RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-769, ZONE CHANGE NO. 07-01, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 08-02, AND SMOKY HOLLOW SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 07-04 AT 1700 EAST GRAND AVENUE.

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On September 5, 2007, Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, filed an application for an Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04), to rezone a 4.25 acre parcel from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and to allow for the construction of a 32,980 square foot commercial office building to be leased by the United States Government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) at 1700 East Grand Avenue;

B. On March 31, 2008, Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, filed an application for Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) to amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 E. Grand Avenue to general office and medical-dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only;

C. The application was reviewed by the City's Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

D. In addition, the City reviewed the project's environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., "CEQA"), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines"), and the City's Environmental Guidelines (City Council Resolution No. 3805, adopted March 16, 1993);

E. The proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts was prepared pursuant to CEQA § 15063. A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA § 15070. The draft Initial
Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration were available for public comment from May 1, 2008 to June 2, 2008;

F. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the applications before the Planning Commission for June 26, 2008;

G. On June 26, 2008 the Planning Commission opened a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the applications including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by City staff, public testimony, and representatives of Mar Canyon Grand, LLC;

H. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2638 recommending City Council approval of Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04);

I. On July 15, 2008 the City Council held a public hearing and considered the information provided by City staff, public testimony and Mar Canyon Grand, LLC;

J. On July 15, 2008 the City Council introduced Ordinance No. ____ approving Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04); and,

K. This Resolution, and its findings, are made based upon the entire administrative record including, without limitation, testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its July 15, 2008 public hearing including the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings. The City Council finds that the following facts exist:

A. The project site is located in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone within the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) at 1700 East Grand Avenue;

B. The surrounding land uses are industrial facilities in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone to the north, an industrial facility and an animal kennel in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the south, an electrical substation and plant nursery in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and the General
Commercial (C-3) Zone to the east, and industrial facilities in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the west;

C. The proposed project includes rezoning a 4.25 acre parcel from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone; amending the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the 4.25 acre parcel to general office and medical-dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only; and allowing construction of a 32,980 square foot commercial office building at 1700 E. Grand Avenue;

D. The subject site is irregular in shape with 449 feet of street frontage on Grand Avenue and a total lot area of 4.25 acres (184,888 square feet);

E. The subject site is currently vacant, and was formerly occupied by an industrial use that manufactured steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries;

F. Vehicular access to the proposed facility would be provided from one secured driveway located on Grand Avenue, egress would be permitted from two secured driveways on Grand Avenue;

G. The proposed FAR for this project would be 0.18 or 32,980 square feet. The maximum FAR for the site as proposed to be rezoned is 0.5. Based on 184,888 square feet of land area (4.25 acres) and an FAR of 0.5, 92,565 square feet could be developed. The subject property is located approximately 400 feet from the nearest residentially zoned property;

H. One hundred thirty two parking spaces and a two loading spaces will be provided on site; and

I. The applicant anticipates that the subject site will initially be leased by the United States Army for fifteen (15) years and be used as a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS).

**SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment.** The City Council makes the following environmental findings:

A. Because of the facts identified in Section 2 of this Resolution, the proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and a Initial Study was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15063. The Initial Study demonstrated that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment with the implementation of mitigation measures. A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines
§ 15070. A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §§ 15072 and 15073, and was available for public comment from May 1, 2008 to June 2, 2008. The mitigation measures listed in the mitigated negative declaration are sufficient to reduce all identified environmental impacts to less than significant levels. A substitution for one mitigation measure, HZ-4, is proposed to read as follows:

"HZ-4: The proposed MEPS facility must be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the Department of Defense (DOD) Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings, except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM."

B. All requirements of CEQA Guidelines § 15074.1 regarding substitution of mitigation measures in a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration are met regarding the proposed substitute mitigation measure since:

1. As a result of the public review process for the proposed mitigated negative declaration, including any administrative decisions and public hearings conducted on the project before its approval, the City Council, as lead agency, concludes that the mitigation measure identified in the mitigated negative declaration is infeasible and undesirable;
2. Another mitigation measure is proposed to be substituted that is equivalent that will not create a more adverse effect of its own than the original mitigation measure and the new proposed mitigation measure will reduce the impact to less than significant;
3. No recirculation of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is required since the mitigation measure is proposed to be substituted for the original mitigation measure and made a condition of the project approval; and
4. The City Council held a duly noticed public hearing regarding this matter.

C. The City Council reviewed and considered information contained in the draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration before approving the project in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15074.

D. In accordance with § 15074 of the CEQA Guidelines, the record on which the City Council's findings are based is located at the Planning and Building Safety Department, City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California 90245. The custodian of records is the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

E. That when considering the whole record for the draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, there is no evidence that the project will have the potential
for an adverse effect on wildlife resources or the habitat on which the wildlife depends, because the project is in a built-out urban environment.

F. These findings are based on the various mitigation measures to be required in the implementation of the project as adopted in the Mitigated Negative Declaration as already having been incorporated into the Project. The City Council finds that all the mitigation measures now incorporated into the project are desirable and feasible.

G. Accordingly, based upon the evidence presented to the City Council, the City need not prepare an environmental impact report for the proposed project.

SECTION 4: General Plan. The proposed project conforms to the City’s General Plan in the ESMC as follows:

A. The General Plan Land Use Designation of the project site is Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use. The Smoky Hollow Mixed Use classification permits primarily light industrial uses including light manufacturing, research and development, warehousing and office uses. Grand Avenue commercial uses are also permitted in locations as designated under the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The permitted FAR for Grand Avenue commercial uses is 0.5 for newly constructed projects. The project site has a Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zoning District designation that allows manufacturing, light industrial, general offices for research, professional and technical services, research and development, warehousing and distribution, public facilities, and public utilities. The proposed zoning designation for the project site is the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone that allows cafes, general offices, medical-dental offices, retail sales and theaters.

B. The General Plan contains a number of relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies in the Land Use Element. Land Use Element Policy LU 4-1.2 requires that “all commercial facilities shall be built and maintained in accordance with Health and Safety Code requirements and shall meet seismic safety regulations and environmental regulations.” The development will be built and maintained in accordance with these requirements and regulations.

C. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU 4-3 to “provide for new office and research and development uses” in that the project will provide a 32,980 square-foot commercial building designed to accommodate general office and medical-office uses.
D. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU 4-3.6 to “require landscaping, its maintenance, and permanent upkeep in all new office and mixed-use developments” in that the project will provide approximately 83,000 square feet of permanent landscaping on the project site.

E. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU 5-2.2 that states “All outdoor storage shall be properly screened by masonry walls and landscaping.” Masonry walls will be utilized for the trash enclosure and equipment area behind the building.

F. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU-5-3 to “Encourage the rehabilitation of existing substandard blighted industrial areas through the combined efforts of private and public sectors.” This site was originally developed with several industrial buildings which have since been demolished. A new, modern commercial office building will be built with significant landscape and hardscape improvements.

G. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU5-3.1 to “Revitalize and upgrade industrial areas which contain aesthetic or functional deficiencies in such areas as landscaping, off-street parking, or loading areas.” The entire site will be developed with new landscape and hardscape, parking and loading areas.

H. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU7-1.2 in that “No new development shall be allowed unless adequate public facilities are in place or provided for.” It is also consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU 4-3.6 which states that the City should require landscaping, its maintenance, and permanent upkeep in all new office and mixed-use developments.” A new, modern commercial office building will be built with significant landscaping and hardscape improvements that will be supported by adequate public infrastructure.

I. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Objective C1-1 to “Provide a roadway system that accommodates the City’s existing and projected land use and circulation needs.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications.

J. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.2 to “Pursue implementation of all Circulation Element policies such that all
Master Plan roadways are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications to upgrade and maintain Grand Avenue at an acceptable level of service.

K. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.5 to “Implement roadway and intersection upgrades to full Circulation Element standards when needed to improve traffic operating conditions and to serve development.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate for possible future right-of-way dedications to implement roadway upgrades to full Circulation Element standards.

L. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.14 to “Require a full evaluation of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed new development before project approval. Further, require the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures before, or in conjunction with, project development. Mitigation measures may include new roadway links on segments that would connect the new development to the existing roadway system, intersection improvements, and other measures. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer.” KOA Corporation completed a Traffic Study for the proposed project and found that although peak hour trips would be added by the project, it would not create a potentially significant number of AM or PM peak hour trips. The Study also found that the project was not expected to create significant traffic impacts at any of the study intersections. The additional trips generated by the project will be mitigated by the payment of a traffic mitigation fee.

M. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.15 to “Pursue and protect adequate right-of-way to accommodate future circulation system improvements.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications.

N. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.16 to “Encourage the widening of substandard streets and alleys to meet City standards wherever feasible.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications to widen Grand Avenue, a substandard street, to meet City standards.
O. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-3.2 to “Ensure that the development review process incorporates consideration of off-street commercial loading requirements for all new projects.” Two off-street commercial loading spaces will be provided consistent with the ESMC requirements. The loading spaces will be screened using masonry walls and landscaping.

P. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C2-1.3 to “Encourage new developments in the City to participate in the development of the citywide system of pedestrian walkways and require participation funded by the project developer where appropriate.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City Standards are incorporated into the design of this project.

Q. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C2-1.4 to “Ensure the installation of sidewalks on all future arterial widening or new construction projects, to establish a continuous and convenient link for pedestrians.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project.

R. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C2-2.2 to “Encourage new development to provide facilities for bicyclists to park and store their bicycles and provide shower and clothes changing facilities at or close to the bicyclist’s work destination.” While ESMC § 15-16-3(A) does not require bicycle facilities for projects less than 50,000 square feet, the proposed project provides three bicycle racks on site that will accommodate bicycles for employee use.

S. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy 3-1.1 to “Require all new development to mitigate project-related impacts on the existing and future circulation system such that all Master Plan roadways and intersections are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service through implementation of all applicable Circulation Element policies. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer.” KOA Corporation completed a Traffic Study for the proposed project and found that although peak hour trips would be added by the project, it would not create a potentially significant number of AM or PM peak hour trips. The Study also found that the project was not expected to create significant traffic impacts at any of the study intersections. The additional trips generated by the project will be mitigated by the payment of a traffic mitigation fee. A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional
9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications.

T. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C3-1.8 to "Require the provision of adequate pedestrian and bicycle access for new development projects through the development review process." Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project that will provide adequate pedestrian access. Adequate bicycle access will be available to the site.

U. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C3-2.1 to "Ensure the provision of sufficient on-site parking in all new development." The proposed project is required to provide 125 parking spaces and 132 are proposed.

V. The ESMC requires review for conformance with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The proposed project would be consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies if the proposed Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone is implemented. The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 (Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines); Objective 2.2 (Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee
parking near the place of employment); and Objective 9.4 (Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems).

SECTION 5: Zone Change Findings. Based upon the factual findings of this Resolution, the proposed Zone Change is necessary to carry out the proposed project because the proposed uses are only allowed in the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and to maintain consistency with the General Plan land use designation of Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP).

SECTION 6: Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment Findings. After considering the above facts regarding proposed Environmental Assessment No. 769, and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, the City Council finds as follows:

A. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the Specific Plan. The proposed project is consistent with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies as required in ESMC § 15-7B-12(D) if the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office use with incidental accessory uses is approved.

The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 (Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) Is responsive to established design guidelines); Objective 2.2 (Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee parking near the place of employment);
and Objective 9.4 (Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems).

B. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the regulations of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone Development Regulations as required in ESMC § 15-7B-12(A).

The proposed project will comply with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone if the Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone is approved and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office use with incidental accessory uses is approved. The project design meets all height, setback, floor area ratio, parking and landscaping requirements.

C. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The proposed project is consistent with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines as required in ESMC § 15-7B-12(B) if the Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone is approved and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office use with incidental accessory uses is approved.

The proposed project complies with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) by incorporating design elements that are consistent with the SHSP Design Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with the following SHSP Design Guidelines in ESMC §§15-11-3(l)(2)(b), 15-11-3(l)(2)(c), 15-11-3(l)(4), 15-11-3(l)(6), 15-11-3(l)(7)(g), 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(1); 15-11-3(l)(e)(2); 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(5), 15-11-3(l)(9)(a), 15-11-3(l)(9)(b), 15-11-3(l)(9)(e), 15-11-3(l)(10)(a), 15-11-3(l)(10)(b), 15-11-3(l)(10)(c), 15-11-3(l)(10)(e), 15-11-3(l)(11)(b) and 15-11-3(l)(11)(c), relating to encouraging the use of richness of surface and texture, play of light and shadow, multi-planes, roofs, and a high degree or wall articulation; avoiding or minimizing the use of highly reflective surfaces, large blank walls, large metal surfaces, chain link fences, and exposed concrete block; encouraging use of subtle warm tones and a mixture of materials for building surfaces; using architecturally integrated rooftop equipment screening; controlled site
access; separate service areas and service access; not locating parking and loading areas in setback areas; locating access points for parking lots away from street intersections; providing front yard landscaping; using landscape materials to enhance the major architectural design elements; using native and drought tolerant plant material where feasible; using landscaping, fences and walls to screen or enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tanks and other items of poor visual quality; and limiting light standards to no greater than 20 feet in height.

D. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the incentives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specified in ESMC § 15-7B-12(C) in that two lots will be consolidated into one larger parcel if the Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone is approved and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office use with incidental accessory uses is approved.

E. The proposed uses in the proposed project will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses when activating the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone because of the unique characteristics of the proposed use in that it is a commercial facility that will contain specialized general office and medical-dental office uses that are not open to the general public or available for lease in competition with downtown businesses. Additionally, no retail activity will be permitted on the site. Furthermore, the proposed MEPS project as designed does not represent the maximum build-out of the 4.25 acre site as would be allowed either under the existing Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone which allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.6 (112,000 square feet maximum) or under the proposed Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone which allows a maximum FAR of 0.5 (92,565 square feet maximum). The proposed project would have a FAR of 0.18 (32,980 square feet). No competition among uses would occur with the downtown businesses since the project site is underutilized and would be limited to specialized uses. Therefore, the special finding can be made as required in ESMC § 15-7B-13.

SECTION 7: Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review Findings. After considering the above facts regarding proposed Environmental Assessment No. 769, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, the City Council finds as follows:

A. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the Specific Plan.
The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 (Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines); Objective 2.2 (Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee parking near the place of employment); and Objective 9.4 (Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems).

B. The plan will not have an adverse impact on the public health, safety, interest, convenience or the general welfare.

The design of the proposed project has incorporated design and safety measures to minimize any adverse impact on the public health, safety, interest, convenience or the general welfare.

C. The site plan is compatible with the intent and purpose of the regulations and design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The proposed project complies with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) by incorporating design elements that are consistent with the SHSP Design Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with the following SHSP Design Guidelines in ESMC §§15-11-3(I)(2)(b), 15-11-3(I)(2)(c), 15-11-3(I)(4), 15-11-3(I)(6), 15-11-3(I)(7)(g), 15-11-3(I)(8)(e)(1); 15-11-3(I)(e)(2);
3(l)(11)(b) and 15-11-3(l)(11)(c), relating to encouraging the use of
richness of surface and texture, play of light and shadow, multi-planes
roofs, and a high degree or wall articulation; avoiding or minimizing the
use of highly reflective surfaces, large blank walls, large metal surfaces,
chain link fences, and exposed concrete block; encouraging use of subtle
warm tones and a mixture of materials for building surfaces; using
architecturally integrated rooftop equipment screening; controlled site
access; separate service areas and service access; not locating parking
and loading areas in setback areas; locating access points for parking lots
away from street intersections; providing front yard landscaping; using
landscape materials to enhance the major architectural design elements;
using native and drought tolerant plant material where feasible; using
landscaping, fences and walls to screen or enclose outdoor storage areas,
loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tanks and other items of
poor visual quality; and limiting light standards to no greater than 20 feet in
height.

SECTION 8: Approvals.

A. The City Council adopts the attached Findings of Facts as set forth in Exhibit
"A," which are incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

B. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)
   and 21081.6, the City Council adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting
   Program (MMRP) as set forth in attached Exhibit "B," which is incorporated
   into this Resolution by reference. The City Council adopts each of the
   mitigation measures expressly set forth in the MMRP as conditions of
   approval of the project. The other project conditions of approval and
   compliance with applicable codes, policies, and regulations will further ensure
   that the environmental impacts of the proposed project will not be greater
   than set forth in the Mitigated Negative Declaration and these findings.

C. As set forth in Ordinance No. _____, the City Council amends the Smoky
   Hollow Specific Plan zone designation from the Medium Manufacturing (MM)
   Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone for the 4.25 acre
   parcel at 1700 East Grand Avenue. The corresponding changes to the
   Zoning Map are set forth in Exhibit "A" to Ordinance No. _____.

D. As set forth in Ordinance No. _____, the City Council amends the Smoky
   Hollow Specific Plan to limit the 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 East Grand Avenue
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to general office and medical-dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only.

E. Subject to the conditions listed on the attached Exhibit "C," which are incorporated into this Resolution by reference, the City Council adopts the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for Environmental Assessment No. 769, and approves Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04.

SECTION 9: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the City Council in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 10: Limitations. The City Council's analysis and evaluation of the project is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the City Council's knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City's ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 11: Summaries of Information. All summaries of information in the findings which precede this section, are based on the substantial evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding, is not based in part on that fact.

SECTION 12: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 13: A copy of this Resolution shall be mailed to William Messori at Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, and to any other person requesting a copy.
SECTION 14: This Resolution is City Council's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 15th day of July, 2008.

____________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO )

I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. ___ was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 15th day of July, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

____________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: ______________________
Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
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CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. _____

Exhibit A

After receiving, reviewing, and considering all the information in the administrative record for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04), including, without limitation, the factual information and conclusions set forth in this Resolution and its attachment, the City Council finds, determines, and declares for the Military Entrance Processing Station project as follows:

I. FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA.

Public Resources Code § 21080 and CEQA Guidelines § 15074 require the City, before approving a project, to determine that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment and that the lead agency shall adopt a negative declaration to that effect. The negative declaration shall be prepared for the proposed project in either of the following circumstances:

1. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

2. An initial study identifies potentially significant effects on the environment, but (A) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant before the proposed negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and (B) there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment.

Further, the decisionmaking body shall adopt the proposed negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration only if it finds on the basis of the whole record before it (including the initial study and any comments received), that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

II. FINDINGS REGARDING THE POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT.

A. Impacts Found to be Not Potentially Significant by the Initial Study.

The Initial Study identified the following environmental effects as not potentially significant. Accordingly, the City Council finds that the Initial Study, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the record of proceedings for the Military Entrance Processing Station project do not identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant environmental effects of the Military Entrance Processing Station project with respect to the areas listed below.

1. Agricultural Resources.

2. Biology.

B. Impacts Identified as Less Than Significant in the Initial Study.

The Initial Study identified the following environmental effects as less than significant. Accordingly, the City Council finds that the Initial Study, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the record of proceedings for the Military Entrance Processing Station project do not identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant environmental effects of the Military Entrance Processing Station project with respect to the areas listed below.

1. Geology and Soils.


3. Land Use and Planning.

4. Population and Housing.

5. Recreation.

6. Transportation and Traffic.


C. Impacts Identified as Potentially Significant But Which Can Be Reduced to Less-Than-Significant Levels with Mitigation Measures.

The City Council finds that the following environmental effects were identified as Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and implementation of the identified mitigation measures would avoid or lessen the potential environmental effects listed below to a level of significance.

1. Aesthetics.

   a) Facts/Effects.

   (1) Light or Glare. Reflective light or glare is primarily a daytime phenomenon caused by sunlight reflecting from highly finished surfaces, such as window glass or other reflective materials, and to a lesser degree from lightly colored surfaces. Typically, the primary cause of adverse glare is buildings with exterior façades of highly reflective glass or mirror-like material from which reflects the sun when it is at low angles in the periods following sunrise and prior to sunset. The proposed project design does not include a large amount of glass on the façade of the building. In addition, the use of highly reflective glass is not proposed. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures, potential impacts related to light and glare during daytime hours would be less than significant.

   b) Mitigation:

   (1) Expansive areas of highly reflective materials, such as mirrored glass, shall not be permitted. Non-reflective building materials shall
be used to the maximum extent possible to reduce potential glare impacts.

(2) Lighting shall be designed to minimize off-site glare.

c) Finding:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the MEPS Development project and the project has been conditioned to avoid or substantially lessen the potential environmental effect as identified in the MND.

2. Air Quality.

a) Facts/Effects.

(1) Construction Phase. Construction activities would include site excavation and grading of the proposed project site and construction of the proposed building. The site is currently vacant and no demolition would be required. Construction emissions are generally the result of demolition and grading activity, truck travel through the project area, painting of new buildings, and laying new asphalt. Construction emissions were estimated using the URBEMIS 2007 computer model, and the results are shown in Table 3-1 (Estimated Peak Daily Construction Emissions in Pounds per Day) of the MND. It is anticipated that standard construction best management practices (BMPs) would be followed to limit the amount of PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions released into the local area during construction activities, consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures and BMPs, construction related emissions are anticipated to be less than significant.

(2) Cumulative Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants. The project site is located within the SCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. Despite consistent improvements in pollution levels in the South Coast Air Basin over the past thirty years, levels of ozone (for which ROG and NO\textsubscript{x} are precursors), PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} are above national and state standards. Therefore, projects could cumulatively exceed an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality exceedance. With regards to determining the significance of the proposed project's contribution, the SCAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of cumulative construction or operational emissions, nor provides separate methodologies or thresholds of significance to be used to assess cumulative construction or operational impacts. Instead, the SCAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed using the same significance criteria as those for project specific impacts; that is, individual development projects that generate construction-related or operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD-recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also cause a
cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment.

As the proposed project does not exceed SCAQMD daily significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, as described under Item 3.3.3(b), implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants for the project region. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project’s construction and operational emissions to less-than-significant levels.

b) Mitigation:

(1) The project applicant’s construction contractor shall implement all rules and regulations by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD that are applicable to the development of the project (such as Rule 402 [Nuisance] and Rule 403 [Fugitive Dust]) and that are in effect at the time of development. The following measures are currently recommended to implement Rule 403. These measures have been quantified by SCAQMD as being able to reduce $PM_{10}$ levels generated by construction activities between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of $PM_{10}$.

(2) Water trucks shall be utilized on the site and shall be available to be used throughout the day during site grading and excavation to keep the soil damp enough to prevent $PM_{10}$ levels being raised by activities associated with project construction.

(3) Areas that are to be graded or that are being graded and/or excavated shall be wetted down in the late morning and after work is completed for the day.

(4) All unpaved parking or staging areas, or unpaved road surface shall be watered three times daily or have chemical soil stabilizers applied according to manufacturer’s specifications.

(5) Exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, and dirt) shall be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or approved soil binders shall be applied to exposed piles according to manufacturer’s specifications.

(6) The construction disturbance area shall be kept as small as possible.

(7) All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or have water applied to the exposed surface prior to leaving the site to prevent $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ from reaching the surrounding areas.

(8) Consolidate truck deliveries when possible.

(9) Wheel washers shall be installed where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads and used to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.
(10) Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads.

(11) Wind barriers shall be installed along the perimeter of the site.

(12) All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour over a 3-minute period.

