial, retail, restaurant, office, and service uses.

The Transit Village area is focused on station-adjacent parcels and blocks. The Transit Village concept should build upon the success of the existing Grove Station project, and new development/redevelopment is encouraged to incorporate similar site design, building form, and architectural elements. Development standards within the area will allow for higher density than the Town Core area to capitalize on the proximity to the future station. A variety of uses will be allowed, including residential, commercial, retail, restaurant, and service uses.

The Town Core area is the traditional, historic downtown segment of the specific plan area. New development and redevelopment projects are required to retain and reflect the historic feel and scale of the buildings along Bonita Avenue in the historic heart of downtown, generally from Cataract Avenue to San Dimas Avenue. Preservation, rehabilitation, and adaptive re-use of historic buildings is strongly encouraged. Pedestrian-oriented uses are required on ground floor street frontages. Building form and site design shall match the historic town core. Commercial vernacular building styles and traditional mixed-use building concepts should be implemented. Maximum setbacks are encouraged (zero to 25 feet, based on site location). New development or redevelopment within the Town Core shall be architecturally compatible with the existing historic buildings within the area.

The Public/Semi-Public zone distinguishes sites designated for public and semi-public uses for the growth and general welfare of the City as a whole. This zoning designation allows for joint use and joint development opportunities between public, semi-public, and private uses, which may include, but are not limited to parks, plazas, parking facilities, and transit-serving facilities.

A commercial use overlay is applied on the south side of Bonita Avenue between Acacia Street and Cataract Avenue, from the northern property line extending 100 feet to the south. In addition to the Public/Semi-Public standards, all commercial uses that are permitted in the Town Core district would apply in the overlay district. Commercial uses in the overlay would be subject to the development standards, design standards and guidelines, and permitting processes that are applicable to the Town Core zone.

The Open Space zone will promote and protect open space and the preservation of natural resources in the City for outdoor recreation and education, as well for public health and safety.

The policies, standards, requirements, and procedures provided in the Project would supersede any conflicting provisions of the San Dimas Municipal Code (SDMC), including the Zoning Ordinance of the City of San Dimas (Title 18 to the SDMC). Any subsequent tract or parcel maps, development agreements, local

public work projects, zoning text or map amendments, and any action requiring ministerial or discretionary approval in the Project area must be consistent with the DTSP. In addition, development plans initiated pursuant to the Specific Plan following its adoption would need to meet sustainability criteria including the most recent Passive Design Handbook by the California Sustainability Alliance, sustainable landscape and stormwater runoff design recommendations in the Urban Street Stormwater Guide published by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO); solar panels; and bicycle facilities.

Statement of Project Objectives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b) requires the Project Description contain “a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project,” which “should include the underlying purpose of the project and may discuss project benefits.” The underlying purpose of the Project is to create the DTSP that would establish a planning and zoning framework for encouraging transit-oriented development meant to complement a new Metro “A” Line (formerly known as the “Gold”/“L” Line) passenger light rail transit station opening in 2025, while preserving the character of the historic commercial district.

The objectives of the Project are:

- A community-supported vision and guiding principles that encourage a vibrant and pedestrian-friendly downtown, and goals and policies to guide decision-makers in achieving the community’s vision for the downtown area.
- Zoning and land uses which encourage the development of new housing, commercial, and recreational opportunities, objective development and design standards to provide clear guidance for property owners, developers, and City staff, and streamlined review and approval processes.
- Infrastructure and mobility recommendations to ensure infrastructure is adequately addressed and to promote safe and efficient circulation, active transportation, and complete streets.
- Implementation strategies and tools to encourage redevelopment and economic investment of residential and commercial development and to promote projects and partnerships.

3.0 Environmental Review and Public Participation

The Final EIR dated September 2024 includes the Draft EIR dated June 2024, all written comments on the Draft EIR received during the public review period, written responses to these comments, and the MMRP. In conformance with CEQA, the City conducted an extensive environmental review of the Project.

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15050, the City is the Lead Agency responsible for preparing the EIR for the Project. The City determined that preparation of an EIR was required for the Project after conducting preliminary review and preparing an Initial Study for the Project, dated October 2022, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060 and 15063. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued on November 2, 2022, to the State Clearinghouse, various public agencies, and other interested parties for the required 30-day review and comment period.

Additionally, a Scoping Meeting was held on November 16, 2022 to facilitate public review and comment on the Project. All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP, including the Initial Study, are contained in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period from June 7, 2024 to July 22, 2024.

4.0 Findings Regarding Project Environmental Effects Determined to Have No Effect on the Environment, or Have a Less Than Significant Impact on the Environment

The City hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project have no impact or are less than significant, and therefore, do not require the imposition of Mitigation Measures. The City's findings are referred to herein as "Finding".

Air Quality

Threshold 4.1-D: Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113 would limit the number of VOCs in architectural coatings and solvents and compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and 403.1 would reduce particulate emissions during construction activities. However, as shown in Table 4.1-8 of the Draft EIR, future development activity in the DTSP area may generate significant dust (particulate matter) emissions. SCAQMD does not consider odors generated from the use of construction equipment and activities to be objectionable. Since the DTSP is planning document meant to guide development, and no specific development projects are proposed at this time, future projects within the DTSP area would be subject to the development review process and potential impacts identified would be addressed through mitigation measures specific to the impact. Further, the Specific Plan does not permit any land uses associated with strong odor impacts such as wastewater treatment plants, landfills or transfer stations, composting facilities, confined animal facilities, food manufacturing, and chemical plants. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

Threshold 4.2-B: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5.(c)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no known archaeological sites reported within the Project area and the portions of the Project area that have been previously disturbed are unlikely to yield intact archaeological deposits. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.2-C: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries pursuant to § 15064.5.(d)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no known human burials within the Project area. Construction of the future development enabled by the Project could uncover unknown subsurface resources. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any suspected human remains, California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 dictates that no further excavation or disturbance of the site may occur until the County Coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If human remains are encountered and determined to be Native American in origin, the County Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission by telephone within 24 hours. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Energy

