
PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Hermosa Beach City Council Project Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations For Adoption of PLAN Hermosa

The Hermosa Beach City Council makes the following PLAN Hermosa Project findings.

1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

Findings pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Sections 15090, 15091, 15092, 15162 and 15163.

1.1 CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was presented to the Hermosa Beach City Council and all voting members of the City Council have reviewed and considered the FEIR and associated appendices prior to making a recommendation on the PLAN Hermosa. In addition, all voting members of the City Council have reviewed and considered testimony and additional information presented at or prior to the public hearings on July 11, 2017 and July 17, 2017. The FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the City Council and the City of Hermosa Beach and is adequate for this proposal.

1.2 FULL DISCLOSURE

The City Council finds and certifies that the FEIR constitutes a complete, accurate, adequate and good faith effort at full disclosure under CEQA. The City Council further finds and certifies the FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and Tribal Consultation requirements implemented under Assembly Bill 52 (2014). The omission of some detail or aspect of the Final EIR does not mean that it has been rejected by the City.

1.3 LOCATION OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the City Clerk, City of Hermosa Beach, 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254.

1.4 FINDINGS REGARDING THE DRAFT PLAN HERMOSA AND THE FINAL EIR

In response to comments from the public and other public agencies, the project has incorporated changes subsequent to publication of the Draft EIR. All of the changes to the Draft EIR are described in Chapter 3 of the Final EIR. Pursuant to CEQA, on the basis of the review and consideration of the Final EIR, the City finds:

1. Factual corrections and minor changes have been set forth as clarifications and modifications to the Draft EIR;
2. The factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR are not substantial changes in the Draft EIR that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Proposed Project, a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect, or a feasible project alternative;
3. The factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR will not result in new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of the previously identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft EIR;

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

4. The factual corrections and minor changes in the Draft EIR will not involve mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Draft EIR that would substantially reduce one or more significant effect on the environment; and
5. The factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR do not render the Draft EIR so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment would be precluded.

Thus, none of the conditions set forth in CEQA requiring recirculation of a Draft EIR have been met. Incorporation of the factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR into the Final EIR does not require the EIR be circulated again for public comment.

Since the release of the Public Review Draft PLAN Hermosa (December 2015), the Planning Commission, Public Works Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, and Emergency Preparedness Advisory Commission held public meetings to review the 2015 Public Review Draft of PLAN Hermosa between January 2016 and June 2016, and have recommended modifications to the document. The Planning Commission held a study session in November 2016 to review and take input on the Draft EIR. The Planning Commission then held public hearings in February and March 2017, continued over six meetings to hear from the community and go through the proposed plan line by line. Through that process the Commission further refined the proposed policies and implementation actions to reflect the community's long-term vision for the City.

The changes to PLAN Hermosa that the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council were incorporated into the Planning Commission Recommended Draft of PLAN Hermosa. These changes included input from the Public Works Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, Emergency Preparedness Advisory Commission, and the public and were included as part of the Planning Commission's recommendation for City Council consideration. The City Council held four Study Sessions to review the Planning Commission recommendations and identify additional changes to PLAN Hermosa.

The proposed changes to the project largely clarify and refine policy language without changing the intent of the PLAN's goals and objectives. A summary of the changes to PLAN Hermosa and associated implementation actions are provided below by area of environmental analysis:

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources** – The Planning Commission recommended modifications to policies and implementation actions that add greater specificity and certainty to the process of evaluating future impacts to scenic vistas and methods to avoid significant impacts by including a new map that establishes prominent public viewpoints and uninterrupted scenic viewing areas to PLAN Hermosa. The Planning Commission also recommended deletion of a policy that would direct the City to explore designation of Pacific Coast Highway as a State Scenic Highway. Since it is not currently designated as such, it would not create a new significant impact. Additionally, while changes have been made to policies and implementation actions used in the analysis of visual character and shade/shadow impacts, the changes do not substantially alter the intent or direction provided in the implementation action. The intent was to maintain the public scenic vistas, and through the CEQA process the policies and implementation actions have been improved to provide more certainty as to

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

how public scenic vistas will be maintained and considered when adjacent development is proposed. *Further discussion of the changes to Aesthetics Mitigation Measures is provided in Section 1.5.*

- **Air Quality** – The Planning Commission recommended modifications to policies that are considered minor clarifications that do not alter the intent or objective of the policies used in the analysis of impacts to air quality or create new significant impacts because the policies and actions still address short-term construction emissions. The Planning Commission also recommended deletion of an implementation action related to grading and landform, however, the extent to which significant amounts of grading may occur on already undisturbed land in Hermosa Beach, because the community is largely built out, is limited and would still be subject to rules and regulations enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Therefore the removal of this implementation action would not create a new or increased significant air quality impact.
- **Biological Resources** – The Planning Commission did not recommend any significant modifications to policies or implementation actions that are used in the analysis of biological resources.
- **Cultural Resources** – The Planning Commission recommended modification to one of the implementation actions associated with the analysis of archaeological and paleontological resources in response to comments from the Native American Heritage Commission and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians. The change to the implementation action associated with archaeological and paleontological resources was made to add greater specificity and certainty to the process of avoiding resources during ground disturbance activities and would not create a new significant impact. The Planning Commission has recommended the modification and removal of policies and implementation actions related to historical resources to be clear that the designation of historic landmarks is a voluntary program, however the EIR already identified that the PLAN policies could result in a significant and avoidable impact related to historic resources. *Further discussion of the changes to mitigation measures related to historic resources and findings that they are infeasible is provided in Section 1.5.*
- **Geology and Soils** - The Planning Commission recommended modifications to policies that are considered minor clarifications that do not alter the intent or objective of the policies used in the analysis of impacts to geology and soils that would create new significant impacts. The Planning Commission also recommended deletion of an implementation action related to grading and landform, however, the extent to which significant amounts of grading may occur on already undisturbed land in Hermosa Beach, because the community is largely built out, is limited and would still be subject to development standards and application requirements that address potential geology and soils hazards, therefore the removal of this implementation action would not create a new or increased significant geology and soils impact.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions** – The Planning Commission recommended modifications to several policies associated with the analysis of impacts to greenhouse gas emissions that are considered minor clarifications that do not alter the intent or objective of the policy. The Planning Commission also recommended the removal of policies associated with the purchase of carbon

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

offsets and to not pursue carbon neutrality, however the analysis presented in Table 4.6-6 of the Draft EIR demonstrates that the "Purchase Offsets" line item, representing 30.1% of the emissions reductions, could be eliminated and the greenhouse gas thresholds to reduce emissions consistent with long-term State greenhouse gas reduction goals (66% below 2005 levels by 2040) would still be met or exceeded with a reduction of approximately 69.9%. The analysis in the Draft EIR related to greenhouse gas emissions specifically did not rely upon offsets to determine whether or not State goals would be met through the implementation of policies and therefore, the removal of policies related to offsets would not create a new significant impact related to greenhouse gas emissions.

The City Council has also recommended modifications to the municipal greenhouse gas reduction goal based on further evaluation and deliberation. Rather than setting a goal to reach municipal carbon neutrality by 2020, Council has recommended a goal to meet or exceed an 80% reduction in municipal greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 in comparison to 2005 levels. Given the progress between 2005 and 2015, the projects recently completed or anticipated to be completed in the next few years, and the previous direction from City Council not to pursue the use of carbon credits or offsets, the City is on course to reduce municipal emissions by approximately 58% by 2020 from 2005 levels, which exceeds the direct emissions reductions identified in the Municipal Carbon Neutral Plan, but does not reach the previously adopted carbon neutral goal for municipal facilities by 2020. PLAN Hermosa includes Sustainability + Conservation Element Goal 1 to meet or exceed an 80% reduction in municipal greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels by 2030 through projects that will directly reduce emissions from municipal facilities and operations (rather than through offsets). While the goal does not commit to carbon neutrality for the municipality as previously indicated in the Municipal Carbon Neutral Plan, Goal 1 and the associated policies will lead to a greater level of direct, measureable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions than identified in the Municipal Carbon Neutral Plan. Given that the revised goal would result in a greater level of direct and measurable reductions in municipal greenhouse gas emissions, this change to the municipal greenhouse gas reduction goal would not create a new significant impact related to greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality** - The Planning Commission did not recommend any significant modifications to policies or implementation actions that are used in the analysis of hydrology and water quality. The Planning Commission recommended the inclusion of new maps within PLAN Hermosa that more clearly depict the range of potential scenarios associated with sea level rise, however these updated maps do not present any greater flooding extent than was previously identified by the maps included in the Draft EIR and therefore would not create a new significant impact related to hydrology and water quality.
- **Land Use and Planning** - The Planning Commission recommended modifications to several policies and implementation actions associated with the analysis of impacts to land use and planning. These changes are considered minor clarifications that do not alter the intent or objective of the policies but add

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

greater specificity and certainty to how the City will achieve consistency between the General Plan, Coastal Land Use Plan, and future updates to the Zoning Code. The Planning Commission has also recommended minor refinements to the Land Use Designations Map that covers less than a dozen parcels along PCH that had a Land Use Designation in the adopted General Plan of commercial uses, but zoning that allowed for residential development and over the course of the General Plan update have been redeveloped for residential use. These changes represent less than a fraction of a percent of the land area in Hermosa Beach and therefore would not create a new significant impact to land use and planning.