(13) The project applicant's construction contractor shall use low-VOC or ultra-low VOC paints that produce no more than 6.66 VOC lbs per 1,000 sf for architectural coating.

c) Finding:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the MEPS Development project and the project has been conditioned to avoid or substantially lessen the potential environmental effect as identified in the MND.

3. Cultural Resources.

a) Facts/Effects.

(1) Archaeological Resources. The project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and contains fill materials. Any archaeological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously disturbed. In addition, the CHRIS records search conducted for the project site revealed that no archaeological resources are located on the project site. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources and result in a significant impact. Therefore, the potential for damage to, or destruction of, these resources would be a potentially significant impact. If archaeological resources are discovered during construction, the Applicant will implement the mitigation measures which will ensure proper evaluation and treatment of archaeological resources, if found. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

(2) Paleontological Resource. The project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and contains fill materials. Any paleontological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously disturbed. In addition, a records check for paleontological resources was requested from the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History for the project site. The records search revealed that no paleontological resources are located on the project site (included as Appendix D [Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Letter]). Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources and result in a
significant impact. Therefore, the potential for damage to, or destruction of, these resources would be a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein, would reduce any potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

(3) Human Remains. A Sacred Lands File records search was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission for the project site. The records search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the project area (included as Appendix E [Native American Heritage Commission Letter]) of the MND. In addition, no formal cemeteries are known to have occupied any portion of the project site, so any human remains encountered would likely come from archaeological or historical archaeological contexts. Human burials, in addition to being potential archaeological resources, have specific provisions for treatment in §§5097 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) and Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054 of the California Health and Safety Code (HSC). Because the area is underlain by disturbed soils, the presence of human remains is remote. However, if remains are encountered, disturbing these remains could violate PRC and HSC provisions, as well as destroy the resource. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein would ensure that this potential impact is less than significant by ensuring appropriate examination, treatment, and protection of human remains, if any are discovered.

b) Mitigation:

(1) In the event that archaeological/paleontological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archeologist has been provided the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.

If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist or paleontologist, as appropriate, shall prepare a research design for recovery of the resources in consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of §§21083.2 of CEQA. The archaeologist or paleontologist shall complete a report of the excavations and findings, and shall submit the report for peer review by three County-certified archaeologists or paleontologists, as appropriate. Upon approval of the report, the County shall submit the report to the Los Angeles Archeological Information Center and keep the report on file at the County of Los Angeles. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

(2) If human remains are unearthed, in accordance with State Health and Safety Code §§7050.5 the applicant shall require from
the construction contractor that no further disturbance will occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code §§5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) of the findings within 24 hours. The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains.

c) **Finding:**

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the MEPS Development project and the project has been conditioned to avoid or substantially lessen the potential environmental effect as identified in the MND.

4. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials.**

a) **Facts/Effects.**

(1) **Transport and Disposal.** Construction and operation of the proposed project would not require extensive or on-going use of materials that would create a significant hazard. Likewise, implementation of the proposed project would not provide for significant transport or disposal of hazardous materials. While not anticipated to be significant, some common hazardous materials would be used in varying amounts during construction and operation of the proposed project. Some examples of hazardous materials handling during construction operations include fueling and servicing construction equipment on-site, and the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, and solvents. These materials are generally disposed of at non-hazardous Class II and III landfills (along with solid waste).

Regarding operation of the proposed project, development of the site would include a 32,980 square-foot military processing center where new recruits are administered medical, physical and written examinations. It is expected that the proposed project would involve little use of hazardous materials. As the proposed project would be used to perform physical examinations of military recruits, biohazards in the form of needles, gloves, and vials may be used and disposed of at the project site. However, the use, transport, and disposal of any hazardous materials during construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements. The following mitigation measures would ensure that this impact is less than significant by requiring compliance with applicable laws and regulations that would reduce the risk of hazardous materials use, transportation, and disposal through the implementation of established safety practices, procedures, and reporting requirements.
(2) **Upset or Accidental Release.** A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) was prepared for the proposed project to identify the potential presence of hazardous substances and other hazardous materials issues that may have an environmental impact on the property or future development. This document is included in Appendix G. The site was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings, and the buildings were utilized for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries. The easternmost buildings on the project site were used to house the main machine shop, which included cutting, shaping, drilling, polishing, and related operations. Major chemicals utilized on site during operations included machine coolants/cutting fluids, hydraulic fluids, and alkaline cleaners. Smaller quantities of alcohols and testing chemicals were also utilized. The Phase I was prepared prior to the demolition of the buildings on-site and inspection of the site conducted for the Phase I reported no major evidence of releases. The only major environmental condition noted by the Phase I was the presence of a subsurface perchloroethylene (PCE) vapor cloud underneath the project site. In addition, the project site is included on several regulatory databases for hazardous materials and is located in the vicinity of several known and suspected contamination sites. Finally, based on historical information, the Phase I indicated that an oil well, sump, and above-ground tanks were located in the southeastern portion of the site in the 1930s. The above-ground oil tanks were most likely used to store oil extracted from the project site. The Phase I recommended that the area around the well be further investigated (SCS Engineers 2006).

(3) To address the PCE vapor cloud present within the soil below the project site, the proposed project will include a vapor barrier (an impermeable membrane and improved venting system) that will be constructed below the project site. Given this design feature, the City of El Segundo’s Environmental Safety Manager concluded that no further action is required with respect to PCE-impacted soil. The mitigation measure requires that, upon installation of the vapor barrier system, the applicant or construction contractor shall contact the El Segundo Fire Department for an inspection and smoke testing. With regards to the inclusion of the project site on several regulatory databases, these listings were generally related to hazardous material use and hazardous waste generation. None of the listings were indicative of known on-site contamination and no violations were found. As for known or suspected contamination off-site, the Phase I indicated that none of the off-site properties posed a threat to the project site. See Item 3.3.7(d) for more detail.

The well located on the southeastern corner of the project site is referred to as the “Ramsey-Wallace” well. The Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources concluded that the well has been abandoned or re-abandoned to current Department of Conservation standards. The Department of Conservation recommends that a well vent system be provided for the Ramsey-Wallace well located at the project site.
During demolition/grading activities, a previously unknown abandoned underground fuel tank and oil sump were discovered on the project site. The tank was subsequently removed and the City of El Segundo Fire Department issued a letter (included as Appendix H) stating that no further action is required. In addition, impacted soil around the sump was also removed and the City of El Segundo Fire Department issued another letter (see Appendix H) stating that no further action is required.

As described above, previous uses of the project site included the use of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable accident conditions. However, potentially significant hazardous conditions have been addressed by the appropriate agency and remedial action has been performed on those potentially significant conditions. Further, the mitigation measures identified herein would require the developer to request an inspection of the vapor barrier be performed by the City's Fire Department. Therefore, the potential for significant hazards to the public or the environment to occur through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction is considered less than significant.

The types of hazardous materials associated with the operation of an office and medical building would generally be limited to those associated with janitorial, maintenance, and repair activities; such as commercial cleansers, lubricants, and paints. In addition, patient care activities would involve relatively small quantities of hazardous materials, such as chemicals used to sterilize equipment; formaldehyde for specimen preservation; and solvents, oxidizers, corrosives, and stains used in clinical laboratories. Operations on-site would also generate biohazardous materials and medical wastes (including blood specimens, and body fluids). Finally, patient care would involve the use of x-ray equipment, which does not involve any radioactive substances, but is regulated as radioactive material.

The amounts and use of these hazardous materials would be very limited and would be subject to federal, State, and local health and safety requirements. Such requirements would be incorporated into the design and operation of the building; such as providing and maintaining appropriate storage areas for hazardous materials, installing or affixing appropriate warning signs and labels, using commercial services that specialize in the recycling of biohazardous materials, installing emergency wash areas for flushing irritating fluids from eyes and exposed skin areas in the event contact occurs, and providing well-ventilated areas in which to use paints and solvents. Therefore, the potential for significant hazards to the public or the environment to occur through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during project operation is considered less than significant.
The MEPS facility is a privately owned building that is proposed to be leased to the federal government and could be a potential target for terrorist activity. It is not possible to estimate the probability of a terrorist attack. However, based on law enforcement's role in combating terrorism, the City has identified critical sites and has assessed the vulnerability of these sites to a terrorist attack. Venues likely to suffer the impact of terrorism include government facilities, military facilities, entertainment and cultural facilities, including the business district, and the popular hotels.

Effective design of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems can significantly reduce the potential for chemical, biological or radiological agents being distributed throughout the buildings. The Department of Defense (DoD) has mandatory antiterrorism standards for the construction and operation of federal facilities. Although the building will not be owned by the federal government, its use by the federal government as a MEPS facility makes it a potential target for terrorist activity. These standards provide effective ways to minimize the likelihood of mass casualties from terrorist attacks against DoD personnel in the buildings in which they work and live. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measures identified herein will ensure potential impacts from bioterrorism for MEPS personnel and recruits are less than significant.

(4) Handle Hazards within One-Quarter Mile of School. El Segundo Middle School, located at 332 Center Street, is located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project site. Hazardous emissions could occur during construction of the proposed project. However, these emissions would be within the accepted levels as established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Further, emissions related to construction are not considered acutely hazardous. As required by the mitigation measures identified herein, the developer would be required to adhere to all regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. Once operational, the most common hazardous material associated with the proposed project would be medical waste. This waste would be properly disposed of, as required by the mitigation measures identified herein. Therefore, the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous material within one-quarter mile of an existing school would be less than significant. As required by the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense. Therefore, potential impacts from bioterrorism would be less than significant. No mitigation measures beyond those outlined under 3.3.7.a are required.

b) Mitigation:

(1) The applicant and construction contractor shall comply with existing hazardous materials regulations, which are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the California Code of Regulations, and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health
and Safety Code. In addition, the applicant and construction contractor shall comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous waste, including, but not limited to, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations and as implemented by Title 13 of the CCR.

(2) The United States Government (MEPS) shall comply with all City and County regulations applying to the use and disposal of medical-based hazardous waste. Furthermore, MEPS personnel shall ensure that all bio-hazardous waste produced at the proposed project site is properly disposed of.

(3) Upon completion of the vapor barrier installation, the project applicant or construction contractor shall contact the City of El Segundo Fire Department to request that an inspection and smoke test be performed to confirm that the vapor barrier was properly installed.

(4) The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which is a reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards and has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.

c) Finding:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the MEPS Development project and the project has been conditioned to avoid or substantially lessen the potential environmental effect as identified in the MND.

5. Noise.

a) Facts/Effects.

(1) Construction Noise. Temporary, intermittent elevated noise levels would occur on and near the proposed project site during the construction phase. Land uses adjacent to, and across from, the proposed project site are commercial properties that would not be impacted by any increase in noise levels at the project site. The nearest sensitive receptors are medium-density residential uses, located at the northeast corner of Grand Avenue and Kansas Street, approximately 500 feet from the proposed project site.

Construction activities could potentially occur within 500 feet of these sensitive receptors. As the project site has already been graded, large scale bulldozing, which generates high noise levels, would not occur. Reference data illustrates that operation of typical construction equipment would result in noise levels between approximately 77 dBA and 86 dBA when measured 50 feet from the source, depending primarily on the type of equipment. These noise
levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site, at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 86 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 80 dBA at 100 feet from the source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dBA, to 74 dBA, at 200 feet from the source to the receptor. As shown in Table 3-5 (Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels), construction-related noise levels measured at 500 feet from the project site would be reduced by approximately 18 dBA to an approximate level of 68 dBA, which is within the existing range of ambient noise levels measured at the corner of Grand Avenue and Kansas Street (refer to Table 3-6 [Summary of Noise Monitoring]).

Construction activities are anticipated to continue at the project site for a period of approximately eleven months. During each stage of construction there would be a different mix of equipment operating, and noise levels would vary based on the type of equipment in operation and the location of activity. Section 7-2-11(D) of the El Segundo Municipal Code (Exemptions), exempts “noise sources associated with or vibration created by construction, repair, or remodeling of any real property, provided said activities do not take place between the hours of six o'clock (6:00) p.m. and seven o'clock (7:00) a.m. Monday through Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a Federal holiday...” The Code also states that construction activity is not to exceed 65 dBA at residential receptors, unless for specified lengths of time as established in Section 7-2-4(B) and (C). Section 7-2-4(B) allows for noise levels of up to 5 dBA above ambient noise levels on residential property receptors, and 8 dBA above ambient noise levels on commercial property receptors. Section 7-2-4(C) allows for adjustments to the noise standards based on the permitted increase and the duration in minutes of increase; however, permitted increases may not exceed 20 dBA for any length of time. Thus, construction noise is exempt from the noise standards established by the City, but only during limited hours of the day and days of the week. Mitigation measures identified herein would further reduce any exposure of persons to noise in excess of established limits.

Implementation of mitigation measures identified herein would reduce noise-related construction impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring BMPs and reducing the time during which excessive noise-producing construction could occur.

(2) Groundborne Vibration or Noise Levels. The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction. However, temporary construction activities at the proposed project site could expose nearby off-site sensitive receptors (residential uses at the corner of Kansas Street and Grand Avenue) to elevated levels of groundborne vibration. Generally speaking, equipment that is the source of largest vibration during construction is bulldozers and loaded trucks. However, the proposed site is already vacant, and no significant
demolition would occur. As with noise, vibration dissipates at a rate of approximately 6 VdB for every doubling of distance. Therefore, assuming that construction-related activities produced by loaded trucks results in groundborne vibration levels of 86 VdB (measured at 25 feet) during construction, vibration levels would dissipate to approximately 61 VdB upon reaching the nearest sensitive receptor, as shown in Table 3-7 (Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment). As with construction noise, construction-related groundborne vibration levels would vary depending on the equipment used and the distance of the vibration-inducing equipment from the sensitive receptor, which is located approximately 500 feet from the project site. However, construction-related vibration is also exempt under El Segundo Municipal Code Section 7-2-10(D), so long as construction-related activities are limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. In addition, implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein would reduce the potential for significant levels of groundborne vibration. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant during construction activities. No additional mitigation is required during construction of the proposed project.

b) Mitigation:

(1) The project applicant's construction contractor shall require by contract specifications that the following construction best management practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels:

(2) The project's construction contractor shall provide advance notification to adjacent property owners and post notices at the Proposed Project site with regards to the schedule of construction activities.

(3) All construction equipment with a high noise generating potential, including all equipment powered by internal combustion engines, shall be muffled or controlled.

(4) All noise-generating construction equipment and construction staging areas shall be placed away from sensitive uses, where feasible.

(5) High noise-producing activities shall be scheduled between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. to minimize disruption to sensitive uses and delivery of materials and equipment shall occur between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

(6) Noise attenuation measures shall be implemented to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets.

(7) Machinery, including motors, shall be turned off when not in use. No mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts below
a level of significance for the Sepulveda/Rosecrans Site Rezoning and Plaza El Segundo Development.

c) Finding:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the MEPS Development project and the project has been conditioned to avoid or substantially lessen the potential environmental effect as identified in the MND.

6. Public Services

a) Facts/Effects.

(1) Public Facilities. The proposed project would receive fire services from the City of El Segundo Fire Department. The proposed project will generate new activity on the project site and increase traffic, both of which will increase demand on fire protection and paramedic services and could result in a potentially significant impact. In the City of El Segundo, the Fire Department is the lead agency for the City's response/crisis management for fire protection services. The Fire Department is challenged to maintain increased demands for fire service which emphasizes preparedness and prevention. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein, impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Impacts are not significant enough to necessitate additional fire personnel.

Terrorism is a continuing threat throughout the world and within the United States (see Item 3.3.13(b) below). The MEPS facility is a privately owned building that is proposed to be leased by the federal government and could be a potential target for terrorist activity. The Department of Defense (DoD) has mandatory antiterrorism standards for the construction and operation of federal facilities. These standards provide effective ways to minimize the likelihood of mass casualties from terrorist attacks against DoD personnel in the buildings in which they work and live. Although the building will not be owned by the federal government, its use by the federal government as a MEPS facility make it a potential target for terrorist activity. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein will ensure potential impacts from bioterrorism for MEPS personnel and recruits are less than significant.

(2) Police Protection. The proposed project would receive police protection services from the City of El Segundo Police Department. Implementation of the proposed development would generate new activity on the project site and increase traffic, both of which could increase demand on police protection services and could result in a potentially significant impact. An act of terrorism, according to the United States Code, The U.S. Department of Justice, and the FBI, is defined by the following components: (1) a criminal action; (2) the action must include violence against civilians; (3) the action is
carried out in order to further political or social objectives; and (4) the action is intended to coerce a government or civilian population.

Terrorism is a continuing threat throughout the world and within the United States. A variety of political, social, religious, cultural, and economic factors underlie terrorist activities. In recent years, terrorism has taken on new form with the introduction of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons. The probability that an individual/location will be targeted by a terrorist is a function of several factors: attractiveness of target, potential for success and potential for avoiding identification and capture. Some terrorists are willing to die for their cause and will select targets regardless of the probability of identification or capture. It is difficult to determine what individual or location will be targeted, however, law enforcement experts agree that a key element is "symbolism." The higher the profile of the target, the better, as far as the terrorist is concerned. Examples include:

a. Federal, state, and local government buildings
b. Mass-transit facilities
c. Public buildings and assembly areas
d. Controversial businesses
e. Communication and utility facilities
f. Water supply locations
g. Research laboratories
h. Places where large groups of people congregate

The MEPS facility is a federal government building which makes it a potential target for terrorist activity. It is not possible to estimate the probability of a terrorist attack. However, based on law enforcement's role in combating terrorism, the City has identified critical sites and has assessed the vulnerability of these sites to a terrorist attack. Venues likely to suffer the impact of terrorism include government facilities, entertainment and cultural facilities, including the business district, and the popular hotels.

In the City of El Segundo, the Police Department is the lead agency for the City’s response/crisis management for police protection services. The Police Department is challenged to maintain increased demands for police service which emphasizes preparedness and prevention. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein, impacts on police protection services would be less than significant. Impacts are not significant enough to necessitate additional police personnel.
Furthermore, as a condition of approval, exterior signs identifying the MEPS facility will not be visible from the public right-of-way and must be limited to the front entry of the building facing towards the parking lot and the side property line. The Department of Defense (DoD) has mandatory antiterrorism standards for the construction and operation of federal facilities. These standards provide effective ways to minimize the likelihood of mass casualties from terrorist attacks against DoD personnel in the buildings in which they work and live. Although the building will not be owned by the federal government, its use by the federal government as a MEPS facility makes it a potential target for terrorist activity. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein will ensure potential impacts from bioterrorism for MEPS personnel and recruits are less than significant.

b) Mitigation:

(1) The applicant shall pay the City of El Segundo a Fire Service Mitigation Fee of $0.14 per gross square foot of building area prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

(2) A fire life safety plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, shall be submitted to the El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed development.

(3) The applicant shall provide fire access roadways to and throughout the property and submit a layout plan to the ESFD for approval.

(4) The applicant shall provide water flow and on-site fire hydrants as required by the ESFD.

(5) The applicant shall submit separate plans for ESFD approval. The following installations require separate ESFD approval:

- Automatic fire sprinklers;
- Fire alarm system;
- Underground fire service mains;
- Fire pumps;
- Emergency generators; and
- Any aboveground or underground storage tanks including elevator sumps and condensation tanks.

(6) The applicant shall pay the City of El Segundo a Police Service Mitigation Fee of $0.11 per gross square foot of building area prior to occupancy of the building.
The applicant shall submit a strategic security plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, to the El Segundo Police Department (ESPD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed project. The strategic security plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following items:

- Depending upon the size of the structure and its location in relation to the streets, the size of the displayed address may vary from a minimum of 4" to as much as 24";
- Building entrances and exits shall be limited in number and located in a manner to increase security and visibility of the building;
- All landscaping shall be low profile especially around perimeter fencing, windows, doors and entryways taking special care not to limit visibility and provide climbing access;
- Adequate street, walkway, building and parking lot lighting must be provided to enhance security; and,
- Provisions for on-site security personnel.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the MEPS Development project and the project has been conditioned to avoid or substantially lessen the potential environmental effect as identified in the MND.

D. Insignificant Cumulative Impacts.

The City Council finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the record of proceedings in this matter do not identify or contain substantial evidence which identifies significant adverse cumulative environmental effects associated with the Military Entrance Processing Station Project with respect to the areas listed below:

1. Aesthetics
2. Agricultural Resources
3. Air Quality
4. Biological Resources
5. Cultural Resources
6. Geology and Soils
7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
8. Hydrology and Water Quality
9. Land Use and Planning
10. Mineral Resources
11. Noise
12. Population and Housing
13. Public Services
14. Recreation
15. Transportation/Traffic

VI. **SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.**

The City Council finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, which is incorporated herein by this reference, and in the record of proceedings in the matter. To the extent applicable, each of the other findings made by the City Council in connection with its approval of the entitlement applications listed in Section I above are also incorporated herein by this reference.
CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. _____
Exhibit B

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires a Lead Agency to adopt a “reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment” (Mitigation Monitoring Program, Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines provides additional direction on mitigation monitoring or reporting). The Planning and Building Safety Department for the City of El Segundo is the Lead Agency for the proposed project for The Aerospace Corporation development project.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. Where appropriate, this environmental document identified project design features or recommended mitigation measures to avoid or to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is designed to monitor implementation of requirements for subsequent environmental documentation and mitigation measures identified for The Aerospace Corporation development project. The MMRP is subject to review and approval by the Lead Agency as part of the approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and adoption of project conditions. The required subsequent environmental documentation and mitigation measures are listed separately and categorized by impact area, with an accompanying identification of the following:

- Monitoring Phase, the phase of the project during which the mitigation measure must be monitored;
  - Pre-Construction, including the design phase
  - Construction
  - Post-Construction
- The Implementing Party, the agency with the power to implement the mitigation measure;
- The Enforcement Agency, the agency with the power to enforce the mitigation measure, and
- The Monitoring Agency, the agency to which reports involving feasibility, compliance, implementation and development are made.
The MMRP performance must be monitored annually to determine the effectiveness of the measures implemented in any given year and re-evaluate the mitigation needs for the upcoming year.

I.  AESTHETICS

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

VQ-1:  Expansive areas of highly reflective materials, such as mirrored glass, must not be permitted. Non-reflective building materials must be used to the maximum extent possible to reduce potential glare impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Pre-construction; Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VQ-2:  Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Pre-construction; Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.  AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

III.  AIR QUALITY

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.
Mitigation Measures

AQ-1: The project applicant’s construction contractor shall implement all rules and regulations by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD that are applicable to the development of the project (such as Rule 402 (Nuisance) and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and that are in effect at the time of development. The following measures are currently recommended to implement Rule 403. These measures have been quantified by SCAQMD as being able to reduce PM10 levels generated by construction activities between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of PM10.

- Water trucks shall be utilized on the site and shall be available to be used throughout the day during site grading and excavation to keep the soil damp enough to prevent PM10 levels being raised by activities associated with project construction.

- Areas that are to be graded or that are being graded and/or excavated shall be wetted down in the late morning and after work is completed for the day.

- All unpaved parking or staging areas, or unpaved road surfaces shall be watered three times daily or have chemical soil stabilizers applied according to manufacturer’s specifications.

- Exposed piles (i.e. gravel, sand, and dirt) shall be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or approved soil binders shall be applied to exposed piles according to manufacturer’s specifications.

- The construction disturbance area shall be kept as small as possible.

- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or have water applied to the exposed surface prior to leaving the site to prevent PM10 and PM 2.5 from reaching the surrounding areas.

- Consolidate truck deliveries when possible.

- Wheel washers shall be installed where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads and used to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

- Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads.

- Wind barriers shall be installed along the perimeter of the site.
• All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour over a 3-minute period.

**Monitoring Phase:** Pre-construction; Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** South Coast Air Quality Management District  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Public Works Department

**AQ-2:** The project applicant’s construction contractor shall use low-VOC or ultra-low VOC paints that produce no more than 6.66 VOC lbs per 1,000 square feet for architectural coating.

**Monitoring Phase:** Pre-construction; Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

#### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

#### Mitigation Measures

**CR-1** In the event that archaeological/paleontological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth disturbing work within a 100-meter radius shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archeologist has been proved the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.

If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist or paleontologist, as appropriate, shall prepare a research design for recovery of the resources in consultation.
with the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of §§21083.2 of CEQA. The archaeologist or paleontologist shall complete a report of the excavations and findings, and shall submit the report for peer review by three County-certified archaeologists or paleontologists, as appropriate. Upon approval of the report, the County shall submit the report to the San Bernardino Archeological Information Center and keep the report on file at the County of San Bernardino. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

**Monitoring Phase:** Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department

CR-2 If human remains are unearthed, in accordance with State Health and Safety Code §§7050.5 the applicant shall require from the construction contractor that no further disturbance will occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code §§5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) of the findings within 24 hours. The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains.

**Monitoring Phase:** Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**Subsequent Environmental Documentation**

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

HZ-1: The applicant and construction contractor shall comply with existing hazardous materials, regulations, which are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the California Code of Regulations, and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. In addition, the applicant and construction contractor shall comply with applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations pertaining to the transport, use and disposal of hazardous waste, including, but not to limited, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations and as implemented by Title 13 of the CCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HZ-2: The United States Government (MEPS) shall comply with all City and County regulations applying to the use and disposal of medical-based hazardous waste. Furthermore, MEPS personnel shall ensure that all bio-hazardous waste produced at the proposed project site is properly disposed of.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HZ-3: Upon completion of the vapor barrier installation, the project applicant or construction contractor shall contact the City of El Segundo Fire Department to request that an inspection and smoke test be performed to confirm that the vapor barrier was properly installed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HZ-4: The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.
XI. NOISE

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

NOI-1: The project applicant’s construction contractor shall require by contract specifications that the following construction best management practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels:

• The project applicant’s construction contractor shall provide advance notification to adjacent property owners and post notices at the Proposed Project site with regards to the schedule of construction activities.

• All construction equipment with a high noise generating potential, including all equipment powered by internal combustion engines, shall be muffled or controlled.

• All noise-generating construction equipment and construction staging areas shall be placed away from sensitive uses, where feasible.

• High noise-producing activities shall be scheduled between the hours of 8 A.M. and 5 P.M. to minimize disruption to sensitive uses and delivery of materials and equipment shall occur between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M.

• Noise attenuation measures shall be implemented to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets.

• Machinery, including motors, shall be turned off when not in use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XII. POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.
Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

PS-1: The applicant shall pay the adopted City of El Segundo Fire Service Mitigation Fee of $0.14 per gross square foot of building area before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.

Monitoring Phase: Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department
Monitoring Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department

PS-2: A Fire Life Safety Plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, shall be submitted to the EL Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed development.

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Fire Department
Monitoring Agency: Fire Department

PS-3: The applicant shall provide fire access roadways to and throughout the property and submit a layout plan to the ESFD for approval.

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction; Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Fire Department
Monitoring Agency: Fire Department

PS-4: The applicant shall provide water flow and on-site fire hydrants as required by the ESFD.

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction; Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Fire Department
Monitoring Agency: Fire Department
PS-5  The applicant shall submit separate plans for ESFD approval. The installations require separate ESFD approval:

- Automatic fire sprinklers;
- Fire alarm system;
- Underground fire service mains;
- Fire pumps;
- Emergency generators; and
- Any aboveground or underground storage tanks including elevator sumps and condensation tanks.

**Monitoring Phase:** Pre-construction; Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Fire Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Fire Department

P-6:  The applicant shall pay the adopted City of El Segundo Police Service Mitigation Fee of $0.11 per gross square foot of building area before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.

**Monitoring Phase:** Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department

PS-7  The applicant shall submit a strategic security plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, to the El Segundo Police Department (ESPDD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed project. The strategic security plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following items:

- Depending upon the size of the structure and its location in relation to the streets, the size of the displayed address may vary from a minimum of 4” to as much as 24”;
- Building entrances and exits shall be limited in number and located in a manner to increase security and visibility of the building;
- All landscaping shall be low profile especially around perimeter fencing, windows, doors and entryways taking special care not to limit visibility and provide climbing access;
- Adequate street, walkway, building and parking lot lighting must be provided to enhance security; and
- Provisions for on-site security personnel.

**Monitoring Phase:** Pre-construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Police Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Police Department
XIV. RECREATION

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

XV TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

XVI. UTILITIES

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.
CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. _____

Exhibit "C"

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City of El Segundo's approval of a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04) ("Project Conditions").

Planning and Building Safety Department

1. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit plans that demonstrate substantial compliance with the plans and conditions of approval on file with the Planning and Building Safety Department. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved, including the site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscaping and materials, must be referred to the Planning and Building Safety Director to determine whether the Planning Commission should review the proposed modification.

2. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must obtain all the necessary approvals, licenses and permits and pay all the appropriate fees as required by the City.

3. All mitigation measures in the Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") project are incorporated by this reference into these conditions of approval. All mitigation measures must be listed on the plans submitted for plan check and on the plans for which a building permit is issued.

4. Any changes to the colors and materials of the exterior façade of the building and the color of the new perimeter wrought iron fencing and masonry wall must be approved to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Director in compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines set forth in ESMC Chapter 15-11.

Materials and Design

5. Before the City issues building permits, the applicant must submit Final Working drawings to the Planning and Building Safety Director for design review for compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines. The design review must include, without limitation, the following:
A. All colors, textures, and materials on exterior elevations must be coordinated to achieve a continuity of design;

B. At least two primary exterior building materials (including without limitation, stucco, brick and stone) must be used;

C. Building materials must be of non-reflective coatings and glazings;

D. All buildings must utilize energy efficient floor plans and controlled HVAC and heat generating equipment to reduce energy use for cooling and ventilation;

E. All roof-mounted mechanical equipment and communications devices must be hidden behind architecturally integrated building parapets or screens to screen these devices from view of adjacent public rights-of-way;

F. Loading areas must be screened from view with opaque walls and landscaping. The walls must be architecturally integrated with the building design; and

G. Chain-link fences are not permitted except as temporary construction fencing.

6. A maximum of one entry sign along the Grand Avenue frontage and one building wall sign facing the side property line must be permitted. The sign design must be architecturally compatible with the building design. Signs must be constructed of durable materials.

7. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit final landscaping and irrigation plans to the Planning and Building Safety Department and the Parks and Recreation Department for review and approval to demonstrate compliance with the City's Water Conservation regulations and Guidelines for Water Conservation in Landscaping (ESMC §§10-2-1 et. seq.). The plant materials used in landscaping must be compatible with the El Segundo climate pursuant to Sunset Western Garden Book's Zone 24 published by Sunset Books Inc, Revised and Updated 2001 edition, which is available for review at the Planning and Building Safety Department. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must demonstrate compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines and the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) development standards. The landscaping and irrigation must be completely installed before the City issues a final Certificate of Occupancy. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must comply with the following:
a. Reclaimed water must be used as the water source to irrigate landscaped areas, if feasible. To that end, dual water connections must be installed to allow for landscaping to be irrigated by reclaimed water, if feasible.

b. Efficient irrigation systems must be installed which minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water which will reach plant roots (e.g., drip irrigation, automatic sprinklers equipped with moisture sensors).

c. Automatic sprinkler systems must be set to irrigate landscaping during early morning hours or during the evening to reduce water losses from evaporation. Sprinklers must also be reset to water less often in cooler months and during the rainfall season so that water is not wasted by excessive landscaping irrigation.

d. Selection of drought-tolerant, low-water consuming plant varieties must be used to reduce irrigation water consumption, in compliance with ESMC §§ 10-2-1 et seq.

8. The two parcels of the project site must be merged into one lot through a lot line adjustment or tentative map.

9. The applicant must provide a sufficient number of bicycle racks to accommodate the storage of at least 8 bicycles.

10. Employees must be provided current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site; telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators; ridesharing promotional materials; and bicycle route and facility information.

11. On-site dining facilities must remain incidental to the primary general office and medical-dental office uses and may not be open to the general public. The on-site dining facilities must be limited to employees, recruits and visitors by invitation.

12. A trash and recycling enclosure must be provided and shown on the site plan that is sufficiently large enough to store the necessary bins required for the regular collection of commercial solid waste and recyclable materials. The site plan with the location and dimensions of the trash and recycling enclosure and an elevation view of the enclosure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval before the City issues building permits.
13. Ground level mechanical equipment, refuse collectors, storage tanks, monitoring wells, generators, and other similar facilities must be screened from view with dense landscaping and walls of materials and finishes compatible with adjacent buildings.

14. Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare.

15. The building must be designed to comply with the ESMC standards for the attenuation of interior noise.

16. The building must be designed, constructed, and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the United States Department of Defense.

Building Division Conditions

17. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit a geotechnical plan that is not more than one year old to the Planning and Building Safety Director for review and approval.

18. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a soils report to the Planning and Building Safety Director for review and approval.

19. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a grading plan to the Planning and Building Safety Director for review and approval.


21. Before building permits are issued, plans must show compliance with accessibility requirements per Chapter 11 of the 2007 California Building Code, as amended by the ESMC.

Fire Department Conditions

22. The project must comply with all applicable requirements in the California Building and Fire Codes, adopted by the ESMC.

23. A chemical inventory of the types of chemicals used at the facility must be submitted to the Fire Department.
Public Works Department Conditions

24. All onsite utilities including without limitation, water, electricity, gas, sewer and storm drains, must be installed underground.

25. The applicant must dedicate 10 feet along the entire Grand Avenue frontage of the subject property and provide an irrevocable offer to dedicate an additional 9 feet along the entire Grand Avenue frontage of the subject property to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department and the City Attorney. The City shall have the right to exercise its right to accept the property subject to the offer of dedication on or after, the earlier of, September 1, 2024, or 15 years after the date on which the final certificate of occupancy was issued for the facility. The City is required to pay fair market value for the property subject to the offer of dedication if, and only if, the City actually takes possession of the property. If the City amends its Circulation Element such that property that is subject to the offer of dedication is no longer required for public right-of-way purposes, then the offer to dedicate is deemed null and void and the City will execute the documents necessary to void the offer to dedicate.

26. The applicant must ensure that all curb, gutters, and driveway aprons fronting Grand Avenue will be replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

27. All damaged or off-grade curb, sidewalk and pavement must be removed and replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

28. The applicant must ensure that encroachment permits are secured from the Public Works Department before commencing any work in the public right-of-way.

29. The project must comply with the latest NPDES requirements and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) for sediment control, construction material control and erosion control.

Police Department Conditions

30. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit a photometric light study to the Police Department for review and approval. The photometric study must be point-by-point and include the light loss factor (.7). Lighting levels must be adjusted to meet the minimum footcandle requirements within each area of the site.

31. Lighting devices must be enclosed and protected by weather and vandal resistant covers.
32. The addressing, open parking lot and trash dumpster must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. A wall pack must be placed over the receiving door and must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. Aisles, passageways and recesses related to and within all sides of the building complex must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of .25 foot-candles on the ground surface during hours of darkness.

33. An exterior camera plan must be provided that includes the height of installation and area of coverage. Camera locations must be designed so that they face the points of entry to the property and that the cameras are installed at such a height that when trees are grown to maturity they will not block the viewing angle. Additionally, an exterior camera must facing the Grand Avenue entrance to the access road that runs along the east property line to capture vehicle license plate numbers and facial images as cars enter this road.

34. Front entry gates must have access control and be viewed by CCTV.

35. Buses must enter the facility either by interior controls or by access card.

36. Deliveries must enter the facility by interior controls/intercom.

37. Security cameras must cover both the interior of the building and all of the exterior property. The applicant must have web based capabilities for CCTV access.

38. Digital cameras must maintain a minimum of 30 days of video storage.

39. An alarm system must be installed in the facility.

40. The applicant must notify the City of El Segundo Police Department when it has advanced notice of any planned public demonstrations or if a public demonstration occurs on or in front of the property.

41. The applicant must maintain a 25-foot standoff distance to the east perimeter fencing.

42. Perimeter fencing must be extended to a total height of eight feet and pickets must be outwardly curved with a triple pointed pale head.
Construction Conditions

43. Before any construction occurs the perimeter of the property must be fenced with a minimum 6-foot high fence. The fence must be covered with a material approved by the Planning and Building Safety Department to prevent dust from leaving the site.

44. Public sidewalks must remain open at all times.

45. All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials must either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard.

46. NOx emissions during construction must be reduced by limiting the operation of heavy-duty construction equipment to no more than 5 pieces of equipment at any one time.

47. Staging of construction vehicles and vehicle entry and egress to the site must occur on Grand Avenue.

48. Construction vehicles must not use any route except the City’s designated Truck Routes.

49. The applicant must develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the Public Works Department, which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD:

   A. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.
   B. Provide temporary traffic controls during all phases of construction activities to maintain traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
   C. Re-route construction trucks away from congested streets.
   D. Maintain equipment and vehicles engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer’s specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize dust emissions.
   E. Suspend use of all construction equipment during second stage smog alerts.
      Contact SCAQMD at (800) 242-4022 for daily forecasts.
   F. Use electricity from temporary power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.
   G. Diesel-powered equipment such as booster pumps or generators should be replaced by electric equipment, if feasible.
   H. Catalytic converters must be installed, if feasible.
   I. Equipment must be equipped with two-to-four-degree engine time retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.
J. Use methanol or natural gas powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.

K. Use propane or butane powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.

50. During construction and operations, all waste must be disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Toxic wastes must be discarded at a licensed, regulated disposal site by a licensed waste hauler.

51. 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.

52. If materials spills occur, they must be cleaned up in a way that will not affect the storm drain system.

53. The project must comply with ESMC Chapter 5-4, which establishes storm water and urban pollution controls.

54. Before anticipated rainfall, construction dumpsters must be covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.

55. 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.

56. The owner or contractor must conduct daily street sweeping and truck wheel cleaning to prevent dirt in the storm drain system.

57. Storm drain system must be safeguarded at all times during construction.

58. All diesel equipment must be operated with closed engine doors and must be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

59. Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

60. The applicant must provide a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with the construction noise. The number must be posted on the project site and must be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

61. During construction, the contractor must store and maintain equipment as far as possible from adjacent residential property locations northwest of the site.
62. As stated in ESMC Chapter 7-2, construction related noise is restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or a Federal holiday.

Service Fee Conditions

63. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time library services mitigation fee of $0.03 per gross square-foot of building floor area.

64. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time fire services mitigation fee of $0.14 per gross square-foot of building floor area.

65. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time police services mitigation fee of $0.11 per gross square-foot of building floor area.

66. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay the required sewer connection fees (as specified in ESMC Title 12-3).

67. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before the City issues certificates of occupancy, the applicant must pay the required traffic mitigation fees as calculated in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 4443.

Miscellaneous

68. Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney’s fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City’s approval of Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04). Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC., agrees to defend the City (at the City’s request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section “the City” includes the City of El Segundo’s elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.
By signing this document, William Messori and Allan Mackenzie on behalf of Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, certifies that they have read, understood, and agree to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

William Messori  
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

Allan Mackenzie  
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL CHANGES TO CONFORM WITH CALIFORNIA LAW.

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Findings. The City Council finds and declares that the amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as follows:

A. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specifically recognizes that individual property owners and market forces should determine what growth should occur in the area. (ESMC § 15-11-2).

B. Both the procedural amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and the activation of a portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan including, without limitation:

1. Objective 1.3 – providing maximum possible responsiveness to market opportunities within the desire development intensification; and

2. Objective 5.1 – Providing for maximum possible capture of market opportunities by property owners.

3. As the Property is covered by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general office and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the Property is consistent.

C. Since the project site is regulated by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the project site is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.
D. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the City's General Plan as the Land Use Map designates the property as Smoky Hollow Mixed Use, which specifically provides for office uses and commercial uses under the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone.

SECTION 2: Additional Findings. The City Council also finds and declares as follows:

A. The findings set forth in Resolution No. ____, adopted on July 15, 2008, are incorporated as if fully set forth.

B. Based upon the entirety of the administrative record including, without limitation, Resolution No. ____, the public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council, and additional information in the record, in accordance with ESMC §§ 15-7B-13 and 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2), the City Council finds that because only the office uses set forth in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) are being activated on the project site, the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses.

SECTION 3: ESMC § 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) A commercial district is provided along the south edge of Grand Avenue for limited commercial development if it can be demonstrated that erosion of downtown commercial potential will not thereby occur. Subject to the discretionary approval of the City Council an application may be filed with the City requesting that only some of the permitted uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone be activated.”

Section 4: ESMC § 15-11-3 (D)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“2. Procedure: The City Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission, giving written notice to adjacent property owners and holding a public hearing may activate either of these floating zones. The Council or the Commission may initiate such change by petition of the property owner(s). If petitioned for by the property owner only limited uses in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone may be activated, in which case the property shall receive a designation of "GAC-[limited/allowed uses]." Before such petition can be considered, the owner(s) must submit a focused supplemental EIR addressing land use, traffic, utilities, noise and air quality. The City shall ultimately determine which supplemental potential impacts must be addressed. Fees for such a procedure shall be established by the City Council.”
SECTION 5: Zoning Map. The City Council amends ESMC § 15-11-3(D) by revising Exhibit III-2 to show the limited activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone for General and Medical/Dental Office Uses (GAC Limited/General and Medical/Dental Office) as specified in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) for the property located at 1700 East Grand Avenue and more specifically identified on attached Exhibit “A,” which is incorporated by reference.

SECTION 6: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(b) is amended to read as follows:

"b. Applicability: Approval of a site plan shall be required prior to or concurrent with a tentative tract or parcel map for all proposed projects within the specific plan area. Where no tentative tract or parcel map is required, approval of a site plan shall occur prior to issuance of building permits. Authority for approval of a site plan shall rest with the Planning and Building Safety Director of Community, Economic and Development Services for projects under fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet in floor area (appealable to the Planning Commission) and with the Planning Commission for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of an overlay zone, the Director or Planning Commission shall make a recommendation and the authority for approval shall rest with the City Council."

SECTION 7: ESMC § 15-11-3 H(2)(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) For projects which are fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area, determination that the site plan complies with the provisions of the Specific Plan and the review factors described in the design guidelines, the staff shall prepare a staff report with recommendations which must be submitted along with the site plan to the Planning Commission at the earliest possible regular meeting. The Planning Commission shall approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of an overlay zone, the Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the City Council must approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan.”

SECTION 8: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(e) is amended to read as follows:

“e. Environmental Determination: The site plan review process is discretionary, not ministerial, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). However, in light of the Master EIR established as part of this Specific Plan, only a focused EIR or mitigated negative declaration will be required for uses permitted in the base districts and then only where it is demonstrated that public facilities are inadequate and improvements beyond the project site may be
required. A full supplemental EIR will be required for activation of any portion of the floating zones."

SECTION 9: Environmental Assessment. Resolution No. ____ adopted an MND for this Project which, among other things, properly assesses the environmental impact of this Ordinance, and the Project, in accordance with CEQA. This Ordinance incorporates by reference the findings and analysis set forth in Resolution No. ____.

SECTION 10: Repeal or amendment of any provision of the ESMC will not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before this Ordinance's effective date. Any such repealed part will remain in full force and effect for sustaining action or prosecuting violations occurring before the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 11: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this Ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo's book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

SECTION 12: Severability. If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the city council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 13: Effective Date. This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first (31st) day following its passage and adoption.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August 2008.

______________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA   )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )   SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  )

I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Ordinance No. ___ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 15th day of July 2008, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 5th day of August, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: ________________________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
I. Introduction

The proposed Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") project consists of Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04 to allow the construction of a 32,980 square-foot, two-story, commercial general office and medical-dental office building on a 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 E. Grand Avenue to be leased by the United States Government to house a Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") where armed forces recruits will receive medical examinations and take written examinations, and where administrative support services including background checks will be conducted before the recruits are sent to basic training. The subject property is located in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone within the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The proposed project involves a Zone Change request that would amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to implement the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone District; and a Specific Plan Amendment that would further limit the uses of the property to office and medical-dental office uses only. The request also includes a Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review that requires Planning Commission approval for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code § 15-11-3(H). The proposed project would have a floor area
ratio of 0.18 and the building would have a maximum height of 35 feet. The project site has approximately 450 feet of frontage along Grand Avenue. The subject property is currently vacant, but formerly housed the Aerojet manufacturing facilities.

**Project Description**

The following applications are proposed:

1) **Environmental Assessment No. 769 (EA No. 769) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** – A Mitigated Negative Declaration is proposed for this project pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. The public review and comment period for the Environmental Document began on May 1, 2008 and ended on June 2, 2008.

2) **Zone Change No. 07-01** - An amendment to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to change the zoning of approximately 4.25 gross acres of land owned by Mar Grand Canyon LLC from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone.

3) **Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02** – An amendment to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office uses only. The amendment also includes technical changes to the SHSP relating to the environmental review requirements to make the SHSP consistent with the law (CEQA).

4) **Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04** – A Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review to allow for the construction of the proposed 32,980 square-foot, two-story, 35-foot tall, commercial building with 132 parking spaces, landscaping, and perimeter walls and fencing.

All four applications require review and recommendation by the Planning Commission. The City Council will take final action on all of the applications.

II. **Recommendation**

In order for the proposed project, a Military Entrance Processing Station, to be approved, the Planning Commission must consider the facts in this report and public testimony, conduct a public hearing, and adopt Resolution No. 2638, recommending that the City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, with conditions.

III. **Background**

**Site Description**

The project site is located on the south side of Grand Avenue between Kansas Street and Sepulveda Boulevard. The site is located in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone within the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The site is relatively flat and contains approximately 4.25 acres (184,888 square feet).
The site is currently vacant. The site was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings, and the buildings were utilized for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries.

Soil contamination occurred on the site as a result of the former land use. The applicant has completed all site soil remediation activities and the site has been released by the City of El Segundo Fire Department’s Environmental Safety Manager. A detailed discussion is contained within the proposed Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration.

**Surrounding Land Uses**

The surrounding area is surrounded primarily with industrial uses. Specifically, the site is surrounded by industrial facilities in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone to the north, an industrial facility and an animal kennel in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the south, an electrical substation and plant nursery in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the east, and industrial facilities in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the west. Additionally, there are multi-family residential uses to the northwest.

Surrounding land uses are as described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Medium Manufacturing (MM) and Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Electrical Substation and Plant Nursery</td>
<td>Medium Manufacturing (MM) and General Commercial (C-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Medium Manufacturing (MM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Medium Manufacturing (MM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Analysis**

**Project Description and Land Use**

The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story 32,980 square-foot commercial general office and medical-dental office building on the 4.25 acre project site to be leased by the United States Government for a Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS").

