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Section 1: Project Description

1.1 – Project Title
Hawaiian Gardens Zoning Code Update (Project #’s 011-031 ZCA, 011-032 ZMA)

1.2 – Lead Agency Name and Address
City of Hawaiian Gardens
21815 Pioneer Boulevard,
Hawaiian Gardens, California 90716

1.3 – Contact Person and Phone Number
Don Boudreau, Associate Planner
Phone: 562-420-2641 x 246
Email: dboudreau@hgcity.org

1.4 – Project Location
The City of Hawaiian Gardens is located in Los Angeles County, generally in the southeast area of the greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area. The City of Long Beach lies directly to the west and south, along with the City of Lakewood to the north, and the Orange County City of Cypress to the east. Hawaiian Gardens is regionally accessible from Interstate 605 (San Gabriel River Freeway), which is located to the immediate west of the City. Also, the Carson Street off ramp is located at the western entrance to the City. The City is also regionally accessible from the Interstate 405 (Long Beach Freeway) located to the south, and Highway 91 to the north.

1.5 – Project Sponsor’s Name and Address
City of Hawaiian Gardens
21815 Pioneer Boulevard,
Hawaiian Gardens, California 90716

1.6 – General Plan Land Use Designation
Multiple

1.7 – Zoning District
Multiple

1.8 – Project Description
The City of Hawaiian Gardens is proposing a number of revisions to the City’s zoning code, to:

1) Implement the recently adopted General Plan policies (2010 General Plan Update)
2) Add provisions mandated by State law
3) Strengthen aesthetic design standards
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4) Refine public noticing requirements and expand the purview of the Community Development Director’s authority to grant variations from certain development standards
5) Update and add sections to increase code effectiveness and to address land use circumstances not addressed by the current zoning code
6) Improve clarity of language and the organization of the document—these are referred to as “clean-ups”

Each kind of revision is described below. The full set of revisions can be reviewed in Appendix A, where changes to the existing code are shown as underline (blue) for text to be added, strikethrough (red) for text to be deleted, and double strikethrough/double underline (green) for text to be relocated.

1. General Plan Implementation/Consistency

General Plan Implementation/Consistency Updates are those which have been proposed to ensure consistency with the recently updated General Plan. All development related documents adopted by the City must be consistent with General Plan as this is a requirement by state law. The updates below have specifically been made to ensure the zoning code is consistent with the recently adopted General Plan Update.

Creation of the C-2 Zone – Downtown Commercial Zone

The General Plan Update created a Downtown Policy Area “established in order to preserve the City’s pedestrian-scale commercial and to develop this specific area of the City for small-scale retail businesses, specialty shops, personal service uses, and restaurants that support resident’s needs and also cater to a broader subregional market.” (City of Hawaiian Gardens General Plan Land Use Element)

The C-2 Zone has been created to implement the Downtown Policy Area established by the General Plan Update, specifically implementing the policies under Goal LU-5 in the General Plan Update, “support the revitalization of a dynamic Downtown District on Norwalk Boulevard.” The Downtown Policy area is located along Norwalk Boulevard north of Carson Street between 214th Street and Tilbury Street and encompasses 43 parcels totaling approximately 6.75 acres in area (See Exhibit 3 – Location of C-2 Downtown Commercial Zoning Map).

The proposed Zoning Code Update establishes the following for the C-2 Zone:

Purpose:
The purpose of the Downtown Commercial (C-2) zone is to develop a specific area of the City for small-scale retail businesses, specialty shops, personal service uses, and restaurants that support resident’s needs and also cater to a broader subregional market. The Downtown Commercial zone is intended to accommodate a variety of retail uses within a well-designed environment with a strong pedestrian-oriented character. In order to promote a pedestrian atmosphere, development standards require that new buildings be constructed adjacent to the sidewalk for convenient pedestrian access.

Development Standards:
- Minimum Lot Size: 5,000 square feet
- Minimum Lot Width: 50 feet
- Minimum Lot Depth: 100 feet
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- Maximum Lot Coverage - parking provided on-site: 70%
- Maximum Lot Coverage - parking provided off-site: 100%
- Setbacks:
  - Front: None required
  - Side: None required
  - Side abutting a residential zone: 1 foot for each foot that the building exceeds 30 feet in height
  - Rear: None required
  - Rear if lot abuts a residential zone: 1 foot for each foot that the building exceeds 30 feet in height
- Maximum Height: 45 feet
- Minimum Distance Between Buildings: 10 feet

Permitted Uses:
For the list of permitted uses please refer to the “Uses Permitted in Non-Residential Zones” table in Section 18.60.050 of the proposed Zoning Code Update.

Creation of Section 18.70.110 Mixed Use Projects
Chapter 18.70 Non-Residential Regulations is being amended to establish regulations for residential/commercial mixed use projects. This section has been created to implement the General Plan Update Policy LU-3.3: Encourage the development of mixed use housing opportunities in the General Commercial land use designation on sites with a minimum lot size of 1 acre.

The Mixed Use Project section provides standards and criteria for the development of mixed-use projects. The primary intent of these standards is to balance the needs of nonresidential uses for access, visibility, parking, loading, safety, and economic development with the needs of residential uses for privacy, security, and relative quiet.

Creation of Exceptions to Section 18.100.130: Non-Conforming Uses and Structures
The City of Hawaiian Gardens has many “strip mall” type developments located along the City’s two main thoroughfares-- Carson Street and Norwalk Boulevard. In many of these locations, parking is inadequate and commercially zoned properties are not large enough to be redeveloped into more cohesive developments. As a result, the City has re-designated the land use from residential to non-residential affecting 36 parcels located adjacent to the commercial areas, to promote the consolidation of larger commercial developments. However, this creates a situation where a number of properties become “non-conforming,” i.e., the existing land use is not permitted within its new zoning designation. Sales of nonconforming residential properties are often prohibited or restricted by lending institutions, unless the local government entity provides a “rebuild letter” indicating the property can be legally rebuilt if it is damaged or destroyed, in-order to protect their investment.

This section has been updated to allow all properties zoned non-residential that were previously zoned residential to maintain all of their development rights under their previous residential zoning as long as the site is not developed as non-residential. This means property owners maintain their right to build, rebuild, and expand under their previous residential zoning designation without limitation. Properties will lose their ability to build or re-build as residential if the site is developed as non-residential.
2. State Law Mandates

State Law is updated constantly and any state law related to development or land use regulations must be reflected within local zoning codes to ensure consistency between state law and local regulations. Each of the items identified below have been included/updated to ensure the zoning code is consistent with California State Law.

**Section 18.60.50.A: Massage Parlor with California State License**
Massage parlors with California State licensed practitioners are now a permitted use in all commercial zones pursuant to State Bill 731. The current code limits massage parlors to the C-4 Zone, subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

**Section 18.70.110: Temporary Emergency Shelters**
This Section provides standards for the establishment and operation of emergency shelters, in compliance with Government Code Section 65583. The current Hawaiian Gardens Zoning Code does not provide development standards for the establishment of temporary emergency shelters. To conform with State law and ensure that the development of this use is compatible with surrounding uses, the updated Zoning Code will include the adoption of a temporary emergency shelters ordinance. The proposed ordinance would allow emergency shelters in the General Commercial (C-4) and Public Facilities (PF) zoning districts only and would provide provisions for their establishment and operations.