- **Mineral Resources** - The Planning Commission did not recommend any modifications to policies or implementation actions that are used in the analysis of mineral resources.
- **Noise and Vibration** - The Planning Commission did not recommend any significant modifications to policies or implementation actions that are used in the analysis of noise and vibration.
- **Population and Housing** - The Planning Commission did not recommend any significant modifications to policies or implementation actions that are used in the analysis of population and housing.
- **Public Services, Community Facilities, and Utilities** - The Planning Commission recommended modifications to several policies and implementation actions associated with the analysis of public services, community facilities, and utilities. The Planning Commission did not propose changes to the policies or implementation actions used in the analysis that would increase demand for: fire protection and emergency medical services; law enforcement services; public schools; library facilities; or water supply and service, wastewater service, storm drainage. The Planning Commission has recommended changes to policies and implementation actions associated with the analysis of impacts to parks and recreation, solid waste disposal, and energy resources, but these changes are considered minor clarifications that do not alter the intent or objective of the policies that would create new significant impacts. The Planning Commission has also recommended modifications to the map of parks, open space and public facilities in Hermosa Beach to highlight some of the City's existing facilities such as the skate park that is located at the community center and to add smaller parkettes that were not previously identified. These changes to the map do not increase demand for parks and recreation, rather they highlight additional facilities that are already available to meet current and future demand and therefore would not create a new significant impact.
- **Transportation** - The Planning Commission recommended modifications to several policies and implementation actions associated with the analysis of impacts to transportation. These changes are considered minor clarifications that do not alter the intent or objective of the policies but adds greater specificity and certainty to how the City will achieve consistency between the General Plan, Coastal Land Use Plan, and future updates to the Zoning Code. The Planning Commission also recommended minor refinements to the street classifications, pedestrian network, and bicycle and multi-use network maps and the addition of a proposed safe routes to school network to be incorporated into PLAN Hermosa. These changes to the map do not increase demand for such

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

facilities, rather they highlight certain routes that may be ideal for various bike and pedestrian improvements that would not affect level of service capacity, but could help to improve safety and therefore would not create a new significant impact.

Pursuant to Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the changes would not result in any new significant environmental impacts nor substantially increase the severity of significant impacts described in the EIR. In reviewing the Implementation Actions, the Commission reviewed which implementation actions were specifically used in the EIR impact analysis to make sure that the changes would not alter the ultimate conclusions or analysis in the EIR. These changes to the implementation action are provided in the revised project description in Attachment 1B. The minor revisions/clarifications to the policy language would not change any of the conclusions in the EIR. Substantial revisions to the EIR are not necessary and, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

1.5 FINDINGS ADDRESSING THE ISSUES ANALYZED IN THE FEIR

1.5.1 FINDINGS THAT NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION WAS CONDUCTED

In accordance with Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) and Government Code 69352.3, and Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) and Government Code 21000, the City of Hermosa Beach requested a list of Tribal Organization contacts from the Native American Heritage Commission in April 2014. The City of Hermosa Beach sent notifications to the appropriate tribal organizations in January 2015 in compliance with SB 18, and again in August 2015 to comply with AB 52.

In response to these letters, the City received requests from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to conduct formal consultation with the tribes. Both tribes requested that an experienced, trained, and certified Native American monitor be present during ground disturbing activities related to the project.

Following the initial request for consultation from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the City pursued consultation. However, the Band has failed to provide comments to the City, or otherwise failed to engage, in the consultation process. Therefore, consultation with the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians has concluded under Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21082.3(d)(2).

The City has engaged in lengthy consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, as noted in the Responses to Comment in the Final EIR NAHC 1 and GMBI-1-2. Since PLAN Hermosa is a program-level document that will not directly result in physical changes to the environment, the City proposed policies and implementation actions that take into consideration the tribal organization requests for subsequent projects with ground disturbance activities that may occur through implementation of PLAN Hermosa. To more explicitly address the Band's request for a Native American monitor to be present during ground disturbing activities, the City proposes amending implementation action LAND USE-23 to explicitly require the City to weigh and consider available evidence to determine whether there is a potential risk for disturbing or damaging any cultural or tribal resources and whether any precautionary measures can be required to reduce or eliminate that risk. Those precautions may include requiring construction workers to complete a training on

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

archaeological and tribal resources before any ground disturbance activity and/or requiring a qualified archaeologist or tribal representative to monitor some or all of the ground disturbance activities.

This is an appropriate response for a Program-level analysis, since site specific impacts cannot be detailed at this time and would be speculative. This implementation action, as amended, would ensure the consultation requirements of AB 52 are followed by the City as a Lead Agency, and that requirements for Native American monitors to be present during ground-disturbing activities in which a tribe or archaeological investigation indicate the potential for tribal resources to be found are clear.

Following multiple requests for feedback on the City's proposed response, the Band has not provided a formal response. The City has acted in good faith and has provided a reasonable effort to respond to the Band's request for monitors, but without a timely response, the City is unable to reach a mutual agreement. Consultation is hereby concluded.

1.5.2 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT FEASIBLE

The FEIR for PLAN Hermosa identifies impacts in three resource areas – air quality, cultural resources, and transportation-- that cannot be fully mitigated and are therefore considered significant and unavoidable. The impact areas pertain to short-term impacts to air quality; potential changes to the significance of historical resources; and reductions to transportation and circulation Level of Service (LOS) performance standards at three intersections and one roadway segment. To the extent that the impacts remain significant and unavoidable such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, legal, technical, and other considerations, including the beneficial effects of the project to the existing circulation and infrastructure, described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations included herein. For each of these significant and unavoidable impacts identified by the FEIR, feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, as discussed below:

a. 4.2-2 Violate Air Quality Standards – Short-Term Impacts

Impact:

Implementation of PLAN Hermosa would guide future development in the city in a manner that could generate air pollutant emissions from short-term construction. Although PLAN Hermosa policies and programs and enforcement of current SCAQMD rules and regulations would help reduce short-term emissions, construction emissions would result in a **significant impact**.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.2-2a	<p>Construction projects within the city shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable standards of the Southern California Air Quality Management District, including the following provisions of District Rule 403:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All unpaved demolition and construction areas shall be wetted at least twice daily during excavation and construction, and temporary dust covers shall be used to reduce dust emissions and meet SCAQMD Rule 403. Wetting could reduce fugitive dust by as much as 50 percent. • The construction area shall be kept sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by grading and hauling, and at all times provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind. • All clearing, earth moving, or excavation activities shall be discontinued during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 15 mph), so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust. • All dirt/soil loads shall be secured by trimming, watering, or other appropriate means to prevent spillage and dust. • All dirt/soil materials transported off-site shall be required to cover their loads as required by California Vehicle Code Section 23114 to prevent excessive amount of dust. • General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. • Trucks having no current hauling activity shall not idle but shall be turned off.
MM 4.2-2b	<p>In accordance with Section 2485 in Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, the idling of all diesel-fueled commercial vehicles (weighing over 10,000 pounds) during construction shall be limited to 5 minutes at any location.</p>
MM 4.2-2c	<p>Construction projects within the city shall comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 limiting the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.</p>
MM 4.2-2d	<p>Construction projects within the city shall install odor-reducing equipment in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1138.</p>
MM 4.2-2e	<p>Project applicants shall identify all measures to reduce air pollutant emissions below SCAQMD thresholds prior to the issuance of building permits. Should attainment of SCAQMD thresholds be determined to be infeasible, construction contractors shall provide evidence of this to the City and will be encouraged to apply for SCAQMD SOON funds.</p>

Finding:

Even with the implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM 4.2-2a** through **4.2-2e**, SCAQMD Rule 403 and PLAN Hermosa policies, it is still anticipated that some projects would have the potential to generate daily construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Because the intensity and schedule of construction activities cannot be determined at the time of this program-level analysis, it would be speculative to conclude that any level of mitigation would reduce daily construction emissions below the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Incentives could be provided for those construction contractors who apply for SCAQMD "SOON" funds. The "SOON" program provides funds to accelerate clean-up of off-road diesel vehicles, such as heavy duty construction equipment. In many cases, because of the amount of construction required for a project, even if all feasible mitigation is implemented, daily emissions could still exceed the significance thresholds.

