



City of El Segundo

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY,
ECONOMIC, AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 322-4670
FAX (310) 322-4167
www.elsegundo.org

REVISED ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

PROJECT No. EA No. 619

I. BACKGROUND

1. **Project Title:** Mixed-Use Residential and Commercial Development
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, CA 90245
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Brandi M. Jones, Contract Planner, (310) 524-2341
4. **Project Location:** 310-332 E. Grand Avenue, El Segundo, CA 90245
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** George, Silvia and Richard Kizirian, 30265 Via Victoria, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90274
6. **General Plan Designation:** Neighborhood Commercial
7. **Zoning:** Neighborhood Commercial (C-2)

8. **Description of Project:** *(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)*

The proposed project is for the development of a mixed-use project comprised of 16,427 square feet of retail/office and food service space and 10 apartment units totaling 10,303 square feet. The project is located within the Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) zone, which is a permitted use for the zone. The commercial component of the project will be located on the ground floor, while the residential component will be located on the second floor. There would be surface parking in front, a garage, and carports in the rear for the residential units. Each use has separate covered parking in a subterranean garage.

The proposed project has been analyzed for its environmental impacts and a draft initial study has been prepared pursuant to Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to Section 15070 of CEQA.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings)*

The subject property is located within the Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) zone. The site is surrounded by Public Facilities (P-F) and Open Space (O-S) to the north, Downtown Commercial (C-RS) to the west, Small Business (SB) to the south and Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) to the east.

10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

None

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below (X) 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.

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

III. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this Initial Study of Environmental Impact, the Planning Commission of the City of El Segundo finds the following:

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.	X
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 "potential 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 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.	


James M. Hansen,
Director of Community, Economic and Development Services;
and, Secretary of the Planning Commission
City of El Segundo

