

CITY OF SOUTH GATE  
**GENERAL PLAN SAFETY ELEMENT**  
**UPDATE**

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

*Prepared for:*

CITY OF SOUTH GATE  
8650 CALIFORNIA AVENUE  
SOUTH GATE, CA 90280

*Prepared by:*

**Michael Baker**

**I N T E R N A T I O N A L**

3900 KILROY AIRPORT WAY, SUITE 120  
LONG BEACH, CA 90806

**JULY 2017**



---

CITY OF SOUTH GATE  
**GENERAL PLAN SAFETY ELEMENT UPDATE**  
DRAFT INITIAL STUDY / NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

*Prepared for:*

CITY OF SOUTH GATE  
8650 CALIFORNIA AVENUE  
SOUTH GATE, CA 90280

*Prepared by:*

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL  
3900 KILROY AIRPORT WAY, SUITE 120  
LONG BEACH, CA 90806

**JULY 2017**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

Environmental Checklist Form..... 1.0-1  
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected ..... 1.0-4  
Determination (to be completed by the lead agency) ..... 1.0-5

**2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

I. Aesthetics..... 2.0-1  
ii. Agriculture Resources..... 2.0-2  
Iii. Air Quality. .... 2.0-3  
Iv. Biological Resources ..... 2.0-4  
V. Cultural Resources ..... 2.0-6  
Vi. Geology and Soils ..... 2.0-7  
Vii. Greenhouse Gas Emissions..... 2.0-10  
Viii. Hazards and Hazardous Materials ..... 2.0-11  
Ix. Hydrology and Water Quality ..... 2.0-14  
X. Land Use and Planning ..... 2.0-17  
Xi. Mineral Resources ..... 2.0-18  
Xii. Noise ..... 2.0-19  
Xiii. Population and Housing ..... 2.0-20  
Xiv. Public Services ..... 2.0-21  
Xv. Recreation. .... 2.0-22  
Xvi. Transportation/Traffic..... 2.0-23  
Xvii. Utilities And Service Systems..... 2.0-25  
Xviii. Mandatory Findings Of Significance ..... 2.0-26

**3.0 REFERENCES**

References..... 3.0-1

**FIGURES**

Figure 1 Project Location..... 1.0-3

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: General Plan Safety Element Update
2. Lead agency name and address: City of South Gate  
8650 California Avenue  
South Gate, CA 90280
3. Contact person and phone number: Alvaro Betancourt  
8650 California Avenue  
South Gate, CA 90280  
323-563-9526
4. Project location: South Gate (citywide)
5. Project sponsor's name and address: City of South Gate Planning Division
6. General Plan designation: Not applicable
7. Zoning: Not applicable
8. Description of project:

The Safety Element is a mandatory element of the General Plan required by Senate Bill (SB) 351, an act that became law on February 23, 1971. Originally addressed in two separate elements of the General Plan, the Safety Element and Seismic Safety Element were combined into one element (the Safety Element) under California Government Code Article 5-65302 (1986). This update is intended to supersede and combine the existing Seismic Safety Element, which was adopted in 1974, and the Safety Element, which was adopted in 1975.

The purpose of the General Plan Safety Element is to identify natural or human activity-related hazards that exist in South Gate and to define policy objectives and implementation actions to address them. Some naturally occurring hazards may be unavoidable, but the potential impact on South Gate can be reduced through advance planning and preparation. The Safety Element addresses geologic, seismic, flood, and fire hazards, as well as hazards created by human activity such as hazardous materials and incidents that call for emergency protection. The Safety Element describes the City's efforts to prepare for and respond to emergencies.

**1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

---

In addition to the Safety Element, the City has updated and adopted the South Gate Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP). The LHMP includes an assessment of the City's risk related to natural hazard impacts such as drought, seismic events, extreme heat, and flooding. The LHMP also includes a comprehensive set of actions the City will complete to mitigate, or reduce, the impacts of those hazards.