Threshold 4.3-A: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Threshold 4.3-B: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project creates a planning framework for future development for facilities that would consume energy during construction and operation. Energy suppliers are required to achieve greater energy efficiency and conservation over time and no conflict between the Project and these plans has been identified. In addition, future development within the Project would be required to meet the building standards if the Project as well as the requirements of the California Building Code related to water and energy conservation, including Energy Efficiency Standards and Green Building Standards, that are applicable at the time of construction. The Project also creates a framework for development that would be mixed-use and transit-oriented which would support a reduction in vehicle miles traveled, which would reduce the consumption of transportation fuel energy. The Project would neither result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy nor conflict with state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Threshold 4.5-A: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Threshold 4.5-B: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: As shown in Tables 4.5-1 through 4.5-4 of the Draft EIR, the DTSP is consistent with and supportive of the goals, policies, and tools of Connect SoCal. The Project would not conflict with the regional effort to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases nor would it generate greenhouse gas emissions that would be considered significant in a regional or state perspective. Future development that results from the Project would be required to comply with applicable building regulations such as the California Green Building Standards Code and California's Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, that would further reduce GHG emissions of future projects. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Threshold 4.6-A: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: As the DTSP is a programmatic, planning-level policy document, the Project would not directly initiate or entitle any new development. Future development initiated pursuant to the DTSP could result in the construction of residential uses and other sensitive receptors adjacent to existing land uses such as dry cleaners or gas stations that require the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed land uses, which do not include industrial uses, do not generally involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials, including hazardous chemical, radioactive, and biohazardous materials. Future projects within the Specific Plan area would be subject to compliance with programs administered by the City of San Dimas and the Los Angeles Health and Hazardous Materials Division (HHMD), Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). These programs, as well as other federal, state, and local regulations and policies, provide a high level of protection to the public and the environment. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.6-B: Would the project 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?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: As the DTSP is a programmatic, planning-level policy document, the Project would not directly initiate any new development projects that could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The land uses that would be allowed by the DTSP do not include industrial uses and generally do not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. Future development initiated pursuant to the DTSP could result in the construction of residential uses and other sensitive receptors adjacent to existing land uses such as dry cleaners or gas stations that require the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. The operation of land uses that use, create, or dispose of hazardous materials is regulated and monitored by federal, state, and local regulations and policies. These materials would be stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Compliance with these regulations and guidelines would reduce hazards from hazardous materials to the public and the environment. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.6-C: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would not emit hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, and/or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, as the DTSP is a programmatic, planning-level policy document. The nearest school to the DTSP planning area is Fred Ekstrand Elementary School, located approximately 0.25 miles to the north. Any transport of hazardous substances or materials within the Specific Plan area that may occur during construction and operation of future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations intended to reduce public safety hazards. The proposed Project would not pose a significant risk of hazardous emissions or significant handling of hazardous materials or substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.6-D: Would the project be 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed DTSP would result in future development of projects within the Specific Plan area which would be subject to site-specific review by the City of San Dimas and potential environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to analyze potential impacts of site-specific past uses involving hazardous materials, thus preventing future development on a site listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The EDR Radius Map records search identified sites within the DTSP Area, pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and listed in Table 4.6-1 of the Draft EIR, which have been closed and determined fully remediated. Future development projects would be required to analyze any potential impacts resulting from the site's past uses involving hazardous materials and to implement any mitigation measures deemed necessary to address any potential impacts identified. The Project would result in development projects within the Specific Plan area, and the demolition of existing buildings and ground disturbance for construction. As such, the proposed Project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.6-E: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The portions of the DTSTP Planning area that lie within the Airport Influence Area of Brackett Field Airport, as established in the Bracket Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) are designated Zone E – Other Airport Environs – which consists of the low-risk areas in a two-mile radius of the airport that are beyond the airport's CNEL 55 dB contour and subject to very low noise impacts. Buildings in Zone E are limited to 150 feet or more above runway elevation to further reduce risk related to potential near-airport accidents. As the land use regulations that would be established as part of the DTSP would not permit the development of buildings above 150 feet. The Project would not conflict with the land use designations, development standards, and provisions of the Brackett Field Airport ALUCP, resulting in less than significant impacts from airport noise or other safety hazards to people residing or working in the DTSP Area. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.6-F: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project provides design guidance for roadways, sidewalks, and driveways within the DTSP planning area that would ensure emergency access would be maintained. Further, existing City development standards would require new development within the Specific Plan to be designed so as not to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.6-G: Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Downtown Specific Plan area is located within an urban area that does not contain wildlands and is not located in an area classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) by CAL Fire. The entirety of the Project Area falls within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA). Local Responsibility Areas include incorporated cities, urban regions, agriculture lands, and portions of the desert where the local government is responsible for wildfire protection. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

Threshold 4.7-A: Would the project physically divide an established community?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project is intended to encourage greater connections with the DTSP area and community, rather than create divisions, through the development of pedestrian connectivity, public transportation, and multimodal access to and from the historic Downtown area or social, recreation, and employment opportunities. The Project will result in compact development near the new Metro “A” Line transit station to decrease automobile dependency, reduce both local and regional traffic congestion and related greenhouse gas emissions, and provide additional guidance and plans to increase multimodal access to and from the historic Downtown area. The DTSP Project Area also includes several opportunity sites within walking distance of the transit station that provide significant potential for infill development and adaptive reuse of existing underutilized downtown properties, the redevelopment of which would

support greater pedestrian and multimodal connectivity in the surrounding area through the enhancement of the public realm. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.7-B: Would the project 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?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would support mixed-use, transit-oriented development that is consistent with the existing General Plan and includes a high-quality, pedestrian-oriented public realm framed by context-sensitive buildings that emulate the historic character of San Dimas' Historic Core. The Project would establish land use regulations, zoning, development standards, and design guidelines for the Project area. The Project would include a General Plan Amendment and amendments to the municipal code to establish consistency between the Project and the General Plan. The Project would not conflict with the land use plans and policies of the City. The Project would be consistent with applicable goals within the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the Land Use, Housing Element, Circulation, Safety, Open Space and Conservation, Recreation, Air Quality, and Noise Elements of the General Plan, as depicted in Table 4.7-1 of the Draft EIR. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Noise

Threshold 4.8-B: Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The FTA guidelines show that a vibration level equivalent to 0.5 in/sec PPV is considered safe for buildings made of reinforced concrete, steel, or timber (no plaster), and would not result in any construction vibration damage. As shown in Table 4.8-11, the forecasted vibration levels caused by on-site construction activities within the Project area would not exceed the threshold of 0.5 in/sec PPV for sites surrounding a site where construction would occur, and would not result in significant vibration impact with regard to building damage. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.8-C: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: According to the City of San Dimas General Plan Noise Element, aircraft noise from the Brackett Field Airport, approximately 0.8 miles southwest of the City, is not considered significant at the current operational level. Furthermore, the DTSP area is located in compatibility Zone E, which is outside of the 55 dB noise contour and would not be exposed to significant noise levels from the airport that would exceed exterior thresholds. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