12/11/03
Date

IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced)
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis
 - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
No. This is an existing site that currently developed with a service station and multi-family residential units. It is neither designated nor adjacent to a scenic vista or highway. No mitigation is required.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
No scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway are located within this area of the City of El Segundo. No mitigation is required.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
No. The project site is will be upgraded by eliminating a service station, with outdoor vehicle storage and residential structures with uncovered parking. No mitigation is required.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
No. The proposed development will not be adverse enough to affect day or nighttime views. There will be an increase in light or glare due to the windows and associated perimeter lighting associated with security and parking. This will be designed so that the light coming from the site does not shine directly onto adjacent lots. No mitigation is required.				
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?				X
There will be no direct or indirect affect on farmlands and or agricultural resources because no such operations or resources exist within the surrounding area of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
The City of El Segundo has no sites zoned for agricultural use. No mitigation is required.				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
There are no agriculturally zoned sites in the City of El Segundo. No mitigation is required.				
3. AIR QUALITY. 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?				X
The site is located within the regional non-attainment area as defined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Operations relocated and consolidated as part of the proposed project have been compared to significance threshold tables 6-2 and 9-1 of the <u>CEQA Air Quality Handbook</u> , prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). These thresholds are for emissions of Reactive Organic Gas (ROG), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Particulates (PM10). Since the level of emissions resulting from the proposed project are significantly less than the screening thresholds, the proposed project does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the objectives of the EPA or SCAQMD.				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The proposed project was compared to significance threshold in the <u>CEQA Air Quality Handbook</u>, prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). These thresholds are for emissions of Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Oxides (SO_x), and Particulates (PM₁₀). SCAQMD has established daily construction and operations emission thresholds of 55 lbs/day for ROC, 55 lbs/day for NO_x, 550 lbs/day for CO, 150 lbs/day for SO_x, and 150 lbs/day for PM₁₀.</p>				
<p>The construction thresholds refer to the emissions created by the construction equipment and the actual process of grading and assembling new facilities or additions to new facilities. The proposed project will involve minor grading after demolition of the existing buildings. Project construction will begin approximately April of 2004 and have a nine-month construction duration. The analysis of the construction emissions and operational (vehicle) emission were derived using the URBEMIS 2002 modeling software. The results of the model indicate that neither the construction nor operational thresholds would be exceeded. Construction emissions for 2004 are as follows: 47.15 lbs/day of ROC, 54.97 lbs/day of NO_x, 29.32 lbs/day of CO, 0.86 of SO_x and 17.78 lbs/day of PM₁₀, for a total of 150.08 lbs/day of emissions. Construction emissions for 2005 are as follows: 4.00 lbs/day of ROC, 31.34 lbs/day of NO_x, 29.03 lbs/day of CO, 0.00 lbs/day of SO_x, and 1.44 lbs/day of PM₁₀. These are below the construction emission thresholds.</p>				
<p>Operation emissions derive from the daily project operations based upon primary land use and square footage. Several categories within this table are similar in operational nature to the proposed project, such as a small shopping center, small office and fast food without drive-thru services. In comparison to any of these, the emissions associated with the construction of 26,730 square feet of mixed-use commercial/retail, residential and basement level garage is significantly less than the maximum screening thresholds. For example, SCAQMD has determined that the daily thresholds of potential significance for air quality is 261 apartment units and 96,211 square feet for a small office before either is considered to have potentially significant impacts. This project's numbers are far below these thresholds. Operational (vehicle) emissions derived from the URBEMIS 2002 model for the duration of the project are as follows: 7.73 lbs/day of ROC, 7.61 lbs/day of NO_x, 82.21 lbs/day of CO, 0.06 of SO_x, and 5.69 lbs/day of PM₁₀, for a total of 103.3 lbs/day of emissions. These are also below the established SCAQMD threshold. As a result, there will be no air quality impacts associated with the construction of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>				X
<p>The site is located within the regional non-attainment area as defined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the SCAQMD. As indicated in 3b, the project size is significantly below the construction and operational significance thresholds defined in the SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook. Operations at the site will not significantly alter the quality of the air in the area. Operations at the site will not significantly alter the quality of the air in the area. The project will not significantly contribute to a cumulative impact. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>				X
<p>Operations at the site will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants since this facility will produce no pollutants. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? No. The construction of a commercial/retail, 10-unit mixed-use development will not create any objectionable odors. No mitigation is required.</p>				X
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>				X
<p>The existing site is currently developed with commercial and residential structures located in an urbanized area where no candidate, sensitive, or special status species are known to exist. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>b) Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?</p>				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed development has existing buildings on the project site and is located in an urbanized area where no riparian habitat is known to exist. No mitigation is required.				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
The proposed development has existing buildings on the project site and is located in an urbanized area where no wetlands exist. No mitigation is required.				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
The proposed development has existing buildings on the project site and is located in an urbanized area where no known migration corridors are apparent and wildlife was previously displaced. No mitigation is required.				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
The proposed development is on a previously developed site. The project will not affect any existing trees or biological resources. No mitigation is required.				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
This site is not affected by the provisions of a Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other habitat conservation plan. No mitigation is required.				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				X
The proposed development is on a previously developed site. The project will not affect any historical resources. No mitigation is required.				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
The proposed development is on a previously developed site. There are no known archeological resources in the project vicinity. No mitigation is required.				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
No paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features are known to exist on site or in the project vicinity. The proposed development is on a previously developed site. No mitigation is required.				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
No human remains, burial sites, or cemeteries are known to exist on site or in the project vicinity. The proposed development is on a previously developed site. No mitigation is required.				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
There are no Alquist-Priolo zones in the City of El Segundo. Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 does not designate this site as a potential for fault rupture. No mitigation is required.				
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
The City of El Segundo is located approximately six miles from the Palos Verdes Fault, which is the closest active fault. The proposed project will be designed in compliance with the 2001 California Building Code (with amendments), which contains the most updated and restrictive building codes for seismic safety. No mitigation required.				
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
There is no risk of liquefaction based on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones - Venice Quadrangle (March 25, 1999). No mitigation required.				
(iv) Landslides?				X
The site and all surrounding properties are generally flat, eliminating the risk for landslide. No mitigation is required.				
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
The proposed project would replace existing buildings, where there is minimal topsoil, in the form of landscaping. No erosion or loss of topsoil will result. No mitigation is required.				
(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
The proposed project is on a site previously developed with buildings and paved parking areas. The California Building Code requires construction to be in compliance with a soils report, which will be prepared to evaluate the soil structure. No mitigation is required.				
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
The existing site is currently developed with commercial and residential structures located in an urbanized area. The soil is not known to be expansive. A soils report will be prepared as required by the California Building Code. No mitigation is required.				
(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?				X
The existing site is currently developed with industrial and residential structures located in an urbanized area. The proposed development will not have septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No mitigation is required.				
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
No. The proposed project is for general commercial/retail, food uses and residential. The residential use will have household chemicals and solutions involved in daily cleaning and sanitizing, which can be obtained from most retail establishments. The commercial/retail and food uses also use chemicals and solutions to cleanse and sanitize work and cooking areas. These are similar to household chemicals and are often stored in small quantities or off-site. They are not considered hazardous materials. No mitigation is required.				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
No. There will be no hazardous materials on site. No mitigation is required.				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
No. There will be no hazardous materials on site. No mitigation is required.				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		X		

