
Initial Study/Negative Declaration

City of Arcadia General Plan Amendment: Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element - DRAFT

OCTOBER 2024

Prepared for:

CITY OF ARCADIA
240 W Huntington Drive
Arcadia, California 91007
Contact: Fiona Graham

Prepared by:

DUDEK

605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024

Table of Contents

SECTION	PAGE
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Project Overview	1
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance	1
1.3 Initial Study Checklist.....	2
2 Project Description.....	3
2.1 Safety Element Update	3
2.2 Environmental Justice Element.....	5
3 Initial Study Checklist.....	9
3.1 Aesthetics	14
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources	15
3.3 Air Quality.....	16
3.4 Biological Resources.....	17
3.5 Cultural Resources	18
3.6 Energy	19
3.7 Geology and Soils	20
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	22
3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	22
3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	24
3.11 Land Use and Planning.....	26
3.12 Mineral Resources	27
3.13 Noise	28
3.14 Population and Housing.....	29
3.15 Public Services	29
3.16 Recreation.....	30
3.17 Transportation	31
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	32
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems.....	33
3.20 Wildfire	34
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	35
4 References and Preparers.....	37
4.1 Initial Study/Negative Declaration References Cited.....	37

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
BMP	Best Management Practice
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CGS	California Geologic Survey
City	City of Arcadia
dB	Decibel
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EJ	Environmental Justice
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GPA	General Plan Amendment
IS	Initial Study
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zones
ND	Negative Declaration
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The purpose of the proposed project is to update the City of Arcadia’s (City’s) General Plan by providing updates to the Safety Element and provide a new Environmental Justice Element. The City’s General Plan provides the policy framework for the long-range planning of physical development in the community and consists of the following elements: Land Use and Community Design Element, Economic Development Element, Circulation and Infrastructure Element, Housing Element, Resource Sustainability Element, Parks, Recreation, and Community Resources Element, Safety Element, and Noise Element. This project involves an amendment to the General Plan in order to adopt, as required by State Law, an updated Safety Element and a new Environmental Justice Element.

The Safety Element of the General Plan is intended to address public safety planning by identifying natural or human-made hazards present in the City and identifying strategies to avoid or mitigate these hazards. Government Code Sections 65302(g) and 65302(f) identify several issues to consider in such planning efforts, as does California Health and Safety Code Section 56050.1. The proposed Safety Element update would integrate the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) into the Safety Element, and all future updates to the LHMP by reference. The proposed project would also update the Safety Element to address potential hazards as a result of climate change.

The new Environmental Justice (EJ) Element includes policies to reduce the “unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities,” “promote civic engagement in the public decision-making process,” pursuant to Per California Government Code Section 65302(h). The primary focuses of the EJ Element are reducing pollution exposure, preparing for the effects of climate change, promoting active and public transportation, improving parks and public facilities, and promoting safe and sanitary housing.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a statewide environmental law described in California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000–21177, applies to most public agency decisions to carry out, authorize, or approve actions that have the potential to adversely affect the environment. The overarching goal of CEQA is to protect the physical environment. To achieve that goal, CEQA requires that public agencies identify the environmental consequences of their discretionary actions and consider alternatives and mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce significant adverse impacts when avoidance or reduction is feasible. It also gives other public agencies and the public an opportunity to comment on the information. If significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided, reduced, or mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) and balance the project’s environmental concerns with other goals and benefits in a statement of overriding considerations.

The City’s Planning Division of the Development Services Department directed and supervised the preparation of this Initial Study (IS)/Negative Declaration (ND). Although prepared with assistance from the consulting firm Dudek, the content contained within and the conclusions drawn by this IS/ND reflect the independent judgment of the City.

1.3 Initial Study Checklist

The following Environmental Checklist (i.e., IS) was prepared per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15063–15065. The CEQA Guidelines include a suggested checklist to indicate whether a project would have an adverse impact on the environment. The checklist is found in Section 3 of this document. Following the Environmental Checklist, Sections 3.1 through 3.21 include an explanation and discussion of each significance determination made in the checklist for the project.

For this IS/ND, the following four possible responses to each individual environmental issue area are included in the checklist:

1. Potentially Significant Impact
2. Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
3. Less-than-Significant Impact
4. No Impact

The checklist and accompanying explanation of checklist responses provide the information and analysis necessary to assess relative environmental impacts of the project. In doing so, the City will determine the extent of additional environmental review, if any, for the project.