**Section 18.90.140: Child Day Care Facilities and Centers**
This section provides standards for the location and operation of day care facilities in accordance with Section 1597.43 of the 2011 California Planning, Zoning, and Development Laws. The current Hawaiian Gardens Zoning Code does provide definitions for child day care facilities and centers and identifies them in Section 18.040.070: Uses Permitted in Residential Zones. However these use are only subject to the regulations of the California Health and Safety Code, with no additional standards provided. The updated zoning code will now include a child day care facilities ordinance that will provide standards for the location and operation of these facilities, which will be in addition to requirements imposed by state regulations.

**Section 18.100.190: Reasonable Accommodations**
This Section provides a procedure to request Reasonable Accommodation for persons with disabilities seeking equal access to housing under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, the Federal Fair Housing Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (also known as the Acts) in the application of zoning laws and other land use regulations, policies, and procedures.

3. Design Standards

Some design standards have been revised to improve the aesthetic quality of development. Examples of such revisions include design articulation, color choice and use of materials. A few examples are provided following to illustrate the types of changes included within this category.

- Prohibiting use of exposed raceway on signs unless they are a design component of the sign. (Section 18.90.050.D.2.e)
- Three-car garages must have the 3rd garage space recessed two feet in from the front of the 2-car portion. (Section 18.50.10.K.2)
Fencing materials for residential development excludes the use of wood and masonry elements on the same plane. (Section 18.50.040.B.1)

4. Procedural

Procedural updates are changes which have been made to improve administrative procedures and changes to the authority of a procedure. A summary of the procedural updates are provided below:

**Section 18.100.020.E**
- Removal of the City Council as the appeal body for City Council decisions
- New requirement for a 300’ public notice mailing for Minor Use Permits
- Removal of the 300’ public notice mailing requirement for Home Occupation Permits
- New requirement for a 300’ public notice mailing Temporary Use Permits
- New requirement for a 300’ public notice mailing Minor Exceptions

**Section 18.100.060.B**

Additions to the Community Development Director’s authority for granting a Minor Use Permit:
- 25% increase in fence height limit with the limitation of 8’ maximum (Under the current code it only allows a 20% increase without maximum)
- A reduction in the number of parking stalls for single family and duplexes when additional parking cannot be accommodated on site
- A 20% reduction for driveway width in the R-1 and R-2 zones

5. Improve Effectiveness

Zoning Code Improvement Updates are updates to improve the effectiveness of the zoning code based upon a comprehensive analysis of the current zoning code standards. These updates cover a wide range of topics including development standards, regulations, allowable uses, and the creation of a new zone. A list of the zoning code improvement updates is provided below:

**Chapter 18.20 - Definitions**
- New Definitions
  - Earth Tone
  - Emergency Shelter
  - Multi-Family Residential
  - Professional Services
  - Single Family Residential
- Modified Definitions:
  - Accessory Structure
  - Building Materials, Retail Sales
  - Guest House
  - Guest Room
  - Flag Lot
  - Open Space - Common Open Space
  - Retail Store or Establishment
  - Vision Clearance Area
  - Wholesale, Distribution and Storage
- Removed Definitions
  - Private Open Space
Chapter 18.30 – Zoning Map
- Addition of C-2 Downtown Commercial Zone to list of zones

Chapter 18.40 – Residential Zones
- Non-residential uses located in residential zones shall comply with all the same development standards as residential uses in residential zones
- Reduction of minimum distance between buildings from 10 feet to 8 feet
- Reduction of minimum setback to alley on residential through lots adjacent to an alley from 20 feet to 10 feet
- Removal of “passive landscape areas” from residential development requirements
- Increasing amount of common useable open space by 100’ square feet to account for the removal of passive landscape areas requirement
- Residential Zone Use Changes
  - New Uses
    - Guest Room – Permitted in all residential zones except Mobilehome Park
  - Removed Uses
    - Second Unit
    - Townhome/Townhouse
    - Recovery Treatment Facility (6 or fewer)
    - Recovery Treatment Facility (more than 6)
    - Child Day Care Center
    - Multi-Family Residential
  - Modified Uses
    - Garage Sales – permitted in all residential zones changed from requiring a Temporary Use Permit
    - Family Day Care Home - changed to Child Day Care Home
    - Group Home, Small – changed from requiring a Conditional Use Permit to being permitted in all residential zones except Mobilehome Park

Chapter 18.50 – Residential Regulations
- Homes with 5 bedrooms or more require a third garage space, the current code requires a third garage space for homes with 4 bedrooms or more.
- Required parking for Townhomes and Condominiums must be enclosed in a garage, not including guest parking
- Required parking for Multi-Family Residential must be enclosed in a garage, not including guest parking
- Reduction of parking requirements on 25 foot wide lots from 2 enclosed spaces to 1
- One covered parking space is required for a guest house in addition to existing parking required for main residence
- Lots 30’ wide or smaller may utilize tandem parking to satisfy their parking requirement through the approval of a Minor Use Permit
- Refinement of regulations for the construction of a detached garage in the rear yard setback area
- Guest parking for residential projects may be located in the rear yard setback
- Detached garages may encroach up 24 feet from the rear property line to allow for a accessible space behind the garage
- Temporary prefabricated canopies may be used for non-required parking spaces
- Two-unit multi-family uses may have driveways which “backup” into a public street
- R-1 zoned single family lots with a minimum width of 75 feet may have a circular driveway
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- Removal of the requirement to provide “no parking” signs at the entrance to a driveway and every 50 feet along the street
- Parking on driveways serving single-family and duplex units shall be perpendicular to the garage door
- Residential lots at least 75 feet wide may have garage parking for up to 4 vehicles
- An exemption to the 6 foot fence height limit may be granted by the Community Development Director when a fence is placed upon a 2 foot high or lower retaining wall.
- Motor homes can only be temporarily parked (72 hour max.) in driveways if they are registered to the home owner (to comply with the previously adopted motor home ordinance)
- Allowing of canopies to be placed 3 feet from side and rear property lines
- Inclusion of regulations for outdoor fire places and fire pits being allowed in the rear yard setback unless fire place is over 6’ in height in which case it must maintain a 5’ setback
- Creation of a new design standards for small lot development
- Prohibiting accessory structures between a primary residence and front or street side property line
- Increasing number of permitted temporary structures from 1 to 2 per parcel
- Establishment of a 50% maximum rear yard setback lot coverage for accessory structures and buildings
- Allowing the addition of a laundry room no larger than 5’ x 7’ to a legal non-conforming residence
- New Section - Parking Lots in Residential Zones
  - This section has been added to provide standards for the development of parking lots for non-residential uses on residentially zoned properties.
- New Section - Temporary Prefabricated Canopies
  - This section has been added to provide standards for the type and use of prefabricated canopies within residentially zoned properties.
- New Section - Small Lot Development
  - This section provides new development standards tailored to accommodate residential development on small lots which are defined as having a width of 30 feet or less.