The City Council finds that the impact as stated above is substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures and that all feasible mitigation measures that are

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

appropriate at the Program-level have been incorporated. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

b. 4.2-7 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Impact:

Implementation of PLAN Hermosa in addition to anticipated growth in the South Coast Air Basin would increase the amount of air quality emissions occurring within the basin and could affect the region's ability to attain ambient air quality standards. This would result in a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Mitigation Measures:

Implement mitigation measures **MM 4.2-2a through MM 4.2-2e**.

Finding:

Even with the implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM 4.2-2a through 4.2-2e**, SCAQMD Rule 403 and PLAN Hermosa policies, it is still anticipated that future construction projects, in combination with other construction in the SCAQMD area, could have the potential to generate construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance on a cumulative basis. While the City of Hermosa Beach has the ability to reduce air quality impacts through the implementation of mitigation measures **MM 4.2-2a through MM 4.2-2e**, when combined with potential exceedances of SCAQMD thresholds of significance by other projects in the SCAQMD region, the contribution of projects in Hermosa Beach may be cumulatively considerable.

The City Council finds that the impact as stated above is substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures and that no other feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project are available, and the City of Hermosa Beach jurisdiction to implement mitigation measures is limited to projects within Hermosa Beach. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

c. 4.4-4 Historical Resources

Impact:

Implementation of PLAN Hermosa would provide for future development and reuse projects in the city in a manner that could cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Although implementation of PLAN Hermosa policies and actions would protect historical resources, this would be a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.4-4a	The City shall require project applicants of discretionary projects to conduct historical resources studies, surveys, and assessment reports on a project-by-project basis, when a project proposes to alter, demolish, or degrade a designated landmark or a potential landmark as defined by Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.53.
MM 4.4-4b	The City shall maintain the "Historical Resources in Hermosa Beach" guide, and shall update the guide so that it is informed by current resource data and its goals and policies are consistent with the Land Use + Design Element.
MM 4.4-4c	The City shall develop procedures and nomination applications to facilitate and streamline the designation of local historic sites and historic districts.
MM 4.4-4d	Historical resources studies, surveys, and assessment reports shall be performed by persons who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (48 CFR 44716).

Finding:

- The Final EIR included a Mitigation Measure MM 4.4-4a that upon further review has been determined to be infeasible and the Planning Commission recommended this mitigation measure be removed in its entirety. First, it is unclear how this measure applies in Hermosa Beach, because the Municipal Code definitions for resources and landmarks are not the same as under CEQA, creating confusion as to what properties must be on a potential resource list. Second, CEQA already requires that environmental analysis be completed for any discretionary project that may impact an historic resource. CEQA applies to discretionary projects regardless of whether the City maintains a list of potential resources and by preparing a list of potential resources that identifies specific properties, the list could be misconstrued as a list of designated landmarks, which carry a different level of review and procedures established in the Historic Preservation Ordinance of the Municipal Code. For this reason, the proposed mitigation is infeasible.
- MM4.4-4a is amended to clarify that discretionary projects are required under CEQA to conduct an historical assessment. The City does not have authority to require studies for ministerial projects and those projects only require ministerial building permits and do not receive any discretionary planning review. The measure is also amended to reflect the definition of landmark, as that term is used in the Hermosa Beach Historic Resource Preservation Ordinance.
- The Final EIR included a Mitigation Measure MM 4.4-4f that upon further review has been determined to be infeasible and the Planning Commission recommended this mitigation measure be removed in its entirety. While the intent of MM 4.4-4f was to apply to designated historical landmarks, the wording could be interpreted more broadly and would effectively prohibit any changes to buildings considered to be potential historic resources and when modified to only apply to designated historical landmarks, it becomes duplicative with requirements under State Law regarding the treatment of designated historical resources, and interpreted more broadly could impede the City's greenhouse gas reduction and sustainability goals by (for example) preventing upgrades to structures to be more energy efficient.

Implementation of the remaining mitigation measures **MM 4.4-4a** through **MM 4.4-4d** would reduce impacts on historical resources to the extent feasible. However,

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

impacts on potentially eligible historic structures could occur depending on the proposed uses, the cost of rehabilitation, and safety and other considerations. Thus, it may not be feasible in all circumstances to rehabilitate a structure and retain its historic significance. If a project applicant proposes to demolish an eligible structure, the City would consider the project's impacts prior to approval.

The City Council finds that the impact as stated above is substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures, that all feasible mitigation measures that are appropriate at the Program-level have been incorporated, and that no other feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project are available. The Final EIR included a Mitigation Measure MM 4.4-4f that upon further review has been determined to be infeasible and that the City Council recommends this mitigation measure be removed in its entirety. While the intent of MM 4.4-4f was to apply to designated historical landmarks, the wording could be interpreted more broadly and would effectively prohibit any changes to buildings considered to be potential historic resources and when modified to only apply to designated historical landmarks, it becomes duplicative with requirements under State Law regarding the treatment of designated historical resources, and interpreted more broadly could impede the City's greenhouse gas reduction and sustainability goals. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

d. 4.4-8 Cumulative Effects on Historical Resources

Impact:

Implementation of PLAN Hermosa in addition to anticipated future development in the South Bay Cities COG planning area could cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource. The loss of some historical resources may be prevented through implementation of PLAN Hermosa policies and similar policies in other communities. However, this would not ensure that these resources can be protected and preserved. This impact would be **cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures:

Implement mitigation measures **MM 4.4-4a** through **MM 4.4-d**.

Finding:

Implementation of mitigation measures **MM 4.4-4a** through **MM 4.4-4d** would not ensure that all historical resources would be protected and preserved within the South Bay Cities COG planning area. As described in the analysis presented in Impact 4.4-4, impacts on historic resources could still occur and the impact cannot be reduced to less than significant.

The City Council finds that the impact as stated above is substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures, that no other feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project are available, and the City of Hermosa Beach jurisdiction to implement mitigation measures is limited to projects within Hermosa Beach. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

e. **4.14-1a Intersections**

• **Pacific Coast Hwy and Artesia Blvd**

Impact:

The intersection at Pacific Coast Highway and Artesia Boulevard would be significantly impacted by PLAN Hermosa-related traffic in both the morning and evening peak periods. Opportunities for physical mitigations are limited by Caltrans's plan to remove a travel lane in each direction on Pacific Coast Highway and alignment issues, as well as major change in roadway characteristics, east to west from Artesia Boulevard to Gould Avenue. Additionally, physical mitigations would conflict with the SBBMP Class III bicycle facility planned for Gould Avenue, as well as PLAN Hermosa Mobility Element policies 1.1, 2.1, 3.6, 7.2, 7.5.

Due to the above-mentioned conflicts between physical mitigations and PLAN Hermosa and adopted plans, the significant transportation impacts on traffic operations at the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway & Artesia Boulevard cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level; therefore this would be a **significant and unavoidable impact**.

Mitigation Measures:

No feasible mitigation measures are available to address the significant transportation and circulation impact.

Finding:

Opportunities for physical mitigation measures, such as restriping of intersection approaches to add turn lanes, were investigated. The emphasis was to identify physical improvements that could be implemented efficiently and maintain consistency with PLAN Hermosa goals. Mitigation measures were reviewed for compliance or conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies, as well as adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Mitigations that decrease the performance or safety of such facilities were not considered. No mitigation measures could be applied to significantly impacted locations at which a vehicular-capacity based mitigation without creating a conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals or other adopted plans.

The City Council finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project available to address or lessen the impact without conflicting with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies or decreasing the performance or safety of the facility. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- **Pacific Coast Hwy and Aviation Blvd**

Impact:

The intersection at Pacific Coast Highway and Aviation Boulevard is significantly impacted by PLAN Hermosa-related traffic in the morning peak period. Opportunities for physical mitigations are limited by Caltrans's plan to remove a travel lane in each direction on Pacific Coast Highway and improvement plans for the intersection included in the Aviation Boulevard Master Plan, including enhanced crosswalks and repurposing of public right of way for parkettes, pedestrian space, or a crossing refuge. Additionally, physical mitigations would conflict with the SBBMP Class II bicycle facility planned for Aviation Boulevard, as well as PLAN Hermosa Mobility Element policies 1.1, 2.1, 3.6, 7.2, 7.5.

