# COMPTON 2045 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
# FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
# CITY OF COMPTON
# DRAFT
# DECEMBER 10, 2025

## 1 OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

This statement of Findings of Fact (Findings) addresses the potential environmental effects associated with the City of Compton 2045 General Update (GPU), as described in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the Final Program EIR (FEIR) for the GPU. These Findings are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.), specifically PRC Sections 21081, and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), specifically Sections 15091 and 15093. The DEIR examines the full range of potential effects of construction and operation of the GPU and identifies mitigation measures that could be employed to reduce, minimize, or avoid those potential effects.

PRC Section 21081, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 require that the Lead Agency, in this case the City of Compton (City), prepare written findings for identified significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 states, in part, that:

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

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

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

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

In accordance with PRC Section 21081, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, whenever significant effects cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance the benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered “acceptable.” In that case, the decision- making agency may prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines states the following:

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

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

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

The Final EIR for the GPU identified potentially significant effects that could result from the proposed GPU. The City finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the approval of the proposed GPU would reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less-than-significant levels. Those impacts that are not reduced to less-than-significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific benefits of the GPU (see Section 6, Statement of Overriding Considerations). As required by CEQA, the City, in adopting these Findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed GPU. The City finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made part of these Findings, meets the requirements of PRC Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the proposed GPU.

In accordance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines, the City adopts these Findings for the proposed GPU. Pursuant to PRC Section 21082.1(c)(3), these Findings reflect the City's independent judgment as the Lead Agency for the proposed GPU Final EIR.

## 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The General Plan Update is intended to achieve the land use, transportation, housing, and other goals of the City that reflect the community's growth over the long-term. Table 1 (identical to Table 3.5 in the Project Description) compares existing 2023 conditions with the projected growth for the 2045 horizon year and includes the City of Compton and its Sphere of Influence (Planning Area). As shown in Table 1, the 2045 planning horizon estimates s future conditions for the Planning Area of 34,023 dwelling units, 130,242 residents, 26,784,445 square feet of non-residential uses, and 27,969 jobs. Therefore, the 2045 planning horizon for the Planning Area is estimated to result in increases of approximately 5,776 dwelling units, 22,552 residents, 1,316,470 square feet of non-residential building area, and 2,401 jobs when compared to existing conditions.

**Table 1**
**General Plan Update: Comparison of 2023 and 2045**

| | EXISTING CONDITIONS (2023) | | | FUTURE CONDITIONS (2045) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Development Indicators** | **City** | **Sphere of Influence** | **Total Planning Area** | **City** | **Sphere of Influence** | **Total Planning Area** |
| Dwelling Units | 24,867 | 3,380 | 28,247 | 30,457 | 3,566 | 34,023 |
| Population | 93,719 | 13,971 | 107,690 | 115,587 | 14,655 | 130,242 |
| Non-Residential Building Square Feet | 25,348,700 | 119,275 | 25,467,975 | 26,681,810 | 102,635 | 26,784,445 |
| Employees | 25,384 | 184 | 25,568 | 27,763 | 206 | 27,969 |

**Source:** City of Compton, Los Angeles County Assessor's Data, and General Plan Update GIS data, 2023.

The General Plan Update is intended to achieve the land use, transportation, housing, and other goals of the City that reflect the community's growth over the long-term. The City of Compton General Plan update succeeds the last comprehensive general plan adopted 1991. The General Plan Update incorporates statutory requirements for general plans and guidance provided in the *2017 General Plan Guidelines* provided by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR); coordinates future development and policies with regional planning efforts and serves as the city's fundamental guide in developing strategies to address greenhouse gas reduction, climate change, and climate planning. The EIR incorporates the goals, policies, and objectives of the following Elements from the updated General Plan:

- Mobility Element
- Land Use Element
- Economic Development Element
- Housing Element
- Public Utilities Element
- Open Space Element
- Environmental Justice Element
- Public Safety Element
- Preserving Compton's Heritage Element

These goals, objectives, and policies are intended to maintain various potential environmental effects of the GPU at levels that are less than significant and are considered when evaluating the potential environmental impacts of implementing the General Plan. EIR Chapters 4.1 through 4.20 list goals, policies, and objectives from the General Plan relative to the specific environmental issue being evaluated.

The Housing Element is updated for the 6th cycle and planned land uses identified in the Land Use Element accommodates the Regional Housing Needs Allocation goal of 1,004 housing units, which represents a 2.95% increase from the existing number of housing units in the Planning Area.

The GPU EIR also includes Amendments to Chapter 30 (Zoning) of the Compton Municipal Code (Zoning Map and Zoning Text Amendments) to support implementation of the Land Use Element.

## 2.1 Project Objectives

The comprehensive update of the Compton General Plan serves as the blueprint for the City's future growth and development. The overall role of the General Plan is to:

- Define a realistic vision of what the City desires to be in 20 years.
- Express policy direction in regard to the physical, social, economic, cultural and environmental character of the City.
- Serve as a comprehensive guide for making decisions about land use, circulation, environmental management, parks and recreation, housing, noise, public health and safety.
- Provide the legal foundation for zoning, subdivision and public facilities ordinances, other adopted Citywide plans, compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) decisions and projects, all of which must be consistent with the General Plan.
- Present a clear and easy to understand format that encourages public participation and under- standing.

The General Plan must contain goals, policies, and programs that will provide City staff and discretionary bodies with a foundation for decisions on development projects and long-range planning related to physical development and public services. The General Plan Update establishes the following objectives for the long-term growth and enhancement of the community:

1. **Street and Infrastructure Systems.** A complete street system paved and improved for all mobility types and that includes accessible, safe sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks. Reliable water and sewer infrastructure systems sized and maintained to meet current and future demands and to minimize risks to public health and safety. A comprehensive network of City facilities well maintained to meet community needs.

2. **Safe and Clean Neighborhoods.** Safe, clean neighborhoods enhanced by street lighting improvements that create greater visibility in residential areas, removal of longstanding blighted structures, elimination of illegal dumping Citywide, revitalized vacant lots, and other improvements shown to contribute to public safety and cleanliness.

3. **Commerce and Entertainment.** Vibrant commercial districts and corridors provide many opportunities for entrepreneurs and flexibility for established local businesses to offer diverse goods and services, leisure activities, and places to dine and entertain.

4. **Parks and Recreation.** Well-designed, well-maintained, and safe parks, recreational facilities, and community centers that meet diverse and evolving community needs. Recreational and community service programs that offer educational classes and culturally relevant events targeting Compton's youth, families, and seniors.

5. **Equity and Environmental Justice.** Improved air quality, elimination of industrial noise and pollution, and noxious truck emissions that impact residential neighborhoods. A City where all residents have easy access to community facilities, healthy food choices, parks and facilities, and safety and sanitary homes. A community in which everyone who desires to can readily engage in civic life and public decision-making processes in languages in which they have most comfort.

6. **City Communication.** Effective forms of communication between City leaders and residents and the business community that allow for trust and transparency.