2 Project Description

This project involves an amendment to the General Plan to adopt an update to the Safety Element and a new EJ Element (proposed project). The Safety Element of the General Plan is intended to identify, evaluate, and address local and regional safety issues, establishes goals, policies, and actions that will reduce loss of life, injuries, property loss or damage, environmental damage, and social and economic disruption from natural and human-caused disasters. The vision for the Safety Element includes minimizing exposure of residents to hazards and incorporating public safety considerations into the planning and decision-making processes. The intention of the EJ Element is to address potential health risks or safety risks of disadvantaged communities and seek to create healthy and safe communities for all, focusing on correcting disproportionate health impacts.

2.1 Safety Element Update

Background

The Safety Element is one of the General Plan elements required by State law. Government Code Sections 65302(g) and 65302(f) identify several issues to consider in such planning efforts, as does California Health and Safety Code Section 56050.1. Per Section 65302(g), the safety element must address the following hazards:

- Seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure
- Tsunami, seiche, and dam failure
- Slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides
- Subsidence
- Liquefaction
- Other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 2690) of Division 2 of the Public Resources Code, and other geologic hazards known to the legislative body
- Flooding
- Wildland and urban fires
- Climate change

In accordance with provision of Assembly Bill (AB) 2140, General Plans: Safety Element (Government Code 65302.6), a city may adopt with its safety element a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) which is specified in the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. Adopting the LHMP with the safety element provides an avenue for implementation of the LHMP. As of 2015, it is also now required by state law (Senate Bill [SB] 379 and Government Code Section 65302(g)(4)) that a local jurisdiction update the safety element to address climate adaptation and resiliency strategies. These updates are required to occur either upon the next revision of a LHMP on or after January 1, 2017, or if the jurisdiction does not have an adopted LHMP, beginning on or before January 1, 2022. The updates should include a climate change vulnerability assessment, and a set of goals, policies, and objectives that address resiliency, hazard mitigation and emergency response strategies. The proposed Safety Element update would adopt the LHMP by reference and would implemented in tandem with the LHMP to address hazards.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes updates to Chapter 8: Safety Element of the Arcadia General Plan to include a *Climate Change* section. This section addresses the emergency events that are associated with climate change, including; extreme heat, flooding, and wildfire. The Climate Change section addresses vulnerabilities specific to climate change, including vulnerable populations and built environments. The proposed project also updates the *Fire Hazards* section to address water resources and recent wildfire events, the *Emergency Services* section to update existing conditions, and the *Emergency Preparedness* section to update critical and non-critical facilities and provide additional policies to address emergency and disaster response preparedness.

The proposed project adds new policies and revises existing policies to address the climate change-related hazards that are identified and provide guidance for future actions of the City to mitigate these hazards. The new goals and policies are as follows:

- Policy S-1.1: Support policies and programs to incentivize/encourage improving resilience to local infrastructure networks vulnerable to increasingly extreme weather events.
- Policy S-1.2: Support policies and programs to engage with residents, including non-English speaking communities, making them aware of the risks of extreme events and providing information on ways to preserve health.
- Policy S-1.3: Explore potential grants, programs, and partnerships to reduce cost burdens related to households addressing changing hazards
- Policy S-2.1: Maintain a healthy urban forest to reduce extreme heat.
- Policy S-2.2: Adopt policies and standards for the built environment that reduce the urban heat island effect.
- Policy S-3.1: Review the performance of culverts and other flood-related infrastructure in recent debris flow events to determine a list of potential improvements required for hazard mitigation.
- Policy S-3.2: Continue to provide alert/emergency notification processes and provide public information and awareness materials for those who live in debris flow hazard areas, as determined by fire risk, slope, and past debris flow events.
- Policy S-4.7: Periodically conduct and evaluate Emergency Operations Center exercises to ensure readiness for earthquakes and/or seismic related events.
- Policy S-4.8: Ensure access and egress routes are planned appropriately to and from identified hazard areas relative to the type of development in these areas.
- Policy S-5.5: Ensure that developments located within the County's Flood Hazard Zones are located and designed to avoid isolation from essential services and facilities in the event of flooding.
- Policy S-6.8: Require redevelopment located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone to comply with the most current version of the California Building Codes and California Fire Code. Encourage post-fire

redevelopments located outside of a Fire Hazard Severity Zone to comply with the most current version of the California Building Codes and California Fire Code.