Threshold 4.9-A: Would the project 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)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The DTSP is identified in the City's 2021-2029 Housing Element as a program intended to support the City's RHNA goal of providing the target of 1,248 additional housing units. Based on the average household size in San Dimas of 2.91 persons per household, the rezoning within the proposed DTSP Area has the potential to increase the City's population by approximately 3,631 if all of these 1,248 units are constructed, and all of the residents were also new to the City. While the development potential of the DTSP could surpass the RHNA target, the population increase would not be considered substantial unplanned population growth as the growth would occur over an extended period through 2045 and remain consistent with the projected increase outlined in the City's General Plan. Additionally, future housing development facilitated by the proposed project would occur in an urbanized location near existing utilities and service systems, and areas already served by public services (e.g., police and fire protection, and other emergency responders). Specifically, the DTSP would facilitate growth near the new Metro "A" Line light rail station that will be opening in 2025, consistent with policies in the SCAG RTP/SCS. All future housing development facilitated by the proposed project would be subject to the City's development review process, which may include additional environmental review under CEQA, and would be assessed on a project-by-project basis for potential effects related to the growth that would be facilitated by the DTSP. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.9-B: Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Consistent with the City's General Plan and Housing Element, the DTSP will rezone property within the Specific Plan Area to potentially provide an additional 1,248 new housing units

by 2045, which are anticipated to be developed on vacant or commercial/industrial sites. Pursuant to SB 330, any housing units that will be removed as part of the DTSP will be replaced through the year 2030, resulting in less than significant impacts due to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services and Recreation

Threshold 4.10-A: 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?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the DTSP would increase the number of residential and non-residential buildings and people within the plan area, which would result in more demand for public services. However, all potential growth that may occur as a result of approval of the DTSP would be consistent with the City's General Plan, which the DTSP is proposed to implement. This growth is not considered substantial in relation to current growth forecasts as this growth would occur over an extended period of time and the proposed Project is intended to help the City implement its Housing Element. The Project would allow development in areas already served by existing public service facilities. Though the new uses expected from the Project could result in additional calls for service, it is not expected that new facilities would be necessary to serve the Project area. Future housing development facilitated by the DTSP would occur in an urbanized location served by public services that are expected to monitor resource demands to ensure adequate facilities, staffing, and equipment to accommodate population growth. Future development and residential development would be subject to state laws regarding impact fees to mitigate the impacts of future projects on public services. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation

Threshold 4.11-A: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: While there is currently no Metro Rail service to San Dimas, Metro is planning to extend Metro Rail “A” Line service through the DTSP area. The proposed Project would not conflict with the San Dimas General Plan policies regarding transit access and would not conflict with RTP/SCS policies regarding transit access and reliability. Implementation of the DTSP would locate more residents near transit facilities and would not result in disruption of an existing transit service.

Roadway improvements proposed in the DTSP are intended to transform the existing auto-oriented streetscape into a more sustainable, multimodal design. Implementation of the DTSP would include roadway improvements to facilitate multimodal connections, including for vehicles, transit, bikes, and pedestrians. No proposed changes to the existing street network are proposed that would limit or reduce vehicular or roadway access upon implementation of the DTSP. The DTSP would not conflict with adopted plan, ordinance or policy related to roadway facilities.

Implementation of the DTSP would include bicycle improvements to facilitate multimodal connections, including for vehicles, transit, bikes, and pedestrians. The proposed bicycle facility improvements within the DTSP include adding bike parking and bicycle friendly intersections. The Project is consistent with adopted plans and policies related to bicycle facilities and would not decrease the performance or safety of these facilities. The DTSP identifies proposed improvements to the pedestrian facilities within the DTSP area. These improvements consist of curb extensions, high visibility crosswalks, and improved wayfinding. Proposed pedestrian spot improvements would primarily occur at intersections. The Project is consistent with the adopted plans regarding pedestrian facilities and would not decrease the performance or safety of these facilities.

For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.11-B: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the DTSP would reduce the total VMT per capita when compared to the existing allowed land uses as the DTSP would provide more sustainable travel modes such as public transit, pedestrian connectivity, and other active transportation, in lieu of vehicle dependency. The mode share for vehicle based trips without implementing the DTSP, in the 2045 Base scenario, is 66 percent compared to 57 percent for trips made to and from the DTSP in the 2045 Base with DTSP scenario. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.11-C: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the DTSP would include improvements to facilitate multimodal connections and safety improvements, but would not significantly alter roadways, traffic patterns, or introduce incompatible uses within the DTSP area. Future individual development projects would either utilize existing driveways or construct new driveways. Plans for individual development projects would be subject to review by the City of San Dimas and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department prior to issuance of building permits. This would ensure that individual projects facilitated by the DTSP would not introduce sharp curves or dangerous intersections. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.11-D: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Development facilitated by the DTSP would be required to comply with the City's standards for emergency vehicle access, such as providing adequate points of access, vertical clearances, and turning radii. Any development projects facilitated by the DTSP that would require a temporary lane closure during construction would provide clear signage to ensure safety for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Additionally, future development projects plans facilitated by the implementation of the DTSP would be subject to review by the City of San Dimas and County of Los Angeles Fire Department, prior to issuance of building permits, thus would not result in inadequate emergency access. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Threshold 4.12-A: Would the project 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 listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no tribal cultural resources listed or known to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources within the DTSP planning area. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.12-B: Would the project 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 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?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City sent consultation requests to Native American tribes to inform them of projects within the City, pursuant to the required consultation provisions of the Public Resource Code. A response was received from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation stating the Kizh Nation concurred with the proposed Specific Plan and requesting consultation for all future projects within the plan area. This response did not identify specific tribal cultural resources within the Project area and the Kizh Nation did not request consultation on the Specific Plan project. No known tribal cultural resources are present within the plan area. The cultural history of the area is such that subsurface tribal cultural artifacts may be present within the Project area. As a plan proposed to implement the City's General Plan, the Specific Plan does not include the approval of any specific individual development projects. For this reason, the Project would not involve ground disturbing activities that could directly or indirectly impact tribal cultural resources. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

Threshold 4.13-A: Would the project Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Threshold 4.13-B: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Threshold 4.13-C: Would the project 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?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed DTSP would create the potential for the development of up to approximately 3,600 additional residential units, with an associated population increase of approximately 10,000, which could increase the population of the City from the existing population of approximately 33,000 to 43,000. This population would be well within the projected population of 54,000 for the GSWC service area addressed in the UWMP and, for this reason, sufficient water supplies will be available to meet the demands associated with growth associated with the proposed DTSP and no major water service infrastructure improvements would be required.