7. **Healthy Community.** Equal access for all residents to affordable housing, mental health and public health services, and other social services, particularly for low-income households and other vulnerable residents. Work force development and educational programs for local residents to provide them with higher income earning potential.

8. **Fiscally Responsible.** Effective High quality and reliable municipal services funded by sustainable and reliable City revenues supported by competent financial management and highly capable staff and City leadership.

9. **Resilient Community.** People, infrastructure, and community assets protected from evolving threats and vulnerabilities.

10. **Housing Access for All.** Improved housing supply and expanded housing opportunities that result in high quality living environments, with access to employment, community facilities, and services. Attractive and safe housing opportunities for a full range of housing types and affordability levels and with equal access and opportunity for all.

11. **Safe and Equitable Mobility.** An interconnected, active transportation system that recognizes and responds to the critical needs of businesses to move commerce while accommodating the equally important necessity for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users to move around the City with convenience and ease. Safe multimodal mobility that creates pleasant travel ways for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists and encourages transit use.

## 3 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The record of proceedings for the GPU EIR consists of those items relevant to the consideration of the proposed GPU EIR. The record of proceedings for the City's decision on the proposed GPU EIR consists of the following documents, at a minimum and without limitation, which are incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these Findings:

- The Notice of Preparation, Notice of Availability, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed GPU EIR.
- The Draft EIR for the proposed GPU and all technical appendices and documents relied upon or incorporated by reference.
- All written comments submitted by agencies, organizations, and members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR, and the City's responses to those comments.
- The Final EIR for the proposed GPU EIR.
- The MMRP for the proposed GPU EIR.
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, and other planning documents relating to the proposed GPU and the GPU EIR prepared by the City or consultants to the City with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the proposed GPU EIR.
- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies and members of the public in connection with the Draft EIR.
- Minutes of public hearings held by the City in connection with the proposed GPU and GPU EIR.
- Documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings.
- All resolutions adopted by the City regarding the proposed GPU EIR, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions.
- Matters of common knowledge related to the proposed GPU EIR, including, but not limited to, federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings, in addition to those cited above.

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) requires that the City, as the Lead Agency, specify the location and custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision has been based. The following location is where review of the record may be performed: City of Compton Community Development Department-Planning Division, 205 South Willowbrook Avenue, Compton, CA 90220. These documents and materials are also available on the City's website at: https://www.compton2045.org/documents.

# 4 FINDINGS OF FACT

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project where an Environmental Impact Report (**"EIR"**) has been certified that identifies one or more significant impacts on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more findings for each of those significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

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

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

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

With respect to significant effects which were subject to finding (3) above, the public agency must find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment. The City of Compton (City) has exercised independent judgment in accordance with the provisions of CEQA Section 21082.1(c) in retaining its own environmental consultant in the preparation of the EIR, as well as reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant. Having received, reviewed, and considered the information in the EIR, as well as any and all other information in the record, the City hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with CEQA Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6. References for discussion of environmental impacts within the Final EIR are noted with each finding. Impact numbers refer to the section number and the threshold letter referenced in the Draft EIR where the full discussion of impacts is included. The Findings of Fact are presented on the following pages.

## 4.1 Effects Determined to Have No Impact or a Less than Significant Impact

The evaluation prepared in the GPU FEIR found and provided substantial evidence that certain impacts of the GPU would have no impact or have impacts that are less than significant. The City Council agrees with the characterization of the FEIR with respect to all of the GPU impacts identified as "resulting in no impact" or "less than significant" impacts and finds that those impacts have been described and analyzed accurately and are supported by substantial evidence as described in the FEIR, including the Draft EIR. Reference should be made to the DEIR and FEIR for a more complete description of the substantiation of the findings regarding these impacts. This finding applies to the evaluation of the potential impacts for the following items as further described in the DEIR, that the project will not:

### *Aesthetics*

- AES-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

- AES-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock

outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- AES-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site/planning area or its surroundings.

- AES-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime.

- AES-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.

***Agricultural Resources***

- AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

- AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g)).

- AG-4: Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

- AG-5: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

- AG-6: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

***Air Quality***

- AIR-4: Result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

***Biological Resources***

- BIO-1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

- BIO-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- 
- BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

- BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

- BIO-7: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources.

***Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources***

- CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

- CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.

- CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

- CUL-4: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.

***Energy***

- ENG-1: Significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

- ENG-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

- ENG-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to energy.

***Geology and Soils***

- GEO-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

    - Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. (Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42).

    - Strong seismic ground shaking.
    - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
    - Landslides.

- GEO-2: Result in substantial soil erosion of the loss of topsoil.

- GEO-3: Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

- GEO-4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

- GEO-5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

- GEO-6: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

- GEO-7: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils, including paleontological resources.

***Greenhouse Gases***

- GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs.

***Hazardous and Hazardous Materials***

- HAZMAT-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- HAZMAT-2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

- HAZMAT-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

- HAZMAT-4: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- HAZMAT-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

- HAZMAT-6: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- HAZMAT-7: Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

- HAZMAT-8: Cause substantial cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

***Hydrology and Water Quality***

- HYD-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.

- HYD-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

    - result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

    - substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

    - create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

    - impede or redirect flood flows.

- HYD-4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.

- HYD-5: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

- HYD-6: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.

***Land Use and Planning***

- LAND-1: Physically divide an established community;

- LAND-2: Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

- LAND-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.

***Mineral Resources***

- MIN-1: Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

- MIN-2: Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land-use plan.

- MIN-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to mineral resources.

***Noise***

- NOI-1: Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

- NOI-2: Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

- NOI-3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

- NOI-4: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to noise or vibration

***Population and Housing***

- POP-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

- POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

- POP-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to population and housing.

***Public Services***

- PS-1: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

    - Fire protection

    - Police protection

    - Schools

- Parks
- Other public facilities.

- PS-2: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to public services.

***Recreation***

- REC-1: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

- REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

- REC-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation facilities.

***Transportation***

- TRANS-1: Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

- TRANS-2: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), related to VMT?

- TRANS-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

- TRANS-4: Result in inadequate emergency access.

- TRANS-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic.

***Tribal Cultural Resources***

- TCR-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a Cultural Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

- TCR-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a Cultural Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of

Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

- TCR-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources.

***Utilities and Service Systems***

- UTS-3: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

- UTS-4: Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

- UTS-5: Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

- UTS-6 Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to Utilities and Service Systems.

***Wildfire***

- WIL-1: Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuated plan.

- WIL-2: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

- WIL-3: Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure such as roads fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

- WIL-4: Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes Sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- WIL-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to wildfire.

## 4.2 Impacts Determined to Be Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

The Final EIR (including the Draft EIR) identifies the following significant environmental impacts associated with the project. Based on the environmental analysis of the project and the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, and the City has found in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) that *"changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the*

*project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment."* The descriptions of the impacts in these findings are summary statements. Mitigation Measures are numbered to correspond to listings in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Reference should be made to the Draft EIR and Final EIR for a more complete description. Based on substantial evidence, the City finds that adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in this section would reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant.

***HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY***

Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the EIR identifies potential significant impacts pertaining to groundwater supply but concludes that impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels.

**Impact HYD-2:** ***Would the GPU substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management for the basin?***

**Substantial Evidence:**

The estimated future population for the City of Compton Water Department's (CWD) and Liberty Utilities – Park Water's (Liberty) respective service areas was based on projections obtained from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The SCAG data incorporates demographic trends, existing land use, general plan land use policies, and input and projections from the Department of Finance (DOF) and the US Census Bureau at the time those documents were prepared (circa 2020). The UWMPs for CMWD and Liberty indicate that these population estimates were used to prepare their water consumption estimates. According to their respective 2020 Urban Water Management Plans (UWMP), the CMWD provided water to a service population of approximately 74,988 in 2020 and is projected to have a service population of approximately 75,412 by 2045, while Liberty provided water service to an area with a population of 132,691 in 2020 and is projected to have a population of 136,245 by 2045. Taken together, the CMWD and Liberty provided water service to a combined service population of approximately 207,679 in 2020 and are projected to have a combined service population of 211,657 by 2045, which represents an estimated population increase of approximately 3,978 within the combined service areas. Additionally, both the CMWD and Liberty project that water supplies are adequate to meet normal domestic water demands in the Planning Area under normal years, single dry years, and a five-consecutive-year drought conditions between 2020 and 2045.

Table 3.5 in Section 3, Project Description, provides a comparison of existing Planning Area characteristics from 2023 and those estimated for 2045. Table 3.5 estimates the Planning Area's population will increase from 107,690 in 2023 to 130,242 by 2045, which is an estimated increase of 22,522. This projected increase is far in excess of that estimated in the CMWD's and Liberty's respective UWMPs to adequately supply future growth under the proposed GPU. The 2020 UWMPs for CMWD and Liberty were adopted around 2021-22 and must be updated every five years according to state law, so they are both due to be revised in the near future. When the UWMPs are next updated, the latest projections from the proposed GPU would need to be incorporated. Since most of the Planning Area's water supply comes from groundwater sources, the growth represented by the proposed GPU exceeds that upon which the CMWD's and Liberty's UWMPs were developed. Since the CMWD only manages a portion of its (ground)water supply, it cannot fully control or mitigate the increased need for water under the proposed GPU until Liberty's UWMP has been updated as planned. Until the City and Liberty update their UMWPs to

incorporate the new growth projections, the proposed GPU may result in potentially significant short- or long-term impacts to local groundwater supplies. Therefore, Mitigation Measure HYD-1 is incorporated to help assure there will be adequate groundwater supplies for future occupants of the Planning Area.

The continued implementation of several existing regulatory/agency mechanisms by which water quality, waste discharge, surface water, and groundwater is protected by law and policy, including the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act and the Construction General Permit, would also assure that future development under the GPU would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. By helping remediate existing groundwater contamination, the City will help secure its groundwater supply in the future. In addition, the Community Services, Open Space, and Natural Resources Element of the proposed GPU includes Goal CR-3, and its supporting policies, which seek to promote efficient water use, reducing water consumption for all land uses. Policy CR-3.1 directs the City to implement public education campaigns and outreach programs to raise awareness about residential water conservation practices, including efficient irrigation techniques, water-saving fixtures, and indoor water use reduction strategies. Policy CR-3.2 requires the City to provide incentives and rebates for residents to invest in water-efficient appliances, such as low-flow toilets, water-saving washing machines, smart irrigation controllers, and drought tolerant landscaping to reduce household water consumption. Policy CR-3.3 directs the City to recommend commercial and industrial facilities to implement water efficiency measures, such as leak detection and repair, water recycling and gray water reuse systems, and landscaping practices that minimize water usage. Policy CR-3.4 mandates that the City implement water conservation measures within municipal operations, including optimizing irrigation practices in parks and public spaces, retrofitting municipal facilities with water-saving fixtures, gray water systems, and prioritizing water-efficient landscaping in city-owned properties while Policy CR-3.5 mandates the City to invest in water infrastructure improvements, such as pipe replacement and rehabilitation, to minimize water loss and improve the overall efficiency and reliability of the water supply system. Similarly, the Urban Systems Element of the proposed GPU includes Goal US-5 and its policies which seek a water system that promotes conservation, resource stewardship, and long-term water security. Finally, Goal US-6 and its policies mandates an efficient and environmentally sound wastewater management and treatment services. By reducing water consumption and helping remediate existing groundwater contamination, these goals and policies help the City to secure its groundwater supply into the future.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**HYD-1** **Water Demand Management.** New developments under the GPU that will be served by local water utility providers shall not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2045 under the most recent Urban Water Management Plan for the involved local water providers.

**Findings:**

With incorporation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, implementation of General Plan goals and policies aimed at reducing water consumption, and continued regulatory compliance with State and regional water quality standards, development within the Planning Area under the proposed GPU would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

## *UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS*

Section 4.19 (Utilities and Service Systems) of the EIR identifies potential significant impacts pertaining to expanded water facilities, water supplies, and cumulative impacts but concludes that impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels.

---

**Impact UTIL-1:** ***Would the GPU require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

---

**Substantial Evidence:**

The CWD is the primary water provider to the City of Compton. The remainder of the Planning Area is served by Liberty Utilities. According to their respective 2020 UWMPs, the CWD had a service population of 74,988 in 2020 and is projected to have a service population of 75,412 in 2045, while Liberty had a service population of 132,691 in 2020 and is projected to have a service population of 136,245 by 2045. Combined, the two water service providers that serve the Planning Area had an estimated service population of 207,679 in 2020 and are projected to have a service population of 211,657, which represents an overall projected service population increase of 3,978. Additionally, according to their respective UMWPs, CWD's and Liberty's water supplies are considered adequate for meeting domestic water demands in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years between 2021 and 2045.

CWD and Liberty's estimates for future population for the City's service area are based on projections obtained from SCAG. The SCAG data incorporates demographic trends, existing land use, general plan land use policies, and input and projections from the DOF and the US Census Bureau at the time those documents were prepared (circa 2020). The respective 2020 UWMPs for CWD and Liberty indicated these population estimates were used to prepare their water consumption estimates (CWD, p. 2-19; Liberty, p. 3-7). Table 3-5 in Section 3, Project Description, provides a comparison of existing City characteristics from 2023 and those estimated for 2045. Table 3-5 estimates the City's population will increase by 22,552 by 2045, which is far in excess of the increase of 3,978 estimated in CWD's and Liberty's 2020 UWMPs to adequately supply future growth. In addition, using CalEEMod default outputs for indoor and outdoor water use, it is estimated that the proposed GPU would result in an increase in annual water usage within the Planning Area by approximately 327 million gallons per year in 2045 when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, implementation of the proposed GPU would likely result in both new and expanded water supply and distribution facilities. Since most of the City's water supply comes from groundwater sources, the growth represented by the proposed GPU exceeds that upon which CWD's and Liberty's UWMPs were developed, and long-term local groundwater supply is a potentially significant impact that requires mitigation. As such, Mitigation Measure HYD-1 has been incorporated to ensure there would be adequate groundwater supplies for City residents in the future with implementation of the proposed GPU.