Policy S-6.9: Reduce the impacts of wildfire by meeting minimum State Fire Safe regulations for fire-resistant building materials, vegetation management, fire-adapted landscaping, fuel modification, and other fire hazard reduction programs.

Policy S-6.10: Ensure long-term maintenance of all fire hazard reduction projects, including community fire breaks and private road and public road clearance.

Policy S-6.11: Maintain water supply and infrastructure to meet the water needs of the Arcadia Fire Department.

Policy S-9.7: Create resilience centers throughout Arcadia to ensure frontline communities are equipped to respond, recover, and rebuild after a hazard event.

Policy S-9.8: Support policies that promote education and resilience awareness about the effects of climate change- induced hazards and ways to adapt and build resiliency to climate change.

Policy S-9.9: Coordinate with other County and public agencies, such as transportation agencies and health care providers, on emergency planning, response activities, evacuation planning, and recovery resources. Focus recovery resources toward the most vulnerable households and populations (e.g. elderly individuals, individuals with disabilities, etc.).

Policy S-9.10: Ensure that essential public facilities are maintained during disasters.

Policy S-9.11: Pursue development impact fees to set aside funding for solutions to address future needs related to emergency response time in the City. This would ensure adequate fire protection for new developments and may include staffing, station coverage, apparatus, equipment, and infrastructure such as a preemption system integrated with City traffic lights

Additional clarifications and revisions are also made to a handful of goals and policies for clarity and consistency with the new policies.

The Safety Element Update is available at the City website <https://www.arcadiaca.gov/generalplan> and is incorporated by reference hereafter.

2.2 Environmental Justice Element

Background

Through the passage of Senate Bill 1000, local governments across California are required to assess if any disadvantaged communities exist within their boundaries. If there is a disadvantaged community identified, environmental justice must be added as a component of the general plan. Per California Government Code Section 65302(h), this environmental justice component must include policies to reduce the “unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities,” “promote civic engagement in the public decision-

making process,” and “prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities.” An assessment of Arcadia determined there is a census tract identified as a disadvantaged community on the southeastern tip of Arcadia. However, this census tract is largely outside of Arcadia, and where inside Arcadia consists solely of Industrial and Public/Institutional zoned lots. It does, however, include non-conforming residential uses. Therefore, this element focuses on citywide needs to best promote the long-term environmental justice concerns.

There are also two low-income Census Tracts in Arcadia (see Figure EJ-2, Low Income Communities). These Census Tracts were not determined to have unique or compounded health risks as determined by HPI. As a result of the limited residential presence in Arcadia’s only disadvantaged community, the City has primarily taken a citywide approach to addressing environmental justice concerns. The Environmental Justice Element evaluates environmental justice-related topics throughout Arcadia and includes a policy matrix based on these findings and input gathered from community members.

Proposed Project

The Environmental Justice Element contains a summary of the existing conditions related to six main subjects, as follows; Active and Public Transportation, Climate Change, Healthy Food, Parks and Public Facilities, Pollution, and Safe and Sanitary Housing. The existing conditions are followed by the goals and policies set forth by the Environmental Justice Element, which the intent to provide the vision and steps to work towards a more equitable Arcadia. The proposed additional goals and policies are as follows:

Goal 1: A community where walking and biking is safe and enjoyable

Policy 1.1: Work with community members to identify high-priority streets and intersections for improvements to sidewalks, bike lanes, and other bike and pedestrian infrastructure via the City’s capital improvement program.

Policy 1.2: Seek a State and Federal grant opportunities for active transportation corridors, including the California Transportation Commission’s Active Transportation Program.

Policy 1.3: Create and maintain a network of Cool Streets with increased tree canopy, reflective pavements, and other interventions to mitigate extreme heat and reduce the heat island effect, prioritizing transit corridors and routes to school.

Policy 1.4: Seek to provide a variety of parks and facilities are provided which cater to a diverse population.

Policy 1.5: Mitigate noise and air pollution impacts to parks and public facilities adjacent to freeways, major roads, and rail corridors with protective fencing, landscaping, and/or walls.

Goal 2: A community with reduced transportation-related air pollution.

Policy 2.1: Continue to update truck route maps that minimize exposure to sensitive land uses.