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The site is included on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List compiled by the California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Materials Data Management Program dated December 1994. The previous use of a portion of the site at the west end was a gasoline sales station as well as an automotive service station. The owner removed the underground fuel storage tanks on March 22, 2001 and continued to use the site for auto repair only without the sale of gasoline. A letter dated May 9, 2003 stated, the El Segundo Fire Department found that the site investigation and corrective action carried out at the underground storage tanks site was in compliance with the requirement of the subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code and with corrective action regulations adopted pursuant to Section 25299.3 of the Health and Safety Code and that no further action related to the petroleum releases at the site has required. The tanks were removed and the City of El Segundo Fire Department determined that no further action was required for that location on the site. The studies done were not performed on the entire site, only under the fuel storage tanks, and there may be some contamination under the waste oil tank and clarifier. The applicant submitted a Health Risk Assessment of the potential impacts of the use of for commercial and residential uses in January 2003. The Fire Department has concluded that the Assessment demonstrate that the site meets all requirements to permit the site to be used as proposed without further remediation of the soil. Additional soil sampling beneath a clarifier located beneath the service station building was prepared by the applicant at the request of the City Fire Department in order to determine if any leaks have occurred. The clarifier was not removed or altered when the underground storage tanks were removed so the other studies did not address this area of potential concern. The results of the additional soil testing beneath the clarifier showed that there were no chemicals or hydrocarbons in the soil that require any remediation. Mitigation Measure MM-1 will ensure that the clarifier is abandoned or retested when it is removed. Impacts related to hazardous materials on site will be reduced to less than significant. **See Mitigation Measure MM - 1**

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The project site is located within two miles of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The proximal location of these aviation uses poses a slight risk for loss of injury due to accidents or risk of upset. The height of the proposed building would not exceed the maximum height limit permitted for that zone, which is 28'. No mitigation is required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No mitigation is required.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The proposed project will not alter the existing emergency response or evacuation plans. No mitigation is required.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
--	--	--	--	---

There are no wildlands in proximity to the site. Therefore there is no associated risk of loss, injury, or death. No mitigation is required.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

While ocean waters will be affected by the site's runoff, changes in ocean water quality due to the proposed project are considered to be insignificant, if not even beneficial and the overall concentrations of pollutants will be diminished due to more frequent maintenance and a reduction in the volume of runoff and pollutants. The project will be required to construct pavement, retaining walls and landscaped areas in general on-site to be maintained to prevent future soil erosion. Because the proposed project will comply with all appropriate City of El Segundo Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Controls, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits requirement, and the County's Storm water Discharge Program policies, and will employ Best Management Practice (BMP) procedures, impacts related to runoff pollutants will be reduced to less than significant. **See Mitigation Measure MM - 2**

b) Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Development of the proposed project will introduce urban contaminants (i.e., tire wear residue, oil and grease, fertilizers, etc.) to the project site, thereby resulting in the potential for long-term degradation of accepting surface waters and ground water quality. Nonetheless, project conditions are anticipated to be an improvement over the existing on-site urban run-off pollutant conditions. The change from auto-related services to commercial/retail and residential will eliminate the presence of many chemical contaminants. Adequate drainage and periodic maintenance and watering of the paved areas, will wash contaminants from the site thereby reducing the opportunity for contaminants to accumulate to undesirable concentration levels. Finally, the overall volume of runoff will be increased by the reduction of permeable landscaped areas; but due to the change in use, reducing or maintaining the volume of contaminants entering the storm drainage/surface water/groundwater systems. See Mitigation Measure MM - 2</p>				
<p>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?</p>			X	
<p>Development of the proposed project will alter the drainage and runoff conditions at the project site. Proposed improvements will decrease the area of permeable surfaces from those currently observed on-site, thereby changing the existing absorption rates and runoff volumes. The existing amount of landscaped area is approximately 9,000 square feet or 20% of the lot, while the proposed landscaped area is approximately 5,015 square feet or 11% of the lot. These figures do not include any paved permeable areas, only landscaping. Proposed improvements will also recontour the existing grade of the project site to eliminate on-site ponding and redirect storm water flows to adjacent streets and ultimately the storm water collection system. These changes are expected to be beneficial both to storm water flood conditions and for water quality. The project will have a less than a significant impact on drainage pattern of the site or area. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>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 surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off site?</p>			X	
<p>The project site will have pavement, extensive landscaping and be covered by structures. Surface flows will be absorbed on-site as well as being redirected to adjacent streets and ultimately the storm water collection system. Proposed improvements will also recontour the existing grade of the project site to eliminate on-site ponding and instead drain off-site onto adjacent streets and eventually to storm drains outletting to the Pacific Ocean. Surface runoff rates would be decreased due to the increase in landscaping. The project will have a less than a significant impact on existing drainage patterns. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>e) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>				X
<p>Introduction of a substantial area of landscaping will both reduce the volume of site runoff through the provision of permeable surface area and enhance water quality by replacing industrial uses with generally "cleaner" residential and commercial type uses and landscaped areas. The project will have a less than a significant impact on runoffs. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p>				X
<p>No. The proposed project does not include potential sources of water pollutants, which would have the potential to degrade water quality. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>g) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>				X
<p>According to Exhibit PS-2 contained in the Public Safety Element of the City's General Plan, El Segundo is not at risk from flooding during a 100-year storm since there are no dams or waterways located near the City. Localized flooding during periods of heavy rainfall may occur but this would be due to the inadequacy of storm drains, therefore, the risk of flooding or other water related hazards on the site is considered remote and no impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? See 8 (g).</p>				X
<p>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p>				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potential, Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
There are no dams or levees located near the City, therefore no associated risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of them flooding is expected. No mitigation is required.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
According to the Public Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the southwestern portion of the City along the coast (and adjacent portions of the City of Los Angeles to the north) are identified as seiche and tsunami hazard areas. However, since the site is not located in these areas, no impacts due to these natural hazards are anticipated. As the project is replacing existing buildings, there will be no change in the risks associated with land subsidence, the potential for landslides, or mudflows. No mitigation is required.				
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
No. The project site is surrounded by multi-family and commercial properties and is currently being utilized for industrial and residential uses. The project will be incorporated into the established community. No mitigation is required.				
b) Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
The proposed project is consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan and complies with the El Segundo Municipal Code Section 15-5A-2 and 15-5A-3-1, which allows for retail uses providing sales and services, restaurants, coffee shops, delicatessens, cafes and residential uses, provided that said residential use will be permitted only on the floor above street level, provided the street level is used for commercial purposes. The properties and proposed development meet all of the criteria required by the Zoning Code. The project will result in a net decrease in one housing unit as well as eliminating 11 existing non-conforming dwelling units. No mitigation is required.				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
No habitat conservation plans or natural communities conservation plans exist for the site or in the project vicinity. No mitigation is required.				
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. 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?				X
In the City of El Segundo's General Plan, the Conservation Element states that the community's mineral resource is oil. The proposed project is not located on one of the five wells sites, which continue to produce oil. Construction of the project will not result in the loss of any known mineral resources. No mitigation is required.				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
No locally-important mineral resource recovery sites have been delineated in the General Plan, Specific Plan, or other Land Use Plan for the area. No mitigation is required.				
11. NOISE. 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 applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
No. The proposed project involves uses that are conducted solely within a building. These uses will be consistent with adjacent uses. According to the Noise Element in the General Plan, the existing noise contours for this area have a 65 CNEL. Streets within the City with adjacent residential uses and noise levels above 65 CNEL include portions of Center Street, Grand Avenue, Main Street and Mariposa Avenue. Any increase in noise levels would not exceed the standards established in the local general plan or the noise ordinance. No mitigation is required.				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
No. The proposed development will not expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration noise levels because the use does not produce these excesses listed above. No mitigation is required.				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
No. The proposed project involves the construction of a mixed-use project, which will not create a substantial increase in ambient noise levels; the surrounding uses are similar to that of the proposed. The vicinity is fully urbanized and is surrounded by commercial, residential and industrial areas and the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The noise levels of operations as a result of the project would not create a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. No mitigation is required.				
d) A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
Construction activities will temporarily elevate ambient noise levels. The City's Noise Ordinance limits construction activity to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No construction is permitted on Sundays or holidays. The Noise Ordinance provides that when temporary increase in noise (i.e., due to construction) exceed noise standards, but are conducted within the operational hours established by the ordinance, impacts are acceptable. The temporary noise increase generated by construction activity are Less Than Significant. No mitigation is required.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is located within two miles of the project site. However, the proposed project involves the alteration of a portion of the interior of an existing building located in a fully developed light industrial area. No mitigation is required.				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
No private airstrips are located in the vicinity of the project. No mitigation is required.				
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
No. The proposed project does propose the construction of 10 apartment units. The current site has 11 units, which decreases the number of units by one. The units are also two-bedroom/one-bath and marketed towards singles. No mitigation is required.				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
No. The difference in units only decreases by one. No mitigation is required.				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
No. There will be a minimal displacement of people because of the reduction of one unit, but this is not substantial. According to 2000 Census data, the average household size for renter-occupied units is 2.03. Therefore, only 2 people overall would be displaced. This displacement would not create the need for replacement housing in the City. No mitigation is required.				
13. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?			X	