The Urban Systems Element of the proposed GPU includes Goal US-1 and its policies which encourage ongoing maintenance, repair, and upkeep of city-owned infrastructure. Goal US-2 and its policies strive for optimized delivery of infrastructure systems, while Goal US-3 and its policies seek sustainable funding sources to adequately maintain and improve infrastructure. Further, Goal US-5 and policies support a water system that promotes conservation, resource stewardship, and long-term water security, while Goal US-6 and its policies aim for an efficient

and environmentally sound wastewater management and treatment services. Goal US-10 and its policies mandates equitable infrastructure access within disadvantaged unincorporated communities. Future development would be required to be consistent with these goals and policies.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**HYD-1** **Water Demand Management.** New developments under the GPU that will be served by local water utility providers shall not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2045 under the most recent Urban Water Management Plan for the involved local water providers.

**Findings:**

With implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 and the application of the proposed GPU goals and policies through the City's development review process, development within the Planning Area under the GPU would not result in significant impacts related to the need for new or expanded water supply facilities.

---

**Impact UTIL-2:** ***Would there be sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?***

---

**Substantial Evidence:**

According to their respective UMWPs, CWD's and Liberty's water supplies are considered adequate for meeting domestic water demands in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years between 2021 and 2045. However, the growth represented by the proposed GPU exceeds that upon which CWD's and Liberty's UWMPs were developed. In addition, it is estimated that the proposed GPU would result in an increase in annual water usage within the Planning Area by approximately 327 million gallons per year in 2045 when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, it was determined that long-term local groundwater supply is a potentially significant impact that requires mitigation. As such, Mitigation Measure HYD-1 has been incorporated to ensure there would be adequate groundwater supplies for City residents in the future with implementation of the proposed GPU.

The Urban Systems Element of the proposed GPU includes Goal US-1 and its policies which encourage ongoing maintenance, repair, and upkeep of city-owned infrastructure. Additionally, Goal US-2 and its policies strive for optimized delivery of infrastructure systems, while Goal US-3 and its policies seek sustainable funding sources to adequately maintain and improve infrastructure. Further, Goal US-5 and policies support a water system that promotes conservation, resource stewardship, and long-term water security, while Goal US-6 and its policies aim for an efficient and environmentally sound wastewater management and treatment services. Future development would be required to be consistent with these goals and policies.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**HYD-1** **Water Demand Management.** New developments under the GPU that will be served by local water utility providers will not be approved if they increase water use in excess of what is identified for supply in 2040 under the most recent Urban Water Management Plan for the involved local water providers.

**Findings:**

With implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 and proposed GPU goals and policies through the City's development review process, development within the Planning Area under the GPU would not result in significant impacts related to insufficient water supplies.

## 4.3 Impacts Determined to be Significant, Adverse, and Unavoidable

As presented in the GPU EIR, the City finds that impacts pertaining to criteria pollutant emissions and generation of significant GHG emissions cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level even with incorporation of mitigation measures.

### *AIR QUALITY*

Section 4.3 (Air Quality) of the EIR identifies potentially significant impacts pertaining to the emission of criteria pollutants and concludes that these impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.

**IMPACT AIR-1:** ***Implementation of the proposed GPU would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management Districts' 2022 Air Quality Management Plan.***

**Substantial Evidence:**

As described in Section 4.3.1 of the DEIR, the proposed GPU is within the South Coast Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. Pursuant to the methodology provided in Chapter 12 of the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, consistency with the AQMP is affirmed if the project: 1) Is consistent with the growth assumptions of the AQMP; and, 2)Does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation, or cause a new one.

Consistency Criterion 1 refers to the growth forecasts and associated assumptions included in the 2022 AQMP. Projects that are inconsistent with the AQMP growth assumptions would interfere with attainment of air quality standards because this growth would exceed the growth included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP. The proposed GPU includes land use designations that support development of up to 5,776 total dwelling units, accommodating a population increase of approximately 22,552 residents, for a total population of up to 130,242 residents by 2045. Employment within the Planning Area would reach 27,969 jobs by 2045. The comparison of the AQMP's and the proposed GPU's potential growth projections is provided in Table 4.3-5 of the DEIR. As shown in Table 4.3-5, the total employment is within the employment projected by the 2022 RTP/SCS. However, the growth envisioned in the GPU is inconsistent with the totals for population and dwelling units that the 2022 RTP/SCS projected for 2045. Therefore, from a population growth standpoint, the proposed GPU would be inconsistent with the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion 2 refers to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Please refer to Section 4.3.1 for a description of the state and federal ambient air quality standards (CAAQS and NAAQS, respectively), and the Basin's attainment status. As described in Section 4.3.1, the Basin is designated nonattainment for national and state Ozone ($O_3$), Particulate Matter 10 ($PM_{10}$), and $PM_{2.5}$ standards. The analyses of potential emissions under Impact AQ-2 indicates the GPU could result in significant emissions that cannot be mitigated during construction activities, which would include Nitrous Oxide (NOx) and Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) (precursor emissions to ozone)

and $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$. The analysis contained under Impact AQ-2 also indicates the operational ROG and NOx emissions (precursor emissions to $O_3$) as well as $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$, associated with implementation of the proposed GPU would exceed the SCAQMD-recommended CEQA thresholds of significance, which have been designed to bring the region into attainment for CAAQS and NAAQS.

Implementation of the proposed GPU would result in population, household, and employment growth that is in excess of that accounted for in the 2022 AQMP. This growth could generate construction and operational emissions of criteria air pollutants, including ROG and $NO_X$ ($O_3$ precursor pollutants), $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ that could exceed SCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance. The SCAQMD, in developing its CEQA significance thresholds, considered the emission levels at which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable (SCAQMD, 2003b; page D-3). Even though the mass amount of emissions attributable to a single project (i.e., pounds per day) does not necessarily contribute to air pollution levels measured throughout the Basin and in or near the City, the SCAQMD considers projects that result in emissions that exceed its CEQA significance thresholds to result in individual impacts that are cumulatively considerable and significant. Since the proposed GPU could result in construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD regional CEQA thresholds, the proposed GPU could increase the frequency and/or severity of air quality violations in the Basin or otherwise impede attainment of air quality standards, particularly national and state ozone standards. This conflict with the AQMP is considered a potentially significant impact and the EIR includes the mitigation measures listed below to reduce potential ROG, NOx, CO, $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions that result from implementation of the proposed GPU.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**AQ-2A: Require a Project-level Construction Air Quality Assessment for Conditional uses and New Discretionary Development Projects.**

Prior to a discretionary approval by the City for development projects subject to CEQA (meaning, non-exempt CEQA projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project-specific construction-related air quality impacts to the City for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. The specific strategies identified for a project shall be included as conditions of project approval, and be incorporated into all appropriate construction bid, engineering, and planning documents prepared for the project. Potential strategies to reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to:

- Using heavy-duty off-road construction equipment that meets U.S. EPA Tier IV Final emissions standards (for equipment greater than 50 horsepower), either through original manufacturer's certification or through the use of California Air Resources Board verified diesel emissions control strategies (e.g., a diesel particulate filter).
- Using electric equipment, particularly for equipment less than 50 horsepower

- Using alternative fuels such as renewable diesel, biodiesel (no more than B20 blend), or liquefied or compressed natural gas biodiesel,
- Using smaller equipment that can complete the same construction activities in the same time as standard-sized equipment.
- Limiting idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to two (2) minutes.
- Ensuring equipment brought to a site has been properly serviced and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's standards.
- Implementing applicable SCAQMD fugitive dust control measures.
- Using interior and exterior coatings that meet SCAQMD Rule "Low-VOC" or "Super-Compliant" definitions.