Goal 3: A community where everyone has a high-quality, affordable home.

Policy 3.1: Promote home weatherization and in-home/portable air conditioning units to better insulate homes and mitigate the effects of extreme heat in residences.

Policy 3.2: Continue to explore temporary housing options for individuals experiencing homelessness in Arcadia, as well as grant funding opportunities for constructing and managing them.

Goal 4: A community where public health is enhanced and heat-related illnesses and fatalities are reduced.

Policy 4.1: Expand the number of cooling amenities in parks and other public spaces such as trees, water refill stations, and water features for children to play in.

Policy 4.2: Expand cooling center amenities as necessary and increase awareness of cooling centers through public education materials and events.

Policy 4.3: Educate residents about personal emergency preparedness and the emergency resources that the City provides to them.

The Environmental Justice Element is available at the City website <https://www.arcadiaca.gov/generalplan> and is incorporated by reference hereafter.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. Project title:

City of Arcadia General Plan Amendment: Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of Arcadia
Development Services Department
Planning Division
240 W. Huntington Drive
P.O. Box 60021
Arcadia, California 91066

3. Contact person and phone number:

Fiona Graham, Planning Manager
240 West Huntington Dr.
Arcadia California 91066
626.574.5442

4. Project location:

Citywide.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

City of Arcadia
Development Services Department
Planning Division
240 W. Huntington Drive
P.O. Box 60021
Arcadia, California 91066

6. General plan designation:

Various; Not Applicable for Adoption of Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element.

7. Zoning:

Various; Not Applicable for Adoption of Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element.

8. Description of project. (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary):

The proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA) would amend the City of Arcadia General Plan with updates to the Safety Element and a new Environmental Justice Element.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The City of Arcadia is located in central Los Angeles County, at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains. The majority of the City is built-out, dominated with residential uses. Recreational, industrial, and commercial uses are also scattered throughout the City. The surrounding land uses are predominantly urban and suburban. The City is bordered by the City of Monrovia to the east and northeast, the Angeles National Forest and the City of Sierra Madre to the north, the City of Pasadena to the northwest, unincorporated Los Angeles County to the west, Temple City to the southwest, and unincorporated County to the southeast.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

There are no other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement) for the proposed Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

The project is subject to compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 California Native American tribal representatives. All California Native American tribal representatives (that have requested notification) who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project were sent letters from the City on November 9, 2023. No tribal representatives responded or requested consultation regarding the project.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



10/23/2024

Signature

Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-d: No Impact.

The Safety Element update includes updated existing conditions information to provide an accurate account of the conditions within the City, as well as updated goals and policies related to natural and human-caused hazards. These goal and policy updates are procedural and will not result in physical changes to the environment such that aesthetics or visual character would change. The goals and policies also provide a framework for future actions the City intends to implement to continue provided adequate public safety. Further, the proposed Environmental Justice Element contains goals and policies that would be adopted and enacted by the City to strive towards a more equitable City, by reducing negative effects on citizens, as well as expand opportunities and access to more citizens. The goals and policies provide guidelines and parameters for future development, and for the City’s consideration and approval of future development projects. These proposed actions do not include physical development or land use changes that would have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics resources. Rather, they provide guidelines and requirements that future City or applicant development would be required to comply with. As such, no aesthetic impacts would occur from the adoption of this policy document.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–e: No Impact.

According to the Department of Conservation California Important Farmland Finder, the City consists entirely of Urban Built Up Land (DOC 2022). The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element do not propose any policies or actions that would result in negative impacts to agricultural and forestry resources, as there is no land within the City that is designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Therefore, updates to the Safety Element and the Environmental Justice Element would have no impacts upon agricultural and forestry resources.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-c: Less Than Significant Impact. **d:** No Impact.