Sewer service in the DTSP area will need to be expanded in order to accommodate projected development. To accommodate the projected residential growth, service lines will need to be constructed to the trunk lines. All improvements would be reviewed by both the City of San Dimas and the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts. Any construction to replace or enlarge existing sewer lines in the DTSP area would result in temporary construction impacts within existing streets in the area. Sewer capacity studies will be required to determine if existing systems are sufficient for the proposed additional flows and/or to determine the appropriate sizing of any new sewer system.

The DTSP area is currently developed and served by existing stormwater infrastructure. As development occurs over time within the DTSP area, pervious surfaces may be replaced with concrete, asphalt, and other impervious surfaces. The DTSP would maintain the pervious area and continue to allow groundwater infiltration at the same rate as existing conditions. Compliance with existing regulations as development occurs within the DTSP area will avoid significant impacts on existing stormwater facilities.

The DTSP area is already served by electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure. New connections to these systems would be established as new development occurs within the Specific Plan area.

For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4.13-D: Would the project 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?

Threshold 4.13-E: Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The California Green Building Standards require new development to meet recycling minimums. The buildout of the DTSP is within the growth forecasts for the City of San Dimas. As stated within the County ColWMP 2018 Annual Report, the County is not anticipating a solid waste disposal capacity shortfall within the next 15 years, under the growth forecasts for the City of San Dimas. For these reasons, potential impacts would be less than significant.

5.0 Findings Regarding Project Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant with Mitigation

Based on the environmental analysis of the Project and identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes, and statutes, and the identification and incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the following potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant; and the City has found - in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and the State Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) - that "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment". The City has determined - pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(2) and State Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2) - that "Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency." The City's findings are referred to herein as "Finding."

Air Quality

Threshold 4.1-C: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the Proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated air pollutant concentrations during construction and operation-related activities, specifically carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants as well as elevated air concentrations of CO, NO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and SO₂. The SCAQMD recommends the evaluation of localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site because of construction activities. As shown in Table 4.1-8 above, localized construction and operational emissions would likely exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and would potentially be significant. As discussed above, regulatory compliance measures will be implemented to reduce air quality impacts. Additionally, **Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1** through **MM AQ-3** would be required.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The City shall require future projects subject to discretionary approval that are not found to be exempt from CEQA review to evaluate potential air quality impacts and implement respective mitigation measures to minimize impacts that exceed SCAQMD thresholds.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2:

Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area shall prepare and implement a worker training program that describes the potential health hazards associated with Valley Fever, common symptoms, proper safety procedures to minimize health hazards, and notification procedures if suspected work-related symptoms are identified during construction. Additionally, this training program shall include worker training on the implementation requirements of the SCAQMD approved Dust Control Plan. Copies of the training program shall be provided to the City of San Dimas Planning Division. The worker training program shall identify safety measures to be implemented by construction contractors during construction. These measures shall include the following:

- HEPA-filtered, air-conditioned enclosed cabs shall be provided on heavy equipment when available. Workers shall be trained on the proper use of cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment;
- Communication methods, such as two-way radios, shall be provided for use by workers in enclosed cabs;
- Personal protective equipment (PPE), such as half-mask and/or full-mask respirators equipped with particulate filtration, shall be provided to workers active in dusty work areas upon request;
- Separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities shall be provided for construction workers; and
- Equipment, vehicles, and other items shall be cleaned before they are moved off-site to other work locations.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3:

Construction Equipment. The applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area shall ensure the following requirements are incorporated into applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Contractors shall confirm the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment prior to any ground-disturbing and construction activities:

- Mobile off-road construction equipment (wheeled or tracked) greater than 50 hp used during construction of the project shall meet the U.S. EPA Tier 4 final standards. In the event of specialized equipment use where Tier 4 equipment is not commercially available at the time of construction, the equipment shall, at a minimum, meet the Tier 3 standards. Zero-emissions construction equipment may be incorporated in lieu of Tier 4 final equipment. A copy of each equipment's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each piece of equipment.
- Mobile off-road construction equipment less than 50 hp used during construction of the individual projects shall be electric or other alternative fuel type. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Electric hook-ups to the power grid shall be used instead of temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators, whenever feasible during construction of development or projects envisioned in the DTSP. If generators need to be used, the generators shall be non-diesel generators.

Cultural Resources

Threshold 4.2-A: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 1506.5.(b)?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The DTSP land use plan includes guidelines to retain and reflect the historic feel and scale of the buildings along Bonita Avenue in the historic core of the downtown area, generally from Cataract Avenue to San Dimas Avenue, where the historic buildings identified above are located. The Specific Plan strongly encourages the preservation, rehabilitation, and adaptive re-use of historic buildings, and requires new development or redevelopment projects within the Town Core to be architecturally compatible with the existing historic buildings in within the zone. There are 25 recognized historic structures within the planning area that are considered historic resources for the purposes of CEQA. Section 5.10. Historic Preservation and Adaptive Reuse in the proposed DTSP addresses

preservation of individual historic resources and the general historic character of the town core district. As a plan proposed to implement the City's General Plan, the DTSP would not result in any specific individual development projects that could directly or indirectly impact historic resources considering the proposed policies, design guidelines and development standards. The policies, guidelines and standards in the proposed DTSP will apply to structures on the current inventory list of the City of San Dimas and resources that may be added to this list over time. Furthermore, all individual historic resources are protected under CEQA. **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2** are proposed to ensure that development that may be facilitated by the DTSP avoids impacts to historic resources to the fullest extent feasible.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historical Resources Evaluation. During review of applications for individual development projects in the DTSP area, the City shall confirm the presence of historical resources with the potential to be impacted by the proposed project. If the property on which the project or development is proposed is not currently designated but contains built environment features over 45 years of age, a historical resources evaluation shall be prepared by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) Professional Qualification Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history (36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61). The qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct an intensive-level survey and perform the historical evaluation in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). Properties shall be evaluated within their historic context and documented in a report meeting the California OHP guidelines. All evaluated properties shall be documented on California Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 Forms. The report with attached DPR forms shall be submitted to the City for review and concurrence.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Prior to obtaining a building permit for any structure that would modify a structure included on the City's list of historic resources, a Historical Resource Documentation Report shall be prepared by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) Professional Qualification Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history (36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61) that demonstrates that

all modifications will be designed and implemented in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings and/or the State Historical Building Code, as appropriate.