The purpose of the proposed MEPS is to perform physical and written examination and provide administrative support services for new recruits into the Armed Forces before they are sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and from the site by van or bus. No recruits are permitted to come to the site on their own. The proposed MEPS facility is planned to operate between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 a.m. and 12:00...
p.m. for a total of 13 Saturdays per year. The proposed MEPS facility will be open to security personnel at 4:30 a.m. and to staff at 5:00 a.m. Some personnel may remain working on-site until 8:00 p.m. A total of 120 employees are anticipated to work in the facility.

Access to the property is from two gated driveways along Grand Avenue; one will provide ingress and both will provide egress. The project would provide a total of 132 on-grade parking spaces. A loading dock area with two loading spaces is proposed on the north side of the building facing the street with screening provided. Additionally, the project provides for approximately 83,500 square feet of open space. A perimeter security wall/fence would be erected around the entire site. The fence would consist of a six-foot tall wrought iron fence, except along the southwest portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound attenuation and security wall adjacent to an industrial facility and animal kennel to the south. The proposed project would be constructed in one phase.

The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan establishes the development standards and design guidelines for properties located within its boundaries. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan includes two “floating zones” including the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone. The proposed project includes a Zone Change request to implement the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone, which, when enacted, would allow for limited commercial uses on the project site. Additionally, the applicant’s request includes a Specific Plan Amendment to further limit the on-site permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office uses with incidental and customary ancillary uses only. General office and medical-dental office uses are two of the permitted uses allowed in the GAC Zone. The proposed office and medical-dental office uses would be consistent with the permitted uses identified in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan once the GAC Zone is activated. The environmental document prepared for this project (a proposed draft Mitigated Negative Declaration), analyzed the proposed project with the limited uses as requested by the applicant and any changes in could necessitate additional environmental review. The proposed project would be required to adhere to the development standards identified for the GAC Zone.

**General Plan Consistency**

The General Plan land use designation for the project site is Smoky Hollow Mixed Use. The Smoky Hollow Mixed Use classification permits primarily light industrial uses including light manufacturing, research and development, warehousing and office uses. Grand Avenue commercial uses are also permitted in locations as designated under the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The permitted FAR for Grand Avenue commercial uses is 0.5 for newly constructed projects. The project site has a Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zoning District designation that allows manufacturing, light industrial, general offices for research, professional and technical services, research and development, warehousing and distribution, public facilities, and public utilities. The proposed zoning designation for the project site is the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone that allows cafes, general offices, medical-dental offices, retail sales and theaters.
The proposed project would be consistent with the following General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives, and Policies if the proposed Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone is implemented:

1) General Plan Land Use Policy LU4-1.2 - "All commercial facilities shall be built and maintained in accordance with Health and Safety Code requirements and shall meet seismic safety regulations and environmental regulations."

2) General Plan Land Use Objective LU4-3 - "Provide for new office and research and development uses."

3) General Plan Land Use Policy LU4-3.6 - "Require landscaping, its maintenance, and permanent upkeep in all new office and mixed-use developments."

4) General Plan Land Use Policy LU5-2.2 - "All outdoor storage shall be properly screened by masonry walls and landscaping."

5) General Plan Land Use Objective LU5-3 - "Encourage the rehabilitation of existing substandard blighted industrial areas through the combined efforts of private and public sectors."

6) General Plan Land Use Policy LU5-3.1 - "Revitalize and upgrade industrial areas which contain aesthetic or functional deficiencies in such areas as landscaping, off-street parking, or loading areas."

7) General Plan Land Use Policy LU7-1.2 - "No new development shall be allowed unless adequate public facilities are in place or provided for." Require landscaping, its maintenance, and permanent upkeep in all new office and mixed-use developments."

8) General Plan Circulation Element Objective C1-1 - "Provide a roadway system that accommodates the City's existing and projected land use and circulation needs."

9) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-1.2 - "Pursue implementation of all Circulation Element policies such that all Master Plan roadways are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service."

10) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-1.5 - "Implement roadway and intersection upgrades to full Circulation Element standards when needed to improve traffic operating conditions and to serve development."

11) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-1.9 - "Provide all residential, commercial and industrial areas with efficient and safe access for emergency vehicles."

12) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-1.14 - "Require a full evaluation of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed new development prior to
project approval. Further, require the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures prior to, or in conjunction with, project development. Mitigation measures may include new roadway links on segments that would connect the new development to the existing roadway system, intersection improvements, and other measures. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer.”

13) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-1.15 - “Pursue and protect adequate right-of-way to accommodate future circulation system improvements.”

14) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-1.16 – “Encourage the widening of substandard streets and alleys to meet City standards wherever feasible.”

15) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C1-3.2 – “Ensure that the development review process incorporates consideration of off-street commercial loading requirements for all new projects.”

16) General Plan Circulation Element Objective C2-1 – “Provide a pedestrian circulation system to support and encourage walking as a safe and convenient travel mode within the City’s circulation system.

17) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C2-1.3 – “Encourage new developments in the City to participate in the development of the citywide system of pedestrian walkways and require participation funded by the project developer where appropriate.”

18) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C2-1.4 – “Ensure the installation of sidewalks on all future arterial widening or new construction projects, to establish a continuous and convenient link for pedestrians.”

19) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C2-2.2 – “Encourage new development to provide facilities for cyclists to park and store their bicycles and provide shower and clothes changing facilities at or close to the bicyclist’s work destination.”

20) General Plan Circulation Element Policy 3-1.1 – “Require all new development to mitigate project-related impacts on the existing and future circulation system such that all Master Plan roadways and intersections are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service through implementation of all applicable Circulation Element policies. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer.”

21) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C3-1.8 – “Require the provision of adequate pedestrian and bicycle access for new development projects through the development review process.”

22) General Plan Circulation Element Policy C3-2.1 – “Ensure the provision of sufficient on-site parking in all new development.”
It should be noted that General Plan Goal LU5 “Attraction of clean and beneficial industrial uses” and some of its associated Objectives and Policies, including Objective LU5-4 to “Preserve and maintain a balanced and diversified industrial base” would no longer be applicable to the project site with the approval of the proposed Zone Change and the implementation of the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone.

**Zoning Consistency**

The following chart reflects development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone and those proposed by the applicant. As described below, the project meets all Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>GAC ZONE STANDARDS</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>Cafes; general and medical-dental offices; restaurants; retail sales; and theaters. ESMC §15-7B-2</td>
<td>The proposed MEPS facility will contain general office and medical-dental offices. Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>43,560 square-foot (1 acre) minimum ESMC § 15-7B-7(B)</td>
<td>4.25 acres Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>35 feet maximum ESMC § 15-7B-7(C)</td>
<td>35 ft. existing Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>Grand Ave. – minimum of a 15-foot fully landscaped front setback. ESMC § 15-7B-7(D)(1)</td>
<td>Building is setback approximately 98’ from Grand Ave. Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setbacks</td>
<td>15 feet minimum. ESMC § 15-7B-7(D)(2)</td>
<td>24 ft. from the easterly property line Complies 150 ft. from the southwesterly property line. Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>None required, except where the rear yard abuts a dedicated alley, a minimum five (5’) foot setback is required. ESMC § 15-7B-7(D)(3)</td>
<td>252 ft. from the southerly property line. Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Frontage</td>
<td>270 feet on Grand Avenue required. ESMC § 15-7B-7(E)</td>
<td>449 feet on Grand Avenue is provided. Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.5 (Net) maximum FAR (92,565 square feet) ESMC § 15-7B-7(F)</td>
<td>0.18 FAR proposed (32,980 square feet). Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Front Yard Setback: 15-foot front yard setback must contain a raised planter, utilizing common brick as accent or veneer application for a minimum of 50% of the total front yard setback area. Turf, artificial plants, AstroTurf, crushed white rock and pavement are not permitted. ESMC § 15-7B-8(A)</td>
<td>Front Yard Setback: All final landscape requirements will meet the ESMC. A 16 inch high raised landscape planter will extend the entire setback area. Various plant materials including 19 trees (18 are required) will be Provided. Will Comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Landscaping</td>
<td>Landscaping shall consist of trees, shrubs, vines, bushes, flowers, evergreen ground covers or any combination thereof. ESMC § 15-7B-8(B)</td>
<td>Site Landscaping: 45% (83,510 sq. ft.) is proposed. Landscaping consists of turf, various trees, shrubs and ground cover. Complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Use Area:</td>
<td>Landscaping shall not consist solely of turf, crushed rock, redwood bark or decorative pavement. ESMC § 15-7B-8(C)</td>
<td>Vehicular Use Area: 5,204 square feet or 7% provided. Complies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vehicular Access | Direct vehicular access to the site from Grand Avenue is prohibited unless the subject property is essentially inaccessible to adjacent side streets. ESMC § 15-7B-10 | Direct vehicular access to the site is taken from Grand Avenue. The site is not accessible from adjacent side streets. Complies. |

| Parking Spaces | 125 parking spaces are required ESMC §§ 15-7B-9, 15-11-3(E)(2) and 15-15-3B(5) | 132 parking spaces are proposed. Complies |

| Parking Space Dimensions | All spaces are 8 ½ by 18 except for the larger handicapped spaces. ESMC §§ 15-15-5(A) and 15-11-3(E)(2) | Complies. |

| Loading Spaces | Two 13' by 50' parking spaces are required for a 32,980 square foot building. ESMC § 15-15-6 | Two 15' by 50' parking spaces are provided. Complies. |
## Driveway Visibility

To provide visibility for pedestrians and drivers, all driveways must maintain a triangular area of 10' in length adjacent to the driveway and property line intersections, in which no fences, walls and landscaping are permitted to exceed 30' in height from street grade, except trees that are trimmed with a 12' high minimum visibility from street grade under the canopy.

ESMC § 15-2-11

The project does not have any obstructions over 30' in height within a 10' triangular corner cut-off at the intersection of driveways and property lines. Complies.

## Project Review and Plan Consistency

- **Project Consistency with GAC Development Regulations**
  - ESMC § 15-7B-12 (A)

- **Project Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines**
  - ESMC § 15-7B-12 (B)

- **Project Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Incentives**
  - ESMC § 15-7B-12 (C)

- **Project Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies**
  - ESMC § 15-7B-12 (D)

A. Project Complies with GAC Development Regulations

B. See Discussion of Project Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines Below

C. See Discussion of Project Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Incentives Below

D. See Discussion of Project Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies Below

## Special Findings

Project must demonstrate that proposed uses do not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses. ESMC § 15-7B-13

See Discussion of Project Below

---

**Access and Parking**

Access to the property is from two gated driveways along Grand Avenue; one will provide ingress and both will provide egress. All vehicles will enter the site through the main 30-foot wide entrance on Grand Avenue. Employees and buses transporting recruits will exit through the main gate. Service vehicles including trash trucks will exit through the second gate. Pedestrian traffic is not anticipated. The proposed leased governmental facility will be secured by perimeter fencing, walls and gates which are open during regular operating hours. Six-foot tall wrought iron fencing seated on top of a 16-inch high brick wall base for a total height of 7 feet 4 inches will secure the site along Grand Avenue. This fencing will be staggered and set back approximately 10 to 15 feet from the Grand Avenue property line. The front building entrance faces southwest. The building entrance will be secured by a locked entry door into the lobby area that will be attended by a security guard. Recruits will arrive at the site in buses
and be dropped off at the front entrance of the building. Buses will also transport the
recruits back to their hotel and/or airport following their processing.

A total of 125 parking spaces are required for the proposed use. The applicant is
proposing 132 parking spaces all of which meet the minimum required dimensions.
Additionally, two loading spaces are required and two are proposed both of which
meet the minimum required dimensions. Small truck (i.e. UPS, FedEx) deliveries are
anticipated once or twice per day. Large truck deliveries are anticipated to occur once
a month.

Street Easement and Offer of Dedication

The El Segundo General Plan Circulation Element Master Plan of Streets classifies
Grand Avenue as a Secondary Arterial with a planned right-of-way width of 98 to 120
feet. A Secondary Arterial street classification provides six through lanes (three travel
lanes in each direction) with a single or double left turn lane at major signalized
intersections and no curb lane parking during peak periods. The current width of
Grand Avenue is 60 feet which just meets the minimum requirements for a Local
Commercial Street street classification. Thus, an additional dedication for street
widening purposes will be required. As staff anticipates that the full planned right-of-
way width for a Secondary Arterial on the section of Grand Avenue between Center
Street and Sepulveda Boulevard may not be required in the future and that expansion
to a 4-Lane Divided Collector Street is expected to meet the needs to accommodate
future growth along and in the vicinity of Grand Avenue, only a 10-foot permanent
dedication is required at this time. A 4-Lane Divided Collector Street classification
provides for four through lanes (two travel lanes in each direction) and a median. An
additional 9 feet will be provided through a 20-year easement with an irrevocable offer
to dedicate so that should the City implement the Secondary Arterial classification for
Grand Avenue west of Sepulveda Boulevard the required right-of-way would be
provided. Since City staff anticipates that Grand Avenue may be changed to a 4-Lane
Divided Collector Street classification in the future the 9 feet could be returned to the
property owner in the future.

Landscaping

The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone requires that
new developments provide a 15-foot front yard setback that contains a raised brick
planter for a minimum of 50% of the total front yard setback area. The applicant is
proposing a landscaped planter along the entire 15-foot front yard setback, with the
exception of the two driveway entrances. The GAC Zone also requires that a
minimum of 5% of the vehicular use area will be landscaped. The applicant is
proposing a total of 83,510 square feet of landscaping (45%) on the site and will meet
or exceed the 5% requirement within the vehicular use area. The GAC Zone also
requires that the landscaping shall consist of a combination of trees, shrubs, vines,
bushes, flowers, and evergreen ground covers and that the landscaping shall not
consist solely of turf, crushed rock, redwood bark or decorative pavement. The project
will comply with these requirements. A permanent irrigation system will be provided in
compliance with the requirements of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.
Architecture

The two-story office building will be constructed using tilt up concrete construction. The two-story building will have a maximum height of approximately 35 feet. Roof mounted equipment will be screened by the building parapets. The building walls will be in several different planes to provide for a visual break up of the exterior walls. In addition four different but complimentary colors will be used to further differentiate wall surfaces. Three different but complimentary brick veneers will also be used to accentuate the entrance to the building. Cast stone accent medallions, aluminum mullions, and tinted glass elements will also be incorporated into the building's contemporary design. All sides of the buildings will incorporate the design elements so as to make each side visually attractive. The building's main entrance point is accentuated by higher vertical design elements and a projecting canopy.

Department of Defense (DOD) Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings

The applicant has provided some information that indicates the reduced potential for terrorist activities at a MEPS facility. City staff and its' consultants after having reviewed the information and analyzed the potential for terrorist activities and safety measures that the United States Government uses to minimize danger to personnel and public safety from terrorist threats for government facilities, proposes to implement mitigation measures and conditions of approval based upon criteria and protective measures contained within The Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) (UFC 4-010-01, July 31, 2002) issued by The Under Secretary of Defense for the purpose of further minimizing potential impacts from terrorist activities that could affect employees, residents, and visitors both in the facility and in the surrounding area. The Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) contain recommended criteria for designing and retrofitting buildings to minimize the possibility of mass casualties in buildings or portions of buildings owned, leased, privatized, or otherwise occupied, managed or controlled by, or for the Department of Defense (DOD). The project will incorporate the following recommended DOD standards:

1. The building will be setback from the Grand Avenue Right-Of-Way a total of 98.5 feet; 82 feet is the minimum standoff distance required by DOD.

2. The building will be built with blast resistant glass and frames.

3. Bollards will be installed around the building between the parking lot and the building to prevent vehicles from driving into the structure.

4. The perimeter fencing and walls will be designed to DOD standards including the use of “S” hooks at the top of the fencing.

Both GSA and MEPS have accepted these design elements.

Facility Operation

MEPS is a Department of Defense joint-services organization staffed with military and civilian personnel. Their job is to determine an applicant's physical qualifications,
aptitude and moral standards as set by each branch of military service, the Department of Defense, and federal law. There are 65 MEPS facilities located throughout the United States.

The proposed MEPS facility is planned to operate during normal business hours on weekdays and on 13 Saturdays each year. A total of 120 (military and civilian) employees are anticipated to work in the facility.

The first floor of the proposed building will contain recruit waiting area, armed forces liaisons offices, and administrative offices. The second floor of the proposed building will contain medical examination offices, recruit testing rooms, administrative offices, and a recruit dining area (not open to the general public).

**Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines**

The broader design goals specified in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines are to create a quality industrial area; to maintain a distinctively smaller scale of development than what exists east of Sepulveda Boulevard; and to enhance the economic potential of the area by attracting quality developments. The following sections of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines are applicable to the proposed project.

*ESMC §15-11-3(l)(2)(b) Elements that are encouraged – Richness of surface and texture.* The applicant is constructing a tilt-up structure but has varied the wall planes, colors, materials and building heights to provide a visual break up of the buildings façade and mass.

*ESMC §15-11-3(l)(2)(b) Elements that are encouraged – Play of light (shapes and shadows).* The applicant has incorporated projecting elements above window areas and at the main entrance that will provide sun control and provide light and shadow on the building’s exterior. There is an additional covered walkway area adjacent to the main entrance and a second level covered patio area that also contributes to the play of light and shadows.

*ESMC §15-11-3(l)(2)(b) Elements that are encouraged – Multi-planed roofs.* The façade of the building has three different levels of parapets. Additional horizontal roof elements over the main entrance and at the northwest corner of the building are used to provide the appearance of multiple levels of roofs.

*ESMC §15-11-3(l)(2)(b) Elements that are encouraged – High degree of wall articulation.* The applicant is proposing eight different wall planes along the 213 foot front elevation. Most of the offsets are between seven and eight feet in the horizontal dimension.

*ESMC §15-11-3(l)(2)(c) Elements to avoid or minimize – Highly reflective surfaces.* The applicant is proposing tinted windows that are not highly reflective. Wall surfaces are also not highly reflective.
3(l)(11)(b) and 15-11-3(l)(11)(c), relating to encouraging the use of richness of
surface and texture, play of light and shadow, multi-planes roofs, and a high
degree or wall articulation; avoiding or minimizing the use of highly
reflective surfaces, large blank walls, large metal surfaces, chain link fences,
and exposed concrete block; encouraging use of subtle warm tones and a
mixture of materials for building surfaces; using architecturally integrated
rooftop equipment screening; controlled site access; separate service areas
and service access; not locating parking and loading areas in setback areas;
locating access points for parking lots away from street intersections;
providing front yard landscaping; using landscape materials to enhance the
major architectural design elements; using native and drought tolerant plant
material where feasible; using landscaping, fences and walls to screen or
enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers,
storage tanks and other items of poor visual quality; and limiting light
standards to no greater than 20 feet in height.

SECTION 8: Recommendations.

A. The City Council should amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan zone
designation from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue
Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone for the 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 East Grand
Avenue.

B. The City Council should amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the
4.25 acre parcel at 1700 East Grand Avenue to general office and medical-
dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only. The corresponding
changes as set forth in the draft Ordinance attached Exhibit “B” are
incorporated into this resolution by reference.

C. Subject to the conditions listed in attached Exhibit “A” and the Mitigation
Monitoring and Reporting Program listed in attached Exhibit “C”, which is
incorporated into this Resolution by reference, the City Council should adopt
the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for
Environmental Assessment No. 769, and approve Zone Change No. 07-01,
Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review
No. 07-04.

SECTION 9: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and
determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence,
both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings
regulations.” The proposed parking and loading facilities are not located in any required setback areas.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(9)(b) “Loading areas and docks shall be permitted only in rear and side lot areas. If a loading area must be located in the front of the building, the building shall be set back an appropriate distance to avoid having delivery vehicles encroaching into the public right-of-way.” The proposed loading areas are located approximately 57 feet and 73 feet from Grand Avenue. The proposed screen wall and landscaping will minimize the view of the loading area.

ESMC § 15-11-3(l)(9)(e) “Major access points for parking lots should be located as far from street intersections as possible.” - The major driveway access is near the center of the Grand Avenue property frontage, roughly at the midpoint between Kansas Street and Sepulveda Boulevard on the south side of the street and approximately 55 feet from Illinois Street and 230 feet from Washington Street on the north side of the street.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(10)(a) “Landscape materials should enhance the major architectural design elements through the coordinated use of shrubs and leaf colors, tree forms, plant masses and lighting.” The applicant has proposed a conceptual landscaping plan that shows extensive landscaping that includes a mix of plant materials and covers approximately 45% of the site.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(10)(b) “Grouped masses of plant materials should be designed to complement architectural elevations and roof lines through color, texture, density and form on both the vertical and horizontal planes.” The applicant has incorporated tree massing, and a variety of tree forms to compliment and effectively break up the massing of the screening walls. Shrubs and ground cover are used to provide the transition from the horizontal ground plane to the vertical screening walls.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(10)(c) “Wherever feasible, native and drought tolerant plant material shall be used.” The applicant has incorporated a variety of plant material, some of which will be drought tolerant.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(10)(e) “Landscaping, fences and walls, or a combination, shall be used on the perimeter of properties to visually screen and/or physically enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tanks and other appurtenant items of poor visual quality.” Loading docks and ramps will be screened from view. A trash enclosure will be provided. No outdoor storage is proposed.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(11)(b) “Light standards shall not exceed twenty feet (20’) in height and in no case shall they exceed the height of the buildings on-site.” No light standards are proposed at this time but any light standards that may be required will not exceed twenty feet in height.

ESMC §15-11-3(l)(11)(c) “All parking lot and driveway lighting should provide uniform illumination of two (2) foot-candles. Accent illumination is recommended at key points.
such as entrances, exits, and loading zones and drives at a minimum of five (5) foot-candles.” All on-site lighting will comply with these design standards.

The design of the proposed MEPS facility complies with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines.

Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Incentives

The proposed project as designed does not utilize any of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan incentives. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan provides incentives for lot consolidation that allow bonuses in parking requirement reductions up to 15 percent, an increased height limit up to 15 feet, and reduced business license fees.

Consistency with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies

The proposed MEPS project is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies that are summarized below.

**Goal 1: Pattern of Use: The highest and best use of the Specific Plan area as a whole and the small parcel/large parcel areas within it.**

*Policy 1.4: Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines.* The proposed project would be an authorized use, would meet the prescribed development regulations and would implement the design guidelines with the approval of the proposed Zone Change and Specific Plan Amendment.

**Goal 2: Condition of Existing Development-A consistent quality of development throughout the area.**

*Objective 2.2 Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed.* The proposed new development project is replacing a deteriorated complex of manufacturing buildings that have been demolished and will comply with the quality of design specified in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines.

*Objective 2.3 Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs.* The proposed new development project is able to comply with all of the development standards of the GAC Zone.

**Goal 3: Visual Improvement-A quality physical appearance of both existing and future development.**

*Objective 3.1 Elimination of visible outside storage.* The proposed new development will not have any outside storage. The existing facility has been demolished already.

*Objective 3.2 More consistent building elevations and materials.* The proposed new development project will use consistent building materials and the design will ensure consistent building elevations.
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2638

Exhibit A

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City of El Segundo's approval of a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04) ("Project Conditions").

Planning and Building Safety Department

1. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit plans that demonstrate substantial compliance with the plans and conditions of approval on file with the Planning and Building Safety Department. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved, including the site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscaping and materials, must be referred to the Director of the Planning and Building Safety Department for a determination regarding the need for Planning Commission review of the proposed modification.

2. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must obtain all the necessary approvals, licenses and permits and pay all the appropriate fees as required by the City of El Segundo.

3. All mitigation measures in the Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") project are incorporated by this reference into these conditions of approval. All mitigation measures must be listed on the plans submitted for plan check and on the plans for which a building permit is issued.

4. Any changes to the colors and materials of the exterior façade of the building and the color of the new perimeter wrought iron fencing and masonry wall must be approved to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Department in compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines in ESMC Chapter 15-11.
Objective 8.3 Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access. Grand Avenue provides pedestrian access that connects the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Area with the residential community to the north, the commercial and industrial areas to the east and other Smoky Hollow Specific Plan properties to the west. The proposed project provides for a sidewalk that meets the Circulation Element standards along the entire Grand Avenue frontage. An on-site sidewalk is provided that connects to the sidewalk on Grand Avenue and provides a safe path of travel to the front entrance to the building.

Goal 9: Parking and Loading: Adequate parking and loading facilities.

Objective 9.2 Adequate employee parking near the place of employment. The proposed project is anticipated to have approximately 120 employees. The recruits will not be permitted to drive to the site. Visitors are generally not anticipated. The ESMC requires 125 parking spaces and 132 spaces are provided. The proposed project will provide adequate employee parking near the place of employment.

Objective 9.4 Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems. Two loading spaces consistent with the requirements of the ESMC will be provided on site that are not in the path of travel of the employee parking area, the public right-of-way or the bus loading area. The loading area is adjacent to the building and will not cause safety or access problems.

V. Inter-Departmental Comments

The project application and plans were circulated for comment. All inter-departmental comments are attached as Exhibit D. Staff has incorporated those comments that are applicable and demonstrate a legal nexus as conditions of approval in the Resolution.

VI. Environmental Review

The proposed project has been analyzed for its environmental impacts as related to the project specific use limitations to restrict the permitted uses to general offices and medical-dental offices and an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts (Exhibit N) was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code § 15063 (California Environmental Quality Act). A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA §15070. The draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration were available for public comment from May 1, 2008 to June 2, 2008. Two letters (Exhibit E and F) were received from the applicant and the applicant’s representative during the public comment period. No letters regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts were received from the public during the public comment period. Five letters of support were received after the close of the public comment period (Exhibits G-K).

The draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that no impacts would occur for the following issue areas: agricultural resources, biology, and mineral resources. The draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that impacts would be less than significant impacts for the following issue areas: geology
and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, population and housing, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Several areas of concern were noted as potentially significant if not mitigated. These areas include: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Public Services. Staff has incorporated Mitigation Measures that reduce the impacts for each of these areas to “Less Than Significant” when mitigated. The Mitigation Measures are incorporated into the Initial Study document as well as the draft Resolution. A detailed analysis of environmental impacts is provided in the attached draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts prepared by the City’s environmental consultant, PBS&J.

Response to Comments

The applicant and the applicant's representative submitted letters relating to one of the mitigation measures, MM HZ-4, which requires that “The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense.”

The applicant's representative, Lisa Kranitz, states that the purpose of the mitigation measure is not to protect the surrounding public, but to minimize mass casualties to persons inside the building from terrorist attacks relating to chemical, biological or radiological agents being distributed throughout the buildings' circulation systems. Ms. Kranitz requests that the proposed mitigation measure be revised to read as follows “The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense, as specifically implemented through the plans approved by GSA and MEPCOM and submitted to the City.” Further, she indicates that she believes that the change would not constitute a substitute mitigation measure, but only a clarification of the existing measure, and therefore, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15074.1 are inapplicable. The draft MND discusses critical sites that may be vulnerable to terrorist attack, including the subject site. The mitigation measure as proposed is intended to ensure that MEPS personnel and recruits, and the general public’s health, welfare and safety are protected from potential impacts from bioterrorism and that potential impacts are less than significant. As discussed earlier in the document, the Department of Defense standards, provides, for example, minimum building setbacks through a 82-foot minimum standoff distance from a public right-of-way, specific standards for building construction such as blast resistant glass and frames, the installation of bollards around the building between the parking lot and the building to prevent vehicles from driving into the structure, and perimeter fencing and walls using “S” hooks at the top of the fencing. Planning Staff believes that the mitigation measure as proposed ensures that the potential impacts are less than significant. However, Planning staff believes that the mitigation measure could be modified to address the applicant’s concerns while ensuring oversight by the City that the impacts of the project as designed could be mitigated to be less than significant. Planning staff proposes a substitute mitigation measure HZ-4 to read as follows:

“HZ-4: The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet
between the building and the adjoining property to the east which reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.”

Planning Staff believes that the change would clarify the existing mitigation measure and be equivalent to the mitigation measure identified in the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. CEQA Guidelines Section 15074.1(d) requires that the substitution of a mitigation measure be equivalent or more effective, that means that the new measure will avoid or reduce the significant effect to at least the same degree as, or to a greater degree than, the original measure and will create no more adverse effect of its own than would have the original measure. Planning staff believes that the substitute measure would not create a more adverse effect of its own than would have the original measure and is based upon the site plan and building design that was analyzed with the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15074.1(b) requires that prior to deleting and substituting for a mitigation measure the lead agency shall hold a public hearing on the matter and adopt a written finding that the new measure is equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and that it in itself will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment. A written finding is incorporated into the attached draft resolution. Planning Staff believes that all provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15074.1 regarding substitution of mitigation measures in a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration have been met.

The second letter from Allan Mackenzie indicates that he believes a comment on pages 63 and 89 in the MND is incorrect. The statement he is referring to is as follows: “MEPS facility is a privately owned facility that is proposed to be leased to the federal government which.....makes it an attractive potential target for terrorist activity.” His letter discusses several areas of research into terrorist incidents and targets and states that only 5 terrorist incidents have occurred in the State of California from 1968 to 2007. He states that the MEPS command does not believe that there is an issue that the facility is a potential target for terrorist activity. The purpose of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is to identify potential impacts and where feasible to mitigate them to be less than significant. Planning staff believes that the proposed mitigation measure as revised and discussed above ensures that any potential impacts are less than significant.

VII. **Mandatory Findings For Approval of Site Plan**

The following are the mandatory findings that the Planning Commission must make before approving or conditionally approving any site plan:

1. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the Specific Plan.

The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 *(Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines)*; Objective 2.2 *(Improvement of development that is deteriorated or
inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee parking near the place of employment); and Objective 9.4 (Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems).

2. The plan will not have an adverse impact on the public health, safety, interest, convenience or the general welfare.

The design of the proposed project has incorporated design and safety measures to minimize any adverse impact on the public health, safety, interest, convenience or the general welfare.

3. The site plan is compatible with the intent and purpose of the regulations and design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The proposed project complies with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) by incorporating design elements that are consistent with the SHSP Design Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with the following SHSP Design Guidelines in ESMC §§15-11-3(l)(2)(b), 15-11-3(l)(2)(c), 15-11-3(l)(4), 15-11-3(l)(6), 15-11-3(l)(7)(g), 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(1), 15-11-3(l)(e)(2); 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(5), 15-11-3(l)(9)(a), 15-11-3(l)(9)(b), 15-11-3(l)(9)(e), 15-11-3(l)(10)(a), 15-11-3(l)(10)(b), 15-11-3(l)(10)(c), 15-11-3(l)(10)(e), 15-11-3(l)(11)(b) and 15-11-3(l)(11)(c), relating to encouraging the use of richness of surface and texture, play of light and shadow, multi-planes roofs, and a high degree or wall articulation; avoiding or minimizing the use of highly reflective surfaces, large blank walls, large metal surfaces, chain link fences, and exposed concrete block; encouraging use of subtle warm tones and a mixture of materials for building surfaces; using architecturally integrated rooftop equipment screening; controlled site access; separate service areas and service access; not locating parking and loading areas in setback areas; locating access points for parking lots away from street intersections; providing front yard landscaping; using landscape materials to enhance the major architectural design elements; using native and drought tolerant plant material where feasible; using landscaping, fences and walls to screen or enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps,
VIII. Special Findings: Impact on Commercial Market for Downtown Businesses

ESMC § 15-7B-13 requires that a market survey shall be conducted in connection with any proposal for activating the GAC Zone which demonstrates to the City Council's satisfaction that proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses. A finding to that effect must accompany the approval.

The applicant submitted a letter from Colliers International Senior Vice President Stephen R. Cramer, dated February 21, 2007. Colliers International is an international commercial real estate services firm that specializes in industrial and office real estate. While the applicant did not conduct a market study per se, Colliers International indicated in their letter that they believed the proposed uses would not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses in that "The proposed use is for an administrative office use and has no retail function whatsoever. It is highly likely that the occupants of the proposed building will take advantage of the El Segundo's excellent downtown commercial market for purchases, lunch, dinner, etc. Additionally, the proposed use for this property requires a 4 acre site in order to satisfy the occupant's requirements. At the time of our search, it did not turn up any potential 4 acre sites in downtown El Segundo."

City staff has not required a market survey because of the unique characteristics of the proposed use in that it is a commercial facility that will contain specialized general office and medical-dental office uses that are not open to the general public or available for lease in competition with downtown businesses. Additionally, no retail activity will be permitted on the site. Furthermore, the proposed MEPS project as designed does not represent the maximum build-out of the 4.25 acre site as would be allowed either under the existing Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone which allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.6 (112,000 square feet maximum) or under the proposed Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone which allows a maximum FAR of 0.5 (92,565 square feet maximum). The proposed project would have a FAR of 0.18 (32,980 square feet). No competition among uses would occur with the downtown businesses since the project site is underutilized and would be limited to specialized uses. Therefore, Planning staff has determined that the required finding that the proposed project and the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses can be made.

IX. Conclusion

Planning staff believes that the proposed project for a Military Entrance Processing Station meets the mandatory findings as set forth in the staff report if the proposed mitigation measures are adopted and the proposed conditions of approval are incorporated. Therefore, Planning staff believes that the Planning Commission may adopt Resolution No 2638, and recommend that the City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, since the required findings for support have been made.
X. Exhibits

A. Draft Planning Commission Resolution No. 2638
B. Draft Specific Plan Amendment
C. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
D. Interdepartmental Comments
E. Letter from Lisa Kranitz, the applicant's representative, dated May 6, 2008
G. Letter from El Segundo Chamber of Commerce dated June 3, 2008
H. Letter from Commander Ralph Duncan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, dated June 8, 2008
I. Letter from Commander James S. Rosa, Veterans of Foreign Wars, dated June 10, 2008
J. Letter from James S. Rosa dated June 16, 2008
M. Applications
N. Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (distributed under separate cover)
O. Plans (distributed under separate cover)

Prepared by: Trayci A. Nelson, Contract Senior Planner
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Planning and Building Safety Department

Gary Chiots, Director
Planning and Building Safety Department
RESOLUTION NO. 2638

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-769, ZONE CHANGE NO. 07-01, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 08-02, AND SMOKY HOLLOW SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 07-04 TO REZONE A 4.25 ACRE PARCEL TO GRAND AVENUE COMMERCIAL; TO AMEND THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN TO LIMIT THE PERMITTED USES TO GENERAL OFFICE AND MEDICAL-DENTAL OFFICE USES ONLY; AND TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 32,980 SQUARE-FOOT COMMERCIAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR A MILITARY ENTRANCE PROCESSING STATION AT 1700 EAST GRAND AVENUE.

The Planning Commission of the City of El Segundo does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1: The Planning Commission finds and declares that:

A. On September 5, 2007, Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, filed an application for an Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04), to rezone a 4.25 acre parcel from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and to allow for the construction of a 32,980 square foot commercial office building to be leased by the United States Government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) at 1700 East Grand Avenue;

B. On March 31, 2008, Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, filed an application for Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) to amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 E. Grand Avenue to general office and medical-dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only;

C. The application was reviewed by the City's Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

D. In addition, the City reviewed the project's environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., "CEQA"), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines"), and the City's Environmental Guidelines (City Council Resolution No. 3805, adopted March 16, 1993);
E. The Department of Planning and Building Safety completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before this Commission for June 26, 2008;

F. On June 26, 2008 the Commission held a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the applications including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by City staff, public testimony, and representatives of Mar Canyon Grand, LLC; and,

G. This Resolution, and its findings, are made based upon the evidence presented to the Commission at its June 26, 2008 hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings. The Commission finds that the following facts exist:

A. The subject site is located in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone within the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) at 1700 East Grand Avenue;

B. The surrounding land uses are industrial facilities in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone to the north, an industrial facility and an animal kennel in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the south, an electrical substation and plant nursery in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the east, and industrial facilities in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the west;

C. The proposed project is to rezone a 4.25 acre parcel from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone; to amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the 4.25 acre parcel to general office and medical-dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only; and to allow for the construction of a 32,980 square foot commercial office building to be leased by the United States Government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) at 1700 E. Grand Avenue;

D. The subject site is irregular in shape with 449 feet of street frontage on Grand Avenue and a total lot area of 4.25 acres (184,888 square feet);

E. The subject site is currently vacant, and was formerly occupied by an industrial use that manufactured steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries;
F. Vehicular access to the proposed facility would be provided from one secured driveway located on Grand Avenue, egress would be permitted from two secured driveways on Grand Avenue;

G. The proposed FAR for this project would be 0.18 or 32,980 square feet. The maximum FAR for the site as proposed to be rezoned is 0.5. Based on 184,888 square feet of land area (4.25 acres) and an FAR of 0.5, 92,565 square feet could be developed. The subject property is located approximately 400 feet from the nearest residentially zoned property; and

H. One hundred thirty two parking spaces and a two loading spaces will be provided on site.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. Because of the facts identified in Section 2 of this Resolution, the proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and a Initial Study was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15063. The Initial Study demonstrated that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment with the implementation of mitigation measures. A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15070. The mitigation measures listed in the mitigated negative declaration are sufficient to reduce all identified environmental impacts to less than significant levels. A substitution for one mitigation measure, HZ-4, is proposed to read as follows:

"HZ-4: The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM."

All provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15074.1 regarding substitution of mitigation measures in a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration have been met regarding the proposed substitute mitigation measure in that:

A. As a result of the public review process for the proposed mitigated negative declaration, including any administrative decisions and public hearings conducted on the project prior to its approval, the Planning Commission, as lead agency, concludes that the mitigation measure identified in the mitigated negative declaration is infeasible and undesirable;

B. Another mitigation measure is proposed to be substituted that is equivalent that will not create a more adverse effect of its own than the
original mitigation measure and the new proposed mitigation measure will reduce the impact to less than significant;

C. No recirculation of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is required since the mitigation measure is proposed to be substituted for the original mitigation measure and made a condition of the project approval; and

D. The Planning Commission has held a duly noticed public hearing regarding this matter.

Accordingly, based upon the evidence presented to the Commission, the City need not prepare an environmental impact report for the proposed project.

SECTION 4: General Plan. The proposed project conforms to the City's General Plan in the ESMC as follows:

A. The General Plan Land Use Designation of the project site is Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use. The Smoky Hollow Mixed Use classification permits primarily light industrial uses including light manufacturing, research and development, warehousing and office uses. Grand Avenue commercial uses are also permitted in locations as designated under the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The permitted FAR for Grand Avenue commercial uses is 0.5 for newly constructed projects. The project site has a Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zoning District designation that allows manufacturing, light industrial, general offices for research, professional and technical services, research and development, warehousing and distribution, public facilities, and public utilities. The proposed zoning designation for the project site is the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone that allows cafes, general offices, medical-dental offices, retail sales and theaters.

B. The General Plan contains a number of relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies in the Land Use Element. Land Use Element Policy LU4-1.2 requires that “all commercial facilities shall be built and maintained in accordance with Health and Safety Code requirements and shall meet seismic safety regulations and environmental regulations”. The development will be built and maintained in accordance with these requirements and regulations.

C. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-3 to “provide for new office and research and development uses” in that the project will provide a 32,980 square-foot commercial building designed to accommodate general office and medical-office uses.
D. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU4-3.6 to “require landscaping, its maintenance, and permanent upkeep in all new office and mixed-use developments” in that the project will provide approximately 83,000 square feet of permanent landscaping on the project site.

E. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU5-2.2 that “All outdoor storage shall be properly screened by masonry walls and landscaping”. Masonry walls will be utilized for the trash enclosure and equipment area behind the building.

F. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU-5-3 to “Encourage the rehabilitation of existing substandard blighted industrial areas through the combined efforts of private and public sectors.” This site was originally developed with several industrial buildings which have since been demolished. A new, modern commercial office building will be built with significant landscape and hardscape improvements.

G. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU5-3.1 to “Revitalize and upgrade industrial areas which contain aesthetic or functional deficiencies in such areas as landscaping, off-street parking, or loading areas.” The entire site will be developed with new landscape and hardscape, parking and loading areas.

H. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU7-1.2 in that “No new development shall be allowed unless adequate public facilities are in place or provided for.” Require landscaping, its maintenance, and permanent upkeep in all new office and mixed-use developments.” A new, modern commercial office building will be built with significant landscaping and hardscape improvements that will be supported by adequate public infrastructure.

I. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Objective C1-1 to “Provide a roadway system that accommodates the City’s existing and projected land use and circulation needs.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications.

J. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.2 to “Pursue implementation of all Circulation Element policies such that all Master Plan roadways are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels
of service.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications to upgrade and maintain Grand Avenue at an acceptable level of service.

K. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.5 to “Implement roadway and intersection upgrades to full Circulation Element standards when needed to improve traffic operating conditions and to serve development.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate for possible future right-of-way dedications to implement roadway upgrades to full Circulation Element standards.

L. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.14 to “Require a full evaluation of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed new development prior to project approval. Further, require the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures prior to, or in conjunction with, project development. Mitigation measures may include new roadway links on segments that would connect the new development to the existing roadway system, intersection improvements, and other measures. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer.” KOA Corporation completed a Traffic Study for the proposed project and found that although peak hour trips would be added by the project, it would not create a potentially significant number of AM or PM peak hour trips. The Study also found that the project was not expected to create significant traffic impacts at any of the study intersections. The additional trips generated by the project will be mitigated by the payment of a traffic mitigation fee.

M. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.15 to “Pursue and protect adequate right-of-way to accommodate future circulation system improvements.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications.

N. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-1.16 to “Encourage the widening of substandard streets and alleys to meet City standards wherever feasible.” A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional 9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications to widen Grand Avenue, a substandard street, to meet City standards.
O. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1-3.2 to “Ensure that the development review process incorporates consideration of off-street commercial loading requirements for all new projects.” Two off-street commercial loading spaces will be provided consistent with the El Segundo Municipal Code requirements. The loading spaces will be screened using masonry walls and landscaping.

P. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C2-1.3 to “Encourage new developments in the City to participate in the development of the citywide system of pedestrian walkways and require participation funded by the project developer where appropriate.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City Standards are incorporated into the design of this project.

Q. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C2-1.4 to “Ensure the installation of sidewalks on all future arterial widening or new construction projects, to establish a continuous and convenient link for pedestrians.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project.

R. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C2-2.2 to “Encourage new development to provide facilities for bicyclists to park and store their bicycles and provide shower and clothes changing facilities at or close to the bicyclist’s work destination.” While ESMC Section 15-16-3(A) does not require bicycle facilities for projects less than 50,000 square feet, the proposed project provides three bicycle racks on site that will accommodate bicycles for employee use.

S. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy 3-1.1 to “Require all new development to mitigate project-related impacts on the existing and future circulation system such that all Master Plan roadways and intersections are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service through implementation of all applicable Circulation Element policies. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer.” KOA Corporation completed a Traffic Study for the proposed project and found that although peak hour trips would be added by the project, it would not create a potentially significant number of AM or PM peak hour trips. The Study also found that the project was not expected to create significant traffic impacts at any of the study intersections. The additional trips generated by the project will be mitigated by the payment of a traffic mitigation fee. A 10-foot offer of dedication will be provided along Grand Avenue along with an additional
9-foot irrevocable offer to dedicate to accommodate future right-of-way dedications.

T. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C3-1.8 to "Require the provision of adequate pedestrian and bicycle access for new development projects through the development review process." Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project that will provide adequate pedestrian access. Adequate bicycle access will be available to the site.

U. The proposed project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C3-2.1 to "Ensure the provision of sufficient on-site parking in all new development." The proposed project is required to provide 125 parking spaces and 132 are proposed.

V. The ESMC requires review for conformance with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The proposed project would be consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies if the proposed Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone is implemented. The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 (Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines); Objective 2.2 (Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee
parking near the place of employment); and Objective 9.4 (Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems).

SECTION 5: Zone Change Findings. Based upon the factual findings of this Resolution, the proposed Zone Change is necessary to carry out the proposed project because the proposed uses are only allowed in the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and to maintain consistency with the General Plan land use designation of Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP).

SECTION 6: Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment Findings. After considering the above facts regarding proposed Environmental Assessment No. 769, and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, the Planning Commission finds as follows:

A. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the Specific Plan. The proposed project is consistent with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies as required in ESMC § 15-7B-12(D) if the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office use with incidental accessory uses is approved.

The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 (Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines); Objective 2.2 (Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee parking near the place of employment);
and Objective 9.4 (*Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems*).

B. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the regulations of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone Development Regulations as required in ESMC § 15-7B-12(A).

The proposed project will comply with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone if the Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone is approved and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-office use with incidental accessory uses is approved. The project design meets all height, setback, floor area ratio, parking and landscaping requirements.

C. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The proposed project is consistent with Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Design Guidelines as required in ESMC § 15-7B-12(B) if the Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone is approved and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-office use with incidental accessory uses is approved.

The proposed project complies with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) by incorporating design elements that are consistent with the SHSP Design Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with the following SHSP Design Guidelines in ESMC §§15-11-3(l)(2)(b), 15-11-3(l)(2)(c), 15-11-3(l)(4), 15-11-3(l)(6), 15-11-3(l)(7)(g), 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(1); 15-11-3(l)(e)(2); 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(5), 15-11-3(l)(9)(a), 15-11-3(l)(9)(b), 15-11-3(l)(9)(e), 15-11-3(l)(10)(a), 15-11-3(l)(10)(b), 15-11-3(l)(10)(c), 15-11-3(l)(10)(e), 15-11-3(l)(11)(b) and 15-11-3(l)(11)(c), relating to encouraging the use of richness of surface and texture, play of light and shadow, multi-planes roofs, and a high degree or wall articulation; avoiding or minimizing the use of highly reflective surfaces, large blank walls, large metal surfaces, chain link fences, and exposed concrete block; encouraging use of subtle warm tones and a mixture of materials for building surfaces; using architecturally integrated rooftop equipment screening; controlled site
access; separate service areas and service access; not locating parking and loading areas in setback areas; locating access points for parking lots away from street intersections; providing front yard landscaping; using landscape materials to enhance the major architectural design elements; using native and drought tolerant plant material where feasible; using landscaping, fences and walls to screen or enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tanks and other items of poor visual quality; and limiting light standards to no greater than 20 feet in height.

D. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the incentives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specified in ESMC § 15-7B-12(C) in that two lots will be consolidated into one larger parcel if the Zone Change from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone is approved and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office use with incidental accessory uses is approved.