Chapter 18.60 – Non-Residential Zones

- Inclusion of a side and rear yard setback requirement for commercial structures
- Non-Residential Zone Use Changes
  - New Uses
    - Coffee Shops
    - Hardware Store, without contractors yard
    - Internet Café
    - Outdoor Dining
    - Outpatient Clinical Dialysis
    - Carpet and Tile Shop (Less than 75% retail floor area)
    - Glass Shop (Less than 75% retail floor area)
  - Removed Because Duplicated Elsewhere
    - Entertainment Centers or Facilities
  - Modified Uses
    - Post Office (Terminal) – From Permitted in the C-4 and M-1 Zones to Conditional Use Permit
    - Adding “drive-through” to “Fast-food Restaurant”
    - Clinics – From Permitted to Minor Use Permit in C-4 Zone
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- Auto Accessories, without installation/repair – From Minor use Permit to Permitted in the C-4 Zone
- Auto Accessory Installation - From Not Permitted to Permitted in the M-1 Zone
- Communication Facilities – From Permitted to Conditional Use Permit in the C-4 Zone
- Composting Facility – From Conditional Use Permit to Prohibited in the C-4 and M-1 Zone
- Electrical Shops – From Permitted to Minor Use Permit in the C-4 Zone
- Mixed Use Development (residential and commercial) - From Conditional Use Permit to Minor Use Permit in the C-4 Zone
- Solar Apparatus/Solar Energy System – From Minor Use Permit to Permitted in all non-residential zones

Chapter 18.70 – Non-Residential Regulations
- Allowing landscaped areas within setbacks on commercial properties to be counted towards overall site landscaping requirement
- Provisions for minimum width of commercial landscaped areas 5’ street frontage and 4’ landscape fingers
- All trash enclosures shall have a solid roof
- Limitations on Outdoor Uses section added to replace the removal of the Allowed Outdoor Storage section.
- New Section - Parking Management Plan
  - This section provides alternative methods for meeting parking requirements when a site does not have enough parking to meet the required off-street parking demand.
- New Section – Minor Exception to reduce parking requirements
  - This section grants the Community Development Director the ability to approve minor exceptions to reduce required number of parking stalls by up to 10 percent.
- New Section - Establishment of Parking Districts
  - This section has been developed to encourage the joint use of parking and evaluate parking on an “area-wide” basis instead of “parcel-by-parcel” within the parking district areas.

Chapter 18.90 – Supplemental Regulations
- Allowing wall signs for each street frontage and updated to include parking lot frontage
- Prohibiting of Billboards and removing the associated standards
- Temporary signs being permitted from 30-60 days but limited to four times per calendar year
- Restaurant drive thru boards require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit
- Accessory units my not be placed in front of the primary dwelling unit on a lot
- Minimum lot size for an ADU increased from 3750 to 6000 sq. ft.
- New Section - Guest Houses
  - This section was created to regulate and provide standards for additional living spaces without direct access from a primary residence.
- New Section - Vision Clearance Areas
  - This section identifies proper distances from corners that must remain unobstructed to ensure proper visibility for vehicular traffic.
- New Section - Outdoor Dining
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- This section provides regulations for the establishment of out-door dining for restaurant uses.

- New Section - Multiple Tenant Occupancies
  - This section has been established to better regulate businesses which have other tenants that occupy the same space to avoid becoming a “swap meet” type use.

Chapter 18.100 – Administration

- Home Occupation Permit uses shall not store materials hazardous to surrounding properties or detrimental to the residential character of the neighborhood.

6. “Clean-Ups”
   “Clean ups” consist of correcting spelling and punctuation errors, grammatical improvements, and increasing clarity in a number of sections of the zoning code which remain otherwise unchanged. Clean-ups also include re-arrangement of existing zoning code sections to improve the organization of the document.

1.9 – Background Information

The City of Hawaiian Gardens periodically updates the general plan and zoning code in order to remain current with the changing development patterns and needs of the community. Staff began a comprehensive update of the City’s zoning code following the recent adoption of the updated General Plan (2010). While the primary focus of the update is to ensure consistency between the Zoning Code and General Plan as required by State Law, Staff also looked for opportunities simplify and improve the effectiveness of the Zoning Code. The Zoning Code Update involves a comprehensive review of existing planning documents, development patterns and the policies and practices of other municipalities.

1.10 – Project Objectives

Improving consistency between the Zoning Code and the recently adopted General Plan is the primary objective of the proposed changes to the Zoning Code. This would be accomplished through the creation and modification of particular sections of the zoning code that will promote the implementation of the General Plan Goals and Policies.

1.11 – Surrounding Land Uses

The City of Hawaiian Gardens is located in the southeast area of Los Angeles County and is surrounded by the City of Long Beach to the west and south, the City of Lakewood to the north, and the Orange County City of Cypress to the east. Surrounding development includes the I-605 Freeway, residential, commercial, public, industrial, and open space uses.

1.12 – Environmental Setting

The Zoning Code Update is a comprehensive update of the City of Hawaiian Gardens Zoning Code that will be applied citywide. The City encompasses approximately 0.9 miles and is currently approximately 99 percent built out, consisting of residential developments, community and regional commercial centers, light industrial businesses, and public community facilities. The City is approximately 9 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean, approximately 18 miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles, and is
surrounded by land currently developed as residential, commercial, public, industrial, and open space uses.

1.13 – **Framework for Environmental Analysis**

The objectives of the proposed Zoning Code Update are to improve consistency with the recently adopted updated General Plan through the creation of new zoning districts, provide updates to sections of the Zoning Code pursuant to state law, update the current design standards to improve overall aesthetics of development, improve the administrative process through procedural updates, improve the effectiveness of the current zoning code through regulation updates, and provide an overall “cleaning up” of the document. No direct physical impacts on the environment would occur, because no particular land use activity, development project or construction project would be authorized as part of this Zoning Code update. The provisions of the updated Zoning Code will be applied to future land use and development proposals. This Initial Study has been prepared to determine if there could be any significant, long-term environmental effects linked to the proposed zoning standards that would not occur under existing zoning regulations. This includes consideration of any significant changes in the environment or pertinent regulatory programs that could affect a determination of a significant effect.

**Tiering upon General Plan EIR**

A “tiered” environmental impact analysis ("tiering") involves the incorporation by reference of generalized discussions from a previous Environmental Impact Report (EIR) into a subsequent environmental document in order to focus the discussion on the action under review. Section 15152 of the California Environmental Quality Act encourages lead agencies to tier environmental analyses to avoid repetitive discussion within subsequent environmental documents and focus on issues directly related to the topic of evaluation. The tiering process focuses the discussion of environmental impacts on issues directly affected by actions that are unique to the site or project under review and could not have been examined at the conceptual and programmatic level of the previous EIR. In this way, the tiered analysis can identify measures designed to reduce or avoid the environmental impacts that are unique to the proposed action. Tiering is appropriate in situations where the proposed action is consistent with the General Plan or where changes in zoning will produce conformity with the General Plan.

The proposed changes to the Zoning Code have been prepared to improve consistency with and help implement the City’s 2008 General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs. Accordingly, this Initial Study is tiered upon the certified Final EIR (FEIR) for the 2008 City of Hawaiian Gardens General Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2008011004).