Geology and Soils

Threshold 4.4-A: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features within the DTSP Area, as most of the Specific Plan area has been previously disturbed. If future development enabled by the Project involves excavation of previously undisturbed soils, and unknown resources are inadvertently discovered, a qualified professional paleontologist must evaluate the discovery and properly document it before authorization to resume construction, resulting in no significant adverse impacts to paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources. In the event an unanticipated fossil discovery is made during project development, work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be stopped, and a qualified professional paleontologist shall be retained to evaluate the discovery, determine its significance, and identify if mitigation or treatment is warranted. Significant paleontological resources found during construction monitoring shall be prepared, identified, analyzed, and permanently curated in an approved regional museum repository. Work around the discovery shall only resume once the find is properly documented and authorization is given to resume construction work.

Noise

Threshold 4.8-A: Generation of 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?

Finding: Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Noise levels generated by typical construction equipment are shown in Table 4.8-8: Typical Maximum Noise Levels for Construction Equipment, of the Draft EIR. All subsequent individual development projects within the DTSP Area would be required to comply with the construction hours and days specified in the City's Municipal Code. Construction noise levels would exceed the City's exterior noise limits, listed in Table 4.8-7 of the Draft EIR, for Residential Low and Medium, Residential High, Commercial, and Industrial zoned areas. Construction measures would be implemented and enforced by the City of San Dimas during construction activities. With implementation of **MM N-1**, construction noise levels would be reduced by a minimum of 27 dB, dependent on the construction activity and height of the temporary noise barrier used.

Subsequent individual development projects within the DTSP will introduce various stationary noise sources similar to existing conditions based off of current land uses. These sources would include HVAC systems. Sensitive receptors could be potentially affected by the introduction of such equipment. Typically, this type of equipment produces noise levels of approximately 56.0 dBA at 50 feet from the source. As the sound distance doubles at 100 feet from the equipment, sound levels would be 50 dBA, which would be similar to the existing ambient noise levels for this area (refer to Table 4.8-3 of the Draft EIR), which range from a low of 53.1 dBA to a high of 83.7 dBA. Other noise sources would include landscape equipment during landscape maintenance activities and fuel modification activities. These activities would be subject to the City of San Dimas Noise Ordinance, County Code Section 8.36.040, which limits sound levels during certain times of, see Table 4.8-7 of the Draft EIR. The Project would be consistent with the General Plan Policies related to noise.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure N-1: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Applicant for a development project in the DTSP area or their designee shall develop a Construction Noise Reduction Plan to minimize construction noise at nearby noise sensitive receptors. The Construction Noise Reduction Plan shall be developed in coordination with a certified acoustical consultant and the Project construction contractors and shall be approved by the City of San

Dimas. The Construction Noise Reduction Plan shall outline and identify noise complaint measures, best management construction practices, and equipment noise reduction measures. The Construction Noise Reduction Plan shall include, but is not limited to, the following actions:

- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (i.e., mufflers, silencers, wraps, etc.).
- Noise construction activities whose specific location on the DTSP area may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) shall be conducted as far as feasibly possible from the nearest noise sensitive land uses.
- If feasible, schedule grading activities so as to avoid operating numerous pieces of heavy-duty off-road construction equipment (e.g., backhoes, dozers, excavators, loaders, rollers, etc.) simultaneously in close proximity to the boundary of properties of off-site noise sensitive receptors surrounding the DTSP area to reduce construction noise levels by approximately 5 to 10 dB.
- Shroud or shield all impact tools, and muffle or shield all intake and exhaust port on power equipment to reduce construction noise by 10 dB or more.
- Where feasible, temporary barriers, including but not limited to, sound blankets on existing fences and walls, or freestanding portable sound walls, shall be placed as close to the noise source or as close to the receptor as possible and break the line of sight between the source and receptor where modeled levels exceed applicable standards. Noise barriers may include, but is not necessarily limited to, using appropriately thick wooden panel walls (at least 0.5-inches thick). Such barriers shall reduce construction noise by 5 to 10 dB at nearby noise-sensitive receptor locations. Alternatively, field-erected noise curtain assemblies could be installed around specific equipment sites or zones of anticipated mobile or stationary activity. The barrier material is assumed to be solid and dense enough to

demonstrate acoustical transmission loss that is at least 10 dB or greater than the estimated noise reduction effect. These suggested barrier types do not represent the only ways to achieve the indicated noise reduction in dB; they represent examples of how such noise attenuation might be attained by this measure.

- Implement noise compliant reporting. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall be posted at the Project construction site, providing a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints. This sign will indicate the dates and duration of construction activities. In conjunction with this required posting, a noise disturbance coordinator will be identified to address construction noise concerns received. The contact name and the telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator will be posted on the sign. The coordinator will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise and will notify the County to determine the cause and implement reasonable measures to the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the City.

6.0 Findings Regarding Project Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the Project, the City has determined that either (1) even with the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant, or (2) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." This is referred to herein as "Findings."

Air Quality

Threshold 4.1-A: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: Impact would be significant and unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: As shown in Table 4.1-7 and Table 4.1-8 of the Draft EIR, the estimate construction and operational emissions that would be generated by future development would exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. Through implementation of mitigation measures, emissions generated within the DTSP through future development would be reduced to the fullest extent feasible. Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with applicable policies of the Air Quality Element which calls for compliance with SCAQMD's AQMP, minimizing emissions within the City, and reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by facilitating development near the transit service and allowing mixed use development. **Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1** through **MM AQ-4** would be required. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to further emissions likely to be generated by subsequent individual development projects in the proposed DTSP area to less than significant that would be consistent with the objectives of the DTSP. Reducing growth in the DTSP area would not necessarily reduce population growth because people could still move to the region or Basin but would reside outside of the DTSP Area. Additionally, as the AQMP is updated to reflect new growth assumptions, the anticipated growth from the DTSP would be accounted for in the next AQMP. Therefore, even with the incorporation of mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The City shall require future projects subject to discretionary approval that are not found to be exempt from CEQA review to evaluate potential air quality impacts and implement respective mitigation measures to minimize impacts that exceed SCAQMD thresholds.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area shall prepare and implement a worker training program that describes the potential health hazards associated with Valley Fever, common symptoms, proper safety procedures to minimize health hazards, and notification procedures if suspected work-related symptoms are identified during construction. Additionally, this training program shall include worker training on the implementation requirements of the SCAQMD approved Dust Control Plan. Copies of the training program shall be provided to the City of San Dimas Planning Division. The worker training program shall identify safety measures to be implemented by construction contractors during construction. These measures shall include the following:

- HEPA-filtered, air-conditioned enclosed cabs shall be provided on heavy equipment when available. Workers shall be trained on the proper use of cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment;
- Communication methods, such as two-way radios, shall be provided for use by workers in enclosed cabs;
- Personal protective equipment (PPE), such as half-mask and/or full-mask respirators equipped with particulate filtration, shall be provided to workers active in dusty work areas upon request;
- Separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities shall be provided for construction workers; and
- Equipment, vehicles, and other items shall be cleaned before they are moved off-site to other work locations.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3:

Construction Equipment. The applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area shall ensure the following requirements are incorporated into applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Contractors shall confirm the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment prior to any ground-disturbing and construction activities:

- Mobile off-road construction equipment (wheeled or tracked) greater than 50 hp used during construction of the project shall meet the U.S. EPA Tier 4 final standards. In the event of specialized equipment use where Tier 4 equipment is not commercially available at the time of construction, the equipment shall, at a minimum, meet the Tier 3 standards. Zero-emissions construction equipment may be incorporated in lieu of Tier 4 final equipment. A copy of each equipment's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each piece of equipment.
- Mobile off-road construction equipment less than 50 hp used during construction of the individual projects shall be electric or other alternative fuel type. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Electric hook-ups to the power grid shall be used instead of temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators, whenever feasible during construction of development or projects envisioned in the DTSP. If generators need to be used, the generators shall be non-diesel generators.

Mitigation Measure AQ-4:

Before occupancy of new structures within the Project Site, the applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area must provide to the Director of Community Development of the incorporation of low-emission technology including solar water heaters, air-source heat pump, natural gas, and/or gas boosted solar as deemed appropriate by future project specific analysis.

Threshold 4.1-B: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?

Finding: Impact would be significant and unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: By applying SCAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of the Project would not result in exceedance of regional thresholds during construction. However, the Project would exceed operational thresholds. The DTSP is a planning document to guide development; it does not propose specific development projects. All future developed would be subject to the existing regulatory environment, including adopted air quality standards, and any impacts identified through site-specific review would be addressed through mitigation measures specific to the impact.

Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-4 would be required. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to emissions likely to be generated by subsequent individual development projects in the proposed DTSP area to less than significant that would be consistent with the objectives of the DTSP. Reducing growth in the DTSP areas would not necessarily reduce population growth because people could still move to the region or Basin but would reside outside of the DTSP Area. Additionally, as the AQMP is updated to reflect new growth assumptions, the anticipated growth from the DTSP would be accounted for in the next AQMP. Therefore, even with the incorporation of mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The City shall require future projects subject to discretionary approval that are not found to be exempt from CEQA review to evaluate potential air quality impacts and implement respective mitigation measures to minimize impacts that exceed SCAQMD thresholds.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area shall prepare and implement a worker training program that describes the potential health hazards associated with Valley Fever, common symptoms, proper safety procedures to minimize health hazards, and notification procedures if suspected work-related symptoms are identified during construction. Additionally, this training program shall include worker training on the implementation requirements of the SCAQMD approved Dust Control Plan. Copies of the training program shall be provided to the City of San

Dimas Planning Division. The worker training program shall identify safety measures to be implemented by construction contractors during construction. These measures shall include the following:

- HEPA-filtered, air-conditioned enclosed cabs shall be provided on heavy equipment when available. Workers shall be trained on the proper use of cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment;
- Communication methods, such as two-way radios, shall be provided for use by workers in enclosed cabs;
- Personal protective equipment (PPE), such as half-mask and/or full-mask respirators equipped with particulate filtration, shall be provided to workers active in dusty work areas upon request;
- Separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities shall be provided for construction workers; and
- Equipment, vehicles, and other items shall be cleaned before they are moved off-site to other work locations.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3:

Construction Equipment. The applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area shall ensure the following requirements are incorporated into applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Contractors shall confirm the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment prior to any ground-disturbing and construction activities:

- Mobile off-road construction equipment (wheeled or tracked) greater than 50 hp used during construction of the project shall meet the U.S. EPA Tier 4 final standards. In the event of specialized equipment use where Tier 4 equipment is not commercially available at the time of construction, the equipment shall, at a minimum, meet the Tier 3 standards. Zero-emissions construction equipment may be incorporated in lieu of Tier 4 final equipment. A copy of each equipment's certified tier specification or model year specification

shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each piece of equipment.

- Mobile off-road construction equipment less than 50 hp used during construction of the individual projects shall be electric or other alternative fuel type. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Electric hook-ups to the power grid shall be used instead of temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators, whenever feasible during construction of development or projects envisioned in the DTSP. If generators need to be used, the generators shall be non-diesel generators.

Mitigation Measure AQ-4:

Before occupancy of new structures within the Project Site, the applicant for an individual development project within the DTSP Area must provide to the Director of Community Development of the incorporation of low-emission technology including solar water heaters, air-source heat pump, natural gas, and/or gas boosted solar as deemed appropriate by future project specific analysis.

7.0 Findings Regarding Alternatives

The identification and analysis of alternatives to a proposed project is a fundamental aspect of the environmental review process under CEQA. Public Resources Code Section 21002 states, in part: “it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects.” In addition, Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(a) states: “The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) emphasizes the selection of project alternatives should be based primarily on the ability to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts attributable to a proposed project, “even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly.” CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) further directs that the range of alternatives be guided by a “rule of reason,” such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice are addressed. In selecting project alternatives for analysis, potential alternatives must be feasible.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires the analysis of a “no project” alternative and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires the evaluation of alternative location(s) for a proposed project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to designate an environmentally superior alternative. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The underlying purpose of the Project is to create the DTSP that would establish a planning and zoning framework for encouraging transit-oriented development meant to complement a new Metro “A” Line (formerly known as the “Gold”/“L” Line) passenger light rail transit station opening in 2025, while preserving the character of the historic commercial district.

The objectives of the Project are:

- A community-supported vision and guiding principles that encourage a vibrant and pedestrian-friendly downtown, and goals and policies to guide decision-makers in achieving the community’s vision for the downtown area.
- Zoning and land uses which encourage the development of new housing, commercial, and recreational opportunities, objective development and design standards to provide clear

guidance for property owners, developers, and City staff, and streamlined review and approval processes.

- Infrastructure and mobility recommendations to ensure infrastructure is adequately addressed and to promote safe and efficient circulation, active transportation, and complete streets.
- Implementation strategies and tools to encourage redevelopment and economic investment of residential and commercial development and to promote projects and partnerships.