The City lies within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional government agency that monitors and regulates air pollution within the SCAB and is responsible for measuring the air quality of the region. The SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for federal and state O₃ standards and federal and state PM_{2.5} standards. The SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for state PM₁₀ standards; however, it is designated as an attainment area for federal PM₁₀ standards. The SCAB is designated as an attainment area for federal and state CO standards, federal and state NO₂ standards, and federal and state SO₂ standards. While the SCAB has been designated as nonattainment for the federal rolling 3-month average lead standard, it is designated attainment for the state lead standard. The updates to the General Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the State Implementation Plan by the SCAQMD because the proposed new goals and policies would not induce growth of the population of the City. The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, nor would they result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard, because the goals and policies would not propose specific development projects that may result in air emissions. Additionally, with the adoption of the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element, goals and policies are included therein to protect residents from exposure to pollutant concentrations. Policy 3.6

would mitigate noise and air pollution impacts to parks and public facilities adjacent to freeways and major roads, and Policy 4.6 requires the City to continue to update truck route maps that minimize exposure to sensitive land uses. Lastly, because the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element do not affect land uses that are typically associated with the creation of objectionable odors (such as rendering plants, landfills, treatment plants, etc.), its adoption would have no impact from odors.

Based on the above, the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would have a less than significant impact on air quality.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-f: Less than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element contain a framework of policies but would not result in land use changes or physical development as a result of adoption. The goals and policies are related to City programs and the continued provision of public services and facilities, all within urbanized areas where little or no native vegetation exists and where little potential exists for the occurrence of sensitive species habitat, riparian habitat, a sensitive natural community, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife corridors or nursery sites. In the event that any biological resources, habitat or trees would be affected, proper mitigation would be implemented, on a project-by-project basis.

Therefore, Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would not, in itself, produce environmental impacts to biological resources.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-c: Less than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents that establish the City’s goals, policies and actions related to risk and hazards associated with climate change, and the expansion of resources for a more equitable City for all citizens. These proposed goals and polices would be implemented City-wide, and would not have the potential to affect any particular site or location. However, certain policies may indirectly result in development of a facility or project in the future, particularly Policy 5.6. However, all future project development would require project-level environmental assessment which would include assessment of potential existence of cultural resources, and analysis and mitigation of possible environmental impacts. Further, all future projects would be required to comply with General Plan policies and Municipal Code regulations related to cultural resources. The proposed goals and policies would not conflict with the implementation of the existing policy framework. Therefore, its adoption would not, in itself, result in land use changes or physical development that would disturb cultural resources, and produce environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-b. No Impact.

The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents that establish the City’s goals, policies and actions related to risk and hazards associated with climate change, and the expansion of resources for a more equitable City for all citizens. The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element does not propose any policies or actions that would result in impacts to energy. However, future development would be required to adhere to all state and/or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. As such, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts associated with energy.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-f: Less than Significant Impact.

Areas with seismic (earthquake) hazards are identified by earthquake fault zones as established by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act of 1972. The California Geological Survey (CGS; formerly the California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]) classifies faults as active, potentially active, or inactive according to standards developed for implementation of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act. A fault that has exhibited surface displacement within the Holocene Epoch (the last 11,000 years) is defined as active. A fault that has exhibited surface displacement during Quaternary time (i.e., within the past 1.6 million years) but that cannot be proven to have moved or not moved during Holocene time is defined as potentially active.

a) According to the City's existing Safety Element, located along the southern slope of the San Gabriel Mountains, Arcadia is situated within a very seismically active area of Southern California. There are currently five documented faults, fault zones, or groundwater barriers that may be faults that underlie Arcadia. In addition to these local faults, another 20 faults have been identified within a 35-mile radius of City Hall. Earthquake activity at any of the faults in and around the City could result in ground shaking within the City limits. Further, ground shaking could cause landslides or liquefaction in certain areas within the foothills that are present in the City. The existing Safety Element contains several goals and policies to alleviate risk related to earthquakes and better protect the City's residents from seismic hazards. The proposed new Safety Element policies as well as the proposed edits and revisions to the element would be consistent and would not interfere with the implementation of policies meant to reduce earthquake risk. Additionally, the potential for significant adverse impacts to result from these phenomena would be substantially reduced through adherence to requirements specified in the Alquist-Priolo Act, the Uniform Building Code, Title 24 of the California Building Code, and all development regulations of the City. Compliance with these building standards would minimize impacts associated with seismic hazards.

b-e: Most lowland areas with relatively level ground surface are not prone to landslides. Other forms of slope instability are also unlikely to occur except along stream banks and terrace margins. The foothill areas are more susceptible to slope instability. The strong ground motion that occurs during earthquakes is capable of inducing landslides and debris flow (mudslides). These types of failure generally occur where unstable slope conditions already exist. The City has in place geologic review procedures to address these hazards. Hillside areas with landslide potential are of particular concern, and slope stability requires appropriate treatment of vegetative cover during and after residential development. The City's General Plan and zoning Code contain policy and regulation to minimize potential impacts from developing on geologically hazardous land or resulting in substantial soil erosion. City regulations and policies cover landslides, seismic shaking, surface rupture, seiches, liquefaction, subsidence, expansive soils, and soil erosion. All new development is required to be consistent with these regulations.

f: Depending on the location, future development in the City has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. The existing General Plan contains policies for the protection of paleontological resources, and all new development must be consistent with these policies. The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would not change or alter these policies.