As an adopted element of the General Plan, the Safety Element is consistent with and supports the other General Plan elements. Other elements in the General Plan also address safety and hazards-related issues. Primary supportive elements include the Public Facilities and Services Element, Healthy Community Element, and Green City Element. Where relevant, the Safety Element references key goals and policies from across the General Plan that address public safety. This element also summarizes key issues on land use and development patterns addressed elsewhere in the General Plan.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

South Gate is a city of approximately 96,547 residents located 8 miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles in Los Angeles County. The city is 7.5 square miles, and hosts a diverse mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and public buildings and land uses. The I-105 freeway is to the south, the I-110 freeway is approximately 3 miles from its western border, and the city is bisected by the I-710 freeway and several freight railroad lines.

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

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration covers all approvals by governmental agencies that may be needed to implement or operate the project. At this time, no discretionary public agency approvals are known to be required for the project, other than those required by the City of South Gate.



FIGURE 1  
PROJECT LOCATION



## 1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

---

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <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 |

**DETERMINATION** (to be completed by the lead agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
  
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
  
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
  
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
  
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

## **1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

**DISCUSSION:**

a-d) **No Impact.** This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area in the city. The goals and policies in the General Plan Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction in potentially hazardous areas of the city is implemented safely. As such, implementation of the Safety Element is not anticipated to have a negative impact on aesthetics, as it does not propose any projects, programs, or actions that could reasonably be expected to adversely affect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources, degrade the visual character of any sites, or create substantial light or glare. No impacts to aesthetics would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION:

- a-b) **No Impact.** According to the City of South Gate Zoning Map (updated March 2015), there are no agricultural zones in the city. No impact to agricultural resources would occur.
- c-d) **No Impact.** There is no timberland or Timberland Production zones in the City of South Gate; therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of forestland, timberland, or Timberland Production areas. No impact would occur.

e) **No Impact.** There are no agricultural or forest resources in South Gate; therefore, no impacts related to the conversion of such resources would occur (DOC 2014).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a-e) **No Impact.** The updated Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, fundamentally change an area in the city, or require any revisions to zoned density or land use designation for any parcel. As such, implementation of the updated Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in the obstruction of the applicable air quality plan, violate any air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, expose sensitive receptors, or create objectionable odors. As a result, no impact would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION:

a-b) **No Impact.** The city is not located within a biological resource area, and no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities or species are present in the city. The only significant amount of open space in the city is in South Gate Park, which consists mostly of playing fields, recreational buildings, and parking lots, and is completely engulfed in an urban setting. Therefore, no impacts to sensitive species or habitats would occur.



- c-d) **No Impact.** South Gate is not located on any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, as the project does not result in any development or land disturbance, the project will not interfere 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. As a result, no impact would occur.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** South Gate Municipal Code, Chapter 5.33, Tree Preservation and Protection, regulates the planting and maintenance of public trees. Section 5.33.030, Permit Requirements, states, "No person, but for a person undertaking official business for the city of South Gate, shall plant, remove, relocate, damage, excessively prune or cut or encroach into the protected zone or any public tree within the city of South Gate without first obtaining a permit from the director of public works and paying the required fee." Tree removal may be undertaken per the policies of the Safety Element update; however, such removal would be done in accordance with Chapter 5.33 of the South Gate Municipal Code, and impacts would be less than significant. Any future tree removals would follow the requirements of Chapter 5.33 of the South Gate Municipal Code.
- f) **No Impact.** The City does not have an adopted habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION:

- a-d) **No Impact.** The Safety Element update does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, fundamentally change an area in the city, or require any revisions to zoned density or land use designation for any parcel. As such, implementation of the Safety Element update would not propose any actions that would directly result in impacts to areas identified as having the potential for archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, no cultural resources impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a.i) **No Impact.** Fault rupture is caused by the actual breakage of the ground surface overlying a fault as a result of seismic activity. This can range in offsets from less than 1 inch to up to 20 feet, depending on the fault and earthquake magnitude. Under the Alquist-Priolo Act, the California State Geologist identifies areas in the state that are at risk from surface fault rupture. The main purpose of the act is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy where traces of active faults are evident on the earth’s surface. These zones are known as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Impacts resulting from fault

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

rupture generally occur in the immediate vicinity overlying the fault. The zones vary in width, but average about one-quarter mile across. South Gate lies within the South Gate 7.5-minute quadrangle. The South Gate quadrangle has been mapped per the Alquist-Priolo Act. According to this map, South Gate is surrounded by fault zones. Since these fault zones don't traverse the city, impacts associated with surface rupture are not anticipated (CGS 2014).