The consideration of alternatives is an integral component of the CEQA process. The selection and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives provides the public and decision-makers with information on ways to avoid or lessen environmental impacts created by a proposed project. When selecting alternatives for evaluation, CEQA requires alternatives that meet most of the basic objectives of the Project, while avoiding or substantially lessening the Project's significant effects.

Three alternatives to the Project were defined and analyzed in the EIR:

Alternative 1 – No Project

Finding: Alternative 1 may lessen new construction and operations related emissions but would not avoid or substantially lessen any significant air quality impacts as the General Plan currently allows substantial development to occur within the proposed Specific Plan area. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potential air quality emissions to the greatest degree feasible. The No Project Alternative would, therefore, lessen, but not avoid the significant air quality impacts identified for the Proposed Project. The No Project Alternative would avoid all other impacts of the Project as proposed. However, no significant impacts would be avoided, and the No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed Project. Alternative 1 would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed Project. For these reasons, no significant impacts would be avoided or substantially lessened by the No Project Alternative.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), the no project alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which a proposed project does not proceed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) states “in certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.” Accordingly, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis must examine the impacts which could occur if the site is left in its present condition, as well as what may reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. Alternative 1 assumes the DTSP would not be adopted or implemented and assumes development in the proposed Specific Plan Area occurs as allowed by the City’s

current General Plan. No changes would occur to the existing allowed uses and new development projects. Under Alternative 1, new development projects would need to comply with the existing General Plan land uses and zoning designations, meaning new development would not include mixed-use and transit-oriented development and new development may occur farther from major transit stops and business centers. Alternative 1 would result in less dense development in the Specific Plan area when compared to the DTSP. However, Alternative 1 does not preclude new development projects within the Specific Plan area. All new development in the Specific Plan area under Alternative 1 would need to be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designations. Alternative 1 would result in lower-density development within the Specific Plan area, resulting in approximately 30 to 35 percent less development when compared with the DTSP. The transportation and mobility improvements envisioned in the DTSP would not occur with this alternative.

Alternative 2 – Alternative Specific Plan Area

Finding: The change in configuration of the Alternative Specific Plan Area and the reduction in total development potential would reduce estimated construction and operational air quality emissions that are likely to exceed regional and localized thresholds. However, reducing growth in the plan area would not necessarily reduce population growth because people could still move to the region or Basin but would reside outside of the plan area. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to emissions likely to be generated by subsequent individual development projects to less than significant that would be consistent with the objectives of the Project. The change in configuration under the Alternative Specific Plan Area would not reduce impacts to cultural resources. This alternative includes portions of established and often locally significant single-family neighborhoods surrounding the commercial core within the alternative plan area, while the proposed DTSP does not. As such, this alternative has potential impacts to cultural resources. Mitigation measures are identified for the proposed DTSP to avoid the potential for significant impacts to any inadvertent discovery of cultural resources that may be encountered during construction activities. While this alternative changes the configuration and reduces development potential of the Specific Plan area, other impacts, such as geology and soils, noise, and tribal cultural resources would not be reduced these impacts as mitigation measures have been identified that already reduce these impacts to less than significant. Given the reduction in total development potential and the change in the configuration of the Specific Plan area under this alternative, it would include three fewer primary opportunity sites for new housing located within the City's downtown as identified by the City's General Plan Housing Element. This alternative would not establish the zoning needed to meet the Housing Element production goals, and, as such, this alternative would not meet the project objectives to the same degree as the proposed DTSP. For these reasons, no significant impacts would be avoided or substantially lessened by the Alternative Specific Plan Area.

Facts in Support of Finding: Alternative 2 proposes an alternative boundary for the proposed Downtown Specific Plan. The Alternative Specific Plan Area generally extends to S. Eucla Avenue on the west to Pony Express Way on the east and includes additional area to the north to W. 2nd Street. This alternative area would encompass approximately 115 acres and would have a development potential of approximately 4.5 million square feet of building space. Alternative 2 would include portions of established and often historic single-family neighborhoods surrounding the commercial core within the alternative plan area.

The proposed DTSP boundary would encompass 202 acres and have a development potential of approximately 15.18 million square feet of building space. The Alternative Specific Plan Area focuses on the central portion of the City's Downtown and does not extend as far west and east as the proposed DTSP which extends to the 57 Freeway on the west and approximately 0.3 miles east of Walnut Avenue. This alternative would result in less overall development. As discussed within the DTSP, existing established single-family neighborhoods surrounding the commercial core have been intentionally excluded from the DTSP boundaries in order to focus on areas of potential growth and to preserve the existing and often historic single-family neighborhoods in the vicinity.

Alternative 3 — Reduced Intensity Alternative

Finding: The Reduced Intensity Alternative would incrementally reduce air quality emissions; however, emission would still exceed regional and localized thresholds. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to emissions likely to be generated by subsequent individual development projects to less than significant that would be consistent with the objectives of the Project. While this alternative changes the total development potential of the Specific Plan area, other impacts, such as cultural resources, geology and soils, noise, and tribal cultural resources would not be reduced. Mitigation measures for these impacts have been identified for the proposed DTSP and this alternative, which would reduce these impacts to less than significant. Because the Reduced Intensity Alternative would incrementally reduce some impacts, it is considered the environmentally superior alternative. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would see a reduction in the total development potential when compared to the proposed DTSP, and, as such, it would not meet the project objectives to the same degree as the proposed DTSP. For these reasons, no significant impacts would be avoided or substantially lessened by the Reduced Intensity Alternative.

Facts in Support of Finding: Alternative 3 would reduce the residential dwelling unit intensity within the DTSP Transit Village plan area by 25 percent. The maximum density of the Transit Village plan area is reduced from a maximum of 40 dwelling units per acre, with a development potential of approximately 787 dwelling units, to a maximum of 30 dwelling units per acre, with a development potential of approximately 591 dwelling units. Alternative 3 would have a development potential of 196 fewer

dwelling units when compared to the DTSP. Development would occur within the same boundaries as proposed by the DTSP. A 25 percent reduction in the maximum allowed number of residential dwelling units within the Transit Village plan area would result in the total square footage allowed under a maximum buildout of Alternative 3 being approximately 400,000 square feet smaller compared to the DTSP as proposed.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Finding: Alternative 3 would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would incrementally reduce air quality emissions; however, emission would still exceed regional and localized thresholds. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to emissions likely to be generated by subsequent individual development projects to less than significant that would be consistent with the objectives of the Project. While this alternative changes the total development potential of the Specific Plan area, other impacts, such as cultural resources, geology and soils, noise, and tribal cultural resources would not be reduced. Mitigation measures for these impacts have been identified for the proposed DTSP, and this alternative, that would reduce these impacts to less than significant. Because the Reduced Intensity Alternative would incrementally reduce some impacts, it is considered the environmentally superior alternative. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would see a reduction in the total development potential when compared to the proposed DTSP, and, as such, it would not meet the project objectives to the same degree as the proposed DTSP. For these reasons, no significant impacts would be avoided or substantially lessened by the Reduced Intensity Alternative.