Based on the above, the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would result in less than significant impacts associated with geology and soils.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–b: Less Than Significant Impact.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are the result of burning fossil fuels, most commonly from vehicles and other gas-powered equipment. The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element contain goals and policies meant to guide the City’s land use decisions and future development within the City. Although the adoption of the document would not result in any physical development, the policies seek to expand pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented facilities, which would reduce new vehicle trips in exchange for pedestrian and bicycle resulting in a reduction of GHG emissions. Further, any future new development projects associated with the new policies, such as affordable housing units, would be required to comply with the Green Building Code, which also reduces GHG emissions.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-c and e-g: No Impact. **d:** Less Than Significant Impact.

As defined in Chapter 6.95 of Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 25501(o), a hazardous material is “...any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material which a handler or the administering agency has a reasonable basis for believing that it would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.”

a-c: The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, and therefore, adoption would not, in itself, result in potential impacts from hazards and hazardous material that may endanger residents or the environment. Implementation of the goals and policies would also not result in the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials or generate significant quantities of hazardous materials. Implementation of Policy 5.1 which states the City would adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance, and Policy 5.5, which states the City would continue to explore a Tiny Homes project, could indirectly result in development of

additional housing units in the future. However, these policies are guidelines for City action, they would not guarantee any future development. All future development would be subject to project-level environmental analysis, and would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations related to handling hazards and hazardous materials. Further, the existing Safety Element includes goals and policies specifically designed to reduce impacts from human-caused hazards to City residents and the environment. As such, no negative impacts would occur.

d: The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents and adoption will not, in itself, result in negative environmental impacts. Implementation of the policies could indirectly result in development in the future; however, the proposed policies would not change land use designations or zoning, or result in new land uses that are not already existing. All sites of future development would be evaluated using appropriate databases including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database which, pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, lists Federal Superfund, State Response, Voluntary Cleanup, School Cleanup, Hazardous Waste Permit, and Hazardous Waste Corrective Action sites. The potential impacts related to any listed hazardous materials sites associated with any specific future development would be assessed at the time the projects are actually proposed. As such, the Housing Element and Public Health, Safety, and Environmental Justice Element Updates would result in less than significant impacts.

e-g: There are no public or private airports in the City of Arcadia. The airport nearest the City is the El Monte Airport. The City does not fall within the safety hazard overlay zone for the El Monte Airport. Future development in the southern section of the City could extend into navigable airspace of the El Monte Airport, and would be required to comply with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 and all other applicable local regulations. The proposed goal and policy updates would not result directly in physical development and would not result in incompatible land uses. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the above, the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would result in no negative impact on hazards or hazardous materials.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a, c-d: Less than Significant Impact. **b and e:** No Impact.

The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, specifically related to risks associated with climate change and environmental justice issues. Therefore, adoption of these updates would not, in itself, result in physical development that would produce negative environmental impacts. Certain proposed policies, such as Policy 5.6 could result in development of projects in the future. Future residential development are expected to be located on infill sites in urbanized areas and the City has procedures and regulations in place to ensure that there would be no significant impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.

a: Construction of future development projects would be subject to compliance with applicable local, regional, state and federal regulations designed to protect water resources, including those regulations requiring implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), preparation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs), and submittal of Erosion Control Plans in compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) provisions. Consistency with this regulatory framework would adequately ensure that such impacts would be

avoided or reduced to less than significant. As such, the proposed policies would not generate a significant impact on water quality over current projections for population and housing units.

b: Adoption of the General Plan Amendment for the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would not affect the City’s ability to implement the water goals outlined within the Resources Element of the General Plan as no physical development is current proposed. Potential future development could involve impervious surfaces, which prevent the absorption of water into the groundwater basin. However, other future development could include parks, which would include pervious surfaces which would encourage groundwater recharge. Implementation of the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would not deplete groundwater supplies.

