



**INGREDIENTS
FOR
SUCCESS**

◆
*The Comprehensive
General Plan of the City
of San Gabriel, California
2004*

Environmental Evaluation

**INITIAL STUDY AND
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**CITY OF SAN GABRIEL
Community Development Department
425 South Mission Drive
San Gabriel, California 91776**

Introduction

Background

California law (*Government Code* Sec. 65300 et seq.) requires every California city to develop its own vision statement for the future, a plan that helps its residents document how they want to grow, develop and prosper.

At a minimum, every general plan must address seven basic topics (often called “elements”):

- Land Use
- Circulation
- Housing
- Public Safety
- Open Space
- Conservation
- Noise

San Gabriel last adopted a general plan (*Vision 2020*) in January 1990, consisting of a general plan text and maps; while there have been several minor changes made to the general plan, there has not been a comprehensive technical review and update of the plan since it was originally created.

About This Project

The City Council has since determined that the existing general plan must be revised to better address the range and breadth of issues, technological, environmental, economic, and demographic changes that have affected San Gabriel since the 1989 plan was adopted. Subsequent analyses prepared by both the Community Development Department and its consultants demonstrated that the City’s general plan required many other technical modifications to keep current.

In 1995, the City adopted a general plan-zoning consistency program that refined the original plan and ensured that its implementing zoning map accomplished the 1989 plan’s objectives. Several specific code amendment projects followed as well.

On June 15, 1999, the City Council authorized the Community Development Department to initiate the technical revision and update of San Gabriel’s general plan. To accomplish its objectives:

- The City subsequently initiated a wide-ranging, four-year citizen participation program including, but not limited to, citizen surveys, community workshops, neighborhood meetings, Citywide meetings, a public information campaign, and other techniques extending substantially beyond the requirements of law; and
- The Planning Commission conducted a series of “Tell-a-Vision Nights,” being four neighborhood meetings, on the following dates:

November 16, 2000
December 2, 2000
January 26, 2001
February 22, 2001

And conducted a series of study sessions before the Planning Commission, with citizen input on the following dates:

January 14, 2002
February 11, 2002
May 13, 2002

The proposed update, prior to adoption, will undergo a second phase of community outreach, citizen participation, and finally, public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

Why a General Plan Update – Why Not A New Plan?

In reviewing the existing general plan, the Community Development Department determined that:

- The existing growth patterns established by the 1990 general plan have served San Gabriel well.
- Growth since 1990 has not exceeded the targets set by the 1990 general plan; in fact, growth is occurring on schedule and in accordance with the plan.
- The many actions taken to implement the 1990 plan have been effective in limiting the untoward impacts of growth, but an additional layer of refinement not available in the original plan.
- Creating a new plan from scratch would not be beneficial, since community consensus on growth has been difficult to achieve. The plan update should therefore refine the community's growth strategy by focusing on new environmental, design and quality of life standards rather than throwing it away and starting from scratch.

Project Description:

What Does the Proposed General Plan Update Do?

The proposed update:

- Updates the technical data and support for the general plan to keep it current. This work includes a new background report documenting community needs and desires, review and refinement of existing tables and charts, creation of new graphics and charts to document changes in community environment, and
- Updates the seven existing elements of the general plan;
- Creates three new elements of the general plan that had heretofore not existed. Each of these projects were specifically intended as quality of life projects, meaning that they were not designed to create new growth, but to better manage the level of growth projected and occurring under the 1990 plan. Those are:
 - A **community design element** that improves the standards and practices of urban design, architecture, landscaping and streetscapes in the community.

- A **historic preservation element** that makes recommendations to preserve and protect structures that had not been fully identified or protected in the 1990 plan.
- An **economic development element** that refines economic development strategies employed by the City to achieve greater consistency with the City's vision.
- A **community facilities element** that documents ongoing needs in improving the City's underlying infrastructure.

The Council's recommended update strategy also included reformatting and re-editing the plan and its recommendations to make it more user-friendly. As a result, the Community Development Department has undergone an extensive effort to produce a new, attractive, easy-to-read document that maintains the original strategies of the plan while ensuring that the updated plan meets today's needs.

In the case of original general plan policies that have been accomplished by subsequent action, or policies that are no longer applicable because of changes in the external environment, those policies have been deleted. In the case of new issues turned up during the City's background assessment, those issues have been added to the *Background Report*.

What Does the Proposed Update Not Do?

- The draft comprehensive general plan proposes no increases in overall density, intensity or capacity beyond the numbers envisioned by the 1989 general plan and its implementing 1995 zoning consistency program. Rather, it imposes additional requirements relative to design review, traffic calming, community greening, economic development, impact fees and other initiatives that refine the original plan with respect to quality of life measures and environmental protection. These changes significantly increase the environmental protections associated with the plan. The initial study documents these facts in detail, and the initial study and negative declaration are incorporated into this resolution and made a part hereof.
- The draft comprehensive general plan does not propose additional general plan amendments or zone changes. Where potential future studies are indicated, it is with the understanding that any resulting proposals will be subject to full environmental review.

What Does This Environmental Evaluation Accomplish?

The environmental evaluation consists of two parts:

- An **initial study**, a model for evaluating potential categories of environmental impact that would be associated with the new plan;
- An **environmental narrative**, which analyzes the potential growth-inducing adverse impacts associated with proposed recommendations and choices under consideration; and finally,
- An **environmental determination**, in which the City staff recommends whether a more comprehensive environmental review is needed, or whether the level of review provided is sufficient to ensure that no adverse impacts to the environment will occur that cannot be mitigated. If this finding is made, the City will issue a

proposed Negative Declaration, finding that the plan will not produce significant adverse impacts after mitigation.

Why Is an Environmental Impact Report Not Being Prepared?

The purpose of an environmental impact report is to assess the potential range of environmental impacts associated with different growth scenarios, and to provide critical information to decision makers that will allow them to choose the best growth scenario. After completing the initial study analysis, the Community Development Department found that:

- There are no new growth-inducing proposals in the plan. Because this project is a technical update rather than a new general plan, the project analysis assumes that the basic growth assumptions of the original plan will remain in place, and limits the range of alternatives for study. If the City creates a new general plan, or decides to change the growth assumptions in such manner that the original general plan growth assumptions are not applicable, a new environmental analysis would be required.
- The update makes technical improvements, but does not change the existing land use plan. The plan proposes no changes in land use categories, densities, building or population intensity, but simply improves and refines the growth management capabilities of the 1990 general plan.
- The update actually refines the environmental protection aspects of the earlier plan by imposing new criteria in the areas of community design, historic preservation, community facilities, and economic development to ensure that the growth strategies of the 1990 plan are accomplished.

In these respects, the general plan update is designed to produce a plan that is “self-mitigating,” in that it establishes mitigation for growth by virtues of the policies themselves. But the plan does not permit additional new growth beyond the target levels as they were projected in 1989.

How is The Environmental Evaluation organized?

This environmental analysis is intended to be used as a companion document to the draft general plan update, meaning that it is best understood when you can compare the relevant portions of the **general plan text** and **background report** to this document.

- The **General Plan text** (a separate document) is the actual plan of maps and policies that will, if adopted, guide the City's growth for the next 20 years.
- The **Background Report** (also a separate document) provides the environmental background, current conditions, and trends that inform both the general plan text and this environmental analysis.
- The analysis begins with a **technical checklist** (pages 8-10) summarizing the environmental issues and making a preliminary recommendation as to the **proposed environmental determination**.
- It is followed (pages 11-27) with an issue-by-issue checklist and **technical analysis** documenting the potential impacts on the plan.
- At the conclusion is a bibliography and source list containing the names of the people, organizations, and documents consulted in the preparation of the environmental documents and the general plan.

Public Notice and Citizen Participation

The general plan update and its policies have been subject to a wide range of citizen participation tools and techniques, including:

- Six **“Tell-a-Vision Nights”** at locations around San Gabriel, advertised in a community-wide campaign that included street banners, mailed notices, press releases, advertisements, the City’s website, and other tools. More than 400 citizens participated.
- Nine Planning Commission community **study sessions**
- More than a dozen **street fairs and community events**
- **Presentations** before many community organizations
- An **on-line survey** at the City’s website
- **Cable television announcements** and banners publicizing general plan events
- Articles in the **Grapevine** and the City’s **recreation guide**, in **local newspapers** and **community organizations’ newsletters**.

In addition, both the environmental evaluation and the final policy plan (the text and maps that together make up a general plan) will be subject to a second round of citizen participation including:

- Formal noticing and posting of the plan and environmental documents
- Notice and comment to responsible and trustee agencies in accordance with the City’s environmental guidelines.
- A second-stage community outreach campaign using many of the same tools as the first phase
- Public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council, with separate presentations and discussion before the City’s Design Review Commission.

How Can I Respond to This Environmental Evaluation?

This report was prepared by the Community Development Department at the City of San Gabriel. You can reach us at (626) 308-2806, or direct inquiries as follows:

Mark S. Gallatin, AICP, City Planner
City of San Gabriel
425 South Mission Drive
San Gabriel, California 91776
(626) 308-2806
(626) 458-2830 Fax

Comments will be received for a 30-day period, through September 22, 2003; but public input will be encouraged throughout the public hearing process as well. Final action on this environmental determination will only occur at the conclusion of the public hearing process, in conjunction with adoption of the proposed general plan update.

STEVEN A. PRESTON, FAICP
Deputy City Manager
City of San Gabriel

Environmental Checklist Form

City of San Gabriel

Basic Information

1. Project title: Comprehensive General Plan Update
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Gabriel, 425 S. Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776
3. Contact person and phone number: Mark S. Gallatin, AICP, City Planner
626-308-2800, ext. 713
4. Project location: San Gabriel, Los Angeles County, California (Citywide)
5. Project sponsor's name and address: City of San Gabriel Community Development Department
6. General plan designation: Varies Citywide (see exhibits and plan)
7. Zoning: Varies Citywide
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Technical and policy update of the existing San Gabriel Comprehensive General Plan, including updated background (environmental setting) report, policy text and maps. Includes the addition of the following new topics: community design, economic development, community facilities, cultural resources. See full narrative description on pp. 3-4 of this assessment.

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

Incorporated boundaries of the City of San Gabriel, comprising 3.9 square miles and 41,000 residents on gently sloping valley floor 9 mi. east of downtown Los Angeles. Contains a range of residential, commercial, industrial and institutional uses. For a detailed description, see the "Ingredients for Success" background report, which is made a part of this analysis.

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

City of San Gabriel, City Council and Redevelopment Agency; City of San Gabriel Planning Commission. California Department of Housing and Community Development (Housing Element Only). California State Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse (environmental review only).

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

Proposed Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:

Date:

Printed Name:

For: City of San Gabriel

Evaluation Of Environmental Impacts

About the Following Evaluation:

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

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X		
d) Create as new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Background. The 1989 general plan had no specific chapter and only generalized provisions in dealing with the quality and character of urban development. Since then, the City has developed design guidelines and some zoning standards, but still lacks a coherent overall framework for the evaluation of quality design in residential, commercial and industrial projects.

Potential Areas of Impact. The draft general plan will actually reduce and eliminate aesthetic impacts by creating, for the first time, detailed policy guidance to affirm the quality of new development expected by the community. To the extent that there was little or no general plan guidance in this area, the new policies of the community design element will actually improve environmental conditions. And since the updated general plan does not intensify or change the growth pattern or projections anticipated by the 1989 plan, there is no additional impact in terms of light, glare or visual character. The new plan also makes specific provisions for addressing scenic corridors, which did not exist in the previous plan. Specific responses to a) – d) above follow:

- a) There are no such identified scenic vistas, although the plan itself establishes certain scenic corridors and creates new design protections to ensure that they are protected. Existing protections for the Mission District are strengthened by the plan.
- b) No impact – there are no such resources in the city, which is a heavily urbanized and fully built-out community on relatively flat land.
- c) The 1989 plan reduced densities and conformed zoning patterns to general plan goals without providing design guidance to improve the quality of new projects. The new plan puts in place stringent standards to ensure a high quality of architectural and landscape design.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: No significance. The plan provides substantial aesthetic and design improvements that would not occur in the absence of its adoption.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. *Would the project:*

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Background. There are no agricultural land uses in the City with the exception of several small parcels of leased land running under a Southern California Edison easement near San Gabriel's eastern boundary. This area constitutes perhaps 20 acres of land, mostly surrounded by unincorporated residential districts of Los Angeles County. Future development of these lands is limited by the existence of overhead transmission lines, although the property owner has permitted long-term leases and sales of certain parcels subject to the utility's safety restrictions.

Potential Areas of Impact. With the exception of existing parcels zoned for commercial use, the plan retains open space zoning for this corridor and establishes no new policies that would affect agricultural use of those parcels.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: None

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Background. Previous studies, including the 1989 general plan and its environmental documents, have documented the significance of air quality issues. These are elaborated further in the general plan background report.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Background. The city remains, as in 1989, a fully urbanized community without significant open space resources. To the extent that the current plan updates the existing plan, the same assumptions remain in place with respect to biotic resources. Two existing watercourses, the Alhambra Wash and the Rubio Wash, cross the city. Each has been placed in a box culvert as the result of flood control improvements of the 1930s and 1940s. A regional plan has been adopted by the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy to improve habitat and environmental management along stream courses in this watershed. The City has adopted this plan and its environmental review, and is acting as a partner with other cities in implementing the plan.

Potential Areas of Impact:

- a) No such modifications of habitat are proposed.
- b) By adopting the provisions of the regional watershed plan known as *Common Ground*, and embodying various provisions of that plan for improving environmental conditions along the community's water courses, which act as the principal remaining conduit for wildlife movement through an otherwise heavily urbanized environment.
- c) There are no such known wetlands in the City. The City has committed to National Pollution Discharge Elimination Systems and SUSMP (urban stormwater management) standards with respect to the effects of urban runoff on these systems.
- d) The updated plan does add several additional provisions designed to enhance the biological environment, including the acquisition of open space and trails in the conservation, open space, mobility and community design chapters; preservation of watercourses that provide movement for animals; and other provisions.
- e) The proposed update actually strengthens compliance with regional habitat plans. The only such plan in effect is that of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, and this update is designed to specifically implement that document's recommendations concerning urban greening and forestry, open space, and watershed protection.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Background. As the birthplace of the region, San Gabriel is a community of substantial historic significance. The background report, accompanied by an analysis by the City's preservation architect, documents these conditions in greater detail. The 1989 general plan contained few provisions regarding historic resources, and few specific policies designed to establish citywide policy on historic preservation issues. The only existing guidance comes in the form of an existing ordinance providing a limited delay on demolition for specified resources on a City historic register.

Areas of Potential Impact:

- c) No adverse change is anticipated. The proposed update actually significantly strengthens the existing general plan by, for the first time, incorporating a cultural resources chapter that establishes a Citywide commitment to protection of historic and cultural resources. The draft chapter also contains specific provisions for use of the Mills Act and other tax incentives, education and training, façade easements and a toolbox of other preservation and adaptive reuse techniques. As a result, the capability of the City to preserve these features is significantly enhanced. **Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
- d) No adverse change is anticipated. The draft cultural resources chapter also includes specific policies for paleontological and archaeological resources for the first time, requires preservation of significant elements, and established a Citywide commitment to preservation. As a result, the capability of the City to preserve these features is significantly enhanced. **Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
- e) No adverse change is anticipated. The plan actually identifies for the first time potentially significant areas in which the City will seek to preserve such resources. Although there are no changes proposed with respect to patterns of growth, the updated proposal will establish a standard of protection not previously available, and therefore represents a significant action to improve protection of these resources. As a result, the capability of the City to preserve these features is significantly enhanced. **Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
- f) The background report identifies significant potential areas of concern in the neighborhood in and surrounding the Mission District. The proposed general plan commits to preserve these resources, provides for appropriate studies, recovery and protection. As a result, the capability of the City to preserve these features is significantly enhanced. **Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse affects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X		
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X		
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	

Background: San Gabriel's land use pattern has been that of a fully built-out, first-ring suburb for more than 40 years. As a result, the existing pattern of development is already established. The City has previously addressed seismic reinforcement issues, and continues to enforce stringent fire safety and building safety standards by virtue of new codes introduced after the 1989 general plan. The *General Plan Background Report* provides a detailed assessment of these factors and other environmental conditions. For purposes of this analysis, however, the results are summarized below:

Areas of Potential Impact:

- a) i-iv) See background report. In addition to ground shaking associated with Southern California fault systems, recent studies have identified a zone in which liquefaction potential is evident, located generally in the southeastern corner of the City (southeast of Valley Boulevard and extending in a pattern from a point east of Del Mar to the city line, north of the San Bernardino Freeway). To address this issue, the general plan requires new development be accompanied by technical studies (geotechnical and soils reports) designed to measure potential impacts and provide corrective recommendations. **Impact After Mitigation:** Less than significant.
- b) No impact anticipated. The City is fully urbanized and does not have areas in which topsoil conditions are such as to pose a threat.
- c) No impact except as noted for liquefaction as specified above.
- d) No impact anticipated. Background investigation identified no particular sites or zones of concern.

Impact After Mitigation (all factors): Less than significant. The proposed update is based on the same growth assumptions as the 1989 plan, and falls within that plan's targets, but further provides strengthening of environmental policies designed to protect residents from the impacts of soil disturbance, shaking, liquefaction, and other geologic incidents.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Background. The General Plan Background report documents the issue more fully. While the community is part of a larger watershed (San Gabriel River and tributaries) that have historically been rich resources for gravel extraction with additional but insignificant deposits of other minerals, the portions of those streams entering San Gabriel are today fully developed and urbanized, without significant opportunity or potential for recovery of minerals.

Potential Areas of Impact.

- a) No (see above). Community is fully developed with no remaining sites available. Existing watercourses exist only as boxed flood control culverts, with development on both sides.
- b) No (see above). Community is fully developed with no remaining sites available.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: None.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Background. The land use element of the 1989 general plan made significant strides toward establishing reasonable limitations on future growth, setting a 2020 target population of approximately 54,000 residents. The plan continues to be on target with respect to both growth projections and its planned mix of residential, commercial and industrial uses. The Background Report further analyzes land use trends in the City and provides specific recommendations that are built into the policy report and land use map.

Areas of Impact.

- a) The proposal will not divide an established community. We note that during the life of the proposed update, an existing section of railway will be lowered. The rail lowering project will be conducted under a federally funded program that is the subject of an independent environmental review conducted by the regional authority responsible for its construction. The impact of this activity, now coming to fruition, has been documented since the 1970s. The lowering will actually reduce separations by providing safe crossings for residents and emergency vehicles that were not previously in existence. The proposal makes no changes to the location of the rail line itself.
- b) The proposal will not conflict because the plan itself is a technical update that intends to be “self-mitigating,” meaning that the plan itself contains the policies and recommendations necessary to mitigate proposed growth. However, growth levels projected by the plan itself are consistent with (will not exceed) the growth levels set by the 1989 general plan. This includes density and intensity factors proposed under the original plan.
- c) There are no habitat conservation plans in place. The plan is consistent with, and embraces the principles of Common Ground, the regional watershed plan of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers Conservancy.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: None.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Background. The general plan update provides a technical update of the acoustical analyses prepared for the 1989 general plan, and makes additional recommendations to ensure that the impacts of noise are reduced to a level of insignificance.

Areas of Potential Impact.

- a) Less than significant impact. The plan actually refines and strengthens noise protections.
- b) Less than significant impact. The plan builds in new standards, and recommends adoption of stronger zoning standards as well.
- c) Less than significant impact. The plan improves on existing noise standards while not increasing underlying density, intensity or other aspects of land use that contribute to noise.
- d) Less than significant impact. The plan is intended to be self-mitigating, and therefore builds in proposals to keep noise below threshold levels specified in the plan.
- e) No impact. Not applicable: there is no such airport within two miles.
- f) No impact. Not applicable: there is no airstrip in the vicinity.

Impact After Mitigation. Any impacts will be reduced below a level of significance.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Background. The City recently adopted a new housing element that has been certified by State’s Department of Housing and Community Development as being in compliance with State law. The 1989 general plan projected a maximum build out population of approximately 54,000 residents; the City currently stands at approximately 41,000 residents, and the rate of growth has consistently stayed within general plan target levels.

Areas of Potential Impact. The Housing Element calls for a modest level of new residential construction accounting for up to 300 new units over the next five years. That housing plan falls within targets of the 1989 plan for future growth. Virtually all these units would be small-scale, infill sites falling within parameters of the 1989 general plan and current zoning ordinance.

- a) The proposed update does not induce substantial population growth. Population growth would remain within the target ranges set by the 1989 general plan. Level of impact after mitigation will be less than significant.
- b) There is no substantial threat of displacement created by the plan. The plan calls for the addition of units, but does not call for demolition of existing units or neighborhoods. In the case of redevelopment project areas covered under the City’s redevelopment plan, existing law requires that the Agency and City provide suitable replacement housing.
- c) There is no substantial threat of displacement. The plan heavily favors conservation strategies over strategies that would result in displacement. The housing component of the plan has been adopted and certified by the State in 2002.

Level of Impact After Mitigation. None.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: i) Fire protection? ii) Police protection? iii) Schools? iv) Parks? v) Other public facilities?		X		

Background. The 1989 general plan addressed these issues only through the prism of land use and the required open space and public safety chapters. Although the new plan changes neither the growth goals or targets of the original plan, it does create an additional new Community Facilities chapter to address public services issues.

A detailed analysis of impacts on each of the categories above can be found in the General Plan Background Report, Ingredients for Success.

Areas of Potential Impact. While the original general plan projected a modest level of growth, neither the plan nor environmental impact report fully mitigated that growth by providing for enhancement or replacement of aging facilities. The Background Report documents these deficiencies in detail. To address these concerns, the revised plan includes new policies to provide for future planning, programming and funding for replacement of the obsolete police facility, built in 1962; two fire stations, each of which is now undersized for current equipment needs and is in need of modification or replacement; and provisions for replacement, renovation and enhancement of recreation facilities.

The San Gabriel Unified School District is in the process of implementing a multi-year, school construction and replacement program. The District has been working in cooperation with the City on plans that have resulted in a new campus for Gabrielino High School; significant improvements at Jefferson Middle School; and planned or ongoing improvements at several other campuses.

The general plan anticipates no new growth beyond the 54,000 population projection of the 1989 general plan, and the plan makes no recommendations to provide new facilities sufficient to induce additional growth beyond that level.

Level of Significance After Mitigation. Impacts will be less than significant after mitigation, due to the physical improvements and financing programs called for in the proposed general plan.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?		X		
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

Background. The City is faced by a significant shortage of park, recreation and open space facilities. National Parks and Recreation Standards call for open space/park ratios of up to 10 acres per 1,000 residents – 400 acres for a city the size of San Gabriel. With only 26 acres of parkland and open space in a city of 41,000 residents, there is a marked deficiency that is only partially offset by the existence of a private golf course and a community park (Almansor) in neighboring Alhambra. The 1989 plan made only modest suggestions for improvements.

Areas of Impact:

- a) Although the proposed plan update provides for no additional growth beyond existing targets, demographic shifts suggest that the need for these facilities will increase due to a younger, more multi-cultural population. The update therefore proposes an array of additional strategies to increase park and open space opportunities within the framework of an established, built-out city. These include mini-parks, medians, minor expansions, refurbishment of existing facilities, and other strategies that encourage low-cost, low-impact park facilities. **Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Less than significant, because the plan itself provides increased mitigation of park impacts through techniques such as the imposition of park impact fees.
- b) The plan includes a modest array of new facilities, and identifies target neighborhoods where new facilities are needed. These would be modestly scaled facilities, however due to the cost and limited land availability that prevent acquisition of large new park sites. **Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Less than significant.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant. The plan intends to increase open space levels to an extent greater than the 1989 plan, but does not propose new facilities that would induce or support additional growth beyond 1989 general plan levels. Small-scale park and open space development under this plan will seek only correct existing deficiencies and provide facilities for the modest level of growth anticipated by the 1989 plan.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X		
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X		
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?		X		
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?		X		

Background. The general plan background report supplies detailed analysis of environmental issues associated with the impacts of traffic on San Gabriel. That report in turn relies on two separate reports prepared by Austin-Foust Associates in June, 2002. Their analysis identifies critical circulation issues, particularly with respect to the Valley Boulevard corridor and a significant number of potentially impacted intersections.

Areas of Impact:

- a) The 1989 general plan actually resulted in significant downzoning and reconciliation of zoning and general plan in a manner that would improve circulation. Even so, the regional impacts of traffic continue to impact San Gabriel. See Background Report.
- b) Several intersections in the Valley Boulevard corridor would potentially exceed Level of Service "D" at peak hours. The general plan proposes significant improvements to the circulation strategies of the 1989 plan, including traffic monitoring, traffic calming in residential neighborhoods, capital improvements to the system to better handle projected growth. The plan does not recommend changes in the circulation network that would increase growth, and the plan remains restricted to the land use pattern, intensities and densities established by that plan. The plan also provides for a future planning process in the Valley Boulevard corridor, with separate environmental impact report, to improve traffic conditions and better tie the land use and transportation systems.
- c) No impact; no change is anticipated.
- d) No impact; no change is anticipated.

- e) The plan actually improves emergency access by committing, through its participation in the Alameda Corridor East planning process, for the undergrounding of rail lines over a ten year period. The San Gabriel portion of this plan calls for all major street crossings to be grade separated, enhancing the ability of emergency vehicles to move freely. See Background Report.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: If all recommendations of the plan are adopted and put into place, circulation would remain impacted in the same manner as identified in the 1989 plan, but to a lesser extent because of the addition of new technologies, new infrastructure and new traffic calming strategies that were not anticipated in the 1989 plan. The impacts will still fall within the range of significance established by the environmental report for that plan; and while improved, will not be eliminated.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Background. The 1989 general plan did not contain specific provisions concerning utilities and service except with respect to basic land use requirements. However, the background report of the general plan update includes new chapters documenting the status of these services, and the impacts of existing and planned growth. Several new chapters have been developed to address these issues, including a community facilities chapter and an environmental resources chapter.

Areas of Potential Impact. State law has changed in the past decade to require a more rigorous evaluation of public services and utilities, particularly with respect to the availability of water resources. The general plan update included contact with water and utility suppliers to ensure these resources would be available.

- a) Less than significant impact. The plan update stays within targets set for the 1989 general plan.
- b) Less than significant impact. The plan updates stays within population and growth targets of the 1989 plan, but adds new chapters in the areas of community facilities and environmental resources to provide stronger regulation and better mitigation of growth impacts.
- c) Less than significant impact. The plan does call for studies concerning the status of the existing sewer and storm drain systems to determine levels of needed repair and replacement, but does not propose

new growth inducing lines or mains, or other actions that would increase capacity beyond that provided by the 1989 plan.

- d) Less than significant impact. With fewer than 300 new residential units proposed over the next five years, and the existing general plan limits in place, water service providers indicate that sufficient capacity and availability is present to meet City needs for the life of this plan.
- e) Less than significant impact. The plan makes no changes in density or intensity of land use patterns that would generate either an additional need for capacity beyond that planned in 1989.
- f) Less than significant impact. In addition to existing landfill resources at the Puente Hills Landfill, which has limited capability to accept new deposits, the City has contracted for recycling of its materials through a material recovery facility operated by Athens Disposal Services. Under this program the City expects to divert more than 50% of its refuse from the landfill.
- g) No impact.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Analysis. The proposed general plan update augments and revises a 1989 growth document that made significant changes in San Gabriel's quality of life by reducing the potential levels of growth that were possible under pre-existing general plan and zoning. That document has been implemented successfully through a number of initiatives, including a zoning consistency program, commercial design guidelines, new zoning ordinances, and a strengthened design review process.

As a result, the updated plan – which continues to work within the limitations set by the 1989 plan – will not produce additional new growth, but rather will further refine the City's program by adopting a wide range of programs including enhanced design guidelines, community greening programs, traffic calming and neighborhood investment strategies, open space and enhanced capital facilities. New capital facilities are planned only to address the obsolescence of certain existing facilities and do not include facilities designed to increase growth above the target levels of the 1989 plan.

Because the plan continues to work within the boundaries of the 1989 plan and EIR – and actually imposes stringent new policies and standards – the updated plan will continue to have a less than significant impact on the environment.

Mandatory Findings Analysis.

- a) The proposed general plan update actually improves the environment by significantly increasing the level of environmental, design and other controls; developing community greening strategies; and substantially enhancing the policies of the 1989 general plan.
- b) The level of cumulative impacts is limited by the goals, policies, targets, density/intensity and population factors set in the 1989 general plan. The general plan update maintains these same parameters, but increases the level and quality of programs designed to protect the City's environment.
- c) No. The plan retains the same principles in limiting growth to reasonable levels; maintains the same target population (54,000), density and development intensity factors; and increases the protections of the plan in the areas of traffic, noise, and cultural resources. The plan adds new policies to promote open space and design quality.

Sources Consulted

PUBLICATIONS

Cantrell, Roger, AIA, AICP. *Design Guidelines: Commercial, Industrial, Institutional*. San Gabriel, CA: City of San Gabriel, 2002.

CBA (Cotton Bridges Associates) and Community Development Department, City of San Gabriel. *Housing Element 1999-2005*. San Gabriel, CA: City of San Gabriel, 2002.

Community Development Department, City of San Gabriel. *Ingredients for Success: General Plan Background Report*. City of San Gabriel, 2002. This is the preliminary report for the planning process, which updates key data and provides an overview of issues and opportunities for preparation of the general plan document; it also serves as the environmental background report for the project.

Office of Planning and Research, State of California. *General Plan Guidelines*. Sacramento: Office of Planning and Research.

Willdan Associates. *Vision 2020: City of San Gabriel General Plan*. City of San Gabriel, 1989. This is the underlying general plan which is updated in the proposed general plan update.