1.14 – **City of Hawaiian Gardens Required Approvals**

Zoning Ordinance Amendment subject to the approval of the Hawaiian Gardens City Council

1.15 – **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required**

None
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### Section 2: Determination

#### 2.1 - Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

|-------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------|----------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

#### 2.2 - Determination

- [ ] I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- [ ] I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITigated NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- [ ] I find that the proposed project **MAY have** a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

- [ ] I find that the proposed project **MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment**, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- [ ] I find that although the proposed project **COULD have** a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required**.

![Signature and Date]

Don Bureau, Associate Planner
City of Hawaiian Gardens
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Section 3: Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

3.1 – Aesthetics

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcroppings, and historic buildings within view from a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The General Plan Open Space Element does not identify any scenic vistas within the city or in the general vicinity. No impacts will occur. (Source: 1).

b) **No Impact.** There are no natural scenic or historic resources identified by the General Plan (2010) in the City of Hawaiian Gardens or in the general vicinity. No impacts will occur. (Source: 1)

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update includes the creation of the C-2 – Downtown Commercial Zone for the purpose of implementing the “Downtown Policy Area” established by the General Plan Update. A total of 43 parcels located along Norwalk Boulevard between 214th Street and Tilbury Street will be rezoned from their current C-4 – General Commercial Zone to the new C-2 zoning. As a result of this change, the new C-2 zoning district development standards would allow an increase in lot coverage from 70% to 100% and reduce the required minimum lot size from 10,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet. This increase in allowed lot coverage could potentially result in more visible building bulk, compared to the current limitations on lot sizes and lot coverage. With the exception of lot coverage and minimum lot size, the development standards for the C-2 Zone and the C-4 Zone are identical;
therefore there could be no taller buildings. Total levels of development could not exceed the maximum intensities established in the General Plan. If there is some increase in the amount of visible building bulk as a result of these zoning changes, they would have a less than significant effect in this already urbanized, fully built environment. Therefore, future potential impacts resulting from the redevelopment of the properties in question will be less than significant. (Sources: 1, 2)

d) No Impact. The current Hawaiian Gardens Zoning Code contains development standards for lighting in residential (Section 18.50.050) and non-residential (section 18.70.050) zoning districts that address the location, design, glare, and shielding of light sources. The proposed Zoning Code Update does not include modifications to these sections. Therefore, no impacts will occur. (Sources: 2)
### 3.2 – Agriculture and Forest Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) <strong>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) <strong>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) <strong>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) <strong>Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) <strong>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a) **No Impact.** No properties in Hawaiian Gardens are designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, according to the California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). No impact will occur; thus, no mitigation is required. (Sources: 5)

b) **No Impact.** No properties in Hawaiian Gardens are zoned for agricultural use and or are subject to a Williamson Act contract. No impact will result; thus, no mitigation is required. (Source: 6)
c) **No Impact.** No properties in Hawaiian Gardens are zoned for forest land or timberland production. No impact will occur. (Source: 2)

d) **No Impact.** There are no forest resources in Hawaiian Gardens. No impact will occur.

e) **No Impact.** The City and surrounding area is fully urbanized. There are no agriculture or forest land uses in this area. Therefore, no conversion of farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest uses will occur. (Source: 2)
3.3 – Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The City of Hawaiian Gardens is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Air Quality Management Plan provides the framework for attainment of federal and State air quality standards in the SCAB. The management plan includes input from all member agencies in the district boundaries, and it reflects the combined technical and policy inputs of the U.S. EPA, CARB, SCAQMD, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

The Hawaiian Gardens 2010 General Plan Program EIR determined the 2010 General Plan Update consistent with the 2007 AQMP for the SCAB. The Air Quality Element of the General Plan includes policies and implementation measures designed to ensure land-use decisions work to implement and comply with federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to air quality. The Zoning
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Code Update would not affect implementation of the AQMP or the City’s Air Quality Element. The primary objective of the project is to improve consistency between the Zoning Code and General Plan. Therefore, no conflict with the regional air quality plan will result, and no adverse impacts will occur as a result of the project. (Source: 1, 4, 7)

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Approval of the proposed zoning code update would not authorize any types of land uses that generate significant air quality impacts. Specific types of emissions and emission levels associated with any future land use proposal cannot be determined until such a proposal is submitted for City review. The updated zoning code would have no effect on existing air quality conditions and would not contribute to any existing or potential future air quality violations. (Source 4)

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Approval of the proposed zoning code update would not authorize any types of land uses that generate significant air quality impacts. Specific types of emissions and emission levels associated with any future land use proposal cannot be determined until such a proposal is submitted for City review. The proposed zoning code amendments would not result in emissions of criteria pollutants that were not anticipated in the General Plan EIR. (Source 4)

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Specific types of emissions and emission levels associated with any future land use proposal cannot be determined until such a proposal is submitted for City review. Since the proposed Zoning Code Update is consistent with the General Plan Update (2010), potential future infill or redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code update would not result in land use types or intensities not anticipated by the General Plan or the General Plan Program EIR. The proposed zoning code updates would not authorize any activities that would result in release of substantial concentrations of air pollutants. Potential impacts to sensitive receptors, therefore, would not differ from what was contemplated in the General Plan Program EIR. (Source: 1, 4)

e) **No Impact.** None of the proposed zone code amendments involving regulations on the location or type of land uses would authorize any activity known to generate odor problems. In addition, Chapters 18.50 (Residential Regulations), 18.70 (Non-Residential Regulations), and 18.90 (Supplemental Regulations) of the Zoning Code include provisions for the avoidance or suppression of odors which could result from residential and non-residential uses. Potential effects involving malodors, therefore, would not be affected by the zoning code update. (Source: 2, 4)
### 3.4 – Biological Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ □ □ ✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.11.3 of the General Plan Program EIR, in Hawaiian Gardens, there is no suitable habitat, any biological corridors, and no verifiable presence of any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status. Since the proposed zone code amendments are consistent with and will implement the land use policies of the updated General Plan, and since there are no sensitive biological resources in the planning area, this project would have no effect on sensitive plants or wildlife species. (Source 1, 4)

b) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.11.3 of the General Plan Program EIR, there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community present within the City, thus no impact will occur. (Source 4)

c) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.11.3 of the General Plan Program EIR, there are no listed federal wetlands inventory identified within the fully urbanized City of Hawaiian Gardens. Therefore, the project would not adversely impact any federally protected wetlands. (Source 4)

d) **No Impact.** The study area does not contain any recognized migratory or biological wildlife corridors, nor are any wildlife nursery sites present within the City. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard. (Source 4)

e) **No Impact.** As discussed in the Conservation Element of the 2010 General Plan Update, the City of Hawaiian Gardens contains no expansive open space areas, natural features or sensitive natural plant communities, or riparian habitats for which to consider conservation. In addition, typical vegetation throughout the City includes nonnative and ornamental plant species. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. (Source 1)

f) **No Impact.** The City does not lie within the boundary of any existing or proposed conservation planning area. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard. (Source 4)
# 3.5 – Cultural Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.10.3 of the General Plan Program EIR, no prehistoric or historic resources have been identified within the City. No impact would occur in this regard. (Source: 4)

b) **No Impact.** Proposed zone code amendments would not allow for encroachment of new development into undeveloped open spaces that might have undiscovered archaeological resources. The Program EIR for the 2010 Hawaiian Gardens General Plan Update includes Mitigation Measure CR-1 which requires preparation of a Phase I archaeological field assessment, as part of any new discretionary land use approval, to determine if the site is considered a prehistoric site. Mitigation Measure CR-2 sets performance standards for the retrieval and curation of any discovered buried cultural resources. No changes in these standard requirements would occur due to the proposed zone code amendments. (Source: 1, 4)

c) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.10.5 of the General Plan Program EIR, the City does not contain unique geologic features and is not known to contain documented paleontological resources. Therefore the proposed Zoning Code Update would have no impact in this regard. (Source: 4)