c–d: There are no areas in the City that lie within a 100-year floodplain. However, storm flooding and flooding due to dam inundation related to the Santa Anita Dam do present potential risk to the City. The existing Safety Element addresses risk associated with flooding. Seiche and mudflow risk would also be negligible, as the City is not located near a large contained body of water or downslope from an unstable hillside. With regard to tsunami risk the City is not located in an area with high risk due to its elevation and distance from the ocean (Arcadia 2010). The proposed policies would not conflict with the existing policy framework established in the Safety Element to mitigate flood risk.

e: The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents that establish the City’s goals, policies and actions related to climate change related hazards expanding equitable resources within the City. The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element does not propose any policies or actions that would result in negative impacts related to hydrology and water quality, and would not propose goals and policies that would conflict with the policy framework established to manage the water system and reduce impacts to water quality.

Based on the above, Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would have a less than significant impact on hydrology and water quality.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a: No Impact. **b:** Less than Significant.

The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents that establish the City’s goals, policies and actions related to the climate change related risks and the expansion of equitable resources across the City. The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element do not propose any policies or actions that would result in physically dividing an existing community. Additionally, the Public Health, Safety, and Environmental Justice Element Update would not conflict with General Plan policy or Municipal Code regulations, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The intended purpose of the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element is to guide land use decisions in such a way that climate change related risks and environmental justice concerns are avoided to the maximum extent feasible, especially in disadvantaged areas. Therefore, the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would have a less than significant impact on land use and planning.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–b: No Impact.

The City has identified Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs, Categories 1–3) as defined by the State Mining and Geology Board (Arcadia 2010). Of the areas designated as a MRZ, one area contains the Livingston-Graham sand and gravel extraction site. The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element does not contain any goals or policies that would prevent the extraction of mineral resources in the future. Further, the proposed goals and policies would not conflict with existing policies in the Resource Sustainability Element of the General Plan meant to protect mineral resources. The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element do not propose any polices that would result in the loss of mineral resources; therefore, there would be no impact associated with adoption of the Element.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–b: Less Than Significant Impact. **c:** No Impact.

Noise varies with time, geographic location, proximity to the source, and duration of the noise event. The effects of noise are considered in several ways: how a proposed project may increase existing noise levels and how those noise levels would affect surrounding land uses. Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than others, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved.

The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, and therefore, adoption would not, in itself, result in potential impacts related to elevated noise levels that would affect residents or the environment. Implementation of the goals and policies would also not result in land uses that would create conflicts of uses due to ambient noise. Implementation of Policy 5.6, which states the City would continue to explore a Tiny Homes project, could indirectly result in development of additional housing units in the future. However, these policies are guidelines for City action, they would not guarantee any future development. All future development would be subject to project-level environmental analysis, and would be subject to the policies of the Noise Element, and requirements and regulations of the Municipal Code related to allowable ambient noise levels, and noise mitigation. The proposed goals and policies would not conflict with the compliance if future projects to the existing regulatory framework. As such, no negative impacts would occur.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a–b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element are policy documents that establish the City’s goals, policies and actions related to mitigating risk related to climate change, and continued and expanded distribution of equitable resources across the City. The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element do not propose any policies that would induce growth or population of the City, or displace people or housing. The proposed policies, especially the policies related to environmental justice issues associated with housing, would reduce potential impacts to citizens related to the provision of housing and other services in the City. As such, the proposed goals and policies would not result in impacts related to population and housing.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a(i-v): Less Than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, and therefore, adoption would not, in itself, result in physical development nor in land use changes that would create conflicts of land uses. The proposed policies would not induce population growth which would result in an increased demand on public services. All future development would be subject to project-level environmental analysis, and would be subject to the policies of the Land Use Element, and the Parks, Recreation and Community Resources Element, as well as requirements and regulations of the Municipal Code related to park facilities or other public service facilities, and noise mitigation. The proposed goals and policies would not conflict with the compliance if future projects to the existing regulatory framework. Therefore, the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element do not propose any policies or actions that would 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.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed new Environmental Justice Element addresses mitigating air and noise pollution at new or existing parks, however does not include any new goals and policies that would result in the development of specific recreational facilities or the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Goals and policies would help shape the type of future recreation-related facilities. Proposed goals and policies would not induce growth in the City that could result in increased demand on existing recreational facilities.