Due to the above-mentioned conflicts between physical mitigations to improve level of service and PLAN Hermosa and adopted plans, the significant transportation impacts to traffic operations at the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway & Aviation Boulevard cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level; therefore this would be a **significant and unavoidable impact**.

Mitigation Measures:

No feasible mitigation measures are available to address the significant transportation and circulation impact.

Finding:

Opportunities for physical mitigation measures, such as restriping of intersection approaches to add turn lanes, were investigated. The emphasis was to identify physical improvements that could be implemented efficiently and maintain consistency with PLAN Hermosa goals. Mitigation measures were reviewed for compliance or conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies, as well as adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Mitigations that decrease the performance or safety of such facilities were not considered. No mitigation measures could be applied to significantly impacted locations at which a vehicular-capacity based mitigation without creating a conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals or other adopted plans.

The City Council finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project available to address or lessen the impact without conflicting with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies or decreasing the performance or safety of the facility. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

- **Manhattan Ave and 27th St**

Impact:

The intersection at Manhattan Avenue & 27th Street is significantly impacted by PLAN Hermosa-related traffic in the morning peak period. Opportunities for physical mitigations are limited by existing narrow roadway widths. Additionally,

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

physical mitigations would conflict with the SBBMP Class III bicycle facility planned for 27th Street, and PLAN Hermosa Mobility Element policies 1.1, 2.1, 3.6, 7.2, 7.5.

Due to the above-mentioned conflicts between physical mitigations to improve level of service and PLAN Hermosa policies and adopted plans, the significant transportation impacts to traffic operations at the intersection of Manhattan Avenue & 27th Street cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level; therefore this would be a **significant and unavoidable impact**.

Mitigation Measures:

No feasible mitigation measures are available to address the significant transportation and circulation impact.

Finding:

Opportunities for physical mitigation measures, such as restriping of intersection approaches to add turn lanes, were investigated. The emphasis was to identify physical improvements that could be implemented efficiently and maintain consistency with PLAN Hermosa goals. Mitigation measures were reviewed for compliance or conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies, as well as adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Mitigations that decrease the performance or safety of such facilities were not considered. No mitigation measures could be applied to significantly impacted locations at which a vehicular-capacity based mitigation without creating a conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals or other adopted plans.

The City Council finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project available to address or lessen the impact without conflicting with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies or decreasing the performance or safety of the facility. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

f. 4.14-1b Roadway Segments

• **Prospect Ave (Aviation Blvd to 2nd St)**

Impact:

Through implementation of PLAN Hermosa, the roadway segment on Prospect Avenue from Aviation Boulevard to 2nd Street would be degraded from its current operation at an LOS C to an LOS D by 2040. While this is improved from the projected LOS E that would be experienced under the 2040 scenario without PLAN Hermosa, it still represents a significant impact. In other words, even though the PLAN Hermosa policies will reduce the degree of impact from the scenario where the PLAN is not adopted, the change in traffic still exceeds the threshold of significance.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In order to reduce the projected LOS impacts along Prospect Avenue, the City would need to consider expanding the roadway to accommodate additional vehicles or consider policies that reduce the number of vehicles traveling along the corridor. However, the opportunities for expanding Prospect Avenue to reduce the impacts to LOS are limited by the narrow roadway widths and presence of on-street parking. Additionally, physical mitigations to expand roadway capacity along Prospect Avenue would conflict with the intent of SB 743 and many of the proposed PLAN Hermosa policies. Under SB 743 Section 21099(b)(2), vehicular capacity and traffic congestion would no longer be eligible as considerations of significant impact under CEQA. Guidelines established for the implementation of SB 743 further state that roadway capacity expansions in a congested corridor are presumed to cause a significant impact under CEQA due to their effects on induced travel. Physical mitigations would also conflict with the SBBMP bicycle friendly street bicycle facility planned for Prospect Avenue, and PLAN Hermosa Mobility Element policies 1.1, 2.1, 3.6, 7.2, 7.5. Due to the above-mentioned conflicts between capacity expansion mitigations and SB 743, the SBBMP, and PLAN Hermosa policies, the significant transportation impact to traffic operations along the segment of Prospect Avenue from Aviation Boulevard to 2nd Street cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level; therefore this would be a **significant and unavoidable impact**.

Mitigation Measures:

No feasible mitigation measures are available to address the significant transportation and circulation impact.

Finding:

Opportunities for physical mitigation measures, such as restriping of intersection approaches to add turn lanes, were investigated. The removal of on-street parking along this roadway segment to accommodate an additional lane of travel would create untenable conditions in Hermosa Beach where parking supply is limited. Therefore it is not feasible. The emphasis was to identify physical improvements that could be implemented efficiently and maintain consistency with PLAN Hermosa goals. Mitigation measures were reviewed for compliance or conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies, as well as adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Mitigations that decrease the performance or safety of such facilities were not considered. No mitigation measures could be applied to significantly impacted locations at which a vehicular-capacity based mitigation without creating a conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals or other adopted plans.

The City Council finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project available to address or lessen the impact without conflicting with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies or decreasing the performance or safety of the facility. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

g. 4.14-7 Cumulative Exceedance of LOS Performance Standards

Impact:

PLAN Hermosa would guide future development and reuse projects in the City in a manner that would not increase overall demand for travel within the city. Both the City's and Caltrans's existing level of service standards for intersections and roadway segments would be maintained at the majority of intersections and segments analyzed. Nonetheless, three intersections and one segment would experience a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No feasible mitigation measures are available to address the significant transportation and circulation impact.

Finding:

Opportunities for physical mitigation measures, such as restriping of intersection approaches to add turn lanes, were investigated. The emphasis was to identify physical improvements that could be implemented efficiently and maintain consistency with PLAN Hermosa goals. Mitigation measures were reviewed for compliance or conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies, as well as adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Mitigations that decrease the performance or safety of such facilities were not considered. No mitigation measures could be applied to significantly impacted locations at which a vehicular-capacity based mitigation without creating a conflict with PLAN Hermosa goals or other adopted plans.

The City Council finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures within the scope of the project available to address or lessen the impact without conflicting with PLAN Hermosa goals and policies or decreasing the performance or safety of the facility. The City Council further finds that although this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the impact is acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 1.6 of these Findings).

1.5.3 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO INSIGNIFICANCE

The FEIR identifies subject areas for which the project is considered to cause or contribute to potentially significant environmental impacts. For each of these impacts identified by the FEIR, feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce the environmental effect to a level that is less than significant, as discussed below:

a. 4.1-1 Scenic Vistas and Viewsheds

Impact:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts are substantially reduced by changes to the PLAN Hermosa Policies and Implementation Actions to a level that is considered to be less than significant. The PLAN Hermosa policies and implementation actions, as revised, would ensure that existing view corridors that provide views of the Pacific Ocean, the Palos Verdes Peninsula, the Santa Monica

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Mountains, and the Los Angeles Basin and the San Gabriel Mountains are maintained by identifying prominent and uninterrupted public views, specifying an evaluation process and offering development standard exceptions to projects that may substantially impede one of the identified public scenic vistas.

Finding:

The EIR reached the original impact conclusion (that mitigation was required) for Impact 4.1-1 because the policies and implementation actions did not include "specific provisions to protect public view corridors." Thus, mitigation was required. The proposed changes to the policies and actions related to public views are designed to provide more specificity on the expectation and process for identifying, evaluating, and addressing potential impacts to scenic vistas in a manner that is consistent with the Coastal Act and the California Environmental Quality Act. The greater level of specificity contained within the policies and implementation actions further helps to appropriately guide City staff and decision makers in the future to objectively and consistently and reasonably evaluate and mitigate impacts to scenic vistas, and provide the opportunity for setback, open space, landscaping or other relief to properties that may otherwise substantially obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista. This allows the property owner to minimize the impact to a public view while providing the owner the same development privileges enjoyed by other similar properties in the vicinity (similar to a variance). The specific exception to be applied to each project will be evaluated on a project level to determine its appropriateness and compatibility with the neighborhood and the list of available exceptions will be specified in the zoning ordinance.