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** There are no existing cemeteries within the City, nor have there been any cemeteries in the City in recent years. No conditions exist that suggest human remains are likely to be found within the City. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure CR-3 of the General Plan Program EIR requires future infill and/or redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code update be subject to the provisions of Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety
Code. Section 7050.5 requires the contractor to notify the County Coroner if suspected human remains are uncovered. The Coroner will then determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner, with the aid of a supervising archaeologist, determines that the remains are or appear to be of a Native American, he/she would contact the Native American Heritage Commission for further investigations and proper recovery of such remains, if necessary. Proposed zone code amendments would have no effect on this existing regulatory standard; therefore, this project would have no effect involving potential disturbance or recovery of human remains. (Source: 4,8)
### 3.6 – Geology and Soils

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** There are no Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones within the City of Hawaiian Gardens; therefore, no impact will occur. (Source: 1, 4)

b) **No Impact.** All properties within the City are subject to strong seismic ground shaking, as are all properties located within Southern California. Any future construction related to infill or redevelopment of properties will be reviewed by the City’s Building Department as part of the City’s routine plan check procedures and in accordance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1 of the General Plan Program EIR. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires a Geologic Study be prepared for new development that specifies the measures necessary to mitigate impacts related to liquefaction and expansion, if any. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure GEO-2 requires applicants of future development projects to comply with each of the recommendations detailed in the Geotechnical Study, and other such measure(s) as the City deems necessary to adequately mitigate potential seismic and geotechnical hazards. Continued implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 will ensure that future site development is adequately designed and constructed to withstand seismic related ground shaking. Proposed zone code amendments would not affect existing geological conditions or the City’s existing plan check and construction permitting procedures to ensure that new construction is seismically safe. This project would thus have no effect involving seismic ground shaking. (Sources: 3, 4)

c) **No Impact.** As discussed in the General Plan Program EIR, the entire City of Hawaiian Gardens is subject to liquefaction. Liquefaction is a hazard associated with intense ground shaking. During seismic events, the earth accelerates and soils can destabilize, particularly when sufficient water is present in the soil. The destabilized soil and water can mix, resulting in liquefaction. Potential infill and/or redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code update could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving liquefaction. As discussed in Section aii), any future construction related to infill or redevelopment of properties will be reviewed by the City’s Building Department as part of the City’s routine plan check procedures and in accordance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1 of the General Plan Program EIR. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires a Geologic Study be prepared for new development that specifies the measures necessary to mitigate impacts related to liquefaction and expansion, if any. Since the proposed zone code amendments would have no effect on existing geological and soils conditions and would have no effect on the City’s existing Building Code standards to ensure proper structural design to mitigate liquefaction problems, this project would have no impact involving liquefaction hazards. (Source: 4)

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Hawaiian Gardens is located on relatively flat topography and is not located adjacent to steep slopes or areas that would otherwise be subject to landslides, debris flow, and/or rockfall. Therefore, damage from landslides and other mass movements is not
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anticipated within the City. No impact would occur in this regard. (Source: 1, 4)

b) **No Impact.** The soils present within the City are sand, silt, and clay silt soils, which have a high erodability potential. However, the City is approximately 99 percent built-out and is considered fully urbanized. Therefore, conditions that contribute to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil are not present within the City. Potential infill and/or redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code Update could result in the exposure of surficial soils during demolition grading activities that could result in wind or rain based erosion. The Zoning Code Update would have no effect on existing ground conditions or the City’s erosion control measures as required by Section J110 (Erosion Control) of the CBC and Sections 6.47.060 and 6.47.090 (Urban storm Runoff Control, Construction Sites and Best Management Practices (BMPs)) of the Municipal Code; therefore, no adverse effects involving loss of topsoil or soil erosion would occur. (Source: 3)

c) **No Impact.** As discussed in the General Plan Program EIR, The conditions favorable for hazards such as landslides or subsidence/collapse are not present in the City. Therefore, the regulatory changes and text revisions contained in the Zoning Code Update would have no impact involving landslides, subsidence or other forms of ground collapse. (Source: 4)

d) **No Impact.** The soils present within the City are sand, silt, and clay silt soils, which have a high expansion potential. Future infill and redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code Update could be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risk to life or property. As discussed in Section aii), any future construction related to infill or redevelopment of properties will be reviewed by the City’s Building Department as part of the City’s routine plan check procedures and in accordance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1 of the General Plan Program EIR. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires a Geologic Study be prepared for new development that specifies the measures necessary to mitigate impacts related to liquefaction and expansion, if any. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 will reduce impacts to less than significant in this regard. (Source: 4)

e) **No Impact.** Hawaiian Gardens is 99 percent developed and has an existing wastewater disposal infrastructure. The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County own, operate, and maintain trunk sewer lines for the regional conveyance and treatment of wastewater. The City owns and is responsible for operation and maintenance of the local sewer lines. None of the proposed zone code amendments involve land uses that depend upon or would require the use of septic tanks or other subsurface wastewater disposal systems. (Source: 4)
### 3.7 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed zoning changes could potentially result in minor differences in land use intensities involving building bulk, but no difference in the types of land uses or potential sources of greenhouse gas emissions. All future development would be subject to whatever energy efficiency standards are in effect at the time. Travel destinations and modes of travel would not be affected by the proposed zoning changes; therefore, vehicular sources of GHGs would not change compared to what could occur under the present zoning regulations.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The Conservation Element of the Hawaiian Gardens General Plan identifies a number of policies and implementation actions that will contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from various sources, including automobile travel and energy consumption. The proposed zoning code update would not change or conflict with any of these policies or regulations.

A variety of standards and regulations have been passed in California since the 1970s that are aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions and mitigating potentially adverse effects of climate change. Chief among these is Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). AB 32 requires that statewide greenhouse gas emissions be reduced to 2000 levels by the year 2010, 1990 levels by the year 2020, and to 80 percent less than 1990 levels by year 2050. The California Air Resources board (CARB) adopted a Scoping Plan in December 2008 that identifies strategies to meet the deadlines of AB 32. Key elements of the plan are:

- Expanding and strengthening existing energy efficiency programs as well as building and appliance standards.
- Achieving a statewide renewable energy mix of 33 percent.
- Developing a California cap-and-trade program that links with other Western Climate Initiative partner programs to create a regional market system.
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- Establishing targets for transportation-related GHG emissions for regions throughout California, and pursuing policies and incentives to achieve those targets.
- Adopting and implementing measures pursuant to state laws and policies, including California’s clean car standards, goods movement measures, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard
- Creating target fees, including a public goods charge on water use, fees on high global warming potential gases, and a fee to fund the administrative costs of the state’s long-term commitment to AB 32 implementation.