- a.ii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The city is subject to strong ground shaking, as is all of seismically active Southern California. However, implementation of the goals and policies in the Safety Element would reduce the exposure of people and/or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic-related activity. Implementation of the goals and policies in the Safety Element, along with adherence to the California Building Code, which is adopted by reference by the City of South Gate Municipal Code, Section 9.02.010, would continue to minimize impacts associated with strong ground shaking. Policy 1.1.1 of the Safety Element requires that all new development and remodels meet state and City seismic safety standards, while Policy 1.1.3 provides for the facilitation of seismic retrofits for existing buildings and infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- a.iii, c) **No Impact.** Liquefaction typically occurs when near-surface (usually upper 50 feet) saturated, clean, fine-grained loose sands are subject to intense ground-shaking, causing the soil to lose strength and behave similar to liquid. The potential for liquefaction depends on the magnitude of ground-shaking, groundwater conditions, the relative density of the soils, and the age of site-specific geologic units. Seismic-induced liquefaction occurs when a saturated, granular deposit of low relative density is subject to extreme shaking and loses strength or stiffness due to increased pore water pressure. The consequences of liquefaction are typically characterized by settlement, uplift on structures, and increases in the lateral pressure of buried structures. If building foundations are not designed properly, the effects of severe liquefaction during seismic conditions may result in structural failure, leading to substantial structural damage and injury or loss of life. According to the Alquist-Priolo Map, the City of South Gate is within an area with conditions that could lead to liquefaction; however, groundwater levels beneath the city are approximately 80–100 feet beneath the surface, which reduces the risk significantly. Regardless of the risk, the City regulates construction in compliance with the California Building Code, which is intended to minimize risk associated with liquefaction. Additionally, it is the intent of the Safety Element to reduce potential risks associated with the effects of seismic activities. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- a.iv) **No Impact.** Landslides and other forms of slope failure form in response to the long-term geologic cycle of uplift, mass wasting, and disturbance of slopes. Mass wasting refers to a variety of erosional processes from gradual downhill soil creep to mudslides, debris flows, landslides, and rock fall—processes that are commonly triggered by intense precipitation, which varies according to climatic shifts. Often, various forms of mass wasting are grouped together as landslides, which are generally used to describe the downhill movement of rock and soil. The generally flat topography of South Gate means that there are no designated zones at an elevated risk of landslides. However, the community faces the possibility of small landslides along the Los Angeles River, drainage channels, or other areas where steep slopes occur. The Safety Element does not propose any construction or development projects; rather the intent of the Safety Element is to reduce any risks associated with existing development. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- b, d) **No Impact.** Since the Safety Element update does not propose any construction or development projects, implementation of the updated Safety Element is not anticipated to have negative impacts related to soils and other geologic conditions. On the contrary, the policies and actions in the Safety Element are designed to protect people and structures in the city from geologic hazards. Therefore, no impacts related to the loss of topsoil would occur. Policy 1.1.1 of the Safety Element requires that all new development and remodels meet state and City seismic safety standards, while Policy 1.1.3 provides for the facilitation of seismic retrofits for existing buildings and infrastructure. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** All development in the City of South Gate is connected to the sanitary sewer system. No septic tanks are proposed as part of the Safety Element update. No impact would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

### DISCUSSION:

- a-b) **No Impact.** This update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, and therefore would not result in any greenhouse gas emissions. As such, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

### DISCUSSION:

- a-b) **No Impact.** State and federal laws require all businesses that generate or accumulate hazardous waste to comply with regulations for proper disposal of these wastes. In South Gate, a prime area of concern for hazardous material releases is rail accidents. Three rail lines run through South Gate, carrying anywhere from 4 to 41 trains each day, depending on the line. Trains carrying hazardous materials may use any of these three rail lines, and an accident involving hazardous materials on any of these rail lines may create a health and safety risk in South Gate.