**AQ-2B: Require a Project-level Operational Air Quality Assessment for New Discretionary Development Projects.**

Prior to a discretionary approval by the City for development projects subject to CEQA (meaning non-exempt CEQA projects) project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project-specific operation air quality impacts to the City for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The specific strategies identified for a project shall be included as conditions of approval, and be incorporated into all appropriate planning documents for the project. Potential strategies to reduce operational emissions include, but are not limited to the following:

- Reducing vehicle trips or vehicle miles travelled (VMT) generated by residential and non-residential projects
- Reducing or eliminating new natural gas fireplaces and hearths in residential projects
- Reducing or eliminating new natural gas appliances in residential and non-residential projects
- Reducing or prohibiting gasoline-powered landscaping equipment in residential and non-residential projects
- Incorporating clean of air vehicle parking, bicycle parking, and electric vehicle and truck charging infrastructure that meets the additional, voluntary standards established in the version of the CALGreen code in effect at the time the building permit application is submitted for a project
- Incorporating appropriate transit-supporting infrastructure into site plans

**Findings:**

Because it cannot be definitively known or stated at this time that construction emissions would be able to be mitigated such that all criteria air pollutant emissions would be below SCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance, implementation of the proposed GPU could still increase the frequency and/or severity of air quality violations in the Basin or otherwise impede attainment of air quality standards in the Basin. Furthermore, operational ROG, NOx, CO, $PM_{10}$,

and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be expected to continue to exceed SCAQMD thresholds, even after the incorporation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B. For these reasons, the proposed GPU would be inconsistent with the AQMP. Therefore, this impact is considered a significant and unavoidable and requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**IMPACT AIR-2:** ***Implementation of the proposed GPU would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutant emissions during both construction and operation.***

**Substantial Evidence:**

The analysis conducted under Impact AQ-2 demonstrates that construction emissions associated with future development activities facilitated under implementation of the proposed GPU could exceed SCAQMD-recommended CEQA significance thresholds for regional criteria air pollutant emissions. Additionally, as shown in Table 4.3-6, the modeled, maximum daily operational emission associated with potential 2045 growth under the GPU would result in reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxide (Nox), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter ($PM_{10}$), and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions that exceed SCAQMD-recommended CEQA significance thresholds. Since the proposed GPU could result in construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD regional CEQA thresholds, the proposed GPU could increase the frequency and/or severity of air quality violations in the Basin or otherwise impede attainment of air quality standards, particularly national and state ozone standards. The exceedances of SCAQMD construction and operational thresholds for criteria pollutant emissions potentially significant impacts that require mitigation, and the DEIR includes Mitigation Measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B to reduce potential impacts.

**Mitigation Measures:**

See Mitigation Measure AQ-2A and AQ-2B, above.

**Findings:**

Despite inclusion of Mitigation Measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B, the proposed GPU would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, and the identified impacts related to air quality would remain significant and unavoidable and require a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**IMPACT AIR-3:** ***Implementation of the proposed GPU would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.***

**Substantial Evidence:**

As discussed under Impact AQ-2, future development activities facilitated under implementation of the proposed GPU would generate emissions, including emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) (a toxic air contaminant [TAC]), during construction activities. These emissions would occur intermittently over the approximately 20-year growth period associated with the GPU. Although specific details regarding project development within the Planning Area are not known at this time, it is possible that one or more projects developed under implementation of the proposed GPU could have the potential to exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance for cancerogenic and non-cancerogenic health risks (see Section 4.3.3). This represents a potentially significant impact.

In addition to criteria air pollutant and TAC emissions on a local scale, receptor exposure to elevated concentrations of criteria air pollutants (e.g., CO, $O_3$, and PM) is capable of causing adverse health effects on heart, lung, and other organ systems. As described under Impact AQ-2, the proposed GPU would generate cumulatively considerable ROG and NOx emissions, which are precursors for $O_3$, and for $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions – pollutants for which the region is designated nonattainment. However, operational emissions would not expose receptors to substantial operational pollutant concentrations, as described below.

**Mitigation Measures:**

See Mitigation Measure AQ-2A, above.

**Findings:**

There is uncertainty regarding the specific nature of construction activities that would be facilitated under implementation of the proposed GPU. Despite the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2A, which requires the preparation of project-specific air quality analysis prior to the construction of any new development and incorporation of mitigation if emissions levels are shown to be above SCAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance for cancerogenic and non-cancerogenic risks, as well as SCAQMD LSTs, it cannot be definitively known or stated at this time that all future development projects occurring under implementation of the proposed GPU would be able to reduce potential risks and localized construction air pollutant emissions to levels that are below SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, with regard to localized criteria air pollutant and TAC emissions generated during future construction activities, this impact would be significant and unavoidable even with the incorporation of feasible mitigation measures and requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**IMPACT AIR-5:** ***Implementation of the proposed GPU would cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to air quality.***

**Substantial Evidence:**

As described in Section 4.3.1, the Basin is designated nonattainment for national and State $O_3$ standards, national and State $PM_{2.5}$ standards, and national $PM_{10}$ standards. The SCAQMD, in developing its CEQA significance thresholds, considered the emission levels at which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. The SCAQMD considers projects that result in emissions that exceed its CEQA significance thresholds to result in individual impacts that are cumulatively considerable and significant. The growth that could occur under the GPU's 2045 growth conditions would be inconsistent with the 2022 RTP/SCS growth forecasts and, as discussed under Impact AQ-2, could result in construction and operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended regional CEQA thresholds. Although the mass amount of emissions attributable to a single project (i.e., pounds per day) does not necessarily contribute to air pollution levels measured within the Basin and in or near the City, the SCAQMD, in developing its CEQA significance thresholds, considered the emission levels at which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. The SCAQMD considers projects that result in emissions that exceed its CEQA significance thresholds to result in individual impacts that are cumulatively considerable and significant. Since potential growth under the GPU would be inconsistent with current AQMP projections and could lead to construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD regional CEQA thresholds, the proposed GPU could increase the frequency and/or severity of air quality violations in the Basin or otherwise impede attainment of air quality standards, particularly national and state $O_3$, $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Therefore,

this is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact and Mitigation Measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B are incorporated to reduce impacts.