In 2008, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) was adopted to implement AB 32 goals for reduction of transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions through better regional planning that focuses on the direct linkages between regional transportation and land use/housing planning.

These statewide strategies and regional planning programs are not applicable to development of any specific sites or to minor changes in local zoning regulations.

Adopted in January 2010, the California Green Building Standards (CALGREEN) code includes mandatory building regulations for all new residential, commercial, and public building construction in the state that will achieve major reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, energy consumption, and water use. New regulations under the CALGREEN Code will require:

- 20 percent mandatory reduction in indoor water use, with voluntary goal standards for 30, 35 and 40 percent reductions;
- Separate water meters for nonresidential buildings’ indoor and outdoor water use, with a requirement for moisture-sensing irrigation systems for larger landscape projects;
- Requiring diversion of 50 percent of construction waste from landfills, increasing voluntarily to 65 and 75 percent for new homes and 80 percent for commercial projects;
- Mandatory inspections of energy systems (i.e. heat furnace, air conditioner, mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity according to their design efficiencies;
- Requiring low-pollutant emitting interior finish materials such as paints, carpet, vinyl flooring and particle board.

Any future redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code Update would be subject to all applicable State adopted regulations to curb GHGs, including the CALGREEN code. The proposed Zoning Code Update will have no effect on the applicability or effectiveness of any such regulations. (Source: 1)
### 3.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed changes to the Zoning Code Update would not authorize any new kinds of land uses or any new or more dangerous processes that involve use, transport, storage, generation or disposal of hazardous substances or wastes. All land uses that would be permitted as a result of the proposed changes were anticipated by the General Plan and the General Plan Program EIR. No impacts are anticipated. (Source: 1, 4)

b) **No Impact.** See preceding discussion for item a.

c) **No Impact.** Several elementary and high schools are located within the City of Hawaiian Gardens. The proposed Zoning Code Update would not authorize any new kinds of land uses or any new or more dangerous processes that involve use, transport, storage, generation or disposal of hazardous substances or wastes. All land uses that would be permitted as a result of the proposed Zoning Code Update were anticipated by the General Plan and the General Plan Program EIR. No impacts to existing or proposed schools are anticipated. (Source: 4)

d) **No Impact.** According to records maintained by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cortese List), a total of 12 sites within the city have been identified as hazardous substances releases or contaminated sites, 4 of which have been reported closed as of October 21, 2008. The proposed Zoning Code Update does not include any specific development projects and will have no affect on any of the identified sites. No impact will occur. (Source: 9)

e) **No Impact.** The City is not located within an airport land use plan and no public airports are located within two miles. No impact will occur. (Source: 4)

f) **No Impact.** The City is not located within two miles of a private airstrip. No Impact will occur. (Source: 4)

g) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.9.2 of the General Plan Program EIR, The City of Hawaiian Gardens Emergency Operations Plan addresses the City’s planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. Hazardous material incident is addressed in this plan. The proposed Zoning Code Update would not authorize or facilitate any roadway modifications that could interfere with the City’s Emergency Operations Plan. No Impact will occur. (Source: 4)
h) **No Impact.** The City of Hawaiian Gardens is approximately 99% built-out and is located in a developed, urban area. No wilderness areas exist within or around the City. No risk of wildland fires or danger to people or infrastructure as a result of such fires is anticipated. No impact will occur.
### 3.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.8.2 of the General Plan Program EIR, the City is subject to the Los Angeles RWQCB Order No. 01-182 (NPDES Permit No. CAS004001), Waste Discharge Requirements For Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges Within the County of Los Angeles and the Incorporated Cities Therein, Except the City of Long Beach” (the “2001 Permit”). These NPDES permit requirements have been codified by the City in Section 6.47.010 (Urban Storm Runoff Control Ordinance) of the Municipal Code. The proposed Zoning Code update would not authorize any specific development that would affect runoff in the City. Potential future redevelopment would require review by the City’s Public Works Department to confirm that there would be no significant change in site runoff and to specify the specific drainage/water quality control measures required to meet the standards of local and regional water quality standards. No significant water quality impacts are anticipated due to the proposed zone change. (Source 2, 3)

b) **No Impact.** Any future development or redevelopment pursuant to the proposed Zoning Code Update will require water in order to operate and will also use water in the maintenance of landscaping. These projects will receive their water by connecting to existing, nearby water mains; therefore, there will be no effect on the production rate of any well. The potential increase in impervious surfaces resulting from future redevelopment in the C-2 Downtown Commercial Zone under less restrictive minimum lot size and lot coverage will not significantly impact on-site recharge capabilities because the sites are mostly paved and they provide little opportunity for groundwater recharge. No significant impacts are anticipated.

c) **No Impact.** The City of Hawaiian Gardens is approximately 99 percent built and has an existing stormwater infrastructure. There are no naturally occurring permanent surface water features within the City of Hawaiian Gardens. Stormwater drainage in the City is provided by a network of regional drainage channels and local drainage facilities. Surface water is deposited into regional channels, which are owned and maintained by Los Angeles County. Due to the existing, developed character of the sites and the established drainage pattern
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within the area, immediate or future erosion or siltation impacts associated with changes to drainage patterns will not occur. (Source: 4)

d) **No Impact.** See discussion for Section c

e) **No Impact.** Over the long-term, the proposed Zoning Code Update could result in more intense development on the properties being rezoned to the new C-2 Downtown Commercial Zone due to less restrictive development standards, including smaller minimum lot size and more lot coverage. This could potentially result in an increase to impervious surfaces on the sites. Future redevelopment of the affected sites are not anticipated to impact the City’s planned storm drain system because the sites are already primarily developed with impervious surfaces and the new C-2 Downtown Commercial Zone does not introduce new land uses that could result in additional pollutants in site runoff from new sources such as outdoor storage or industrial products or wastes. No impacts are anticipated. (Source: 2)

f) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update will not produce any direct development or redevelopment as a result of the proposed changes. No new sources of runoff, waste discharges, or hazardous material sites would arise from adoption of the proposed zone amendments. Any future development project pursuant to these regulations will be required to comply with City, County, and State regulations that protect water quality. The project will not impact water quality.