E. The proposed uses in the proposed project will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses when activating the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone because of the unique characteristics of the proposed use in that it is a commercial facility that will contain specialized general office and medical-dental office uses that are not open to the general public or available for lease in competition with downtown businesses. Additionally, no retail activity will be permitted on the site. Furthermore, the proposed MEPS project as designed does not represent the maximum build-out of the 4.25 acre site as would be allowed either under the existing Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone which allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.6 (112,000 square feet maximum) or under the proposed Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone which allows a maximum FAR of 0.5 (92,565 square feet maximum). The proposed project would have a FAR of 0.18 (32,980 square feet). No competition among uses would occur with the downtown businesses since the project site is underutilized and would be limited to specialized uses. Therefore, the special finding can be made as required in ESMC § 15-7B-13.

SECTION 7: Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review Findings. After considering the above facts regarding proposed Environmental Assessment No. 769, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, the Planning Commission finds as follows:

A. The proposed project is compatible with the intent and purpose of the Specific Plan.
The proposed project complies with numerous Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP). Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with SHSP Policy 1.4 (Promote expansion or redevelopment of existing development that a) is an authorized use; b) meets prescribed development regulations; and c) is responsive to established design guidelines); Objective 2.2 (Improvement of development that is deteriorated or inefficiently designed); Objective 2.3 (Reasonable development standards for new development that occurs); Objective 3.1 (Elimination of visible outside storage); Objective 3.2 (More consistent building elevations and materials); Objective 3.3 (Contemporary landscape treatments); Policy 3.1 (Require adherence to design guidelines in the plan for new development); Policy 4.3 (Establish and maintain immediate height, i.e. between thirty five feet and forty five feet); Objective 5.3 (Location of new uses in areas which contribute most to overall improvement of the area); Objective 7.4 (Site development regulations which require safe and effective ingress and egress for each business enterprise); Policy 7.3 (Include responsiveness to design guidelines as a major consideration in site plan review and approval); Objective 8.1 (Maintenance or improvement of existing service levels); Objective 8.2 (Adequate sight distances at all intersections); Objective 8.3 (Safe sidewalks where there is a purpose for pedestrian access); Objective 9.2 (Adequate employee parking near the place of employment); and Objective 9.4 (Convenient loading which does not cause safety or access problems).

B. The plan will not have an adverse impact on the public health, safety, interest, convenience or the general welfare.

The design of the proposed project has incorporated design and safety measures to minimize any adverse impact on the public health, safety, interest, convenience or the general welfare.

C. The site plan is compatible with the intent and purpose of the regulations and design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The proposed project complies with the development standards for the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone and the design guidelines of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) by incorporating design elements that are consistent with the SHSP Design Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with the following SHSP Design Guidelines in ESMC §§15-11-3(l)(2)(b), 15-11-3(l)(2)(c), 15-11-3(l)(4), 15-11-3(l)(6), 15-11-3(l)(7)(g), 15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(1); 15-11-3(l)(e)(2);
15-11-3(l)(8)(e)(5), 15-11-3(l)(9)(a), 15-11-3(l)(9)(b), 15-11-3(l)(9)(e), 15-11-3(l)(10)(a), 15-11-3(l)(10)(b), 15-11-3(l)(10)(c), 15-11-3(l)(10)(e), 15-11-3(l)(11)(b) and 15-11-3(l)(11)(c), relating to encouraging the use of richness of surface and texture, play of light and shadow, multi-planes roofs, and a high degree or wall articulation; avoiding or minimizing the use of highly reflective surfaces, large blank walls, large metal surfaces, chain link fences, and exposed concrete block; encouraging use of subtle warm tones and a mixture of materials for building surfaces; using architecturally integrated rooftop equipment screening; controlled site access; separate service areas and service access; not locating parking and loading areas in setback areas; locating access points for parking lots away from street intersections; providing front yard landscaping; using landscape materials to enhance the major architectural design elements; using native and drought tolerant plant material where feasible; using landscaping, fences and walls to screen or enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tanks and other items of poor visual quality; and limiting light standards to no greater than 20 feet in height.

SECTION 8: Recommendations.

A. The City Council should amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan zone designation from the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Floating Zone for the 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 East Grand Avenue.

B. The City Council should amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the 4.25 acre parcel at 1700 East Grand Avenue to general office and medical-dental offices uses and incidental accessory uses only. The corresponding changes as set forth in the draft Ordinance attached Exhibit “A” are incorporated into this resolution by reference.

C. Subject to the conditions listed in attached Exhibit “B” and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program listed in attached Exhibit “C”, which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference, the City Council should adopt the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for Environmental Assessment No. 769, and approve Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04.

SECTION 9: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings
and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the Planning Commission in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 10: Limitations. The Planning Commission's analysis and evaluation of the project is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the Planning Commission's knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City's ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 11: Summaries of Information. All summaries of information in the findings which precede this section, are based on the substantial evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding, is not based in part on that fact.

SECTION 12: This Resolution will remain effective unless superseded by a subsequent resolution.
SECTION 13: According the El Segundo Municipal Code, a copy of this Resolution shall be mailed to William Messori at Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, and to any other person requesting a copy.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June, 2008.

Cheryl Frick, Chairperson
City of El Segundo Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Gary Chicots, Secretary

Fellhauer  -
Frick    -
Fuentes  -
Rotolo  -
Wagner -

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: ____________________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2638

Exhibit B

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City of El Segundo’s approval of a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04) ("Project Conditions").

Planning and Building Safety Department

1. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit plans that demonstrate substantial compliance with the plans and conditions of approval on file with the Planning and Building Safety Department. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved, including the site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscaping and materials, must be referred to the Director of the Planning and Building Safety Department for a determination regarding the need for Planning Commission review of the proposed modification.

2. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must obtain all the necessary approvals, licenses and permits and pay all the appropriate fees as required by the City of El Segundo.

3. All mitigation measures in the Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") project are incorporated by this reference into these conditions of approval. All mitigation measures must be listed on the plans submitted for plan check and on the plans for which a building permit is issued.

4. Any changes to the colors and materials of the exterior façade of the building and the color of the new perimeter wrought iron fencing and masonry wall must be approved to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Department in compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines in ESMC Chapter 15-11.
Materials and Design

5. Before the issuance of the Building Permit, the applicant must submit Final Working drawings to the Planning and Building Safety Director for design review for compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines. The design review must include, without limitation, the following:

A. All colors, textures, and materials on exterior elevations must be coordinated to achieve a continuity of design;

B. At least two primary exterior building materials (including without limitation, stucco, brick and stone) must be used;

C. Building materials must be of non-reflective coatings and glazings;

D. All buildings must utilize energy efficient floor plans and controlled HVAC and heat generating equipment to reduce energy use for cooling and ventilation;

E. All roof-mounted mechanical equipment and communications devices must be hidden behind architecturally integrated building parapets or screens to screen these devices from view of adjacent public rights-of-way;

F. Loading areas must be screened from view with opaque walls and landscaping. The walls must be architecturally integrated with the building design; and

G. Chain-link fences are not permitted except as temporary construction fencing.

6. A maximum of one entry sign along the Grand Avenue frontage and one building wall sign facing the side property line must be permitted. The sign design must be architecturally compatible with the building design. Signs must be constructed of durable materials.

7. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit final landscaping and irrigation plans to the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department and the Parks and Recreation Department for review and approval to demonstrate compliance with the City’s Water Conservation regulations and Guidelines for Water Conservation in Landscaping (ESMC §10-2-1 *et seq.*). The plant materials used in landscaping must be compatible with the El Segundo climate pursuant to Sunset Western Garden Book’s Zone 24 published by Sunset Books Inc, Revised and Updated 2001 edition, which is available for review at the Planning and Building Safety Department. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must demonstrate
compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines and the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) development standards. The landscaping and irrigation must be completely installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and/or a final building permit. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must comply with the following:

a. Reclaimed water must be used as the water source to irrigate landscaped areas, if feasible. To that end, dual water connections must be installed to allow for landscaping to be irrigated by reclaimed water, if feasible.

b. Efficient irrigation systems must be installed which minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water which will reach plant roots (e.g., drip irrigation, automatic sprinklers equipped with moisture sensors).

c. Automatic sprinkler systems must be set to irrigate landscaping during early morning hours or during the evening to reduce water losses from evaporation. Sprinklers must also be reset to water less often in cooler months and during the rainfall season so that water is not wasted by excessive landscaping irrigation.

d. Selection of drought-tolerant, low-water consuming plant varieties must be used to reduce irrigation water consumption, in compliance with ESMC § 10-2-1 et seq.

8. The two parcels of the project site must be merged into one lot through a lot line adjustment or tentative map.

9. The applicant must provide a sufficient number of bicycle racks to accommodate the storage of at least 8 bicycles.

10. Employees must be provided current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site; telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators; ridesharing promotional materials; and bicycle route and facility information.

10. On-site dining facilities must remain incidental to the primary general office and medical-dental office uses and may not be open to the general public. The on-site dining facilities must be limited to employees, recruits and visitors by invitation.

11. A trash and recycling enclosure must be provided and shown on the site plan that is sufficiently large enough to store the necessary bins required for the
regular collection of commercial solid waste and recyclable materials. The site plan with the location and dimensions of the trash and recycling enclosure and an elevation view of the enclosure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval before the City issues building permits.

12. Ground level mechanical equipment, refuse collectors, storage tanks, monitoring wells, generators, and other similar facilities must be screened from view with dense landscaping and walls of materials and finishes compatible with adjacent buildings.

13. Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare.

14. The building must be designed to comply with the El Segundo Municipal Code standards for the attenuation of interior noise.

15. The building must be designed, constructed, and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense.

Building Division Conditions

16. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit a geotechnical plan that is no more than one year old to the Director of Planning and Building Safety for review and approval.

17. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a soils report to the Director of Planning and Building Safety for review and approval.

18. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a grading plan to the Director of Planning and Building Safety for review and approval.


20. Before building permits are issued, plans must show compliance with accessibility requirements per Chapter 11 of the 2007 California Building Code, as amended by the ESMC.
Fire Department Conditions

21. The project must comply with all applicable requirements in the California Building and Fire Codes, adopted by the ESMC.

22. A chemical inventory of the types of chemicals used at the facility must be submitted to the Fire Department.

Public Works Department Conditions

23. All onsite utilities including without limitation, water, electricity, gas, sewer and storm drains, must be installed underground.

24. The applicant must dedicate 10 feet along the entire Grand Avenue frontage of the subject property and provide an irrevocable offer to dedicate an additional 9 feet along the entire Grand Avenue frontage of the subject property to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department and the City Attorney.

25. The applicant must ensure that all curb, gutters, and driveway aprons fronting Grand Avenue will be replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

26. All damaged or off-grade curb, sidewalk and pavement must be removed and replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

27. The applicant must ensure that encroachment permits are secured from the Public Works Department before commencing any work in the public right-of-way.

28. The project must comply with the latest NPDES requirements and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) for sediment control, construction material control and erosion control.

Police Department Conditions

29. Before issuance of a building permit, the applicant must submit a photometric light study to the Police Department for review and approval. The photometric study must be point-by-point and include the light loss factor (.7). Lighting levels must be adjusted to meet the minimum footcandle requirements within each area of the site.

30. Lighting devices must be enclosed and protected by weather and vandal resistant covers.
31. The addressing, open parking lot and trash dumpster must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. A wall pack must be placed over the receiving door and must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. Aisles, passageways and recesses related to and within all sides of the building complex must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of .25 foot-candles on the ground surface during hours of darkness.

32. An exterior camera plan must be provided that includes the height of installation and area of coverage. Camera locations must be designed so that they face the points of entry to the property and that the cameras are installed at such a height that when trees are grown to maturity they will not block the viewing angle. Additionally, an exterior camera must facing the Grand Avenue entrance to the access road that runs along the east property line to capture vehicle license plate numbers and facial images as cars enter this road.

33. Front entry gates must have access control and be viewed by CCTV.

34. Buses must enter the facility either by interior controls or by access card.

35. Deliveries must enter the facility by interior controls/intercom.

36. Security cameras must cover both the interior of the building and all of the exterior property. MEPS must have web based capabilities.

37. Digital cameras must maintain a minimum of 30 days of video storage.

38. The building must be alarmed.

39. The MEPS facility must notify the City of El Segundo Police Department when they have advanced notice of any planned public demonstrations or if a public demonstration occurs on or in front of the property.

40. MEPS must maintain a 25-foot standoff distance to the east perimeter fencing.

41. Perimeter fencing must be extended to a total height of eight feet and pickets must be outwardly curved with a triple pointed pale head.
Construction Conditions

42. Before any construction occurs the perimeter of the property must be fenced with a minimum 6-foot high fence. The fence must be covered with a material approved by the Planning and Building Safety Department to prevent dust from leaving the site.

43. Public sidewalks must remain open at all times.

44. All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials must either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard.

45. NOx emissions during construction must be reduced by limiting the operation of heavy-duty construction equipment to no more than 5 pieces of equipment at any one time.

46. Staging of construction vehicles and vehicle entry and egress to the site must occur on Grand Avenue.

47. Construction vehicles must not use any route except the City’s designated Truck Routes.

48. The applicant must develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the City of El Segundo Public Works Department, which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD:

A. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.
B. Provide temporary traffic controls during all phases of construction activities to maintain traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
C. Re-route construction trucks away from congested streets.
D. Maintain equipment and vehicles engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer’s specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize dust emissions.
E. Suspend use of all construction equipment during second stage smog alerts. Contact SCAQMD at (800) 242-4022 for daily forecasts.
F. Use electricity from temporary power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.
G. Diesel-powered equipment such as booster pumps or generators should be replaced by electric equipment, if feasible.
H. Catalytic converters must be installed, if feasible.
I. Equipment must be equipped with two-to-four-degree engine time retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.
J. Use methanol or natural gas powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.
K. Use propane or butane powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.

49. During construction and operations, all waste must be disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Toxic wastes must be discarded at a licensed, regulated disposal site by a licensed waste hauler.

50. 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.

51. If materials spills occur, they must be cleaned up in a way that will not affect the storm drain system.

52. The project must comply with ESMC Chapter 5-4, which establishes storm water and urban pollution controls.

53. Before anticipated rainfall, construction dumpsters must be covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.

54. 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.

55. The owner or contractor must conduct daily street sweeping and truck wheel cleaning to prevent dirt in the storm drain system.

56. Storm drain system must be safeguarded at all times during construction.

57. All diesel equipment must be operated with closed engine doors and must be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

58. Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

59. The applicant must provide a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with the construction noise. The number must be posted on the project site and must be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

60. During construction, the contractor must store and maintain equipment as far as possible from adjacent residential property locations northwest of the site.
61. As stated in ESMC Chapter 7-2, construction related noise is restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or a Federal holiday.

Service Fee Conditions

62. Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must pay a Police Service Mitigation Fee based upon the applicable Police Service Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Currently, the fee is $0.11 per gross square foot of floor area, but the fee is subject to change. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

63. Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must pay a Fire Service Mitigation Fee based upon the applicable Fire Service Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Currently, the fee is $0.14 per gross square foot of floor area, but the fee is subject to change. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

64. Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must pay a Library Service Mitigation Fee based upon the applicable Library Service Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Currently, the fee is $0.03 per gross square foot of floor area, but the fee is subject to change. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

65. The applicant must provide payment to the City El Segundo for the Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fee Program per ESMC Chapter 15-27A before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, as a "fair share contribution" toward programmed roadway improvements in order to assist in addressing future cumulative traffic deterioration. The current fee for this project is $105 per PM peak hour trip generated. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Miscellaneous

66. Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney’s fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City’s approval of
Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04). Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC., agrees to defend the City (at the City’s request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section “the City” includes the City of El Segundo’s elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

By signing this document, Allan Mackenzie on behalf of Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, certifies that they have read, understood, and agree to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

__________________________
Allan Mackenzie
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
Exhibit B

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA
AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC
PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION
OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED
COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL
CHANGES IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LAW

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: General Findings. The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan was adopted in the mid-1980s. The goals of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan include: allowing growth to incur in the area where market forces are evident; allowing commercial uses in specified areas upon removal of the existing uses; depending on private market decisions to stimulate development in the area; and allowing decisions about uses of property in the Specific Plan area to remain with the individual property owner.

B. On September 5, 2007, applications were filed by Mar Canyon Grand LLC (“MCG”), the property owner and applicant, to activate the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay zone in accordance with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and for Site Plan Review for a Military Enlistment Processing Station (“MEPS”).

C. Both the City and MCG agree that in order to permit the MEPS, it is only necessary to activate a limited portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone. In order to allow a limited activation of uses, it is necessary to create a procedural mechanism in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. Accordingly, a supplemental application was filed on March 31, 2008 by MCG to implement a procedure to allow activation of only limited uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone. Additional technical changes are also being made to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to conform with State law and to insure that the procedures set forth in the Specific Plan clearly reflect the City’s actual procedures in processing applications.
D. An Initial Study was prepared in accordance with CEQA for the Specific Plan amendments, activation of a limited portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone, specifically general office and medical-dental office uses as specified in El Segundo Municipal Code § 15-7B-2B, and the site plan for the MEPS (collectively, the "Project"). The Initial Study found no substantial evidence that the Project would have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the environment that could not be mitigated. Accordingly, a mitigated negative declaration was prepared. The notice of intent to adopt the mitigated negative declaration was circulated for public review and comment between May 1, 2008 and June 2, 2008.

E. On June 26, 2008, the Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the Project, including, without limitation, information submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department in the staff report and information provided by MCG. Following the public hearing, the Commission considered the evidence and adopted Resolution No. 2638, recommending that the City Council approve: Environmental Assessment No. EA-769; this Ordinance amending the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and activating limited general office and medical-dental offices in a portion of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area already covered by the GAC overlay designation; and the site plan for the MEPS.

F. On July 15, 2008, the City Council held a public hearing and considered documentary and verbal testimony, including, without limitation, the staff report.

G. Prior to adopting this Ordinance, the City Council adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this Ordinance and the site plan review pursuant to Resolution No. _____, on July 15, 2008.

H. This Ordinance and the findings made herein are based upon the testimonial and documentary evidence presented to the City Council at its July 15, 2008 hearing.

Section 2. Land Use Findings.

A. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the City’s General Plan as the Land Use Map designates the property as Smoky Hollow Mixed Use, which specifically provides for offices uses and commercial uses under the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone.
B. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the provisions of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as follows:

1. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specifically recognizes that individual property owners and market forces should determine what growth should occur in the area. (ESMC § 15-11-2A, § 15-11-2B)

2. Both the procedural amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as well as the activation of a portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan including, but not limited to:
   
a. Objective 1.3 – providing maximum possible responsiveness to market opportunities within the desire development intensification; and

b. Objective 5.1 – Providing for maximum possible capture of market opportunities by property owners.

3. As the Property is covered by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general office and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the Property is consistent.

C. In accordance with ESMC §§ 15-7B-13 and 15-11-2E(1)(c)(2), the City Council finds that because only the office uses set forth in ESMC § 15-7B-2B are being activated on the Property, the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses. This finding is confirmed by the realtor’s letter submitted by MCG, which suffices as a market survey.

Section 3. ESMC § 15-11-2 E(1)(c)(2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

E. Land Use Plan

c. Floating Or Overlay Districts:

(2) A commercial district is provided along the south edge of Grand Avenue for limited commercial development if it can be demonstrated that erosion of downtown commercial potential will not thereby occur. Subject to the discretionary approval of the City Council an application
may be filed with the City requesting that only some of the permitted uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone be activated.

Section 4. ESMC § 15-11-3 D(2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

D. Floating Zones:

2. Procedure: The City Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission, giving written notice to adjacent property owners and holding a public hearing may activate either of these floating zones. The Council or the Commission may initiate such change by petition of the property owner(s). If petitioned for by the property owner only limited uses in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone may be activated, in which case the property shall receive a designation of “GAC – [limited/allowed uses].” Before such petition can be considered, the owner(s) must submit a focused supplemental EIR addressing land use, traffic, utilities, noise and air quality. The City shall ultimately determine which supplemental potential impacts must be addressed. Fees for such a procedure shall be established by the City Council.

Section 5. ESMC § 15-11-3D is hereby amended by revising Exhibit III-2 to show the limited activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone for General and Medical/Dental Office Uses (GAC Limited/General and Medical/Dental Office) as specified in ESMC § 15-7B-2B for the property located at 1700 East Grand Avenue and more specifically described on Exhibit A hereto.

[NEW MAP TO BE INSERTED]

Section 6. ESMC § 15-11-3 H(2)(b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

H. Site Plan Review Procedures

b. Applicability: Approval of a site plan shall be required prior to or concurrent with a tentative tract or parcel map for all proposed projects within the specific plan area. Where no tentative tract or parcel map is required, approval of a site plan shall occur prior to issuance of building permits. Authority for approval of a site plan shall rest with the Director of Community, Economic and Development Services for projects under fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet in floor area (appealable to the Planning Commission) and with the Planning Commission for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of a floating or overlay zone, the Director or Planning Commission shall make a recommendation and the authority for approval shall rest with the City Council.
Section 7. ESMC § 15-11-3 H(2)(d)(3) is hereby amended to read as follows:

H. Site Plan Review Procedures

b. Procedures:

(3) For projects which are fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area, upon determination that the site plan complies with the provisions of the Specific Plan and the review factors described in the design guidelines, the staff shall prepare a staff report with recommendations which shall be submitted along with the site plan to the Planning Commission at the earliest possible regular meeting. The Planning Commission shall approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of a floating or overlay zone, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation and the City Council shall approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan.

Section 8. ESMC § 15-11-3 H(2)(e) is hereby amended to read as follows:

H. Site Plan Review Procedures

e. Environmental Determination: The site plan review process is discretionary, not ministerial, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)\(^5\). However, in light of the Master EIR established as part of this Specific Plan, only a focused EIR or mitigated negative declaration will be required for uses permitted in the base districts and then only where it is demonstrated that public facilities are inadequate and improvements beyond the project site may be required. A full supplemental EIR will be required for activation of any portion of the floating zones.

Section 9. Severability. If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the city council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.
Section 10. Effective Date. This Ordinance will take effect on the 31st day following its final passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August, 2008.

______________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO )

I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Ordinance No. _________ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 15th day of July, 2008, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 5th day of August, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: ______________________________
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires a Lead Agency to adopt a “reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment” (Mitigation Monitoring Program, Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines provides additional direction on mitigation monitoring or reporting). The Planning and Building Safety Department for the City of El Segundo is the Lead Agency for the proposed project for the Aerospace Corporation development project.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. Where appropriate, this environmental document identified project design features or recommended mitigation measures to avoid or to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is designed to monitor implementation of requirements for subsequent environmental documentation and mitigation measures identified for the proposal for The Aerospace Corporation development project. The MMRP is subject to review and approval by the Lead Agency as part of the approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and adoption of project conditions. The required subsequent environmental documentation and mitigation measures are listed separately and categorized by impact area, with an accompanying identification of the following:

- Monitoring Phase, the phase of the project during which the mitigation measure must be monitored;
  - Pre-Construction, including the design phase
  - Construction
  - Post-Construction

- The Implementing Party, the agency with the power to implement the mitigation measure;

- The Enforcement Agency, the agency with the power to enforce the mitigation measure, and

- The Monitoring Agency, the agency to which reports involving feasibility, compliance, implementation and development are made.
The MMRP performance must be monitored annually to determine the effectiveness of the measures implemented in any given year and re-evaluate the mitigation needs for the upcoming year.