However, the update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or have any effect on areas of the city. Rather, the Safety Element provides policies that would serve to reduce risks from hazardous materials in the City of South Gate. Policy 1.5.2 directs the City to minimize exposure to hazardous materials along truck routes and rail corridors, while Policy 1.5.3 directs South Gate to prepare for hazardous materials incidents. Implementation of the Safety Element would not result in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would it result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, impacts associated with these issue areas would not occur.

- c) **No Impact.** There are nine schools located within city boundaries: San Gabriel Elementary School; Saint Helen School; Victoria Elementary School; Madison Elementary School; Montara Avenue Elementary School; Liberty Boulevard Elementary School; South Region Elementary School; South East High School; and South Gate High School. However, the update to the General Plan Safety Element would not directly result in any development and as a result would not impact schools. In fact, the policies and actions in the Safety Element are designed to protect people in the city from hazard and hazardous materials. As such, no impact would occur.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Cortese List is a compilation of various sites throughout the state that have been compromised due to soil or groundwater contamination from past uses (CalEPA 2014). Based on a review of the Cortese List, the city does not have sites that are:
- Listed as a hazardous waste and substance site by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) (2012a);
  - Listed as a hazardous solid waste disposal site by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB 2014); or
  - Developed with a hazardous waste facility subject to corrective action by the DTSC (SWRCB 2012b).

Several sites in South Gate have known or potential contamination from past activities involving hazardous materials, although none of these meet Cortese List criteria shown above. The DTSC identifies four such facilities in South Gate undergoing cleanup activities as of 2015. Additionally, South Gate has 155 contamination sites, mostly consisting of underground storage tanks. These sites are monitored by the SWRCB due to the potential for contamination of water bodies. The majority of these sites are closed and have undergone cleanup. As of 2015, less than a handful of sites remain that could result in contamination. These remaining sites are in various states of operation, closure, or remediation.



The Safety Element update does not propose actions that will result in development or any activity that would affect these sites. Additionally, Safety Element policies and actions are designed to protect residents, businesses, and government functions from human-caused or technological hazards. As such, this impact is considered less than significant.

- e-f) **No Impact.** The city is not located within an airport land use plan, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in proximity to a private airstrip. As such, there would be no impact.
  
- g) **No Impact.** The City of South Gate is integrated into the regional network of emergency preparation, response, and services, providing the city with access to additional resources and expertise from partner jurisdictions. Safety Element Policy 1.5.7 directs that the City continue to consult and coordinate with Los Angeles County and other regional partners to prepare and respond to hazardous materials events, and Policy 2.1.1 sets forth that the City consult with Los Angeles County and other service providers to achieve optimal allocation of public safety resources and services. Policy 2.1.4 requires that the City establish and maintain clear evacuation routes for potential hazardous events or emergencies. As such, there would be no impact.
  
- h) **Less Than Significant Impact.** South Gate is currently served by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. According to the Los Angeles County Fire Hazard Severity Zones map, the entirety of South Gate lies outside fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2011). Further, the project does not propose actions that would result in any development. Additionally, the updated Safety Element provides policies and actions designed to protect residents, businesses, and government functions from fire-related hazards. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