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>No. Two city fire stations currently serve the project site. The existing levels of service would not be impacted by the proposed project since the operations for the proposed project would consist of residential and commercial uses and the previous use also contained residential and industrial uses. There will probably be a decrease in the amount of residents and the new access to the commercial component will be accessible for fire protection. The proposed project will decrease the localized population by a nominal amount. A significant impact may occur if the City of El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project based upon response time, access or fire hydrant/water availability. The proposed project site is served by two fire stations; the Headquarters Station, located at 314 Main Street and Station 2, located at 2161 East El Segundo Boulevard. Headquarter Station is two blocks away and has two engine companies and a rescue team. Station 2 has an engine company, rescue team, and a truck company. Existing staffing levels are not expected to be adversely impacted by the proposed project. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on fire service. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>b) Police protection? No. The City of El Segundo requires development project applicants to prepare and submit a lighting plan and photometric study for review and approval. City review provides the opportunity to ensure that the project lighting demonstrates compliance with relevant conditions of approval, policies, safety and security considerations, which enhance safety and minimize the potential for crime. A significant impact may occur if a proposed project resulted in an increase in demand for police services that would exceed the capacity of the police department responsible for serving the site. Police service for the proposed project site is provided by the El Segundo Police Department (ESPD), which is located at 348 Main Street, in the City of El Segundo. The proposed project would decrease on-site population, which would reduce the demand for additional security. The extent of additional protection needed would vary in accordance with the mixed-use residential component and the demand of the commercial uses and expected number of visitors on-site. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on police service. No mitigation is required.</p>			X	
<p>c) Schools? No. The reduction of units may decrease the number of residents on site, including any school-aged children. The decrease in population will result in no increased demand for schools. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on school facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>			X	
<p>d) Parks? No. The local parks are adequate to accommodate the population of the project. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on park service. No mitigation is required.</p>			X	
<p>e) Other public facilities? The proposed project will decrease the localized population by approximately two residents (using a 2.03 person per household calculation). The change in population and commercial space will result in no increase and incremental demand for fire, police, parks, library and other governmental services, including schools. Both components of the project provide adequate off-street parking, which will decrease any on-street parking and impacts on the public right-of-way. Because the project is relatively small in size and represents infill development within existing service boundaries, the increase in demand for these services is insignificant. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on other public facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>			X	
14. RECREATION.				
<p>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? No. The decrease in population will result in a change in the usage of parks. The local parks are adequate to accommodate the population of the project. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on park service. No mitigation is required.</p>			X	
<p>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? The proposed project does not provided on-site recreational facilities. The decrease in population would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The project would have a less than significant impact on recreational facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>			X	
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
<p>a) Cause an increase in the traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</p>			X	