g) **No Impact.** The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Los Angeles County and Orange County indicate that the city lies outside the 100-year flood zone. No impact will occur. (Source: 11)

h) **No Impact.** Refer to discussion under Section g

i) **No Impact.** All of Hawaiian Gardens is within the inundation area of the Whittier Narrows Dam and the Prado Dam. Failure of either dam could inundate the City with 3-4 feet of water in approximately 1.5 hours. No people or structures would be exposed to risk of inundation as a result of the Zoning Code Update since there is no specific development being proposed as part of this project. Implementation of the proposed zone code amendments would have no effect on the potential for dam inundation or potential damage related thereto. Therefore, no impact will occur. (Source: 4)

j) **No Impact.** The City of Hawaiian Gardens is not subject to tsunamis, since the City is located inland and no significant water bodies exist within the City limits, so there is no risk of flooding from a seiche condition. Due to the relatively flat topography and mostly built character of the City, no mudflow impacts would occur. (Source: 4)
3.10 – Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning code Update is specifically intended to achieve consistency with the 2010 General Plan Update. This project would not facilitate the development of roads, flood control channels, or any other facilities that could divide an established community. The proposed zoning amendments would have no effect on land use or circulation patterns within the community.

b) **No Impact.** The proposed zoning amendments are minor refinements intended to reflect the historic and current land uses of the city. All of the proposed changes are consistent with the land use goals and policies of the General Plan. Allowing emergency shelters within the General Commercial (C-4) and the Public Facilities (PF) zone could have the potential to create land use conflicts relating to visual compatibility and noise; however, implementation of Section 18.70.110: Temporary Emergency Shelters would effectively address any potential conflicts as all projects would be required to comply with applicable development standards and operational restrictions. No impacts relating to the City’s adopted land use plans and policies would occur. (Source: 1, 2)

c) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.11.3 of the General Plan Program EIR, the City does not lie within the boundary of any existing or proposed conservation planning area. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard. (Source: 4)
### 3.11 – Mineral Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The City of Hawaiian Gardens is approximately 99% built-out and is located in a developed, urban area. There are no mineral extractions or processing facilities located in the city or in nearby areas. There are no known mineral resources of value in or near the city; therefore no impact will occur.

b) **No Impact.** The Hawaiian Gardens General Plan does not identify any portion of the City of Hawaiian Gardens having an important mineral resource recovery site, thus the project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (Source: 1)
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3.12 – Noise

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update is intended to achieve consistency with the 2010 General Plan update. The Zoning Code Update establishes Section 18.70.110: Mixed Use Projects in order to implement the following Policy of the 2010 General Plan Land Use Element:
LU-3.3 Encourage the development of mixed-use housing opportunities in the General Commercial land use designation, on sites with a minimum lot size of 1 acre.

The incorporation of multi-family residential development into commercial/mixed-use development could expose people to noise levels in excess of those typically associated with multi-family residential development. Section 18.70.110 establishes provisions to address potential noise impacts resulting from mixed-use projects, including the requirement of sound mitigation and a disclosure statement explaining potential impacts associated with mixed-use. These standards are sufficient to mitigate potential noise impacts associated with future mixed-use projects to a level of less than significant. (Source: 1, 2)

b) **No Impact.** The proposed zone changes are intended to achieve consistency with the 2010 General Plan Update and reflect existing development patterns. The proposed changes would not introduce new land uses with the potential to generate substantial groundborne noise or vibrations.

c) **No Impact.** The Zoning Code Update would not authorize any new land uses in the City that would lead to the establishment of a noise environment different than that existing in the City today. All existing and future land use activities will be required to comply with the City’s Noise Control Ordinance. No impact will result. (Source: 2, 3)

d) **No Impact.** Since no construction is authorized by the proposed zoning amendments, no temporary increase in noise levels would occur. The revised zoning standards would not permit any new types of land uses or operations that could generate significant temporary or periodic noise impacts. No impact is anticipated. (Source: 2)

e) **No Impact.** The City is not located within an airport land use plan and no public airports are located within two miles. The nearest public airport is the Long Beach Airport, located approximately 4.1 miles west of the City. The nearest airfield, the Los Alamitos Army Airfield, is located approximately 3.4 miles south of the City. The City is not within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of either the Long Beach Airport or the Los Alamitos Army Airfield. (Source: 4)

f) **No Impact.** Refer to discussion under Section e
3.13 – Population and Housing

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial 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)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update will not allow for increases in housing density or total dwelling units beyond those previously analyzed under the General Plan Program EIR. The zoning amendments proposed as part of this project are intended to achieve consistency with the 2010 General Plan Update and reflect current development patterns. The proposed project does not involve any changes to roadways or other infrastructure that support growth. Thus, the project will not induce growth.

b) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update would not authorize the demolition of any housing or businesses and would not facilitate displacement of people or housing. Services to assist people who are temporarily displaced would be enhanced through proposed Zoning Code revisions that would accommodate and facilitate emergency shelters. No impact with regard to housing displacement or displacement of persons will result.

c) **No Impact.** Refer to discussion under Section b.
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3.14 – Public Services

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The project implements General Plan policies and programs and in particular, adopted land use policy. The project will not facilitate any new development activity beyond that analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR and would not affect existing land use and circulation patterns or the types of building construction. The General Plan Program EIR concluded that sufficient measures are in place to meet public services needs over time, through the review of individual projects and the application of standard City requirements. The proposed zone code update would have no effect on demands for or performance of public services and thus no effect involving construction of new or expanded public services facilities. (Source: 4)

b) **No Impact.** See discussion for Section a

c) **No Impact.** See discussion for Section a

d) **No Impact.** See discussion for Section a

e) **No Impact.** See discussion for Section a
3.15 – Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update does not include or authorize any specific development that would result in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The General Plan Program EIR concluded that the long-term implementation of the updated General Plan would have a less than significant impact on existing parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed zoning updates would not change the potential impacts already anticipated in the General Plan EIR; thus it would result in no independent impacts.

b) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update does not contemplate or authorize the development of any recreational facilities. Furthermore, the proposed project does not include any specific development that would require the expansion of existing recreational facilities. Thus, no impacts would result.
### 3.16 – Transportation and Traffic

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update is specifically intended to achieve consistency with and implement the policies of the 2010 General Plan Update, including those establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. None of the proposed zone amendments involving regulatory changes and text revisions will conflict with the City's established policies and performance standards pertaining to the circulation system. Furthermore, the proposed zoning code update would not generate additional traffic beyond what was previously analyzed by the General Plan Program EIR, thus the project would result in no independent impacts to the City's adopted circulation system policies and performance standards. (Source: 1, 2)

b) **No Impact.** The City of Hawaiian Gardens is required to demonstrate compliance with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (LACMP). I-605 is the only route in or near the City of Hawaiian Gardens designated in the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (LACMP). There are no intersections in Hawaiian Gardens designated as CMP monitoring intersections.