Facts in Support of Finding: CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that an EIR identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated. If the “no project” alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives.

Of the other alternatives considered, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior, as it would avoid all impacts of the Project as proposed. However, no significant impacts would be avoided, and the No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed Project. For this reason, no significant impacts would be avoided or substantially lessened by the No Project Alternative.

Of the other alternatives evaluated, the Alternative Specific Plan Area, which would include approximately 115 acres and with a development potential of approximately 4.5 million square feet of building space. The proposed DTSP would encompass 202 acres and have a development potential of approximately 15.18 million square feet of building space. The change in the plan area size and configuration would

reduce the development potential by approximately 10.7 million square feet of building space, which is 70 percent less than the proposed DTSP. The change in configuration of the Alternative Specific Plan Area and the reduction in total development potential would reduce estimated construction and operational air quality emissions that are likely to exceed regional and localized thresholds. However, reducing growth in the plan area would not necessarily reduce population growth because people could still move to the region or Basin but would reside outside of the plan area. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to emissions likely to be generated by subsequent individual development projects to less than significant that would be consistent with the objectives of the Project. The change in configuration under the Alternative Specific Plan Area would not reduce impacts to cultural resources. This alternative includes portions of established and often locally significant single-family neighborhoods surrounding the commercial core within the alternative plan area, while the proposed DTSP does not. As such, this alternative has potential impacts to cultural resources. Mitigation measures are identified for the proposed DTSP to avoid the potential for significant impacts to any inadvertent discovery of cultural resources that may be encountered during construction activities. While this alternative changes the configuration and reduces development potential of the Specific Plan area, other impacts, such as geology and soils, noise, and tribal cultural resources would not be reduced these impacts as mitigation measures have been identified that already reduce these impacts to less than significant. Given the reduction in total development potential and the change in the configuration of the Specific Plan area under this alternative, it would include three fewer primary opportunity sites for new housing located within the City's downtown as identified by the City's General Plan Housing Element. This alternative would not establish the zoning needed to meet the Housing Element production goals, and, as such, this alternative would not meet the project objectives to the same degree as the proposed DTSP.

Alternatives Considered But Not Evaluated In Detail

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed and the reasons for eliminating alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR is failure to meet most of the basic Project objectives, infeasibility, or inability to avoid or substantially reduce significant environmental impacts. In reviewing and defining alternatives to the Proposed Project, the City did not consider any alternatives other than the alternatives described in Section 6.5 of the Draft EIR.

8.0 Findings Regarding Growth Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines, as amended, requires that a Draft EIR include discussion of the potential growth-inducing impacts of a project. Growth-inducing impacts are defined as the ways a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Such a discussion should also include projects that would remove obstacles to population growth and the characteristics of a project, which may encourage and/or facilitate other activities that, either individually or cumulatively, could significantly affect the environment. The CEQA Guidelines state that growth in an area should not be considered beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. Therefore, the proposed project's growth inducing effect is considered a significant environmental impact if project-induced growth could result in significant physical effects in one or more environmental issue areas.

Based on the CEQA Guidelines, a project has the potential to foster economic or population growth in a geographic area if it meets any of the following criteria:

- Removal of an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service or the provision of new access to an area).
- Urbanization of land in a remote location (leapfrog development).
- Economic expansion or growth occurring in an area in response to a project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion, etc.).
- Establishment of a precedent-setting action (e.g., a change in zoning or general plan designation).

Should a project meet any one of these criteria, it may be considered growth inducing under CEQA.

Findings: The Project is intended to expand the existing downtown by providing for compact urban development that features active streetscapes and pedestrian connections to the existing downtown and both existing and future public transportation currently under construction. The Project planned growth would not be induced in isolated, undeveloped areas or in built-out neighborhoods. As such, the Project would induce growth according to the goal of the City and in a way that minimizes effects on the environment.

Facts in Support of Finding: Removal Of An Impediment To Growth: The Project area is currently served by the full range of public services and utilities and would not alter physical impediments to growth. The Project would alter the existing policy framework to accommodate a different quantity and shape of

growth within the Plan area. The Project is intended to foster growth that is in accordance with local and regional planning. The purpose of the Project is to guide growth and development in the City that will support new infill, mixed use development that facilitates pedestrian and transit use within the City's downtown core. As such, the Project is intended to encourage and facilitate other activities that would improve the vitality of the downtown.

Urbanization: The Project plan area covers an area of central San Dimas that is already urban in its form and character. As such, it would not result in urbanization of land in a remote location. The project is better characterized as the opposite of leapfrog development. Instead, it locates new mixed-used development on underutilized land located immediately adjacent to the existing mixed-use downtown area, where adequate infrastructure and transit already exist.

Economic Expansion: One of the primary economic development goals of the Project is to support the downtown area as an attractive, livable, and economically vital core. Much of the land located in the Plan Area is occupied by low activity-generating uses due to the disjointed character of area uses or awkward lot design. The Project is intended to remedy these conditions by providing a detailed vision and strong guidance for a vibrant mixed-use extension of downtown San Dimas. The resulting positive economic development, increased residential, office, retail and possibly hotel uses would be consistent with the economic conditions already found in the downtown area and not to create new economic conditions that could have a negative impact on the environment. As such, some economic expansion is intended to make conditions more consistent with the surrounding areas of the City and reduce development pressures in surrounding neighborhoods. Therefore, any economic expansion resulting from the project is not considered growth inducing or likely to have significant negative environmental impacts.

Precedent-Setting Action: Precedent setting actions could include approvals that have implications for other properties or that could make it easier for other properties to develop. The Project involves adopting a specific plan which is consistent with the General Plan and similar to specific plans that has been implemented throughout the City. The Project has implications for properties within the Plan Area as it is intended to accommodate growth on these properties. The enhancement of the Plan Area could potentially encourage development on other properties within the vicinity. However, the use of a Specific Plan to accommodate growth consistent with the General Plan is not in itself precedent setting. The proposed Specific Plan is similar to mixed use zones and other specific plans found throughout the City. As such, the Project would not establish a precedent that could have implications for other parts of the City.