- a-c) **No Impact.** There is no development and no water demand associated with the adoption of the Safety Element update. The Safety Element has specific policies that reduce the impacts of surface and groundwater contamination, such as Policy 1.5.4. Policy 1.2.5 requires that new projects and remodels use low-impact development techniques that limit paving and hardscape while increasing on-site stormwater retention. Implementation of these policies and compliance with federal and state regulations would ensure that no impact would occur.
- d) **No Impact.** Although the Los Angeles River and the Rio Honda drainage channel run through the city, they would not be altered with implementation of the Safety Element. The Safety Element has several policies that would reduce the impacts of flooding throughout the City of South Gate. Policy 1.2.1 requires the City to consult with regional partners for ongoing implementation of flood control and drainage measures and stormwater permitting programs. Policy 1.2.3 mandates that the City continue implementation of its floodplain management ordinance. Policy 1.2.6 requires that the use of pervious paving and landscaping be utilized for maximum on-site stormwater retention. Implementation of these policies and compliance with federal and state regulations would ensure that no impact would occur.
- e) **No Impact.** The update to the Safety Element does not propose any specific project that would cause more water runoff. Rather, the Safety Element has policies to protect and increase storm drain capacity from existing sources of runoff. Policy 1.2.2 requires that the City maintain and enhance the City-operated stormwater and flood control system. Policy 1.2.5 requires that new projects and remodels use low-impact development techniques that limit paving and hardscape while increasing on-site stormwater retention. Policy 1.2.6 requires that the use of pervious paving and landscaping be utilized for maximum on-site stormwater retention. Implementation of these policies and compliance with federal and state regulations would ensure that no impact would occur.
- f) **No Impact.** There is no development and no water demand associated with the adoption of the Safety Element update. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- g-i) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Flooding occurs in areas where drainages become overwhelmed by the amount of runoff received. Often this will occur within the built environment as a result of inadequate drainage infrastructure (either missing or undersized). According to the most recent Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FEMA 2015), portions of southeast South Gate are

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

located within the 100-year and 500-year floodplains. In addition, many of the major roadways in the city have suffered from flooding in the past, which can affect evacuation operations. To address flood impacts on the built environment, the City requires new development to be anchored and flood-proofed with appropriate materials and construction methods (Municipal Code 7.47.050). Policy 1.2.3 mandates that the City continue implementation of its floodplain management ordinance. No site-specific development is associated with the Safety Element update; as a result, flood-related impacts are less than significant.

In addition, all of South Gate lies within one of several dam inundation zones for at least one dam. The majority of the community lies within the hazard zone for the Hansen Dam. Built in 1940, Hansen Dam was constructed as a flood control measure to the Los Angeles River floods of 1938. It is located approximately 23 miles northwest of South Gate, in the San Fernando Valley. As required by the US Army Corps of Engineers, operators of Hansen Dam update the dam's Emergency Action and Notification Plan annually, with special inspections triggered if the water level reaches a certain height. Two other dams posing potential inundation hazards to the community are the Whittier Narrows Dam and the Garvey Dam. While each dam is located within 10 miles of South Gate and closer than the Hansen Dam, these dams pose lower overall threats. The proposed element does not result in the potential for development; rather, the intent of the Safety Element is to implement policies and programs that result in the reduction of risk to property and lives. Policies 1.2.1 through 1.2.7 support the objective of minimizing flood and dam inundation hazards with reliable drainage infrastructure and flood-ready development practices. As a result, no impact would occur.

- j) **No Impact.** The average elevation of the relatively flat city is 115 feet above mean sea level, and its westernmost border is over 11 miles from the Pacific. Therefore, a tsunami is not a threat. As a result, no impact would occur.

**2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a-c) **No Impact.** The Safety Element update does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site, fundamentally change an area in the city, or require any revisions to zoned density or land use designation for any parcel. As such, adoption and implementation of the goals and policies of the Safety Element would not physically divide an established community, nor would the element conflict with any established land use plan, policy, regulation, or applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No land use and planning impacts would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION:

- a-b) **No Impact.** South Gate is developed predominantly with urbanized land uses, including residential and commercial uses. According to the Green City Element of the General Plan, the city does not have mineral resources. Further, the update to the General Plan Safety Element does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or have any effect on areas of the city. Therefore, it would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state. No impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a-f) **No Impact.** The Safety Element update does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site. It does not propose any actions that would expose people to, or generate, excessive groundborne vibration levels or noise levels in excess of applicable state or local standards or the guidelines of the City’s Noise Regulations as found in the Noise Element of the General Plan. As such, no noise impacts would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

### DISCUSSION:

- a-c) **No Impact.** The update to the Safety Element does not include construction or operational components that could induce population growth, nor does it require the demolition of housing or other structures that could displace people. Therefore, no impact would occur.