I. AESTHETICS

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

VQ-1: Expansive areas of highly reflective materials, such as mirrored glass, must not be permitted. Non-reflective building materials must be used to the maximum extent possible to reduce potential glare impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Pre-construction; Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VQ-2: Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Pre-construction; Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

III. AIR QUALITY

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.
Mitigation Measures

AQ-1: The project applicant's construction contractor shall implement all rules and regulations by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD that are applicable to the development of the project (such as Rule 402 (Nuisance) and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust)) and that are in effect at the time of development. The following measures are currently recommended to implement Rule 403. These measures have been quantified by SCAQMD as being able to reduce PM10 levels generated by construction activities between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of PM10.

- Water trucks shall be utilized on the site and shall be available to be used throughout the day during site grading and excavation to keep the soil damp enough to prevent PM10 levels being raised by activities associated with project construction.

- Areas that are to be graded or that are being graded and/or excavated shall be wetted down in the late morning and after work is completed for the day.

- All unpaved parking or staging areas, or unpaved road surfaces shall be watered three times daily or have chemical soil stabilizers applied according to manufacturer's specifications.

- Exposed piles (i.e. gravel, sand, and dirt) shall be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or approved soil binders shall be applied to exposed piles according to manufacturer's specifications.

- The construction disturbance area shall be kept as small as possible.

- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or have water applied to the exposed surface prior to leaving the site to prevent PM10 and PM 2.5 from reaching the surrounding areas.

- Consolidate truck deliveries when possible.

- Wheel washers shall be installed where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads and used to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

- Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads.

- Wind barriers shall be installed along the perimeter of the site.
• All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour over a 3-minute period.

**Monitoring Phase:** Pre-construction; Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** South Coast Air Quality Management District  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Public Works Department

**AQ-2:** The project applicant's construction contractor shall use low-VOC or ultra-low VOC paints that produce no more than 6.66 VOC lbs per 1,000 square feet for architectural coating.

**Monitoring Phase:** Pre-construction; Construction  
**Implementation Party:** Applicant  
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department  
**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Subsequent Environmental Documentation**

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Subsequent Environmental Documentation**

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

**Mitigation Measures**

**CR-1** In the event that archaeological/paleontological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth disturbing work within a 100-meter radius shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archeologist has been proved the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.

If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist or paleontologist, as appropriate, shall prepare a research design for recovery of the resources in consultation.
with the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of §§21083.2 of CEQA. The archaeologist or paleontologist shall complete a report of the excavations and findings, and shall submit the report for peer review by three County-certified archaeologists or paleontologists, as appropriate. Upon approval of the report, the County shall submit the report to the San Bernardino Archeological Information Center and keep the report on file at the County of San Bernardino. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

CR-2 If human remains are unearthed, in accordance with State Health and Safety Code §§7050.5 the applicant shall require from the construction contractor that no further disturbance will occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code §§5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) of the findings within 24 hours. The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

HZ-1: The applicant and construction contractor shall comply with existing hazardous materials, regulations, which are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the California Code of Regulations, and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. In addition, the applicant and construction contractor shall comply with applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations pertaining to the transport, use and disposal of hazardous waste, including, but not to limited, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations and as implemented by Title 13 of the CCR.

**Monitoring Phase:**
**Implementation Party:** Construction Applicant
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department

**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department

HZ-2: The United States Government (MEPS) shall comply with all City and County regulations applying to the use and disposal of medical-based hazardous waste. Furthermore, MEPS personnel shall ensure that all bio-hazardous waste produced at the proposed project site is properly disposed of.

**Monitoring Phase:**
**Implementation Party:** Construction Applicant
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department

**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department

HZ-3: Upon completion of the vapor barrier installation, the project applicant or construction contractor shall contact the City of El Segundo Fire Department to request that an inspection and smoke test be performed to confirm that the vapor barrier was properly installed.

**Monitoring Phase:**
**Implementation Party:** Construction Applicant
**Enforcement Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department

**Monitoring Agency:** Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department
HZ-4: The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DoD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DoD standards has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.

Monitoring Phase:  Construction
Implementation Party:  Applicant
Enforcement Agency:  Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department
Monitoring Agency:  Planning and Building Safety Department; Fire Department

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.
XI. NOISE

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

NOI-1: The project applicant’s construction contractor shall require by contract specifications that the following construction best management practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels:

• The project applicant’s construction contractor shall provide advance notification to adjacent property owners and post notices at the Proposed Project site with regards to the schedule of construction activities.

• All construction equipment with a high noise generating potential, including all equipment powered by internal combustion engines, shall be muffled or controlled.

• All noise-generating construction equipment and construction staging areas shall be placed away from sensitive uses, where feasible.

• High noise-producing activities shall be scheduled between the hours of 8 A.M. and 5 P.M. to minimize disruption to sensitive uses and delivery of materials and equipment shall occur between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M.

• Noise attenuation measures shall be implemented to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets.

• Machinery, including motors, shall be turned off when not in use.

Monitoring Phase: Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department
Monitoring Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department

XII. POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.
Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

PS-1: The applicant shall pay the adopted City of El Segundo Fire Service Mitigation Fee of $0.14 per gross square foot of building area before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.

Monitoring Phase: Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department
Monitoring Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department

PS-2: A Fire Life Safety Plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, shall be submitted to the EL Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed development.

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Fire Department
Monitoring Agency: Fire Department

PS-3: The applicant shall provide fire access roadways to and throughout the property and submit a layout plan to the ESFD for approval.

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction; Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Fire Department
Monitoring Agency: Fire Department

PS-4: The applicant shall provide water flow and on-site fire hydrants as required by the ESFD.

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction; Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Fire Department
Monitoring Agency: Fire Department
PS-5  The applicant shall submit separate plans for ESFD approval. The installations require separate ESFD approval:

- Automatic fire sprinklers;
- Fire alarm system;
- Underground fire service mains;
- Fire pumps;
- Emergency generators; and
- Any aboveground or underground storage tanks including elevator sumps and condensation tanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Pre-construction; Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-6:  The applicant shall pay the adopted City of El Segundo Police Service Mitigation Fee of $0.11 per gross square foot of building area before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS-7  The applicant shall submit a strategic security plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, to the El Segundo Police Department (ESPD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed project. The strategic security plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following items:

- Depending upon the size of the structure and its location in relation to the streets, the size of the displayed address may vary from a minimum of 4" to as much as 24";
- Building entrances and exits shall be limited in number and located in a manner to increase security and visibility of the building;
- All landscaping shall be low profile especially around perimeter fencing, windows, doors and entryways taking special care not to limit visibility and provide climbing access;
- Adequate street, walkway, building and parking lot lighting must be provided to enhance security; and
- Provisions for on-site security personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Phase:</th>
<th>Pre-construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Party:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Agency:</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Agency:</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIV. RECREATION

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

XV  TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

XVI. UTILITIES

Subsequent Environmental Documentation

No subsequent environmental documentation is required for the MEPS development project.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.
City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 16, 2008

TO: Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
Laurie Risk, Police Department
James Carver, Fire Marshal
Stephanie Katsouleas, Interim City Engineer
Sam Lee, Building Official

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director, Planning and Building Safety
      Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
STAFF PLANNER: Trayci Nelson, Contract Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. EA-769 and Zone Change for the
         Activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Floating Zone No. 07-01,
         Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, and Specific Plan
         Amendment No. 08-02.

Address: 1700 East Grand Avenue
Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
Property Owner: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story 32,980 square foot building on the 4.25 acre
site to be used by the U.S. government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS).

The project site is located on the south side of Grand Avenue between Kansas Street and
Sepulveda Boulevard. The site is in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and located within
the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area and Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Overlay. The
site is flat and is currently vacant.

The site was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings, and the buildings
were utilized for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense
industries resulting in some onsite soil contamination. However, the applicant has completed
all site remediation activities and the site has been released by the City of El Segundo Fire
Department’s Environmental Safety Manager. Evidence of this is contained within the Draft
Mitigated Negative Declaration which was circulated on May 2, 2008.

The purpose of the proposed MEPS is to perform physical and written examination and
provide administrative support services for new recruits into the Armed Forces before they are
sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and
from the site by van or bus, no walk-ins are permitted. The proposed MEPS facility is planned
to operate between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 A.M. and 12:00 P.M. 13 Saturdays per year. A total of 120 employees are anticipated to work in the facility.

Access to the property is from two gated driveways along Grand Avenue; one will provide ingress and both will provide egress. The project would provide a total of 132 on grade parking spaces. Additionally, the project provides for approximately 83,500 square feet of private outdoor open space. A perimeter security fence would be erected around the entire site. The fence would consist of a six-foot tall wrought iron fence, except along the southwest portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound attenuation and security wall.

An initial study of environmental impacts was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code § 15063 (CEQA) for the approval of the subdivision and development. A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts was proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA § 15070.

Attached for your review and comment is a copy of the application and plans. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was previously routed to your department on May 1, 2008. Please return the plans along with any comments, including any comments regarding the environmental documentations by 2:00 P.M. on June 18, 2008. Should you have any questions about the project, please contact Contract Planner Trayci Nelson at extension 2342.

COMMENTS:

The overall landscape design is good with use of drought tolerant or native plant material. I did notice the use of Cercidium floridum (Blue Palo Verde) on the Tree species palette. This tree is recommended for low deserts and is not compatible with El Segundo's climate zone.

Reviewed By:

[Signature]

[Name]

[Title]

[Date]

Encl.: P:\Planning & Building Safety\PROJECTS\EA-769\2006.EA-769.IDC.doc
Cercidium floridum
Blue palo verde
Fabaceae Family

Compiled by the Master Gardeners
of the University of Arizona Pima County Cooperative Extension.

HOME

Form: low multistemmed tree, rounded crown

Seasonality: deciduous (in drought or cold)
Size: 15-30ft with equal spread; growth rate varies with water supply

Leaves: bipinnately compound, in pairs, about 1/2in long with leaflets of 1/4 to 1/8in; often leafless most of the year

Flowers: bright yellow pea-like blooms cover entire tree; first Cercidium to bloom in spring

Fruit: flat pod, single or multiple seeded; brown bleaching to white with age; 1.5-3in long

Stems/Trunks: normally green, growing more gray or dark and rough with age; tree has overall bluish cast; dense growth; small thorns

Range/Origin: Sonoran and Mojave deserts, Baja California; elevations to 4000ft

Hardiness: mid to low teens

LANDSCAPE VALUE:

http://ag.arizona.edu/nima/gardening/bridal-wreath/Cercidium_floridum.html
City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 16, 2008

TO: Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
    Laurie Risk, Police Department
    James Carver, Fire Marshal
    Stephanie Katsouleas, Interim City Engineer
    Sam Lee, Building Official

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director, Planning and Building Safety
      Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Trayci Nelson, Contract Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. EA-769 and Zone Change for the
         Activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Floating Zone No. 07-01,
         Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, and Specific Plan
         Amendment No. 08-02.

Address: 1700 East Grand Avenue
Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
Property Owner: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story 32,980 square foot building on the 4.25 acre site to be used by the U.S. government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS).

The project site is located on the south side of Grand Avenue between Kansas Street and Sepulveda Boulevard. The site is in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and located within the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area and Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Overlay. The site is flat and is currently vacant.

The site was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings, and the buildings were utilized for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries resulting in some onsite soil contamination. However, the applicant has completed all site remediation activities and the site has been released by the City of El Segundo Fire Department's Environmental Safety Manager. Evidence of this is contained within the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration which was circulated on May 2, 2008.

The purpose of the proposed MEPS is to perform physical and written examination and provide administrative support services for new recruits into the Armed Forces before they are sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and from the site by van or bus, no walk-ins are permitted. The proposed MEPS facility is planned
to operate between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 A.M. and 12:00 P.M. 13 Saturdays per year. A total of 120 employees are anticipated to work in the facility.

Access to the property is from two gated driveways along Grand Avenue; one will provide ingress and both will provide egress. The project would provide a total of 132 on grade parking spaces. Additionally, the project provides for approximately 83,500 square feet of private outdoor open space. A perimeter security fence would be erected around the entire site. The fence would consist of a six-foot tall wrought iron fence, except along the southwest portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound attenuation and security wall.

An initial study of environmental impacts was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code § 15063 (CEQA) for the approval of the subdivision and development. A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts was proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA § 15070.

Attached for your review and comment is a copy of the application and plans. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was previously routed to your department on May 1, 2008. Please return the plans along with any comments, including any comments regarding the environmental documentations by 2:00 P.M. on June 18, 2008. Should you have any questions about the project, please contact Contract Planner Trayci Nelson at extension 2342.

COMMENTS:

Please see attached comments made in a previous memo.

Reviewed By:

Signature and Title

6-17-08

Date

Encl.: P:\Planning & Building Safety\PROJECTS\EA-769\2006.EA-769.IDC.doc
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City of El Segundo  
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE  

May 1, 2008

TO: Gary Chicots, Director of Planning and Building and Safety
FROM: David Cummings, Chief of Police
SUBJECT: Plan Check No. B1554-07
MEPS, Los Angeles (Military Processing)
1700 E Grand Avenue

Gates/Perimeter Fencing:
- Perimeter fencing shall be extended to a total height of eight feet and shall be consistent with the style of fencing depicted on “Security Fence along Grand Avenue” shown on the elevation page SF-1.
- Pickets shall be outwardly curved with a triple pointed pale head.

Security Cameras:
- Please provide an exterior camera plan including the height of installation and area of coverage. (Of particular interest are cameras that face points of entry and that the cameras are installed at such a height that when trees are grown to maturity they will not block the viewing angle.)
- On several occasions the access road that runs along the east property line has been used to commit burglaries to the surrounding properties. This road could also provide a place for persons with criminal intent to park a vehicle alongside the MEPS perimeter fence line and commit any number crimes to the facility.
  - A camera facing the Grand Avenue entrance to this access road shall be added to the east property line to capture vehicle license plate numbers and facial images as cars enter this road.

Lighting:
The addressing, open parking lot and trash dumpster shall be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one footcandle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. A wall pack shall be placed over the receiving door and shall be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one footcandle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. Aisles, passageways and recesses related to and within all sides of the building complex shall be illuminated with a maintained minimum of .25 footcandles on the ground surface during hours of darkness.
Lighting devices shall be enclosed and protected by weather and vandal resistant covers.

A PHOTOMETRIC STUDY, WHICH INCLUDES ALL OF THE ABOVE, MUST BE PROVIDED PRIOR TO ISSUING THE PERMIT.

THE PHOTOMETRIC STUDY MUST BE POINT-BY-POINT AND INCLUDE THE LIGHT LOSS FACTOR (.7). LIGHTING LEVELS SHALL BE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY TO MEET THE MINIMUM FOOTCANDLE REQUIREMENTS WITHIN EACH AREA OF THE PROJECT.

*Traffic Division (Lt. Garcia/Sgt. De La Rambelje)*
- None

*Police Notes Only (per MEPS-Andy Minicz (facilities) and Bill Boyle (security cameras))*:
- Front entry gates will have access control and be viewed by CCTV.
- Buses will enter facility either by interior controls or by access card. Deliveries enter facility by interior controls/intercom.
- Security cameras to cover interior and all of exterior. MEPS will have web based capabilities.
- Digital cameras to have a minimum of 30 day storage.
- MEPS will be open from approximately 0500-1700 hours with some Saturdays and extended evening hours.
- Building will be alarmed.
- Demonstrations are possible; however, they have advance warning and will notify police department.
- MEPS will leave east perimeter fencing and building as they are with a 25’ standoff as they are only leasing the property.

DC:Ir
City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 16, 2008

TO: Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
    Laurie Risk, Police Department
    James Carver, Fire Marshal
    Stephanie Katsouleas, Interim City Engineer
    Sam Lee, Building Official

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director, Planning and Building Safety
      Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Trayci Nelson, Contract Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. EA-769 and Zone Change for the
         Activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Floating Zone No. 07-01,
         Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, and Specific Plan
         Amendment No. 08-02.

Address: 1700 East Grand Avenue
Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
Property Owner: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story 32,980 square foot building on the 4.25 acre
site to be used by the U.S. government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS).

The project site is located on the south side of Grand Avenue between Kansas Street and
Sepulveda Boulevard. The site is in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and located within
the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area and Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Overlay. The
site is flat and is currently vacant.

The site was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings, and the buildings
were utilized for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense
industries resulting in some onsite soil contamination. However, the applicant has completed
all site remediation activities and the site has been released by the City of El Segundo Fire
Department's Environmental Safety Manager. Evidence of this is contained within the Draft
Mitigated Negative Declaration which was circulated on May 2, 2008.

The purpose of the proposed MEPS is to perform physical and written examination and
provide administrative support services for new recruits into the Armed Forces before they are
sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and
from the site by van or bus, no walk-ins are permitted. The proposed MEPS facility is planned

1
to operate between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 A.M.
and 12:00 P.M. 13 Saturdays per year. A total of 120 employees are anticipated to work in
the facility.

Access to the property is from two gated driveways along Grand Avenue; one will provide
ingress and both will provide egress. The project would provide a total of 132 on grade
parking spaces. Additionally, the project provides for approximately 83,500 square feet of
private outdoor open space. A perimeter security fence would be erected around the entire
site. The fence would consist of a six-foot tall wrought iron fence, except along the southwest
portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound
attenuation and security wall.

An initial study of environmental impacts was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code §
15063 (CEQA) for the approval of the subdivision and development. A Mitigated Negative
Declaration of Environmental Impacts was proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA §
15070.

Attached for your review and comment is a copy of the application and plans. The Mitigated
Negative Declaration was previously routed to your department on May 1, 2008. Please
return the plans along with any comments, including any comments regarding the
environmental documentations by 2:00 P.M. on June 18, 2008. Should you have any
questions about the project, please contact Contract Planner Trayci Nelson at extension
2342. .

COMMENTS:

Applicant must comply with California Building & Fire Code & El
Secundo Fire Department regulations

Reviewed By:

James Corwin, Fire Marshal

Signature and Title

June 18, 2008

Date
Trayci:

I have reviewed the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration document for the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station at 1700 E. Grand Ave. I concur with Mitigation Measures MM PS-1, MM PS-2, MM PS-3, MM PS-4 and MM PS-5. On page 61, there starts discussion on installing a vapor barrier at the site. As with past installations, the Environmental Safety Division needs to review and approve the vapor barrier system plans prior to the contractor commencing work, along with performing required inspections. I would recommend adding the plan approval by ESFD Environmental Safety to the discussion. I will be out of town next week at training; please e-mail me if you have any questions or need more information. I will respond to e-mails as tme permits.

Thanks,

James Carver
Fire Marshal
El Segundo Fire Department
(310) 524-2239
City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 16, 2008

TO: Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
    Laurie Risk, Police Department
    James Carver, Fire Marshal
    Stephanie Katsouelas, Interim City Engineer
    Sam Lee, Building Official

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director, Planning and Building Safety
      Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Trayci Nelson, Contract Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. EA-769 and Zone Change for the
         Activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Floating Zone No. 07-01,
         Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, and Specific Plan
         Amendment No. 08-02.

Address: 1700 East Grand Avenue
Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
Property Owner: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story 32,980 square foot building on the 4.25 acre
site to be used by the U.S. government for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS).

The project site is located on the south side of Grand Avenue between Kansas Street and
Sepulveda Boulevard. The site is in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone and located within
the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area and Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Overlay. The
site is flat and is currently vacant.

The site was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings, and the buildings
were utilized for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense
industries resulting in some onsite soil contamination. However, the applicant has completed
all site remediation activities and the site has been released by the City of El Segundo Fire
Department's Environmental Safety Manager. Evidence of this is contained within the Draft
Mitigated Negative Declaration which was circulated on May 2, 2008.

The purpose of the proposed MEPS is to perform physical and written examination and
provide administrative support services for new recruits into the Armed Forces before they are
sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and
from the site by van or bus, no walk-ins are permitted. The proposed MEPS facility is planned
to operate between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 A.M. and 12:00 P.M. 13 Saturdays per year. A total of 120 employees are anticipated to work in the facility.

Access to the property is from two gated driveways along Grand Avenue; one will provide ingress and both will provide egress. The project would provide a total of 132 on-grade parking spaces. Additionally, the project provides for approximately 83,500 square feet of private outdoor open space. A perimeter security fence would be erected around the entire site. The fence would consist of a six-foot tall wrought iron fence, except along the southwest portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound attenuation and security wall.

An initial study of environmental impacts was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code § 15063 (CEQA) for the approval of the subdivision and development. A Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts was proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA § 15070.

Attached for your review and comment is a copy of the application and plans. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was previously routed to your department on May 1, 2008. Please return the plans along with any comments, including any comments regarding the environmental documentations by 2:00 P.M. on June 18, 2008. Should you have any questions about the project, please contact Contract Planner Trayci Nelson at extension 2342.

**COMMENTS:**

0. Applicable code to be 2007 California Building Code.

Reviewed By:

Signature and Title: Plan Check Eng.

6/17/08

Date

Encl.
P:\Planning & Building Safety\PROJECTS\EA-769\2006.EA-769.IDC.doc
May 6, 2008

Gary Chicots
Director of Planning and Community Development
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, California 90245

Re: Military Entrance Processing Station

Dear Gary:

This letter is to provide a point of clarification on the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS").

Mitigation Measure HZ-4 provides that the facility shall be “designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense.” The purpose of this mitigation measure is not to protect the surrounding public, but to minimize mass casualties to persons inside the building from terrorist attacks relating to chemical, biological or radiological agents being distributed throughout the buildings circulation systems.

Prior to the plans being submitted to the City for approval, they were submitted for review, and approved by, both GSA and MEPCOM (Military Entrance Processing Command). Since these entities are charged with ensuring that building plans meet the antiterrorism standards, we assume that their pre-approval of the plans submitted to the City satisfies the mitigation measure. However, in order to avoid any confusion, we suggest that MM HZ-4 be revised to read as follows:

The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense, as specifically implemented through the plans approved by GSA and MEPCOM and submitted to the City.
We believe that the change outlined above does not constitute a substitute mitigation measure, but only a clarification of the existing measure and therefore, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines section 15074.1 are inapplicable. Please advise us if the City has a differing interpretation.

Very Truly Yours,

Lisa E. Kranitz
Wallin, Kress, Reisman & Kranitz

cc: Allan Mackenzie
Mark Hensley
May 13, 2008

Gary Chicots
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: 1700 E. Grand Avenue

Dear Gary,

On behalf of the applicant, I wanted to respond to a comment in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

In two places, on page 63 and on page 89, the document states that the “MEPS facility is a privately owned facility that is proposed to be leased to the federal government which...makes it an attractive potential target for terrorist activity.” The list of sources on pages 111-112 does not list out any expert source to justify this comment, and so the reader does not know whether it is based on expert information or the speculation of the writer.

Since this issue has been raised in the past, we, as applicant, have undertaken a considerable amount of research. We have talked to numerous individuals and organizations with expertise in this field, including the Rand Corporation and Supervisor Knabe (California’s Appointee to the President’s Homeland Security Advisory Council). We have also reviewed a database now administered by the Department of Homeland Security on all terrorist incidents in the world from 1968 to 2004. From this information (Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism – Terrorism Knowledge Base www.tkb.org), the following conclusions can be drawn, none of which appear to support the hypothesis that this is an attractive terrorist target:

1. There is a definite inverse correlation between the individual’s knowledge on the subject of terrorism, to whom we spoke, and their willingness to comment in any more than very general terms on what is or what is not an attractive terrorism target. For obvious reasons, those who know don’t talk.