Through the public hearing process, the community and commissioners have had an opportunity to synthesize PLAN Hermosa Figure 5.3, which shows the proposed Prominent Public Views and Uninterrupted Viewing Areas. Based on community and commissioner input, the Figure has been revised to remove two sites that do not meet the criteria for Prominent Public Views. The two views deleted include 8th Street at Loma Drive and El Oeste Drive. The 8th/Loma location can be deleted because the view is already surrounded by properties that have been developed close to or at the maximum extent allowed and therefore, future development during the life of the plan will not further impact the view beyond the existing development. The El Oeste viewpoint can be deleted because, while it presents a highly intact uninterrupted view, it does not meet the prominent viewpoint criteria of having a large number of public viewers. This location is at the end of a dead end residential street where the general public does not typically access, pass or congregate. Therefore, it would be unlikely to have a large number of public viewers.

The language incorporated into the policies and actions has been changed such that properties adjacent to, rather than within 50 feet of, the Prominent Public Views and Uninterrupted Viewing Areas will be required to evaluate and reasonably mitigate any substantial impact to a public view. Additionally, portions of Implementation Action PARKS-12 have been removed because of their

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

specificity to appropriate colors and textures and the portions of the actions pertaining to public works projects have been incorporated into PARKS-11. To specify appropriate colors or textures to private property owners would go against a long-standing community policy against judging or dictating design. These language changes are also appropriate because the 50 foot requirement, as well as the requirements for specific screening methods or use of certain materials may not be appropriate in all situations and does not allow for any site specific flexibility. Additionally, the language was too precise for policy language and implementation actions (and for the originally proposed mitigation measure). These types of details are better worked out through the implementation process and development of the ordinance. In some cases 50 feet may be too far, and in others it may not be far enough. There are site specific conditions like width of the road, setback requirements, and building height limits (vary from 25-35 feet) that may require variation in the distance needed to analyze impacts to views. It is further noted that the changes to the policies and implementation actions related to public views achieve the same purpose as proposed Mitigation Measure MM 4.1-1, that the potential impact to scenic vistas is adequately mitigated to a level that is less than significant, and that no new significant impacts to Aesthetics have been identified based on these changes.

b. 4.3-1 Special-Status Species

Impact:

PLAN Hermosa would guide future development and reuse projects in the city in a manner that could result in the development or expansion of beach-supporting uses that could adversely affect western snowy plover and California least tern. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.3-1	Construction of facilities on the beach that must occur between the months of April and August (roosting season for snowy plovers) will require preconstruction surveys to determine the presence of western snowy plovers or California least terns. If these species are present, no construction may occur until the species leave the roost based on review by a qualified biologist and consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). If the project is within a Special Protection Zone, construction activities will not be allowed until western snowy plovers are no longer present. If the area is not within a Special Protection Zone, a qualified biologist will survey the area for western snowy plovers using established protocols and in coordination with the USFWS and CDFW to determine if plovers are present. If they are present, no work will occur until after snowy plovers leave the roost site for the season. The qualified biologist will also survey the area for California least terns using established protocols and in coordination with the USFWS and CDFW to determine if California least terns are present. If surveys are negative for western snowy plovers or California least terns, work may proceed during the roosting period and the biologist will be present to monitor the establishment of the beach landing sites to ensure that no western snowy plovers or California least terns are injured or killed, should they arrive in the area subsequent to work commencing. The project will include fencing/walls that will prevent western snowy plovers or California least terns from entering the work areas. The biologist will conduct weekly site visits to ensure that fencing/walls are intact until construction activities are finished at the sites and all equipment is removed from the beach. The results of the preconstruction survey will be submitted to the City prior to the establishment of beach landing sites. All biological monitoring efforts will be documented in monthly compliance reports to the City.
-----------------	---

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Finding:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts, as stated above, are **substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures to a level that is considered to be less than significant**. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3-1 would specifically require that western snowy plovers or California least terns that roost on the beach are protected if they occur in an area proposed for beach-supporting facilities.

c. 4.4-3 Paleontological Resources, Site, or Geologic Feature

Impact:

Implementation of PLAN Hermosa would guide future development and reuse projects in the city in a manner that could damage previously unknown unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.4-3	As a standard condition of approval for future development projects implemented under PLAN Hermosa that involve ground disturbance or excavation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For any project where earthmoving or ground disturbance activities are proposed at depths that encounter older Quaternary terrace deposits, a qualified paleontologist shall be present during excavation or earthmoving activities.• If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the construction crew shall immediately cease work in the vicinity of the find and notify the City. The project applicant(s) shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines (1996). The recovery plan may include, but is not limited to, a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, museum storage coordination for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan that are determined by the lead agency to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities can resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered.
-----------------	---

Finding:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts, as stated above, are **substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures to a level that is considered to be less than significant**. Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.4-3** would provide for the appropriate treatment and/or preservation of paleontological resources, if encountered. For instance, a paleontological resource evaluation would consist of a paleontological resources records search through the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, a pedestrian survey of the project site (if applicable), a review of the land use history, and a review of geologic mapping and/or geotechnical reports. At that point, appropriate project-specific mitigation would be developed and implemented to mitigate impacts on the paleontological resource before construction activities can resume.

d. 4.4-7 Cumulative Effects on Paleontological Resources

Impact:

Ground disturbance, earthmoving, and excavation activities associated with implementation of PLAN Hermosa combined with construction activities in the

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

South Bay Cities COG planning area could damage previously unknown unique paleontological resources. This impact would be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures:

Implement mitigation measure **MM 4.4-3**.

Finding:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts, as stated above, are **substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures to a level that is considered to be less than significant**. Ground disturbance, earthmoving, and excavation activities would occur under PLAN Hermosa and in the South Bay Cities COG planning area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM 4.4-3** would reduce impacts on paleontological resources by requiring that fossil specimens be recovered and recorded and undergo appropriate curation, in the event that resources are encountered during construction activities in Hermosa Beach. Thus, the city will not be contributing to any cumulative impact in the South Bay planning area.

e. 4.6-1 Generate GHG Emissions

Impact:

PLAN Hermosa would guide future development and reuse projects in the city in a manner that could result in additional greenhouse gas emissions generated. However, the plan also includes numerous policies and actions to reduce or eliminate GHG emissions from both new and existing development through incentives and voluntary actions that will meet or exceed the long-term greenhouse gas reduction goals to reduce emissions at least 66 percent below 2005 levels by 2040 (see discussion on page 4.6-22) through direct and local programs. However, since the City is relying on incentive-based or voluntary actions to achieve GHG reduction goals, there is a lower degree of certainty that the emissions reductions thresholds would be met compared to regulatory or mandatory actions. This impact would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.6-1a	The City of Hermosa Beach will utilize the climate action plan, under development by the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, or other appropriate tools to research current data gaps, identify specific actions, and define the responsible parties and time frames needed to achieve the greenhouse gas reduction goals (monitoring milestones) identified in mitigation measure MM 4.6-1b.
MM 4.6-1b	The City of Hermosa Beach will re-inventory community GHG emissions and evaluate implementation progress of policies to reduce GHG emissions for the calendar year of 2020 and a minimum of every five years thereafter. The interim reduction goals to be achieved for consistency with long-term state goals include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020: 15 percent below 2005 levels • 2025: 31 percent below 2005 levels • 2030: 49 percent below 2005 levels • 2035: 57 percent below 2005 levels • 2040: 66 percent below 2005 levels
MM 4.6-1c	The City will revise PLAN Hermosa and/or the City's Climate Action Plan when, upon evaluation required in mitigation measure MM 4.6-1b, the City determines that Hermosa Beach is not on track to meet the applicable GHG reduction goals. Revisions to PLAN Hermosa, the Climate Action Plan, or other City policies and programs will include

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

	additional regulatory measures that provide a higher degree of certainty that emissions reduction targets will be met. Use of an adaptive management approach would allow the City to evaluate progress by activity sector (e.g., transportation, energy, water, waste) and prescribe additional policies or programs to be implemented in the intervening five years for activity sectors that are not on track to achieve the GHG reduction goals.
--	--

Finding:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts, as stated above, are **substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures to a level that is considered to be less than significant**. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 a through c, commits the City of Hermosa Beach to achieving specific emissions reduction targets within every five-year time period and modifying policies and programs, including the addition of new policies or modification of existing policies to become mandatory, to achieve greater levels of emissions reductions if the City falls short of meeting the established targets in MM 4.6-1b. The implementation of PLAN Hermosa policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, in conjunction with mitigation measures MM 4.6-1a through MM 4.6-1c, will add the degree of certainty needed to determine that PLAN Hermosa would have a less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions and would not be cumulatively considerable.

f. 4.7-2 Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials

Impact:

Implementation of PLAN Hermosa would guide future development in the city in a manner that could lead to accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. Compliance with existing federal and state regulations and implementation of PLAN Hermosa policies would reduce risks associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials. However, development of the City's Maintenance Yard or other sites in the city could release known or unknown hazardous materials which would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7-2a	For any development activities that would encroach upon or take place at the City's Maintenance Yard, the City shall require the preparation and implementation of a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) and a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) to be approved by the appropriate agencies.
MM 4.7-2b	Future discretionary projects involving the use of hazardous materials that may be accidentally released or encountered during construction shall be required to implement the following procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop all work in the vicinity of any discovered contamination or release. • Identify the scope and immediacy of the problem. • Coordinate with responsible agencies (Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, or US Environmental Protection Agency). • Conduct the necessary investigation and remediation activities to resolve the situation before continuing construction work as required by state and local regulations.