Based on the above, the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would have a less than significant impact on recreational facilities.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–d: Less Than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element are policy documents that establish the City’s goals, policies and actions related to mitigating risk related to climate change, and continued and expanded distribution of equitable resources across the City. The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element do not propose any policies that would induce growth of population or jobs within the City, which would as a result have the potential to impact transportation systems. The proposed goals and policies would not result directly in physical development, but would shape the planning and implementation of development in the City. Specifically, proposed Environmental Justice policies focus on the provision of accessible and safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Future development associated with implementation of the proposed goals and policies would be expected to generate fewer vehicle miles traveled and more multi-modal trips than conventional development. Potential traffic impacts related to increased transportation system demands associated with specific future residential projects would be assessed at the time the projects are proposed using the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) methodology, consistent with state guidelines. Mitigation measures would then be adopted as necessary, in conformance with CEQA. The proposed goals and policies would not increase hazards due to a design feature, result in inadequate emergency access, or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Based on the above, the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would result in a less than significant impact on transportation/traffic.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, no actual physical development are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, its adoption would not, in itself, produce environmental impacts. Further, the implementation would not change or alter policies established to protect tribal cultural resources.

The City completed the tribal consultation process, consistent with the requirements of Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52. All California Native American tribal representatives (that have requested notification) who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project were sent letters from the City on November 9, 2023. No tribal representatives responded or requested consultation regarding the project.

Based on the outcome of the notification process, the Safety Element Update and the Environmental Justice Element would result in less than significant impacts to tribal cultural resources.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–c and e: No Impact; **d:** Less than Significant Impact.

Generally, increased demand on utilities and service systems would occur as a result of increased density, development, or induced growth. The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, consisting of goals and policies and no physical development would occur as part of implementation of the project. Further, none of the proposed goals and policies would result in indirect growth, increased development, or density. Therefore, its adoption would not, in itself, result in impacts to the provision of utilities and service systems. The proposed goals and policies would not conflict with other policies or regulations related to the provision of utilities and service systems. As such, the impact would be less than significant.

3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–d: Less Than Significant Impact.

The Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element are policy documents, related to mitigating risk associated with climate change, and continued and expanded distribution of equitable resources across the City. The Safety Element Update includes additional discussion of climate-change related wildfire and urban fire risks, and proposed new policies intended to mitigate potential risk. Specifically, the following policies are related to wildfire and would implementation of these policies would reduce impacts related to wildfire events.

Policy S-6.5: Prohibit new subdivisions in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones unless the new subdivision is generally surrounded by existing built or entitled development or is located in an existing approved specific plan and meets secondary egress route requirements and the level of capacity of adjoining major highways and street networks can accommodate evacuation. Discourage new subdivisions in all other Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

Policy S-6.8: Encourage rebuilds and additions to comply with fire mitigation guidelines.

Policy S-6.9: Reduce the risk of wildfire hazards by meeting minimum State regulations for fire-resistant building materials, vegetation management, fire smart landscaping, fuel modification, and other fire hazard reduction programs.

Policy S-6.10: Ensure long-term maintenance of all fire hazard reduction projects, including community fire breaks and private road and public road clearance.

Because these policies would reduce risk and potential impacts related to wildfire events, the implementation of the proposed goals and policies would result in less than significant impacts related to wildfire.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a–c: Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed throughout the above portions of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element are policy documents and adoption of these updates alone would not produce

environmental impacts. Although implementation of the proposed goals and policies could indirectly result in development of public facilities or other projects in the future, implementation of the General Plan Amendment to adopt the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would not permit or allow specific development projects. The proposed goals and policies would guide the vision and requirements of future development in the City. Therefore, the adoption of the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would not have the potential to result in environmental impacts, either limited or cumulative, affecting habitat; plant or animal communities; rare, endangered or threatened species; historic resources; or human beings. As discussed in Sections 3.1 through 3.20 of this Initial Study/Negative Declaration, impacts associated with the adoption of the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice Element would either result in no negative impacts, or less than significant impacts.

4 References and Preparers

4.1 Initial Study/Negative Declaration References Cited

City of Arcadia. 2010. Arcadia General Plan. November 2010. https://www.arcadiaca.gov/shape/development_services_department/planning___zoning/general_plan.php#outer-446. Accessed January 2024.

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2022. California Important Farmland Finder. Available at <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed January 2024.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK