

Section 6

Additional Analyses

This section contains additional environmental analyses required in the State CEQA Guidelines for environmental impact reports.

6.1 ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR consider a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project that can attain most of the basic project objectives, but has the potential to reduce or eliminate significant adverse impacts of the proposed project and may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner, considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved. As presented in Section 2, the Vision for the Master Plan (Proposed Project) is:

The San Gabriel River will be the corridor of an integrated watershed system while providing protection, benefit and enjoyment to the public.

The following goals of the Master Plan support the vision for the San Gabriel River:

1. Habitat: Preserve and enhance habitat systems through public education, connectivity, and balance with other uses.
2. Recreation: Encourage and enhance safe and diverse recreation systems, while providing for expansion, equitable and sufficient access, balance, and multi-purpose uses.
3. Open Space: Enhance and protect open space systems through conservation, aesthetics, connectivity, stewardship, and multi-purpose uses.
4. Flood Protection: Maintain flood protection and existing water and other rights while enhancing flood management activities through the integration with recreation, open space, and habitat systems.
5. Water Supply and Water Quality: Maintain existing water and other rights while enhancing water quality, water supply, groundwater recharge, and water conservation through the integration with recreation, open space, and habitat systems.
6. Economic Development: Pursue economic development opportunities derived from and compatible with the natural aesthetic and environmental qualities of the river.

An EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.6(a), (d) and (e)). If certain alternatives are found to be infeasible, the analysis must explain the reasons and facts supporting that conclusion. Section 15126.6(d) also requires that, if an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those caused by the proposed project, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed. One of the alternatives analyzed must be

Section 6 - Additional Analyses

the “No Project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)). The EIR must also identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and should briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)).

The Master Plan document does not detail any alternatives. Therefore, for the purposes of EIR analysis, this section evaluates the environmental effects of the following alternatives to the Master Plan:

- No Project
- Maximum Habitat Alternative
- Maximum Recreation Alternative
- Maximum Master Plan
- Specific Alternatives for Individual Master Plan Elements

6.1.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative under CEQA represents what is reasonably expected to occur in the future given well-defined trends and other parameters, such as adopted or on-going plans and programs (e.g., general plans and population projections), in the absence of the proposed project.

This section presents the following:

- No Project analysis for the overall Master Plan, which is the continuation of projects under the existing general plans and land use policies of the municipalities in the study area; and
- No Project analysis for the Concept Design Studies
 - Implementation of the Concept Design Studies without the Master Plan
 - “No build” assumption for the Concept Design Studies

6.1.1.1 No Project Analysis for the Overall Master Plan

In the absence of the Master Plan, the existing general plans and land use policies of the municipalities in the study area would continue to be in place (and updated as necessary), and apply to various types of projects implemented along the river corridor. A review of the Geographic Information System (GIS) database (accessed April, 2004) of general plan land use designations collected by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) was conducted to describe the types of general land use designations within the Master Plan study area (1-mile wide corridor along 58 river miles of the San Gabriel River from its headwaters in the San Gabriel Mountains to its terminus at the Pacific Ocean) (see **Table 6-1**). In the absence of the Master Plan, restoration and enhancement projects with a nexus to the river could be proposed for areas within any of these land use designations.

**Table 6-1
General Plan Land Use Designations in the Master Plan Study Area
by Area and Percentage**

General Plan Land Use Designation Type*	Approximate Area (Square Miles)	Approximate Percent of Total
Public Facilities	0.2	<1 %
Open Space/Parks	8.6	14 %
Industrial	12.1	20 %
Residential	32.5	54 %
Transportation	5.4	9 %
Commercial	0.7	1 %
Other/Mixed Use	1.1	2 %
Total	60.5	100 %

Source: Developed from SCAG GIS Database, accessed April 2004.

* Various names of general plan land use categories used by different jurisdictions were grouped and standardized into the land use designation types shown.

Under the No Project alternative, the 134 river corridor enhancement projects proposed or planned by stakeholders and identified in the Master Plan action grid would most likely still be implemented by their respective project leads. Other restoration projects in the river corridor not currently listed in the action grid are also anticipated. In the absence of the Master Plan, implementation of each project would be subject to a variety of local, state, and federal regulatory processes, including the existing general plan land use designations of the relevant municipality, as is currently the case. In addition, other projects of various types (those not identified in the Master Plan action grid, such as a housing development) would be implemented and would be subject to the same existing processes.

The Master Plan does not involve any modifications to existing general plans or other land use policies/regulations of the local jurisdictions within the study area. Therefore, under both the Proposed Project and the No Project alternative, the existing land use policies and regulations would continue to guide development within the Master Plan study area.

However, under the No Project alternative there would not be any unifying planning process or Master Plan document to guide future projects in the river corridor. In the absence of the Master Plan, future projects would not be compared to the objectives and performance criteria defined in the Master Plan, and the individual projects may not properly consider the design guidelines advocated by the Master Plan. Therefore, the focus of the Master Plan on integration and multi-use would be lost. Similarly, a facilitated mechanism for information sharing, building on past experience, public education, integration of monitoring systems and cost sharing (including coordination of grant applications) would not exist. Under No Project, no momentum for restoration efforts along the San Gabriel River would be built. Without the Master Plan, identification of opportunities for new river corridor enhancement projects may also be reduced since the spatial analysis and mapping completed for the project would not be widely adopted.

Section 6 - Additional Analyses

Under the No Project alternative, the environmental benefits that would result from the collaborative process and the multi-objective planning approach advocated by the Master Plan would be reduced as described below for specific resource areas:

- Biological resources – reduced consistency of restoration projects, possible reduction in the use of native species and therefore reduced habitat values, no planned wildlife corridors or linkages would be established, reduced coordination for invasive species removal and therefore potentially reduced success of individual efforts
- Recreation – reduced integration of trails and reduced focus on underserved areas
- Open space – reduced integration of land acquisition, potentially reduced coordination of clean-up efforts
- Water resources – elimination of another coordination mechanism for TMDL and NPDES processes
- Aesthetics – reduced potential for common design elements for signs, fences, gates, etc.

Therefore, the No Project alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

6.1.1.2 No Project Alternative for the Concept Design Studies

The purpose of the Master Plan Concept Design Studies is to illustrate how the Master Plan goals of habitat, recreation and open space can be simultaneously accomplished. The five Concept Design Studies were selected from projects that had already been planned or proposed by various stakeholders along the river corridor. During the Master Plan planning process, the Steering Committee members participated in the selection of the Concept Design Studies (based on the process and selection criteria described in **Section 3.3.2.3**) and also provided input regarding the potential elements of the Concept Design Studies. This participation process and input by the Steering Committee members (and the resultant momentum for the project leads to implement the project) would not have taken place without the Master Plan planning process; however, the Concept Design Studies as projects would have eventually been implemented by their respective project leads in some form even without the Master Plan.

The design of each Concept Design Study as described in the Master Plan is preliminary and conceptual, and each project lead is conducting additional planning to further develop the project. While the effect of the Master Plan's participatory process on the final project description of the Concept Design Studies is not known, it is assumed that, without the Master Plan, the individual projects may not reflect the design guidelines or multi-use approach advocated by the Master Plan. However, implementation of the Concept Design Studies in the absence of the Master Plan would be expected to have the same or similar environmental impacts as detailed in **Sections 4.1** through **4.11**.

A second type of No Project alternative for the Concept Design Studies involves the “no build” assumption. Under the “no build” assumption, the Concept Design Study projects would not be implemented in any form. Since all five Concept Design Studies involve use of publicly owned properties and there is no reasonably predictable development proposed by others, the existing

uses are assumed to continue at all five sites under the “no build” assumption as described in **Table 6-2**.

Table 6-2
“No Build” Assumptions for the Concept Design Study Sites

Concept Design Study Site (Jurisdiction)	Zoning Designation*	General Plan Land Use Designation	Existing Use and Assumed Continued Use under the “No Build” Assumption
San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds (City of Azusa)	C-3 and W	Conservation and Open Space	Public facilities (LADPW spreading grounds; City of Azusa water tanks, wells, and pumps)
Woodland Duck Farm (County of Los Angeles and City of Industry)	A-1, C-1, and M	Open Space, Recreation, and Low-Density Residential	Vacant and recreation (equestrian center)
San Gabriel River Discovery Center (County of Los Angeles)	O-S, A-1, and A-2	Open Space	Recreation and open space within Whittier Narrows flood control basin
Lario Creek (County of Los Angeles)	O-S, A-1, and A-2	Open Space	Public facilities, recreation, and open space Whittier Narrows flood control basin
El Dorado Regional Park (City of Long Beach)	P	Open Space and Park	Public park

* Zoning Designations (see also Section 4.7)

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| A-1: Light Agricultural | M: Industrial |
| A-2: Heavy Agricultural | O-S: Open Space |
| C-1: Restricted Business | P: Park |
| C-3: Commercial | W: Water Conservation |

Under a “no build” No Project alternative for the Concept Design Studies, environmental impacts (primarily temporary impacts associated with construction of new facilities) associated with development of the sites would not occur (see Section header “Impacts of Implementing the Concept Design Studies” in **Sections 4.1 through 4.11**). For example, air pollutant emissions, noise, and traffic associated with earthwork and installation of new facilities at each of the sites would not occur. However, the No Project alternative with the “no build” assumption for the Concept Design Studies would not result in the beneficial effects described for the Concept Design Studies or meet project objectives since continuation of existing uses at the Concept Design Study sites would not result in enhancement of habitat, open space, recreation, flood protection, water quality, or water supply. Therefore, the No Project alternative for the Concept Design Studies is identified as environmentally inferior to the Proposed Project.

6.1.2 Maximum Habitat Alternative

The proposed Master Plan is designed to integrate and balance the goals established in the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors’ resolution (habitat, recreation, and open space) and the additional goals identified by the Steering Committee (flood protection, water supply and water quality, and economic development). In contrast, the Maximum Habitat Alternative places the primary focus on meeting the habitat objective. This alternative de-emphasizes the recreation

Section 6 - Additional Analyses

element since certain forms of recreation (particularly active recreation) are generally not compatible with habitat preservation and enhancement. This alternative was defined to avoid or reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed project related to: traffic, air pollutant emissions, and noise from active recreational use (as described in **Sections 4.11.4, 4.1.3, and 4.8.4**); trampling of vegetation and disturbance to nesting behavior from human activities (as described in **Section 4.2.5**); and increases in stormwater runoff from creation of new parking lots at new parks (as described in **Section 4.6.3**). Under the Maximum Habitat Alternative, each future Master Plan project would maximize the opportunities for habitat preservation and enhancement available at each site. The recreation component of each project would consist mostly of passive forms of recreation that are compatible with the habitat component of the project (e.g., bird watching, wildlife appreciation, etc.). Active recreation (e.g., extensive trails, sports fields) that involves more intense human activity would not be incorporated into project design or would be minimized. This alternative is therefore defined as the River Corridor Master Plan which includes only the Habitat and Open Space elements (goals), objectives, and performance criteria (see **Tables 3-1 and 3-3 in Section 3**).

Adverse impacts identified for the Proposed Project are primarily temporary impacts related to construction of new facilities. It is anticipated that impacts for all environmental topics would be less than significant after incorporation of mitigation. Therefore, this alternative does not avoid any significant unmitigable impacts identified for the Proposed Project but would have greater beneficial impacts on biological resources than the proposed Master Plan by encouraging a greater number of projects to maximize habitat enhancement and preservation of open space. The Maximum Habitat Alternative would mostly avoid potentially adverse impacts associated with the Recreation, Flood Protection, Water Quality, and Economic Development Elements (see tables summarizing the Impacts from Adopting the Master Plan Elements in **Sections 4.1 through 4.11**). This alternative would largely avoid the traffic, noise, and air pollutant emissions related to an increase in recreational visitor trips associated with active recreation. It would also minimize the potential for trampling of vegetation and disturbance to nesting behavior from human activities and mostly eliminate the need for new parking lots at parks thus avoiding increases in impervious surface area which increase stormwater runoff.

For this reason, and since this alternative would maximize habitat restoration efforts within the river corridor resulting in greater beneficial impacts on biological resources, it can be considered the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative would not encourage projects that provide active recreation to the communities along the river thus not meeting the Master Plan objectives to encourage and enhance *diverse* recreation systems. Where there are existing deficiencies in recreational resources, this alternative would fail to provide for expansion, equitable and sufficient access, balance and multi-purpose uses. Since it would fail to meet the goal of balancing habitat, recreation, and open space, as intended by the Board of Supervisors' resolution and as defined by the project objectives, it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.

6.1.3 Maximum Recreation Alternative

The Proposed Project is designed to integrate and balance the goals established in the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors' resolution (habitat, recreation, and open space) and the additional goals identified by the Steering Committee (flood protection, water supply and water

quality, and economic development). In contrast, the Maximum Recreation Alternative places the primary focus on meeting the recreation objective, particularly through provision of opportunities for active recreation (e.g., development of sports fields). This alternative also de-emphasizes the habitat element since habitat enhancement and preservation are generally not compatible with active recreation. This alternative was defined to avoid or reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed project related to creation of mosquito habitat and increase in liquefaction hazard from development of stormwater retention facilities (as described in **Sections 4.5.3 and 4.6.3**). Under the Maximum Recreation Alternative, each future Master Plan project would maximize the opportunities for providing recreational facilities, particularly those for active forms of recreation. The habitat component of each project would consist of landscaping, tree planting, and other forms of enhancements that are compatible with human activities. Restoration of habitat for sensitive species, for example, would be avoided or minimized under this alternative, since it would be incompatible with the more intense human activity associated with active recreation. This alternative is therefore defined as the River Corridor Master Plan which includes only the Recreation element (goal), objectives, and performance criteria (see **Table 3-2 in Section 3**).

Adverse impacts identified for the Proposed Project are primarily temporary impacts related to construction of new facilities. It is anticipated that impacts for all environmental topics would be less than significant after incorporation of mitigation. Therefore, this alternative does not avoid any significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project but would have greater beneficial impacts on recreation than the proposed Master Plan by encouraging a greater number of projects to maximize recreational opportunities. The Maximum Recreation Alternative would mostly avoid potentially adverse impacts associated with the Habitat, Open Space, Flood Protection, Water Quality, and Economic Development Elements (see tables summarizing the Impacts from Adopting the Master Plan Elements in **Sections 4.1 through 4.11**). This alternative would avoid impacts associated with development of stormwater retention facilities such as an increase in mosquito breeding habitat or potential liquefaction concerns. However, this alternative would have increased operational impacts on traffic, air quality, and noise associated with recreational visitors as compared to the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would not encourage projects that provide habitat restoration and preservation of open space, reducing beneficial impacts on biological resources thus not meeting the Master Plan objectives to preserve and enhance habitat systems. Where there are existing degraded habitats, this alternative would fail to provide for public education, connectivity, and balance with other uses. Since it would fail to meet the goal of balancing habitat, recreation, and open space, as intended by the Board of Supervisors' resolution and as defined by the project objectives, it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.

6.1.4 Maximum Master Plan

An alternative approach for the Master Plan that would meet the overall vision defined by the Steering Committee could be termed the "Maximum Master Plan". Under this alternative, the goal of the Master Plan would be to restore the river to a more natural state reminiscent of its condition prior to urban development. This alternative could include removal of the engineered features currently found on the river, including the dams and concrete- or riprap-lined channels that provide flood control and water supply benefits. Concrete removal would increase the roughness of the channel, which would increase the area required to convey the same amount of

Section 6 - Additional Analyses

flow. Without the concrete and riprap currently in place, vegetation growth would also increase, further limiting the capacity of the river to convey flood flows. Therefore, removal of concrete to re-naturalize the river would result in:

1. Significant flooding impacts from decreased flood control capacity currently designed into the system, or
2. Significant land use changes from expansion of the floodplain to accommodate flood flows, for example, the displacement of existing residential, commercial, and industrial land uses through building demolition and replacement with open space.

This alternative was not designed to and does not avoid any significant impact identified for the Proposed Project but could maximize beneficial impacts on biological resources, recreation, and open space. However, this alternative would have significant impacts on water supply, flooding, land use, population, and housing. Implementation of this alternative is therefore not environmentally superior to the Proposed Project and, at this time, is considered infeasible.

6.1.5 Specific Alternatives for Individual Master Plan Projects

For many of the future Master Plan projects, more than one project description will be considered. These alternatives may focus on balancing project objectives at specific sites. For example, recreation areas at the Woodland Duck Farm could be developed for active (e.g., soccer fields) or passive (e.g., open space) opportunities. Other alternatives will focus on operational issues. For example, two alternatives for modification of Lario Creek were initially defined: a dual flow model and a dual channel model (see **Section 3.3.3.4**). Overall, future definition of component-specific alternatives will focus on balancing the multiple uses of the sites to accommodate various interests and maximize beneficial effects.

6.2 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR should discuss "...the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment." Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including through the elimination of obstacles to growth, or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region.

The Proposed Project does not involve construction of new homes or businesses and does not include construction of new, potentially growth-inducing, infrastructure such as roads or potable water or wastewater systems. Minor improvements to existing roadways may be proposed to improve site-specific access and circulation. The Master Plan would encourage projects that include infiltration of stormwater which could increase the volume of available groundwater. Since no new potable water treatment or distribution systems are proposed, this is not considered growth inducing. The Proposed Project would provide recreation and open space benefits to areas that have already been developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Therefore, it would not result in the elimination of obstacles to growth. No growth inducing impacts would occur.

**Table 6-3
Project Consistency with SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide Policies**

No.	Policy	Consistency with San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan
Growth Management Chapter of Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide		
3.03	The timing, financing, and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region’s growth policies.	At this time, phasing and implementation of individual public facilities proposed under the Master Plan are not known. However, since the project is not growth inducing (see Section 6.2), it will not conflict with growth policies for the region. Construction and operation of the project will provide a limited number of both temporary and permanent jobs but is unlikely to impact housing.
3.18	Encourage planned development in locations least likely to cause adverse environmental impact.	The project includes development of public facilities including trails, education centers, parks, open space, and stormwater management facilities. The project is designed to enhance environmental conditions. For potentially adverse effects (especially those related to construction), mitigation measures are proposed where feasible. The Proposed Project does not involve development of residential, commercial, or industrial facilities.
3.22	Discourage development, or encourage the use of special design requirements, in areas with steep slopes, high fire, flood, and seismic hazards.	The Proposed Project includes educational centers but does not include construction of any residences. All structures (buildings, pipelines, retention basins, etc.) will be constructed in consideration of site specific slope, fire, and seismic hazards. Regarding flood protection, one of the Master Plan goals is to: “Maintain flood protection and existing water and other rights while enhancing flood management activities through the integration with recreation, open space and habitat systems.”
3.23	Encourage mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards, minimize earthquake damage, and to develop emergency response and recovery plans.	Program-level and site-specific mitigation measures for these resource topics have been identified in the Program EIR (see Sections 4.2, 4.4 and 4.8). Additional site-specific mitigation measures will be developed in second-tier environmental documents as necessary. Additionally, Master Plan goals include: “Preserve and enhance habitat systems through public education, connectivity, and balance with other uses.”
3.27	Support local jurisdictions and other service providers in their efforts to develop sustainable communities and provide, equally to all members of society, accessible and effective services such as: public education, housing, health care, social services, recreational facilities, law enforcement, and fire protection.	The project has been developed in cooperation with and input from the Steering Committee members, whose members includes over 80 municipalities, regulators, service providers, and organizations. The project proposes to provide opportunities for environmental education and recreational facilities to communities throughout the San Gabriel River corridor. See Section 4.10.1 regarding the existing levels of recreational opportunities in the planning area.

6.3 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL AND AREAWIDE PLANNING

CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d) requires that EIRs discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.

6.3.1 Local Zoning and General Plans

The corridor for the Master Plan transverses numerous municipalities. Site-specific analysis will be necessary for each individual project component to compare the zoning and land use of the site with the proposed use. The consistency of the Master Plan with applicable local plans is presented in **Section 4.7**. The types of general land use designations within the Master Plan study area are described in **Section 6.1.1**. As an environmentally beneficial project, most elements are anticipated to be consistent with local planning. For example, public facilities such as parks and open space are consistent with most land use and zone designations. In locations where proposed uses are not expressly allowed, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or zoning variance may be required for implementation of the specific component.

6.3.2 Air Quality Management Plan

As discussed in **Sections 4.1** and **6.2**, the project does not include development of housing or employment centers, and would not induce population or significant employment growth. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan developed by the SCAQMD.

6.3.3 SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the metropolitan planning organization for six southern California counties: Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. SCAG is mandated by both the federal and state governments to plan for transportation, growth management, hazardous waste management, and air quality throughout the region. As part of its mandate, SCAG develops demographic projections of each city and unincorporated community within its planning area. The Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), published by SCAG, is intended to serve the region as a framework for decision-making with respect to the growth and changes that can be anticipated during the next 20 years and beyond (SCAG, 1996).

The proposed Master Plan is considered a regionally significant project by SCAG (see SCAG NOP letter in **Appendix B**). **Table 6-3** summarizes RCPG policies potentially relevant to the Master Plan. As an environmentally beneficial project, the project is considered to be consistent or neutral with regard to RCPG policies.

Table 6-3 (Continued)
Project Consistency with SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide Policies

No.	Policy	Consistency with San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan
9.05	Minimize potentially hazardous developments in hillsides, canyons, areas susceptible to flooding, earthquakes, wildfire and other known hazards, and areas with limited access for emergency equipment.	The proposed project includes educational centers but does not include construction of any residences. All structures (buildings, pipelines, retention basins, etc.) will be constructed in consideration of site specific fire, flood and seismic hazards. As described in the Master Plan goals, project elements will be designed to maintain existing levels of flood protection.
9.06	Minimize public expenditure for infrastructure and facilities to support urban type uses in areas where public health and safety could not be guaranteed.	The project involves construction of recreational, educational, open space, and water resources facilities throughout an existing urban corridor.
9.07	Maintain adequate viable resource production land, particularly lands devoted to commercial agriculture and mining operations.	<p>Aside from plant nurseries, lands in agricultural production are not present in the planning area. For the project elements identified to date, one plant nursery (at Woodland Duck Farm) may be impacted. This property is leased by the nursery operator. Since this nursery could be relocated, the change in land use at this project site is not considered to significantly impact viable resource production land.</p> <p>Development of project elements at existing gravel mines has not yet been specifically defined. Future elements could include multi-use stormwater management and recreational facilities at these sites as part of closure procedures for the mines.</p>
9.08	Develop well-managed viable ecosystems or known habitats of rare, threatened and endangered species, including wetlands.	The project includes development of wetlands at numerous sites (e.g., Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park) and other enhancements of wildlife habitat areas (e.g., exotics removal or revegetation).
Water Quality Chapter Recommendations and Policy Options		
11.02	Encourage “watershed management” programs and strategies, recognizing the primary role of government in such efforts.	As described in Section 2 , the vision and goals of the Master Plan are to develop the river corridor as an integrated watershed system that enhances habitat, provides recreational benefits, and protects open space while maintaining and enhancing flood protection and water resources. As listed in Table 2-1 , the project is a cooperative effort involving numerous governmental agencies.
11.03	Coordinate watershed management planning at the sub-regional level by: (1) providing consistent regional data; (2) serving as a liaison between affected local, state, and federal watershed management agencies; and (3) ensuring that watershed planning is consistent with other planning objectives (e.g., transportation, air quality, and water supply).	The project has been developed in cooperation with and input from the Steering Committee members, who represent over 80 federal, state, and local agencies and groups related to natural resources management.

Table 6-3 (Continued)
Project Consistency with SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide Policies

No.	Policy	Consistency with San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan
11.05	Support regional efforts to identify and cooperatively plan for wetlands to facilitate both sustaining the amount and quality of wetlands in the region and expediting the process for obtaining wetlands permits.	The project includes development of wetlands at numerous sites (e.g., Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park) and other enhancements of wildlife habitat areas (e.g., exotics removal or revegetation).
11.07	Encourage water reclamation throughout the region where it is cost-effective, feasible, and appropriate to reduce reliance on imported water and wastewater discharges. Current administrative impediments to increase use of wastewater should be addressed.	<p>Project goals include: “Maintain existing water and other rights while enhancing water quality, water supply, groundwater recharge, and water conservation through the integration with recreation, open space, and habitat systems.” For example, the project includes replacement of the water supply for the lakes at El Dorado Regional Park with a non-potable source.</p> <p>Additionally, implementation of some of the Master Plan elements will increase local groundwater supply by infiltrating stormwater in stormwater management facilities.</p>

Source of Policies: SCAG, 1996 and SCAG comment letter on the NOP dated May 7, 2003 (see **Appendix B**).