	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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 following public services:</p>				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a-e) **No Impact.** Adoption and implementation of the Safety Element would not have direct physical effects on the environment and would not result in any changes to the existing land use designations in the General Plan. As a result, the update to the Safety Element would not result in an increased resident population, nor would it result in additional visitors requiring additional facilities or manpower. Therefore, no impact would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION:

- a-b) **No Impact.** Adoption and implementation of the goals and policies in the Safety Element update would not result in greater demand for parks and recreational facilities. In addition, these goals and policies do not conflict with the City's General Plan Community Design Element (City of South Gate 2009), which includes goals and policies to ensure that parks and recreational facilities are developed, protected, and preserved. No impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a-f) **No Impact.** The Safety Element update does not propose any actions that would directly result in development of a specific site or fundamentally change an area in the city, nor would it have a negative impact on traffic. The goals and policies in the Safety Element are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction in potentially hazardous areas of the city is implemented safely. An important aspect of the Safety Element update is community evacuation in response to an emergency or disaster event. The Safety Element identifies recommended evacuation routes, which indicate the preferred routes of movement that should be followed in order

## **2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

---

to accommodate safe and efficient evacuation of residents and businesses. These routes are designed to relocate people from hazardous areas to safer locations during an emergency. Through the use and promotion of these evacuation routes, city residents and businesses are better informed and prepared to evacuate. If a larger proportion of residents and businesses in the city understand and use these routes, first-responder agencies, such as fire and police protection workers, will spend less time assisting in evacuation efforts and be able to dedicate more resources to emergency response efforts associated with the disaster situation. Therefore, the adoption and implementation of the goals and policies in the Safety Element would have a beneficial impact on traffic and circulation during an emergency event. No impacts related to traffic and transportation would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION:**

a-g) **No Impact.** Implementation of the Safety Element update is not anticipated to have a negative impact on utilities and service systems, as the element does not propose any projects, programs, or actions that could reasonably be expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements; result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage facilities; result in insufficient water supplies or landfill capacity; or violate solid waste-related regulations. The goals and policies in the Safety Element update are intended to reduce or eliminate potentially hazardous conditions and ensure that construction in potentially hazardous areas of the city is implemented safely. No impacts to utilities and service systems would occur.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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 rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION:

- a-c) **No Impact.** Implementation of the Safety Element update is not anticipated to degrade biological resources or the overall quality of the natural environment in South Gate; eliminate important historic or prehistoric resources; have environmental effects causing substantial adverse effects on humans; or have cumulatively considerable impacts. The Safety Element would have a beneficial impact on city residents and businesses because it would provide enhanced emergency preparedness information as compared to the previous Safety Element, as well as emergency evacuation routes. Adoption and implementation of these goals and policies would not require any changes to existing zoning or General Plan designations for parcels in the city. No impacts would occur.

### REFERENCES

- CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2014. Cortese List. [www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/](http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/).
- CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2011. High and Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zones. [http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire\\_prevention/fire\\_prevention\\_wildland\\_zones](http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones)
- CGS (California Geological Survey). 2014. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. [http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap\\_maps.htm](http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap_maps.htm).
- City of South Gate. 2009. *Community Design Element of the General Plan*.
- DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2014. California Important Farmland Finder. <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>.
- DTSC (California Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2012a. EnviroStor. [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp).
- . 2012b. Hazardous Facilities Subject to Corrective Action. [www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionA.htm#Facilities](http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionA.htm#Facilities).
- FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2015. FEMA's Flood Map Service Center. Accessed November 9. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>.
- SWRCB (California State Water Resources Control Board). 2012. List of Active CDO and CAO. <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionC.htm>
- . 2014. Sites Identified with Waste Constituents Above Hazardous Waste Levels Outside the Waste Management Unit. [www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/CurrentList.pdf](http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/CurrentList.pdf).

### **3.0 REFERENCES**

---

This page intentionally left blank.