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The project will increase the amount of traffic to the site because of the change in use and increase in commercial floor area. The amount of residential traffic will be consistent with current number of trips generated from the existing housing on-site. The commercial component consists of general retail uses and food services. The amount of food service space is limited to approximately 4,575 square feet and the amount of trips produced can vary depending on the type of food service that occupies a tenant space. The total number of daily trips would be approximately 1,866 for all of the proposed uses and 1,210 trips for the existing uses. The trip calculation for the existing automotive use was based on a service station with three pumps and 6 nozzles for fueling, which was one of the original uses on-site. This dated is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers, <i>Trip Generation Manual</i>, 5th Edition. There would be a net increase of 656 daily trips over the existing auto repair facility and other commercial and residential uses. Currently the segment of Grand Avenue in front of the project site carries approximately 8,300 vehicles per day and operates at a Level of Service (LOS) A. The roadway has a capacity of 31,000 vehicles per day. Additionally, not all of the additional 656 trips per day would be on Grand Avenue. As a result the project would not significantly increase traffic in the area. The Level of Service on Grand Avenue would remain at LOS A. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>				X
<p>No. The proposed project will not result in any significant impacts on the level of service for the existing intersections. Grand Avenue has an existing capacity of 31,000 vehicle trips per day and operates at a Level of Service (LOS) A. The net increase will not change the level of service.</p>				
<p>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?</p>				X
<p>No. The proposed project will not affect any existing airtraffic patterns. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?</p>				X
<p>No. There will be no modifications to the existing street pattern. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>				X
<p>No. There are multiple points of access on the site from Grand Avenue, Eucalyptus Street and the alley to the south. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</p>				X
<p>No. The proposed development provides a total of 128 on-site parking spaces for both the commercial and residential uses. The on-site parking capacity exceeds the El Segundo Zoning Code requirements by one space. The proposed project requires 127 parking spaces. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>g) Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</p>				X
<p>No. The proposed project will not affect the adopted policies and alternative transportation to remain. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</p>				X
<p>No. The proposed project is subject to the City's Sewer Allocation Ordinance, which limits the generation of City wastewater generation to the City of Los Angeles' Hyperion treatment plant during any three-month quarter. The allocation system is based on a "first come, first served" basis, and any development, which would be displaced due to the project allocation, would be held until the future quarter. The project site would filter into Pump Station No. 2 and it has been determined that Pump Station No. 2 could handle the increase. In the City's Sewer Master Plan, Pump Station No. 2 has ample capacity to handle the observed flows and is scheduled to be replaced in order to accommodate current and future volume load creating a less than significant impact within a minimum of five years. No mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See 16a. The proposed project involves a moderate increase in water usage and wastewater produced. The proposed development generates approximately 7,813 gallon/day of wastewater, while the existing uses generate approximately 2,359 gallons/day of wastewater, an increase of 5,454 gallons/day. The proposed development consumes approximately 9,374 gallons/day of water, while the existing uses consume approximately 2,828 gallons/day of water, an increase of 6,546 gallons/day. These changes do increase the services of existing facilities, but would not be significant and can be served by the existing facilities. No mitigation is required.				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
No. The proposed project involves the replacement of existing buildings and does not require the construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities. The existing storm drains are adequately sized to support the new project. No mitigation is required.				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
There are sufficient water supplies available to accommodate adequate water. No mitigation is required.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
The proposed project is subject to the City's Sewer Allocation Ordinance which limits the generation of City wastewater generation to the City of Los Angeles' Hyperion treatment plant during any three-month quarter. The allocation system is based on a "first come, first served" basis, and any development, which would be displaced due to the project allocation, would be held until the future quarter. No mitigation is required.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
The project developer will be required to recycle all disposable material whenever possible. The total solid waste generated by the project would be approximately 149 lbs/day, based on the proposed 10 multi-family apartment units (10,303 square feet), 10,928 square feet of retail, 924 square feet of office and 4,575 square feet of restaurant and/or fast food uses. The current uses on the site are composed of 11 non-conforming units, which would generate approximately 55 lbs/day, a 1,000 square foot sandwich shop which would generate approximately 60 lbs/day and the 1,684 square foot service station would generate approximately 10 lbs/day for a total of 125 lbs/day. This results in an increase of 24 lbs/day. This information is based on equations from Table 4.2.4-21 (Solid Waste Generation by the Related Projects) of the LAAFB Land Conveyance, Construction and Development Project; Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIR/EIS). No mitigation is required.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
This proposal will comply with all federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No mitigation is required.				
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
The project site is in an urbanized setting already developed with light industrial and residential uses. The transition of land uses will not effect or substantially reduce fish, wildlife or plant habitats, communities or species. Additionally, the proposed project will not adversely effect or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. These conclusions are documented in Items 4 and 5 above. Further, as documented in Items 1 through 16, all potential impacts related to the proposed project will be reduced to Less Than Significant, thereby avoiding degradation of the environment. No mitigation is required.				
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				X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
As noted above, all project-related impacts will be reduced to Less Than Significant. There are no other significant new development projects in the project vicinity. As a result, project impacts when considered with other cumulative development will not result in any incremental effects. No mitigation is required.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
No. The proposed land uses, which will result in a convenient place to live, work and shop, with implementation of the proposed project will eliminate incompatible uses in an established area. The proposed project will improve existing visual and physical conditions as encouraged by the General Plan. Overall, the change in uses will result in a beneficial effect on humans and the surrounding area.				