Finding:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts, as stated above, are **substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures to a level that is considered to be less than significant**. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

4.7-2a and MM 4.7-2b would ensure that accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment, either from redevelopment at the City Yard or from unknown contamination, would be remediated in accordance with state and local regulations in a manner that would protect public health during construction activities and later use of the site.

g. 4.11-2 Groundborne Vibrations or Groundborne Noise Levels

Impact:

PLAN Hermosa would guide future development and reuse projects in the city in a manner that may expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.11-2	<p>For development located at a distance within which acceptable vibration standards would be exceeded, the City shall require the applicant to have a structural engineer prepare a report demonstrating the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vibration level limits based on building conditions, soil conditions, and planned demolition and construction methods to ensure vibration levels would not exceed acceptable levels where damage to structures using vibration levels in Draft EIR Table 4.114 as standards.• Specific measures to be taken during construction to ensure the specified vibration level limits are not exceeded.• A monitoring plan to be implemented during demolition and construction that includes post-construction and post-demolition surveys of existing structures that would be impacted. <p>Examples of measures that may be specified for implementation during demolition or construction include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prohibition of certain types of impact equipment.• Requirement for lighter tracked or wheeled equipment.• Specifying demolition by non-impact methods, such as sawing concrete.• Phasing operations to avoid simultaneous vibration sources.• Installation of vibration measuring devices to guide decision-making for subsequent activities.
------------------	---

Finding:

The City Council finds that the potentially significant impacts, as stated above, **are substantially reduced by the identified mitigation measures to a level that is considered to be less than significant**. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.11-2 would minimize impacts on sensitive structures from groundborne vibration to acceptable levels.

1.5.4 FINDING THAT MITIGATION OF CERTAIN IMPACTS IS WITHIN THE RESPONSIBILITY AND JURISDICTION OF ANOTHER PUBLIC AGENCY

No mitigation measures identified in the FEIR are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency.

1.5.5 FINDINGS THAT IDENTIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES OR MITIGATION MEASURES ARE NOT FEASIBLE

All mitigation measures discussed herein are feasible. Where potential mitigation has been deemed infeasible, it is discussed in the DEIR and above sections. All feasible

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

mitigation has been recommended and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for this project.

The FEIR examines three alternatives:

- Alternative 1 – Retain Existing General Plan/ Coastal Land Use Plan
- Alternative 2 – Achieve Carbon Neutrality by 2030
- Alternative 3 – Stronger Retention of Visual and Cultural Resources

a. Alternative 1: Retain Existing General Plan/ Coastal Land Use Plan

Alternative:

This alternative assumes that PLAN Hermosa would not be implemented and that future development would proceed as indicated in the existing General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan. Hermosa Beach would continue to grow and develop consistent with currently allowable land uses according to the existing 1980 Land Use Element (Figure 33); however, redevelopment patterns would be expected to be similar to PLAN Hermosa because the same infill properties would be vacant or available for redevelopment, resulting in increased intensity of development within an identical development footprint as PLAN Hermosa. Table 6.0-2 provides an estimate of what density or intensity of development is estimated to be allowed under the adopted General Plan, compared to the proposed densities and intensities of PLAN Hermosa. Note that the existing General Plan does not include Floor Area Ratios (FAR) but has setback and height requirements which can be used to calculate an estimate of FAR allowed based on recent approved or constructed projects.

**Table 6.0-2
Comparison of Allowed/Estimated Density and Intensity**

Land Use Designation	No Project Alternative		Proposed under PLAN Hermosa		Allowed Density/Intensity Comparison of No Project to PLAN Hermosa
	Max	Min	Min	Max	
Low Density (du/ac)	13.0	2.0	13.0	13.0	Similar
Medium Density (du/ac)	25.0	13.1	25.0	25.0	Similar
High Density (du/ac)	33.0	25.1	33.0	33.0	Similar
Mobile Home (du/ac)	13.0	2.0	13.0	13.0	Similar
Neighborhood Commercial (FAR)	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	Similar
Community Commercial (FAR)	1.75	0.5	1.25	1.25	Greater
Recreational Commercial (FAR)	2.5	1.0	1.75	1.75	Greater
Gateway Commercial (FAR)	1.5	1.0	2.0	2.0	Lesser
Service Commercial (FAR)	1.0	0.25	0.5	0.5	Greater
Light Industrial Creative (FAR)	0.75	0.25	1.0	1.0	Lesser
Public Facilities (FAR)	n/a	0.1	1.0	1.0	Similar
Open Space (FAR)	n/a	0.0	0.1	0.1	Similar
City Beach (FAR)	n/a	0.0	0.05	0.05	Similar

Source: City of Hermosa Beach, 2015.

Italicized lines indicate new or altered land use designations introduced through PLAN Hermosa.

This alternative is analyzed in this EIR, as it is required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), the “no project” analysis shall discuss “what is reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services."

As shown in Table 6.0-2, the No Project Alternative would allow for similar levels of residential development as PLAN Hermosa. For nonresidential development, the No Project Alternative would allow for greater levels of development in the Community Commercial, Recreational Commercial, Service Commercial designations, and lesser levels of development in the Gateway Commercial and Light Industrial Creative designation than is proposed under PLAN Hermosa. All other nonresidential or institutional categories propose similar levels of allowed development intensity for both PLAN Hermosa and the No Project Alternative.

Additionally, as shown in **Table 6.0-3 (No Project/Existing General Plan Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Trips Generated)**, Alternative 1 would result in 30,000 more VMT per day and 2,600 more daily vehicle trips compared to PLAN Hermosa.

Table 6.0-3 No Project/Existing General Plan Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Trips Generated

Scenario	Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled	Daily Vehicle Trips
2040 No Project Alternative	356,000	37,200
2040 PLAN Hermosa	326,000	34,600

Source: City of Hermosa Beach Traffic Study 2015

Finding:

The City Council finds that:

- **Project Objectives**

The No Project Alternative would only partially meet the project objectives established for PLAN Hermosa. The existing General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan can reasonably achieve project objectives to enhance and support a strong, diverse, and vibrant local economy (Objective 2) and provide a safe and clean natural environment (Objective 4) by relying on the existing policies and programs related to economic development and resource conservation. Additionally, the existing General Plan contains an element on Urban Design, however it fails to establish various character areas and identify the unique characteristics of each area, making it difficult to effectively achieve project Objective 1, to preserve the city's small beach town character. Finally, while the existing General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan contain policies and programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled and expand alternative modes of transportation, these documents do not identify promoting healthy and active lifestyles (Objective 3) and achieving a low-carbon future (Objective 5) as the primary motivation for including such policies, nor do the mobility policies and programs contained within the existing General Plan advance the reduction in VMT enough to claim that they can effectively achieve Objectives 3 and 5.

- **Comparison of Environmental Impacts**

The No Project Alternative would not lessen any environmental impacts compared to the proposed project, and instead would have greater impacts to aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise and vibration, public services, community facilities, and utilities, and transportation.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- **Feasibility**

Alternative 1 is infeasible as it would not meet the updated goals and policies clearly expressed by the City of Hermosa Beach and set forth in the PLAN Hermosa such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions, creating a vibrant local economy and a fostering a healthy and safe environment. The City is committed to providing the community with a current, long-range planning document that is reflective of the changing conditions and new state requirements (i.e., AB 32 and SB 375), as well as consistent with current planning trends, as proposed in the PLAN Hermosa. The existing General Plan does not address current planning trends or new state requirements. Because of these factors, the existing General Plan would not adequately address the economic, environmental, and social needs of the community. Given that this alternative would not achieve the project objectives and also would not lessen any environmental impacts compared to the proposed project, the City Council finds that this alternative is infeasible.

b. Alternative 2: Achieve Carbon Neutrality by 2030

Alternative:

This alternative would be focused on achieving a community-wide goal of carbon neutrality by 2030. Carbon neutrality is the state of achieving net zero carbon emissions, generally by balancing a measured amount of carbon released with an equivalent amount sequestered or offset by the community. There are two primary differences between this alternative and the Public Review draft of PLAN Hermosa which included a goal to achieve carbon neutrality no later than the year 2040:

1. expediting achievement of a carbon neutral goal by ten years from 2040 to 2030 and
2. bypassing the use of carbon credits to offset carbon emissions that could not be eliminated.