**Mitigation Measures:**

See Mitigation Measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B, above.

**Findings:**

As described in Section 4.3.1, the Basin is designated nonattainment for national and State $O_3$ standards, national and State $PM_{2.5}$ standards, and national $PM_{10}$ standards. The SCAQMD, in developing its CEQA significance thresholds, considered the emission levels at which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. The SCAQMD considers projects that result in emissions that exceed its CEQA significance thresholds to result in individual impacts that are cumulatively considerable and significant. The growth that could occur under the GPU's 2045 growth conditions would be inconsistent with the 2022 RTP/SCS growth forecasts and, as discussed under Impact AQ-2, could result in construction and operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended regional CEQA thresholds. Although the mass amount of emissions attributable to a single project (i.e., pounds per day) does not necessarily contribute to air pollution levels measured within the Basin and in or near the City, the SCAQMD, in developing its CEQA significance thresholds, considered the emission levels at which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. The SCAQMD considers projects that result in emissions that exceed its CEQA significance thresholds to result in individual impacts that are cumulatively considerable and significant. Since potential growth under the GPU would be inconsistent with current AQMP projections and could lead to construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD regional CEQA thresholds, the proposed GPU could increase the frequency and/or severity of air quality violations in the Basin or otherwise impede attainment of air quality standards, particularly national and state $O_3$, $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Therefore, this is considered a potentially significant adverse and unavoidable impact even with incorporation of mitigation measures and requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

***GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS***

Section 4.8 (Greenhouse Gases) of the EIR identifies potentially significant impacts pertaining to the emission of greenhouse gases and concludes that these impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.

**IMPACT GHG-1:** ***Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.***

**Substantial Evidence:**

As shown in Table 4.8-4 of the Draft EIR and Table 2 below, with implementation of the GPU, the Planning Area would emit approximately 586,990 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MTCO_2e$) annually by 2045. Dividing through by the Planning Area's service population (SP) (158,211 residents and employees) results in an efficiency metric of 3.7 $MTCO_2e$/yr/SP for 2045. Although this GHG efficiency level does not meet the adjusted target for 2045 (1.0 $MTCO_2e$/yr/SP), it does show an appreciable reduction from existing and future baseline conditions (the GHG efficiency occurring under 2045 with the GPU would be approximately 35% less than existing 2023 conditions [5.7 $MTCO_2e$/yr/SP] and 8% less than 2045 conditions without the GPU [4.0 $MTCO_2e$/yr/SP). The primary source of GPU GHG emissions would be mobile

sources, which represent approximately 78% of total annual GHG emissions occurring under 2045 growth conditions. The next highest source of GPU GHG emissions would be energy sources, which would represent approximately 15% of total annual GHG emissions. As shown in Table 4.8-4 of the Draft EIR and Table 2 below, the GPU's 2045 growth projection would result in GHG emissions that exceed the adjusted SCAQMD derived plan-level efficiency metric. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact and Mitigation Measure GHG-1 is incorporated to reduce GHG emissions. Nevertheless, this impact is considered potentially significant and the mitigation measures listed below were incorporated to reduce potential impacts.

**Table 2**
**Unmitigated GPU GHG Emissions**

| Source | GHG Emissions ($MTCO_2e$ / Year) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Existing Land Uses (2045)[(A)] | Compton GPU Land Uses (2045) | Net Change |
| Area | 9,993 | 11,955 | +1,962 |
| Energy | 80,983 | 87,006 | +6,023 |
| Mobile | 408,454 | 458,604 | +50,150 |
| Refrigerants | 6,767 | 850 | -5,917 |
| Waste | 18,963 | 20,677 | +1,714 |
| Water | 14,732 | 7,898 | -6,834 |
| Total[(B)] | 532,613 | 586,990 | +54,377 |
| Service Population (SP) | 133,258 | 158,211 | +24,953 |
| $MTCO_2e$/yr/SP | 4.00 | 3.71 | -0.29 |
| SCAQMD Tier 4 2035 Plan Level Efficiency Threshold | 4.1 | 4.1 | -- |
| SCAQMD Tier 4 Adjusted 2045 Plan Level Efficiency Threshold | 1.0 | 1.0 | -- |
| **Exceeds Threshold?** | **Yes** | **Yes** | **--** |

*Source: MIG, 2025 (see Appendix D).*
(A) See Table 4.8-3 for existing GHG emissions in the Planning Area.
(B) Totals may not equal due to rounding.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**GHG-1:** **Require a Project-level Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment for Conditional Uses and New Discretionary Development Projects.** Prior to a discretionary approval by the City project applicants for residential development projects with more than 30 dwelling units or nonresidential development projects over 50,000 square feet that are subject to CEQA (meaning non-exempt CEQA projects) shall prepare and submit to the City for review and approval a technical assessment evaluating potential project-specific greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts. The assessment shall evaluate the project's consistency with adopted state-wide GHG emissions reduction goals, such as Senate Bill 32, Assembly Bill 1279, or an interpolated GHG emission reduction goal for 2045 that is based on regional data (e.g., an interpolated SCAQMD efficiency metric of 1.0 $MTCO_2e$/yr/SP). If GHG emissions levels are determined to have the potential to be inconsistent with the State GHG reduction goals, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate strategies to reduce GHG emissions during operational activities. The specific strategies identified for a project shall be included as conditions of approval, and be incorporated into all

appropriate planning documents for the project. Potential strategies to reduce GHG emissions include, but are not limited to:

- Reducing vehicle trips or vehicle miles travelled (VMT) generated by residential and non-residential projects
- Requiring new residential and non-residential development to incorporated on-site renewable energy systems that reduce grid electricity consumption
- Requiring new residential and non-residential projects to incorporate water efficient landscaping and water conservation measures such as low-flow fixtures, grey water systems, etc.

**Findings:**

The GPU includes goals and policies that promote mixed-use developments, transportation demand strategies, expansion of transit service, and other actions that reduce transportation-related GHG emissions. The GPU also includes goals and policies that encourage sustainable and green development that reduce energy-related GHG emissions. Although the GPU contains numerous goals and policies that highlight the City's intent to grow sustainably over the next couple decades, further actions are required to reduce GHG emissions. Accordingly, the City would implement Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to reduce the quantity of GHG emissions generated under implementation of the GPU. Although Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would require a project-level evaluation for future discretionary projects proposed under implementation of the GPU, it cannot be assured future development projects would be able to mitigate their emissions in line with state-wide goals. Since the GHG emissions associated with the GPU would not meet the interpolated SCAQMD efficiency metric of 1.0 $MTCO_2e/yr/SP$, the identified impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would remain significant and unavoidable despite inclusion of Mitigation Measure GHG and requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**IMPACT GHG-3:** ***Implementation of the proposed GPU would cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to greenhouse gases.***

**Substantial Evidence:**

As stated at the beginning of Section 4.8.4, global climate change is the result of GHG emissions worldwide; individual projects do not generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change. Thus, the analysis of GHG emissions is by nature a cumulative analysis focused on whether an individual project's contribution to global climate change is cumulatively considerable. As described under Impacts GHG-1 and GHG-2, the proposed GPU would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions; however, it would generate GHG emissions that exceed the project specific GHG efficiency threshold (1.0 $MTCO_2e/SP/yr$) used to provide context for the magnitude of potential GHG emissions levels with the GPU. Accordingly, this impact was considered potentially significant and Mitigation Measure GHG-1 was incorporated to reduce GHG emissions.