Mitigation Measures

- MM-1: The applicant will discontinue the use of the clarifier in the existing service station building and weld a cover shut over the clarifier within 14 days from the effective date of this resolution. Alternatively, the applicant may continue to use the clarifier until demolition of the service station building and conduct soil testing at the time of demolition to be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department to determine if any soil contamination has occurred from the continued use of the clarifier.
- MM-2:
- a) During construction and operations, all waste must be disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Toxic wastes must be discarded at a licensed, regulated disposal site by a licensed waste hauler.
 - b) All leaks, drips and spills occurring during construction must be cleaned up promptly and in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations to prevent contaminated soil on paved surfaces that can be washed away into the storm drains.
 - c) If materials spills occur, they should clean up in a way that will not affect the storm drain system.
 - d) The project must comply with the City of El Segundo Ordinance No. 1235 and No. 1348, which establishes storm water and urban pollution controls.
 - e) Before anticipated rainfall, construction dumpsters must be covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.
 - f) Inspections of the project site before and after storm events must be conducted to determine whether Best Management Practices have been implemented to reduce pollutant loadings identified in the Storm Water Prevention Plan.
 - g) The owner or contractor must conduct daily street sweeping and truck wheel cleaning to prevent dirt in the storm drain system.
 - h) Storm drain system must be safeguarded at all times during construction.
 - i) The applicant will construct pavement, retaining walls and landscaped areas in general on-site to be maintained in order to prevent future soil erosion.