Table 6-3 (Continued)
Project Consistency with SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide Policies

No.	Policy	Consistency with San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan
Regional Transportation Plan Policies		
4.02	Transportation investments shall mitigate environmental impacts to an acceptable level.	The Proposed Project includes improvements to existing, and installation of new, facilities to increase the connectivity of bicycle and pedestrian transportation systems (bridges, trails, gateways, and access points). Aside from the addition of new parking, the project does not expand the capacity of motor vehicle transportation systems. At some locations (e.g., Woodland Duck Farm) improvements to vehicle access points to improve circulation are proposed. Construction of project elements would result in temporary traffic impacts. Mitigation measures are identified in Section 4.11 to minimize these effects.
4.04	Transportation Control Measures shall be a priority.	
4.16	Maintaining and operating the existing transportation system will be a priority over expanding capacity.	
Air Quality Chapter Core Actions		
5.07	Determine specific programs and associated actions needed (e.g., indirect source rules, enhanced use of telecommunications, provision of community based shuttle services, provision of demand management based programs, or vehicle-miles-traveled/emission fees) so that options to command and control regulations can be assessed.	Project-related adverse impacts on air quality and transportation would be mostly limited to short-term construction impacts. Air quality is discussed in Section 4.1 and Transportation is discussed in Section 4.11 . Mitigation measures are identified in both sections in order to reduce project-related effects. Indirectly, project-related improvements in trail systems could have a beneficial impact on air quality by increasing pedestrian and bicycle travel. Land use issues are discussed in Section 4.7 .
5.11	Through the environmental document review process, ensure that plans at all levels of government (regional, air basin, county, sub-regional and local) consider air quality, land use, transportation and economic relationships to ensure consistency and minimize conflicts.	
Open Space Chapter Ancillary Goals		
9.01	Provide adequate land resources to meet the outdoor recreation needs of the present and future residents in the region and to promote tourism in the region.	The Proposed Project includes development of new parks, playgrounds, greenways, and natural areas along the San Gabriel River. Access to existing and proposed facilities would be enhanced by the proposed improvements to trails, fencing, bridges and gateways.
9.02	Increase the accessibility to open space lands for outdoor recreation.	
9.03	Promote self-sustaining regional recreation resources and facilities.	
9.04	Maintain open space for adequate protection of lives and properties against natural and man-made hazards.	

6.4 PROJECT IMPACT SUMMARY

6.4.1 Significant, Irreversible Environmental Changes

CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15126 and 15127) require that an EIR identify any significant irreversible changes that would result from project implementation. Section 15126.2(c) of CEQA Guidelines provides guidance as to what sorts of changes might be considered irreversible. Such changes include commitment of nonrenewable resources to uses that future generations will probably be unable to reverse and environmental accidents that could occur as a result of the project.

No significant, irreversible impacts have been identified for the Master Plan. Construction of the project components and, to a lesser extent project maintenance, would result in the consumption of nonrenewable vehicle and equipment fuels. However, the volume of this fuel use is considered limited and less than significant. Additionally, mitigation measure A-14 (Section 4.1) will be considered by the County during the implementation of components with more extensive construction. This measure calls for the use of alternative fuel vehicles and equipment to the extent feasible and would reduce the unavoidable consumption of traditional fossil fuels from implementation of the project.

6.4.2 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

An EIR must address any significant effect on the environment that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented (Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(2)(B)). Based on the programmatic analyses presented in this document, adoption and implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not result in significant unavoidable impacts on the environment. It is anticipated that mitigation measures will be identified in second-tier CEQA documents for each of the project components that would reduce adverse environmental impacts (mostly related to short-term construction effects) to less than significant levels.

6.4.3 Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

Table 6-4 summarizes potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project found to be less than significant, as well as beneficial impacts and impacts mitigated to levels of less than significant, as required by Public Resources Code section 21100(c).

**Table 6-4
Summary of Less than Significant Impacts**

Topic	Beneficial Impact	Less than Significant Impact		Potentially Significant Impact but Mitigation Identified to Reduce Impacts Below a Level of Significance
		No Mitigation Proposed	Mitigation Identified to Further Reduce Adverse Effects	
Aesthetics	X	X		
Agricultural Resources		X		
Air Quality		X	X	X
Biological Resources	X	X	X	X
Cultural Resources		X	X	X
Geology and Soils		X		X
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		X		X
Hydrology and Water Quality	X	X	X	X
Land Use	X	X		
Mineral Resources		X		X
Noise		X		X
Population and Housing		X		
Public Services		X	X	X
Recreation	X	X		X
Traffic and Transportation		X	X	X
Utilities		X	X	X