**Mitigation Measures**

See Mitigation Measure GHG-1, above.

**Findings:**

Despite inclusion of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, the identified impacts related to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions would remain significant and unavoidable and require a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

## 4.4 Conclusion with Respect to Impacts that Cannot be Mitigated

The City finds, based on the facts set forth in the administrative record, which include but are not limited to the facts as set forth below, those facts contained in the DEIR, and any other facts set forth in materials prepared by the City or the City's consultants, that there are no additional, feasible mitigation measures, changes, or alternatives available to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts identified above, beyond those identified in the mitigation measures adopted for the project. Therefore, as outlined in Public Resource Code Section 21081(b) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, adoption of the project will require a Statement of Overriding Considerations for impacts pertaining to conflicts with applicable air quality plans, emissions of criteria pollutants, and emissions of greenhouse gases, which is included with these Findings. As fully described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 6 herein), the City has concluded and hereby finds and declares that, based on substantial evidence, that the project's significant and unavoidable impacts are outweighed by the project's benefits, including but not limited to the project's significant benefits to the residents of the City of Compton. Accordingly, based on substantial evidence in the DEIR and the administrative record, the City finds and declares, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that specific economic legal, social, technical or other considerations, including accomplishing the project objectives, make infeasible any additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the DEIR.

## 5 FINDINGS OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." The section also states that "the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if those alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly." Under Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR does not need to consider alternatives that are not feasible, nor need it address every conceivable alternative to the project. The range of alternatives "is governed by a 'rule of reason' that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice." (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[f]). For alternative locations, "only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR" (Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A)). The significant impacts of the proposed project (air quality and GHG emissions) are based on the type and size of the proposed use so this project on any other site would still result in significant impacts identified in the EIR. Below is a discussion of the following alternatives that have been evaluated in comparison to the project:

- Alternative 1: No Project/Existing General Plan
- Alternative 2: Reduced (-10%) Overall Development
- Alternative 3: Reduced (-25%) Residential Development

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), the discussion of impacts associated with these alternatives is less detailed than the evaluation included in Chapters 4.1 through 4.20 of the impacts associated with implementation of the proposed GPU. Table 2 shows the development assumptions of each alternative. Table 3 shows how impacts associated with the implementation of the alternatives compare to the impacts associated with implementation of the proposed GPU (refer to accompanying text for full explanation).

**Table 2**
**Land Use Alternatives Development Assumptions**

| Land Use | Existing Conditions (2023) | Proposed GPU (2045) | Net Change in Growth Potential (2045) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1. No Project / Existing General Plan Development Alternative[(a)] | 2. Reduced (-10%) Overall Development Alternative | 3. Reduced (-25%) Residential Development Alternative |
| Dwelling Units | 28,247 | +5,776 | +15,632 | +5,198 | +4,332 |
| Population | 107,690 | +22,552 | +62,999 | +20,297 | +16,914 |
| Non-Residential | 25.5 MSF | +0.3 MSF | +0.2 MSF | +0.27 MSF | +0.3 MSF |
| Employees | 25,568 | +2,401 | -- | +2,161 | +2,401 |

*Source: Table 3.5, DEIR Project Description, MIG, 2025*
(a) 1991 Compton General Plan, Table LU-1 – Land Use Policy Implications, p. 3-1 (does not include employment projections).
MSF = million square feet (rounded off)

**Table 3**
**Alternatives' Impacts Compared to Project Impacts**

| Impact/Resource | Alternative 1: No Project / Existing General Plan Growth Potential | Alternative 2: Reduced (-10%) Overall Growth Potential | Alternative 3: Reduced (-25%) Residential Growth Potential |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Aesthetics** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Agriculture and Forest Resources** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Air Quality** | **Increased SU** | **Reduced SU** | **Reduced SU** |
| **Biological Resources** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Cultural Resources** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Energy** | Increased LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Geology and Soils** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Greenhouse Gas Emissions** | **Increased SU** | **Reduced SU** | **Reduced SU** |
| **Hazards and Hazardous Materials** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Hydrology and Water Quality** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Land Use** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Mineral Resources** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Noise** | Similar LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Population and Housing** | Similar LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Public Services** | Increased LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Recreation** | Increased LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Transportation (VMT)** | Increased LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Tribal Cultural Resources** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |
| **Utilities and Service Systems** | Increased LTS | Reduced LTS | Reduced LTS |
| **Wildfire** | Similar LTS | Similar LTS | Similar LTS |

*Source: MIG, 2025.*
LTS = Less Than Significant Impact
**SU** = **Significant and Unavoidable Impact**

## 5.1 Selection of Alternatives

To provide a basis for further understanding of the environmental effects of a proposed project and possible approaches to reducing its identified significant impacts, the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to also "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." The following alternatives were selected for detailed evaluation in comparison to the proposed Project:

**Alternative 1 – No Project/Existing General Plan.** The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative (No Project Alternative) assumes that development would occur within the Planning Area that was anticipated under the 1991 General Plan. Development assumptions for this alternative are shown in Table 2. As shown in Table 2, development under the 1991 General Plan would result in a significant increase in residential development and population, and a small decrease in non-residential development when compared to the proposed GPU. Additionally, no new policies, goals, or development standards associated with the proposed GPU would be

implemented; the standards, goals, and policies associated with the 1991 General Plan would be applicable.

**Alternative 2 - Reduced Overall Development.** The Reduced Overall Development Capacity Alternative reflects a reduced amount of growth in the number of residential units and a reduced amount of non-residential development (both approximately 10 percent less) compared to those expected under the proposed GPU. This alternative assumes that policies, goals, or development standards associated with the Project would apply to this alternative. This alternative would result in less employment generation that the Project, but would still meet the City's current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.

**Alternative 3 – Reduced Residential Development.** The Reduced Residential Alternative assumes that the total number of dwelling units under this alternative would be 25 percent less than the increase expected under the proposed GPU. This alternative also assumes a small decrease in the amount of non-residential development than expected under the proposed GPU. This alternative assumes that policies, goals, or development standards associated with the Project would apply. This alternative would also meet the current City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goal of accommodating 1,004 additional dwelling units.

## 5.2 Evaluation of Alternatives

**Substantial Evidence:**

***No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative***

DEIR Section 5.3 concluded that Alternative 1 would have the following less than significant impacts that are similar/equivalent to those of the project: Aesthetics; Agriculture and Forest Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use; Mineral Resources; Noise; Population and Housing; Tribal Cultural Resources; and Wildfire.