Changing these two parameters would have a number of effects on the proposed project. While the total level of local reductions needed to achieve a carbon neutral goal by 2030 or 2040 are virtually identical, the number of years to achieve the goal would be reduced from 24 years to just 14. A 2030 goal would necessitate the implementation of new policies and programs each year to reduce emissions at a rate of 6,750 MTCO₂e/yr, compared to annual reductions of 3,975 MTCO₂e/yr for a 2040 goal.

To do this, the following steps would be taken to modify PLAN Hermosa to increase and accelerate the rate of carbon emissions reductions from the energy, waste and transportation sectors:

- Require onsite renewable energy generation and Zero Net Energy as part of all new construction and major building renovations.
- Mandate retrofits to existing buildings to improve energy efficiency at time of sale, through rental inspections, and prior to issuance of building permits.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- Eliminate the use of natural gas within the city through the installation of biogas technologies and electrification of heating and cooking appliances and fixtures within the building stock.
- Participate in a Community Choice Aggregation program or other similar program and procure or generate renewable energy to account for 100% of the energy portfolio by increasing the rate of installation for local renewable energy generation sources or procuring long-term renewable energy contracts for sources outside of the city.
- Modify Land Use Designations to facilitate mixed-use development and increase commercial and residential densities within the Community Commercial and Gateway Commercial designations to facilitate shorter trips lengths and increase the number of trips captured internally.
- Mandate public and private clean fuel and electric vehicle infrastructure to facilitate deployment of electric vehicles, neighborhood electric vehicles and/or clean fuel vehicles.
- Modify parking standards and programs to disincentivize conventionally fueled automobile use, and incentivize alternative modes of transportation and zero-emission vehicle use through programs that include, but are not limited to: increases in the cost of public-parking, elimination of parking minimums and establishment of maximums for new development, elimination of practices to assign parking spaces to particular uses, and changes to the preferential parking permit program.
- Pursue regional transportation projects and infrastructure to facilitate carbon-free regional travel options.
- Mandate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs for institutions and businesses.
- Accelerate the implementation of pedestrian and bicycle network investments, electric vehicle and alternative fuel infrastructure, programs to achieve zero waste, and net zero energy requirements.

This Carbon Neutral by 2030 Alternative with the added or modified policies would result in greater levels of emissions reductions compared to the policies and programs proposed in PLAN Hermosa, as noted in Table 6.0-4.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

**Table 6.0-4
Comparison of Emissions Reduction Scenarios 2030 vs 2040**

	2030 Scenario		2040 Scenario	
	Share of Carbon Reductions (%)	Annual Carbon Reduction (MTCO ₂ e)	Share of Carbon Reductions (%)	Annual Carbon Reduction (MTCO ₂ e)
Baseline 2005 Emissions		137,160		137,160
2012 Emissions	-7.7%	126,610	-7.7%	126,610
BAU Emissions (2040)	+1.2%	128,290	+5.0%	133,430
State Programs (2040)	-24.6%	33,750	-27.7%	38,010
Local Remaining Emissions to be Reduced		94,540		95,420
Building Efficiency				
New Construction Residential Efficiency	-0.8%	1,090	-1.3%	1,810
Existing Buildings Residential Efficiency	-4.4%	6,100	-4.4%	6,100
New Construction Non-Residential Efficiency	-1.2%	1,690	-2.0%	2,810
Existing Buildings Non-Residential Efficiency	-2.0%	2,770	-2.0%	2,770
Sub Total	-8.5%	11,650	-9.8%	13,490
Renewable Energy Generation				
Rooftop Solar	-5.8%	8,020	-5.9%	8,100
Community Solar	-27.0%	36,990	-0.4%	550
Renewable Energy Procurement	-7.5%	10,290	-7.3%	10,010
Purchased Renewables (Green Rate)	-0.0%	0	-0.0%	0
Sub Total	-40.3%	55,300	-13.6%	18,660
Transportation + Land Use				
Land Use & Transportation Alternatives	-8.1%	11,130	-4.0%	5,500
Additional Transportation Strategies	-3.2%	4,450	-1.9%	2,560
Electric Vehicles	-5.7%	7,750	-7.4%	10,100
Sub Total	-17.0%	23,330	-13.0%	18,160
Other Sectors + Offsets				
Waste + Recycling	-2.5%	3,430	-2.5%	3,480
Water + Wastewater	-0.6%	840	-0.2%	330
Purchase Offsets	-0.0%	0	-30.1%	41,310
Sub Total	-3.1%	4,270	-32.9%	45,120
TOTAL	-100.0%	94,540	-100.0%	95,420

Source: City of Hermosa Beach Carbon Planning Tool 2015.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Finding:

The City Council finds that:

- **Project Objectives**

The Carbon Neutral by 2030 Alternative has the ability to substantially support each of the project objectives identified. Implementation of this alternative would prioritize the achievement of a low or no carbon future (Objective 5), while also providing a safe and clean natural environment (Objective 4) and promoting healthy and active lifestyles through land use and transportation investments (Objective 3) by reducing air quality and transportation impacts compared to the proposed project. This alternative would also meet Objective 2, enhance and support a strong, diverse, and vibrant local economy, as many of the land use and transportation policies that reduce vehicle miles traveled do so by providing a greater range of daily services and employment opportunities within closer proximity so that residents may reasonably choose to utilize alternative modes of transportation.

- **Comparison of Environmental Impacts**

This alternative could pose greater impacts to aesthetics and biological resources due to increased use of renewable energy systems such as solar, wind, or ocean-based renewable energy sources, and greater impacts to cultural resources due to greater alteration or demolition of designated or potentially eligible historic resources to construct high energy performance buildings. While the impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, and cultural resources may be greater than the proposed project, it is unknown whether they would rise to the level of being considered a significant impact, because the specific design and location of additional renewable energy projects cannot be determined at this time.

This alternative would also have far reaching environmental benefits for Hermosa Beach by decreasing impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise and vibration, and transportation. Air pollutants associated with the burning of fuel for building energy and transportation uses would be reduced. Noise levels would likely be somewhat better as the primary source of noise in Hermosa Beach is automobile use. Reduced automobile use and an increase in electric vehicles, which are quieter than gasoline and diesel powered vehicles, would reduce noise levels. Transportation impacts would also likely be decreased as this alternative would result in a reduction in vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.

- **Feasibility**

Alternative 2 is infeasible because this alternative could pose greater environmental impacts compared to the proposed project to aesthetics and visual resources, biological resources, and cultural resources. Additionally, it could be cost prohibitive, with mandates that are overly-burdensome on residents if they are carried out to require upgrades prior to the end of useful life of vehicles, equipment or other building materials. It is also burdensome to limit natural gas from homes, restaurants and hotels.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

c. Alternative 3: Stronger Retention of Visual and Cultural Resources

Alternative:

This alternative would focus on implementing additional policies or implementation actions that would facilitate greater retention of visual and cultural resources in Hermosa Beach. While PLAN Hermosa includes several goals and policies to address community character, historic buildings, and scenic views, they largely do so in a manner that encourages rather than mandates the protection of these resources. To facilitate greater retention of the existing visual and cultural resources in Hermosa Beach the steps taken to modify PLAN Hermosa would include:

- Reduction in density or establishment of Floor Area Ratios (FAR) for Medium and High Density Residential (reduce capacity to encourage retention of existing buildings that contribute to the character of residential neighborhoods).
- Establishment of an overall cap or reduction in development intensity for the Community Commercial and Recreational Commercial land use designations to limit the scale and amount of additional development or increased redevelopment within those areas.
- Addition of mixed use designation to allow limited residential development, in conjunction with commercial uses, accommodating the projected population growth reduced through changes to medium and high-density designations.
- Development of design standards (as opposed to guidelines) to address the compatibility of building scale, design aesthetics, and community character for residential and commercial neighborhoods.
- Addition of historic resource protection policies, including City initiation of historic landmark designation of potentially eligible historic resources.
- Achievement as a Certified Local Government (CLG) by the California Office of Historic Preservation, including establishment of an historic preservation commission.
- Development of a historic preservation plan, historic context statement, and/or historic preservation element of the General Plan.
- Establishment of view protection ordinances and development standards to physically depict building form/massing in the evaluation of a project's impact on views.
- Change the issuance of a demolition permit from a ministerial action to a discretionary action for those properties that have been identified as a potentially eligible historic resource.