The General Plan Program EIR determined that implementation of the General Plan Update would result in less than significant impacts regarding consistency with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (LACMP). The proposed Zoning Code Update is specifically intended to achieve consistency with the General Plan Update. The project will not facilitate any new development activity beyond that analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. Thus, the proposed zone amendment will have no new impacts on the CMP network. (Source: 1, 4, 11)

c) **No Impact.** The Los Alamitos Army Airfield is located approximately 3.4 miles south of the City; Fullerton Municipal Airport is approximately 6.47 miles to the east of the City; and Long Beach Municipal Airport is approximately 4.1 miles to the west of the City. The City of Hawaiian Gardens is 99 percent developed and any projected, future developments within the City limits would not impact current air traffic patterns. If any future developments would propose significant lighting and/or cellular communication towers, a review would be conducted by the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) to determine if any impact would occur. Proposed zone code amendments would have no effect on this review process. No impacts would occur. (Sources: 4)

d) **No Impact.** The proposed zoning amendments would not authorize any specific land use activity that could necessitate modifications to existing street access. Potential effects involving street access would depend on a specific site plan submitted for a future development proposal. If different street access is proposed, line-of-sight analysis and other design criteria would be applied by the City Engineer during the City’s standard review procedures, to ensure that unsafe conditions are not created. The proposed Zoning Code Update would not affect the City’s existing street design standards or development plan review process related thereto. Proposed zoning regulations would not facilitate will not introduce new land use types or restrictions that could generate a different type of vehicle traffic that could be incompatible with the existing circulation system of the community. No impacts would occur.
e) **No Impact.** No development is being proposed as part of the Zoning Code Update. All future development would be evaluated to determine the appropriate land use permit for authorizing their use and the conditions for their establishment and operation. At a minimum, future development would be subject to compliance with the Municipal Code’s access requirements, in order to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. The Zoning Code Update will not alter the Municipal Code’s current access requirements. No impact will occur. (Source: 3, 4)

f) **No Impact.** The proposed changes in zoning are limited in scope and would affect only the properties involved. All City regulations, plans and policies pertaining to alternative travel modes would remain in effect, without any modifications related to this action.
### 3.17 – Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed Zoning Code Update would have no effect on how the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) adopted for the Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant (NPDES No. CA0054119, CI No. 5662) as issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) apply within Hawaiian Gardens. No new uses or development standards are proposed that would require new methods or equipment to process wastewater discharge. (Source: 4, 12)

b) **No Impact.** According to the General Plan Program EIR, long-term build-out of the City’s Land Use Plan would require construction of new or expanded treatment or processing facilities due to the increase in water demand and wastewater generation. Given that an extensive water distribution system exists within Hawaiian Gardens and future development sites have already been subject to extensive ground disturbance, as well as the built-out nature of the surrounding cities, the General Plan Program EIR found that no significant environmental impacts would occur from the potential future expansion or upgrading of water distribution facilities. In regards to wastewater, Mitigation Measure USS-2 of the General Plan Program EIR requires that all new development that may occur under the General Plan Update undertake a site-specific sewer evaluation, including flow monitoring and modeling, in order to determine the adequacy of the existing conveyance system capacities in the affected project area lines, including trunk and local sewers. Compliance with the recommended mitigation and General Plan Policies would ensure that impacts to the wastewater conveyance system from development under the General Plan Update would be less than significant. The proposed zoning changes to the affected sites reflect historic and current land uses that are consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element and its policies. The proposed Zoning Code Update is specifically intended to achieve consistency with the 2010 General Plan Update and, therefore, would be consistent with the levels anticipated in the analysis provided in the General Plan Program EIR. (Source: 1, 4)

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed C-2 Downtown Commercial Zone would allow for the possibility of an expanded building footprint and thus an increased impervious surface area due to reduced minimum lot size and the expansion of allowable lot coverage. Since all sites are currently developed, potential expansions of impervious surfaces are expected to be minor and less than significant. The need for localized storm drainage improvements would be determined as part of the City’s routine development plan review process, at the time such plans are submitted. Major modifications to or expansions of the City’s storm drainage system are not anticipated. (Source: 4)

d) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.13 of the General Plan Program EIR, the Golden State Water Company, which provides water to the City via the Southern Artesia System, has concluded they would have access to water supplies necessary to serve the level of growth permitted by the General Plan Update. The proposed Zoning Code Update will not facilitate any new development activity beyond that analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR; thus it would result in no independent impacts (Source: 4)

e) **No Impact.** The proposed zone amendments are consistent with the General Plan Land Use element, therefore, this would not affect any wastewater demand
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projections or facilities planning based on the City’s General Plan land use designations. This project would not result in any new impacts involving wastewater demand and conveyance facilities that were not anticipated in the General Plan EIR. (Source: 1)

f) **No Impact.** According to the General Plan Program EIR, solid waste generated in Hawaiian Gardens is primarily disposed of at Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfill. The General Plan Program EIR indicates that long-term build-out of the City’s Land Use Plan would be adequately served by existing landfills. The proposed Zoning Code Update would not introduce new land uses that would substantially increase the volume of solid waste disposal, compared to existing uses. In addition, per the City’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) program, all future development projects within the City would be required to comply with the SRRE program for diverting solid waste which would further reduce impacts to landfills. Thus, this project would not result in any new impacts related to landfill capacity that were not anticipated in the General Plan EIR. (Sources: 4, 13, 14)

g) **No Impact.** Solid waste from the city is currently handled and disposed of by Consolidated Disposal Services pursuant to the City’s franchise agreement codified in Chapter 6.12 (Refuse – Garbage) of the Municipal Code. Any potential development or redevelopment pursuant to the Zoning Code Update will comply with the waste pick-up and disposal requirements of the City and the City’s waste reduction obligations as mandated by the State pursuant to AB 939. The proposed zoning amendments would have no effect on the City’s solid waste regulations.
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3.18 – Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

□ □ ✓ □

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

□ □ ✓ □

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

□ □ ✓ □

Discussion:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Potential redevelopment resulting from the proposed zoning amendments would not differ from the location, type and intensity of long range community development that was anticipated in the 2010 General Plan Program EIR. As such, the proposed zone changes will not result in significant impacts to scenic vistas or the visual character of the affected sites or the surrounding areas, as discussed in Section 3.1, and will not impact any sensitive plants, plant communities, fish, wildlife or habitat for any sensitive species, as discussed in Section 3.4. Given the long urbanized character of the city and its surroundings, adverse impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources are considered unlikely. Therefore, the proposed zoning amendments will not degrade the quality of the environment, impact any habitat or species and will have less than significant impacts on important examples of California history and prehistory.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** No near-term development or infrastructure projects or any other policy-level land use actions are planned in this area that could contribute to the minor impacts associated with the potential development or redevelopment resulting from the Zoning Code Update. Furthermore, the
primary objective of the proposed zoning amendments is to improve consistency between the Zoning Code and General Plan through minor refinements that better reflect the current land uses and pattern of development within the city. Impacts resulting from potential redevelopment as a result of the proposed changes would not result in significant impacts, as discussed in Sections 3.1 through 3.17, and cumulative effects for the entire planning area would not differ from what was anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR. (Source: 15)

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** There are no significant geological, hydrologic, or natural hazards affecting the project, as discussed in Sections 3.6 through 3.9. The proposed zoning changes would not result in physical disruption of any neighborhood or established community area and would not displace any persons or any housing units, as discussed in Section 3.10 and Section 3.13. As discussed in Section 3.3, potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed zone changes would not differ from the kinds and levels of impacts anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR. As discussed in Section 3.12, significant noise impacts are not anticipated. Approval of the requested zoning changes would not result in substantial, adverse effects on human beings.
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APPENDIX A

Hawaiian Gardens Zoning Code Update 2011
The Zoning Code has been removed from Appendix A and is included as Exhibit #2 in the Staff Report.