DEIR Section 5.3 also concluded that Alternative 1 would have the following increased but less than significant impacts relative to those of the project since the adopted General Plan supports a much larger population than the GPU: Public Services; Recreation; Transportation; and Utilities and Service Systems.

Lastly, DEIR Section 5.3 concluded that Alternative 1 would have the following impacts that are greater than those of the project and are still significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all recommended feasible mitigation measures: Air Quality; and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

***Alternative 2: Reduced Overall Development***

DEIR Section 5.4 concluded that Alternative 2 would have the following less than significant impacts that are similar/equivalent to those of the project: Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use; Mineral Resources; Tribal Cultural Resources; and Wildfire.

DEIR Section 5.4 also concluded that Alternative 2 would have the following reduced and less than significant impacts relative to those of the project since the adopted General Plan supports a much larger population than the GPU: Energy; Noise; Population and Housing; Public Services; Recreation; Transportation; Utilities and Service Systems.

Lastly, DEIR Section 5.4 concluded that Alternative 2 would have the following impacts that are less than those of the project but are still significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all recommended feasible mitigation measures: Air Quality; and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

***Alternative 3: Reduced Residential Development***

DEIR Section 5.5 concluded that Alternative 3 would have the following less than significant impacts that are similar/equivalent to those of the project: Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use; Mineral Resources; Tribal Cultural Resources; and Wildfire.

DEIR Section 5.5 also concluded that Alternative 3 would have the following reduced and less than significant impacts relative to those of the project since the adopted General Plan supports a much larger population than the GPU: Energy; Noise; Population and Housing; Public Services; Recreation; Transportation; Utilities and Service Systems.

Lastly, DEIR Section 5.5 concluded that Alternative 3 would have the following impacts that are less than those of the project but are still significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all recommended feasible mitigation measures: Air Quality; and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

**Meeting Project Objectives**

DEIR Section 5.3 indicates the No Project Alternative would meet some of the Project objectives but not nearly to the degree as the GPU. However, it was determined that this alternative would still meet the RHNA allocation of accommodating 1,004 dwelling units.

DEIR Section 5.4 indicates the Reduced Overall Development Capacity Alternative would meet most of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the GPU. However, it was determined that this alternative would still meet the RHNA Objective of accommodating 1,004 additional dwelling units.

DEIR Section 5.5 indicates the Reduced Residential Development Alternative would meet most of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the GPU. However, it was determined that this alternative would still meet the RHNA Objective of accommodating development of the City's 1,004 dwelling unit RHNA allocation.

**Environmentally Superior Alternative**

DEIR Section 5.6 indicates that none of the alternatives would eliminate or reduce any of the significant impacts of the GPU to less than significant levels. However, it was determined that Alternative 3, the Reduced Residential Development Alternative, would reduce potential impacts to the greatest degree and would therefore be the "environmentally superior alternative." This conclusion was based on the comparative impact conclusions in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 (Tables 2 and 3 of this chapter) and the analysis within this chapter. In addition, this alternative would meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation goals.

## 6 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a) and (b), the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental effects when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” (14 CCR 15093[a]). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (14 CCR 15093[b]). The Lead Agency’s written reasons are referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations. For those significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the Lead Agency is required to find that the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant impacts on the environment.

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

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

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

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

The City of Compton will approve the project and has prepared a Final EIR that satisfies the requirements of CEQA. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR (DEIR), the Final EIR (FEIR), and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), when implemented, would avoid or substantially lessen some of the significant effects identified in the EIR for the project. However, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. The following adverse impacts of the project are considered significant and unavoidable based on the analysis in the DEIR, FEIR, and the Findings of Fact.

- Impact AIR-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plans because it would exceed the growth assumption of the 2022 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and because emissions of $NO_X$, ROG, CO, $PM_{2.5}$, and $PM_{10}$ would exceed SCAQMD’s regional threshold, thereby impeding AQMP attainment.

- Impact AIR-2: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of non-attainment criteria pollutants for which the project region is in non-attainment (including $NO_X$, ROG, CO, $PM_{2.5}$, and $PM_{10}$).

- Impact AIR-3: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction activities.

- Impact AIR-5: Cause adverse substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to air quality (Cumulative Impact from NOx, ROG, CO, $PM_{2.5}$, and $PM_{10}$ emissions).

- Impact GHG-1: Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

- Impact GHG-3: Cause a substantial adverse cumulative impact with respect to greenhouse gas emissions (Cumulative Impact).

The City of Compton finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the DEIR, FEIR, and Findings that are within the purview of the City would be implemented by the project, and that those mitigation measures that may be within another agency's discretion have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency. The City finds that any one of the benefits set forth below is sufficient by itself to warrant approval of the project, and this determination is based on the Findings herein and the evidence in the record. The City further finds that the remaining significant unavoidable effects related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits based on the facts set forth above, the Final EIR, and the record.

- The project would create a complete street system paved and improved for all mobility types and that includes accessible, safe sidewalks, and pedestrian crosswalks, resulting in reduced traffic and air pollution.

- The project would result in reliable water and sewer infrastructure systems sized and maintained to meet current and future demands and to minimize risks to public health and safety.

- The project supports a comprehensive network of City facilities well maintained to meet community needs.

- The project promotes safe, clean neighborhoods enhanced by street lighting improvements that create greater visibility in residential areas, removal of longstanding blighted structures, elimination of illegal dumping Citywide, revitalized vacant lots, and other improvements shown to contribute to public safety and cleanliness.

- The project would result in vibrant commercial districts and corridors that provide opportunities for entrepreneurs and flexibility for established local businesses to offer diverse goods and services, leisure activities, and places to dine and entertain.

- The project would result in the development of well-designed, well-maintained, and safe parks, recreational facilities, and community centers that meet diverse and evolving community needs.

- The project would support recreational and community service programs that offer educational classes and culturally relevant events targeting Compton's youth, families, and seniors.

- The project seeks to provide all residents with easy access to community facilities, healthy food choices, parks and recreation facilities, safety, and sanitary homes.

- The project supports equal access for all residents to affordable housing, mental health and public health services, and other social services, particularly for low-income households and other vulnerable residents.

- The project promotes work force development and educational programs for local residents to provide them with higher income earning potential.

- The project would provide high quality and reliable municipal services funded by sustainable and reliable City revenues supported by competent financial management and highly capable staff and City leadership.

- The project would result in improved housing supply and expanded housing opportunities that result in high quality living environments, with access to employment, community facilities, and services.

- The project promotes attractive and safe housing opportunities for a full range of housing types and affordability levels and with equal access and opportunity for all.

- The project supports an interconnected, active transportation system that recognizes and responds to the critical needs of businesses to move commerce while accommodating the equally important necessity for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users to move around the City with convenience and ease.

- The project promotes multimodal mobility that creates safe travel ways for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists and encourages transit use.

The City Council hereby finds that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through the approval of the project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated. The City Council finds that each of the project benefits separately and individually outweighs all of the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable. The City Council further finds that no feasible alternative exists that both would provide all of the foregoing benefits to the public and reduce environmental impacts when compared to the project.