This Character Retention Alternative, with the added or modified policies, would result in greater levels of certainty that cultural and visual resources would be retained, compared to the policies and programs proposed in PLAN Hermosa. However, the policies in this alternative may also discourage the redevelopment, reuse, or renovation of existing buildings and structures which will be necessary to improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions.

Finding:

The City Council finds that:

- **Project Objectives**

The Character Retention Alternative prioritizes achievement of Objective 1, preserve the city's small beach town character, and Objective 2, to enhance and support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy through safe and

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

beautiful commercial corridors, but would not conflict or prevent the achievement of the other project objectives. This alternative would provide similar policies and implementation actions to PLAN Hermosa related to the mobility network, transportation enhancements, and resource conservation, meaning it would equally achieve project Objective 3 to promote healthy and active lifestyles and project Objective 4 to provide a safe and clean environment including clean air and water.

While this alternative may have a slightly greater impact on greenhouse gas emissions, it would carry forward similar policies to PLAN Hermosa related to reducing emissions from transportation sources, water conservation, and diverting solid waste from landfills to support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions partially consistent with Project Objective 5, to achieve a low or no carbon future. However, reductions in the amount of new development allowed could mean limited opportunities to realize certain sustainability programs.

- **Comparison of Environmental Impacts**

This Character Retention Alternative would pose greater impacts to greenhouse gas emissions compared to PLAN Hermosa. The challenge of renovating or constructing high energy performance buildings in a manner that does not diminish the significance of a historical resource or cause potentially eligible historic resources to become ineligible due to alterations that are inconsistent with standards for the treatment of historical resources is presented in this alternative.

This alternative would also reduce impacts associated with aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, and cultural resources, where both construction related air quality impacts and significance of a historical resource are both considered significant and unavoidable impacts under implementation of PLAN Hermosa. However, it is unknown whether this alternative would lessen these impacts to levels that are considered less than significant.

- **Feasibility**

The Final EIR included an Alternative focused on Greater Retention of Character (Alternative 3). Alternative 3 is not feasible because it would potentially cause greater impacts to one category, greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, the City does not have the staff or expertise to establish a historic preservation commission. Throughout the years, the community has opposed design restrictions (often referred to as art juries) in favor of allowing individual property owners to design as they please within the confines of development standards. To do otherwise would go against a long-standing community policy. The community has also consistently rejected the idea of a private view protection ordinance, because a view protection ordinance favors the views of those who have already built to the height limit over those properties that have not yet built up. Rather, the community values a more fair system, whereby each property can build to a set height limit that applies universally to the entire zone.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Environmentally Superior Alternative:

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the “environmentally superior alternative”. Based on the alternative analysis, both the Carbon Neutral by 2030 and Character Retention Alternatives would reduce several of the categories listed as Potentially Significant or Significant and Unavoidable under the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts to several categories, including: aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise and vibration, public services, and transportation. The Carbon Neutrality by 2030 Alternative would also have potentially greater impacts to aesthetics and visual resources, biological resources, and cultural resources, while the Character Retention Alternative would only cause potentially greater impacts to one category, greenhouse gas emissions.

1.6 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b) and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City has balanced the benefits of the proposed PLAN Hermosa against the unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the proposed project and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures. The City has also examined alternatives to the proposed project, and has determined that adoption and implementation of the proposed project is the most desirable, feasible, and appropriate action.

1.6.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The proposed project would result in the following unavoidable significant adverse impacts after mitigation:

1. Implementation of PLAN Hermosa would guide future development in the city in a manner that could generate air pollutant emissions from short-term construction. Although PLAN Hermosa policies and programs and enforcement of current SCAQMD rules and regulations would help reduce short-term emissions, construction emissions would result in a significant impact.
2. Implementation of PLAN Hermosa in addition to anticipated growth in the South Coast Air Basin would increase the amount of air quality emissions occurring within the basin and affect the region's ability to attain ambient air quality standards. This would result in a cumulatively considerable impact.
3. Implementation of PLAN Hermosa would provide for future development and reuse projects in the city in a manner that could cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Although implementation of PLAN Hermosa policies and actions would protect historical resources, this would be a potentially significant impact.
4. Implementation of PLAN Hermosa in addition to anticipated future development in the South Bay Cities COG planning area could cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource. The loss of some historical resources may be prevented through implementation of PLAN Hermosa policies and similar policies in other communities. However, this would not ensure that these resources can be protected and preserved. This impact would be cumulatively considerable.

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

5. The intersection at Pacific Coast Highway and Artesia Boulevard would be significantly impacted by PLAN Hermosa-related traffic in both the morning and evening peak periods.
6. The intersection at Pacific Coast Highway and Aviation Boulevard is significantly impacted by PLAN Hermosa-related traffic in the morning peak period.
7. The intersection at Manhattan Avenue & 27th Street is significantly impacted by PLAN Hermosa-related traffic in the morning peak period.
8. Through implementation of PLAN Hermosa, the roadway segment on Prospect Avenue from Aviation Boulevard to 2nd Street would be degraded from its current operation at an LOS C to an LOS D by 2040. While this is improved from the projected LOS E that would be experienced under the 2040 scenario without PLAN Hermosa, it still represents a significant impact.
9. PLAN Hermosa would guide future development and reuse projects in the City in a manner that would not increase overall demand for travel within the city. Both the City's and Caltrans's existing level of service standards for intersections and roadway segments would be maintained at the majority of intersections and segments analyzed. Nonetheless, three intersections and one segment would experience a cumulatively considerable impact.

1.6.2 PROJECT BENEFITS

The City has balanced the proposed project's benefits against its significant and unavoidable impacts. The City finds that the proposed project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts and, therefore, that those impacts are acceptable in light of the proposed project's benefits. The City finds that each of the following benefits is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the proposed project notwithstanding the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, and transportation. The proposed project would provide several public benefits as described below:

1. Provides a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, last adopted in 1979, and the City's Coastal Land Use Plan, certified by the Coastal Commission in 1982, to reflect the community's values and vision for the City, provides updated policy directives to guide development in the City over the next 25 years, and addresses topics that have emerged as important priorities since the last update including greenhouse gas emissions, sea level rise, complete streets, infrastructure.
2. The proposed PLAN is more focused and user-friendly, comprehensively addresses recent changing conditions in the City, and would implement smart growth principles, concepts of sustainable development and resource management, and environmental protection.
3. Preserves the city's small beach town character through policies and design standards that maintain buildings at an appropriate scale and size with existing ones and recognizes the unique features of the city's eclectic residential neighborhoods.
4. Enhances and supports a strong, diverse, and vibrant local economy through policies that stimulate sustainable businesses and jobs, enhance safe and

PROJECT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- beautiful commercial corridors, articulate clear and consistent standards for new businesses, and provide convenient services to residents, employees, and visitors.
5. Promotes healthy and active lifestyles through land use and transportation improvements that enhance pedestrian, transit, and bike safety and access to a variety of destinations in the city.
 6. Provide a safe and clean natural environment – including clean air and water - and stewardship of our ocean resources, open space, and other natural resources.
 7. Will help the City achieve a low-carbon future through the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by reducing fuel consumption, diverting solid waste from landfills, conserving water and improving the efficiency of energy use and utilizing renewable energy sources, benefitting the local and global environment.
 8. The transportation system in the PLAN strategically links land use and transportation to make efficient use of the existing roadway capacity through the promotion of a multi-modal circulation system, including improvements to the pedestrian, transit, and bicycling environment in the City of Hermosa Beach.
 9. Through its sustainability policies, the PLAN would help promote energy efficiency, the conservation of water resources, and encourage the reduction of waste through recycling, providing a local, statewide, national and ultimately global benefit.

Finding:

The proposed project represents a balance between several competing objectives in the City of Hermosa Beach. After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, and technological, and other benefits of the proposed project, the Planning Commission has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified may be considered acceptable due to the specific considerations listed above which offset the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts that will be caused by implementation of the project.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record it is hereby determined that:

- All significant Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise and Vibration, and Transportation effects on the environment due to approval of the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible; and
- Any remaining significant Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and Transportation effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations above.

1.7 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) require the City to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to avoid or substantially lessen significant effects on the environment. The monitoring program is hereby adopted for the project. The monitoring program is designed to ensure compliance with required mitigation measures.