2. Despite this, clearly high impact targets like: Chevron oil refinery; Los Angeles Hyperion Sewage Treatment Plant; LAX Airport; Los Angeles Air Force Base; Aerospace Corporation (or any one of several private sector defense industry facilities); several surface transportation hubs, large private office buildings;
public shopping areas; and plazas; to name a few in the local area, appear to be more likely targets of choice. When the phrase “government facility” is used, we should not forget far more impact is made on the public by targeting non-military government facilities i.e. airports, sewage treatment plants, etc. than military targets.

3. Of the 555 terrorist incidents in the US from 1968 to 2004 (Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism – Terrorism Knowledge Base www.tkb.org): the vast majority were domestic terrorism such as the Weathermen and the New World Liberation Front; only 38 or 7% were directed at government facilities, and only 5 or 1% were directed at military targets.

4. In a more terrorism prone country such as Israel, the percentages remain similar, with only 4% directed at military targets, and the vast majority at civilian facilities.

5. In the state of California from 1968 to 2007, there have been 5 terrorist incidents.

6. The MEPS command clearly does not believe there is an issue, since they do not plan to have a secured gate, but only a security guard in the lobby. As with any Department of Defense building, certain setback requirements are met.

In conclusion, we believe the comment in the MND to be incorrect.

Yours very truly,

Allan W. Mackenzie
President
El Segundo Planning Commission  
City of El Segundo  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Commissioners:

We are writing on behalf of the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce to express our support of the proposed relocation of the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) at 1700 E. Grand Avenue.

This Department of Defense facility will complement the diverse organizations that make up the business and commercial development of our City. MEPS represents a clean, low-density use of the property that will have a minimal impact on local traffic.

It is important to note that the MEPS facility is not a recruiting station. It provides pre-employment services such as medical and aptitude testing for recruits who have already passed an initial screening. All pre-screened recruits will arrive and depart in government vans or buses. No walk-ins are permitted.

Because of its low-profile appearance as an office building, we also do not believe its presence in our community will increase the chance of a terrorist attack.

Further, its location in El Segundo will reinforce our City’s support of the military presence already here, positively impacting not only El Segundo but the entire South Bay. The City’s willingness to welcome this important, low-risk activity to the community will send a favorable message to the U.S. Government during the next round of military base closures.

After taking these positive factors into account, the El Segundo Chamber’s Board of Directors voted unanimously to support the location of the MEPS facility in El Segundo. We urge you to approve the proposal for the MEPS location at 1700 E. Grand Avenue.

Respectfully,

James Hart  
President

William B. Mason  
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee

427 Main Street • El Segundo, CA 90245 • 310.322.1220 • Fax 310.322.6880
Email: info@elsegundochamber.org
Dear El Segundo Mayor, Council and Planning Commission Officials,

I am writing this letter on behalf of the 6500+ Veteran of Foreign Wars (VFW), the 1,600+ VFW Ladies Auxiliary, and the 50+ VFW Men's Auxiliary members who belong to the 20 VFW Posts in the area and who reside in the South Bay of Los Angeles.

I have been asked to write to the City of El Segundo Planning Commission, Mayor, and the City Council to show our support for the proposed re-location of the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Station (LA MEPS) to the City of El Segundo.

Obviously, we're a Veterans organization and we are responsible for speaking out on those occasions effecting active duty, Guard, and Reserve military matters or Veteran issues and when our numbers and voice need to be heard. The approval of the LA MEPS moving to the City of El Segundo can be nothing but positive. The LA MEPS itself is a Department of Defense (DoD) activity made-up of military and civil service personnel just like any other military base, installation, or activity. MEPS do not recruit. MEPS to not seek out anyone or anything. MEPS do not draw attention to themselves. MEPS do not draw negativity.

What the MEPS does is process young Americans for service into the Armed Forces of the United States. Applicants come into the MEPS, take a test (ASVAB), receive a medical screening from the medical staff, have a security background check accomplished, and are sworn into the prospective military service. They are then set-up in a local hotel, normally for one night, and then are shipped-off to basic training. As a matter of fact, it is forbidden for the military service recruiters to do ANY recruiting in or around a station.

Now if the City of El Segundo is opposed to having military installations and government contractors in their City, if the City of El Segundo is opposed to having Junior ROTC in their High Schools, and if the City of El Segundo is opposed to having additional government contractors in their City, then I think we have a much greater problem than having a discussion about a small DoD activity such as a MEPS being re-located here.

I recommend that the City of El Segundo embrace the proposal for the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Station (LA MEPS) to be located in their city. El Segundo is ideally centralized to the Los Angeles county area with close access to local hotels and the Los Angeles Airport.

If you have any questions, please let me know. I can be reached at 323-755-5931.

Ralph Duncan
Commander
10 June 2008

Dear El Segundo City Officials,

I am currently the Post Commander for VFW Post 1622, located in the City of Lomita. We are one of the largest and most active VFW Posts and Auxiliaries in the South Bay of Los Angeles. We currently have a membership comprised of 520 Veterans, 275 VFW Ladies Auxiliary members, and over 50 VFW Men’s Auxiliary members.

At our last meeting, the Post and Auxiliary memberships voted and asked that I write this letter of support for locating the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Station (LA MEPS) to the City of El Segundo. So, on behalf of our members, I am asking that City of El Segundo Planning Commission recommend approval and forward their full support of the LA MEPS relocation to the City of El Segundo Mayor and City Council.

As an organization, we have a lot of outreach in the communities in which we live and work. We are highly involved in supporting Veterans and Veteran programs throughout the year. When necessary, we also support active duty military activities and if necessary will contact elected Federal, State and local City governments to show our support. In this instance, we would like to think that there would be absolutely no question of the City of El Segundo showing their support for this DoD activity. As a matter of fact, we are embarrassed to think that there is even a consideration of NOT supporting this relocation.

We’ve always felt that the City of El Segundo has been blessed with a military installation in their city – Los Angeles Air Force Base. LAAFB along with their $8-10 Billion dollar annual budget and numerous government contractors supporting the Space industry, is nothing but a positive! If you agree, then why does the addition of a small DoD activity such as a MEPS seem to be so controversial?

We’re hopeful that whoever is not in favor of this activity, will publicly explain their concerns in detail as to why they think this would activity would be a “negative influence” on the community. We would like to see the statistical evidence from the City of LA Police Department on crimes on the current facility over the past 10 years. What other evidence is there to discuss?

We will be available to personally discuss this with the City of El Segundo Planning Commission, the City of El Segundo Mayor and Council and with the local press on our support for this issue.

If you have any questions, please let me know. I can be reached at 571-723-5862.

JAMES S. ROSA
Commander
Dear El Segundo City Officials,

First of all, let me say that I am NOT representing any of the three organizations whose logo appears above. However, I'm writing to you from the standpoint of someone who a.) retired from the USAF with 24+ years of service and seven years of which were at Los Angeles Air Force Base (LAAFB), b.) has been with the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) for over twelve years, including a year as District Commander for the 23 VFW Posts in the South Bay area of Los Angeles (7,500+ members), and c.) has a lot of insight into the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Station (LA MEPS), since I was the LA MEPS Commander between 01-03. I tell you all this because I think I am probably one of the most uniquely qualified people to discuss this whole matter from a myriad of standpoints.

The City of El Segundo is truly blessed to have a military installation within their city. Not only do you have the base itself and its huge annual budget ($8-10 Billion), but you also have a tremendous Space-based related industry located throughout the city that is here strictly because of their support to the LAAFB Space mission. The local Space industry includes such heavy hitters as: The Aerospace Corporation, Northrop-Grumman, Boeing, Lockheed-Martin, Raytheon, etc. They have all long been strong partners with the City of El Segundo and have greatly added to its economy, welfare, and growth. I'm also sure that their ranks include thousands of Veterans.

As far as the Los Angeles MEPS is concerned, it is the largest in the country of 65 MEPS across the nation. The LA MEPS covers a nine-county region covering 62,500 square miles. There are over 700 high schools that fall within their umbrella. There are many, many recruiting stations across this wide area where service recruiters work and recruit from. Once applicants have determined their interest in joining one of the armed forces and in many cases have their parent's approval, the service recruiters bring the applicant to the MEPS for processing. Processing includes aptitude testing (ASVAB), medical examination by medical doctors, security background screening, and if acceptable, the oath of enlistment. The applicants are housed, normally overnight, and then shipped off to the various service basic training locations across the country.

As far as community support, there are over 100 military and civil service employees who will be staffing the LA MEPS. That means lot's of visits to local restaurants for breakfast and lunch - including some weekends. The MEPS will oversee a vending machine contract for food, drinks, and games, a food contract that will feed lunch to the many applicants while they process throughout the day, a bus contract to take applicants to in-state basic training, and an airline ticket office (contract) that will make the numerous airline reservations for applicants to fly to various
nothing but themselves to stand between a potential terrorist threat and the young adults who were processing inside. We have terrific young people working in the MEPS with a sprinkling of more senior civil service employees including a dozen medical doctors. I trust that all of you feel the same as I do and do not have any reservations about having a MEPS located in El Segundo.

What more can I say in support of this relocation. Your city is ideally located, with easy access from large state highways, are close to LAX for air transportation, and you have numerous hotels in the area to support the lodging of applicants. You also have a large military population with LAAFB and the many thousands of Veterans within the local area who are still working in the many Space-related industries around El Segundo. You are a military-minded community.

I seek the Planning Commission, Mayor, and City Council Members support in this relocation. If you have any questions, please let me know. I can be reached at 571-723-5862.

JAMES S. ROSA

Courtesy Copy:
United States Senator Barbara Boxer
United States Senator Dianne Feinstein
United States Congresswoman Jane Harman, 36th Congressional District
California State Senator Jenny Oropeza
California Assemblyman Ted W. Lieu
California Secretary of Veterans Affairs Thomas Johnson
Los Angeles County Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, Director Colonel Joe Smith
June 16, 2008

The Honorable Cindy Mortesen
City Clerk, City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: Military Entrance Processing Station

Dear Cindy:

I have been briefed by Lieutenant Colonel David Phillips, Commander of the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Center ("MEPS"), on its proposed future home on Grand Avenue in the City of El Segundo. This MEPS facility is critical to the United States Military and its approval by the El Segundo City Council on a timely basis is essential for MEPS to meet its obligations to the country.

Welcoming the MEPS facility will continue the City of El Segundo’s long tradition in partnering with the United States Government and the many aerospace companies that are currently located in the City.

My office strongly supports this future facility in the City of El Segundo.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TED W. LIEU
California State Assemblymember
53rd Assembly District
February 21, 2007

Gary Chicots
Planning Commission
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

RE: MEPS Use
1700 E. Grand Avenue, El Segundo, CA

Dear Mr. Chicots:

The proposed use at 1700 E. Grand Avenue would not in any way compete or erode the commercial market for downtown El Segundo. The proposed use is for an administrative office use and has no retail function whatsoever. It is highly likely that the occupants of the proposed building will take advantage of El Segundo's excellent downtown commercial market for purchases, lunch, dinner, etc.

Additionally, the proposed use for this property requires a 4 acre site in order to satisfy the occupant's requirements. At the time of our search, it did not turn up any potential 4 acre sites in downtown El Segundo.

If I can answer any questions or clarify any of the above, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN R. CRAMER
Senior Vice President

SRC:ds
c.c. Bill Messori
COMMUNITY, ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 524-2344
FAX (310) 322-4167

INITIAL STUDY
APPLICANT QUESTIONNAIRE

A. GENERAL INFORMATION
1. Name, address and phone number of current property owner:

Mar Canyon Grand, LLC  @ 2050 W. 190th Street, Suite # 108,

Torrance, Ca 90504 Attn: Allan W. Mackenzie Telephone # 310-787-4730

(Note: Property Owner’s signature is required on Page 6 and 7)

2. Address of project: 1700 East Grand Avenue, El Segundo, California 90245
Assessor’s Block and Lot No.: City of El Segundo, APN: 041-009-001 & 901

3. Name, address, and telephone number of applicant, including name of person to be contacted concerning this project (if different from Property Owner): Primary Contract: Owner as Stated above
Secondary Contact: Architect: BVA INC., @ 4915 Coldwater Canyon #3, Sherman Oaks, Ca 91423
Telephone No. (818) 205-7420

(Note: Applicant’s signature is required on Page 7)

4. List and describe any other related permits and other public approvals required for this project, including those required by city, regional, state, and federal agencies:
CITY: Grading permit, Building Permit, Electrical Permits, Sign Permit
COUNTY: Fire Hydrant Permits, Sewer Permits

5. Existing zoning district: Medium Manufacturing (MM) with GAC Floating Zone

6. Proposed use of site (project for which this form is filed): Development of a 2 story, 32,980 square foot building with parking lot designed for the U.S. Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS)

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION Use additional sheets as necessary.
1. Site size: 184,886 SF (4.244 Acres)

2. Total square footage of building(s) or structure(s): 32,980 Square Feet

3. Number of floors of construction: Two Floors

4. Amount of on-site parking provided: 151 Spaces
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5. Proposed scheduling: Construction to commence on December 1, 2007

6. Associated projects and relationship to larger project or series of projects: N/A

7. If residential, include the number of units, schedule of unit sizes, range of sale price or rents, and type of household size expected: N/A

8. If commercial, indicate the type, whether neighborhood, city or regionally oriented, square footage of building area, and nature of loading facilities provided. See Below:

   Project No. EA_________
   
   o Commercial Office Building per City's determination
   o Regionally Oriented
   o Site area: 4.25 acres
   o Building square footage: 32,980
   o FAR: 0.18
   o Height: 2 Stories (35 feet)
   o Parking: 151 Spaces
   o Landscaping: 96,000 s.f. – 52% of site area
   o Loading: one loading area
9. If industrial, indicate type, estimated employment per shift, and nature of loading facilities. N/A

10. If institutional, indicate the major function, estimated employment per shift, estimated occupancy, nature of loading facilities provided and community benefit to be derived from the project. N/A

11. If the project requires a variance, conditional use permit or rezoning application, state this and indicate clearly why the application is required. Need to activate Commercial Overlay zone.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1. Describe the project site as it exists before the project, including information on topography, soil stability, plants and animals, and any cultural, historical, or scenic aspects. Describe any existing structures on the site, and the use of the structures. Attach photographs of the site. Snapshots or Polaroid photos will be accepted.

   Currently, the site is vacant. The property is roughly triangular, approximately 4 acres and was previously developed with four manufacturing/office buildings (approximately 56,000 square feet); several detached outbuildings, and associated parking lots. The property was the home of Aerojet, which used the manufacturing buildings for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries. The structures have been demolished.

SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT “A” PHOTOGRAPHS OF PREVIOUS SITE CONDITIONS

2. Describe surrounding properties, including information on plants and animals and any cultural, historical, or scenic aspects. Indicate the type of land use (residential, commercial, etc.), intensity of land use (one-family, apartment houses, shops, department stores, etc.), and scale of development (height, frontage, setback, rear yard, etc.). Attach photographs of the vicinity. Snapshots or Polaroid photos will be accepted.

The property is bounded as follows:

   1) North – Grand Avenue; Grand Auto Parts & Jim & Jack’s Collision Center (auto paint & body) is located across Grand Avenue to the North
   2) East - Southern California Edison electrical substation and International Garden Center (nursery).
   3) South – Grateful Dogs Clubhouse (kennel, dog training, grooming) and International Rectifier (a manufacturer of electronics components).
   4) West – International Rectifier.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS  Brief explanations of all answers are required on attached sheets, or refer to previous responses to Items B and C above.

   YES          MAYBE          NO

1. Land Use Planning. Would the proposal:

   a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?

   b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

   YES          MAYBE          NO
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| c) | Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| d) | Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| 2. Population and Housing. Would the proposal: | | | | |
| a) | Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| b) | Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| c) | Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| 3. Geologic Problems. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving: | | | | |
| a) | Fault rupture? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| b) | Seismic ground shaking? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| c) | Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| d) | Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| e) | Landslides or mudflows? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| e) | Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| g) | Subsidence of the land? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| h) | Expansive soils? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| l) | Unique geologic or physical features? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| 4. Water. Would the proposal result in: | | | | |
| a) | Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| b) | Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| c) | Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
| d) | Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | YES | MAYBE | NO |
d) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?

e) Change in the quality of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capacity?

f) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

h) Impacts to groundwater quality?

i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?

5. Air Quality. Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?

b) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any changes in climate?

d) Create objectionable odors?

6. Transportation/Circulation. Would the proposal result in:

a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?

c) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?

f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts; bicycle racks)?

g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?

7. Biological Resources. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to, plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hazards. Would the proposal involve:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Noise. Would the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increases in existing noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Services. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?  NO

e) Other governmental services?  NO

12. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a) Power or natural gas?  NO

b) Communications systems?  NO

c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?  NO

d) Sewer or septic tanks?  NO

e) Storm water drainage?  NO

f) Solid waste disposal?  NO

g) Local or regional water supplies?  NO

13. Aesthetics. Would the proposal:

a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic-highway?  NO

b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?  NO

c) Create light or glare?  NO

14. Cultural Resources. Would the proposal:

a) Disturb paleontological resources?  NO

b) Disturb archaeological resources?  NO

c) Affect historical resources?  NO

e) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?  NO

f) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?  NO

15. Recreation. Would the proposal:

a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?  NO

b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?  NO

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?

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

c) 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 conjunction with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

---

OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

I, (We) Allan W. Mackenzie am (are) the OWNER(S) of the property involved in this application; I (we) have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application; and the information on all documents and all plans is true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief.

MAR CANYON GRAND LLC a California limited liability company

By: MVT Properties, Inc. a California corporation

Its: Managing Member

By: Allan W. Mackenzie Its: President

Date 9/4/07

---
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I hereby authorize Allan W. Mackenzie to act for me in all matters relevant to this application. I understand that this person will be the primary contact on the project and will be sent all information and correspondence.

Owner’s Signature:  

Date: 9/4/07

APPLICANT AFFIDAVIT

I, (We), William D. Messori, am (are) the APPLICANT (S) of the property involved in this application; I (we) have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application; and the information on all documents and all plans is true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief.

Applicant’s Signature:  

Date: 9/4/07

FOR PLANNING DIVISION USE ONLY

13Copies of Plans  
300’ Notification Map  
3 sets of Property Owner Labels  
2 sets of Envelopes with Postage  
Required Supplemental Info Sheets  

Fee/Deposit Received: $________.  
Date Filed: __________, 20____.  
Received By: ________________

Revised 01/01

Intsit-3.qst
BRIEF EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST ANSWERS

1. Land Use Planning
   
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? No

   The City has determined that the proposed Military Enlistment Processing Station is a commercial use for medical and general office buildings. The property at issue lies within the Smoky Hollow Mixed Use Land Designation. This specific property is within the Medium Manufacturing Zone with a Grand Avenue Commercial ("GAC") Floating Zone. General and medical-dental offices are permitted use in the GAC overlay under §15-7B-2. Once the zone is activated, the use will be consistent.

   b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans/policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? No

   There are no applicable plans or policies of other jurisdictions with which this project would conflict.

   c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? No

   The use to the north is new construction for International Rectifier and an auto collision center. The uses to the east are a SCE substation and a nursery. The uses to the south are a dog kennel/training/grooming business and an electronics manufacturing facility. The use to the west is electronics manufacturing that may be redeveloped into either senior housing or office/industrial buildings for sale and/or lease. The medical/general office uses will not impact any of these uses. Additionally, the low-scale, high quality design of the MEPS facility will be compatible with the potential senior housing to the north.

   d) Affect agricultural resources or operations? No

   The use is being proposed on a site that was previously used for the machining of parts for the aerospace and defense industries. There are no agricultural resources or operations on the property or in the vicinity.

2. Population and Housing

   a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? No
The project will relocate a facility which already exists in the Los Angeles area into a more convenient location and is not expected to add any population to the regional area. Although some individuals may move due to the relocation of the project, the numbers would not exceed local population projections for the City of El Segundo.

b) Induce substantial growth in the area? No

The project is being proposed in an already developed area and no new infrastructure is needed to service the facility. As this is a relocation of an operation already existing in the regional area, it will not induce new growth.

c) Displace existing/affordable housing? No

The project will be built on a vacant site that was previously occupied with a manufacturing use. Residential is not an allowable use in the project zone.

3. Geologic Problems – Would the project result in or expose people to -

a) Fault rupture? No

No active faults are known to project through the site nor does the site lie within the bounds of an “Earthquake Fault Zone” as defined by the State of California in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. As such, the potential for ground rupture due to fault displacement beneath the site is considered low. See Albus-Keefe & Associates, Inc. report dated March 10, 2006.

b) Seismic ground shaking? No

The site is located in a seismically active area that has been historically been affected by moderate to occasionally high levels of ground motion. The site lies in relatively close proximity to several active faults; therefore, during the life of the proposed development, the property will probably experience moderate to occasionally high ground shaking from these fault zones, as well as some background shaking from other seismically active areas of the southern California region. The proposed facility will be designed in accordance with the current California Building Code (CBC) and the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? No
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The site was evaluated by Albus-Keefe for potential liquefaction and it was determined that the potential for liquefaction at the site is considered remote.

d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? No

The project site is located several miles from the water and elevated and therefore would not be subject to seiche or tsunami. There are no volcanoes in the area.

e) Landslides or mudflows? No

The site is not located within an area identified by the California Geologic Survey (CGS) as having potential for seismic slope instability. Geologic hazards associated with landslides are not anticipated for this site.

f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill? No

The site is relatively flat with no unstable soils conditions. The perimeter of the site will be protected during construction for any potential erosion.

g) Subsidence of the land? No

The site will be over excavated and re-compacted reducing the potential for any subsidence of the land.

h) Expansive soils? No

The laboratory tests and the USCS visual manual classification of the near surface soils within the site are generally anticipated to possess very low expansion potential.

i) Unique geologic or physical features? No

There are no unique features on the site of any type.

4. Water

a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? No
The project will enhance the rate of surface runoff because the site had been designed so that 100% of the runoff will be absorbed.

b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards? No
The property will not generate any water related hazards.

c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality? No
Again, the project has been designed to absorb 100% of the runoff water.

d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? No
The project will not impact the surface water of any adjacent water bodies.

e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? No
The project will not have any impact on the course or direction of water movements. The project will be over excavated to a maximum depth of 15' which is well above the ground water levels at the site.

f) Change in ground water quality? No
The absorbed water will be filtered prior to being percolated into the subsurface. The proposed project will not generate any hazardous materials that will impact the quality of the groundwater.

g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? No
The project will not have any impact on the course or direction of water movements. The project will be over excavated to a maximum depth of 15' which is well above the ground water levels at the site that are estimated to be below 50' at this location.

h) Impacts to groundwater quality? No
The proposed project will not generate any hazardous materials that will impact groundwater quality.

i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water or supplies? No
The project will not impact the quality of the groundwater or utilize the groundwater so there will be no impact to available groundwater quality.

5. **Air Quality**

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to air quality violation? No

The proposed project will be built to LEED standards and will not contribute to air quality violations.

b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? No

The project will not create any exhaust or other pollutants that will expose sensitive receptors.

c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause climate changes? No

The project will not alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause climate changes as it's a basic office / medical facility.

d) Create objectionable odors? No

The proposed project will consist of medical and general office type uses and will not emit any odors.

6. **Transportation/Circulation**

a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? No

The proposed use will nominally increase the weekday daily trips from 318 to 379 according to the Fehr & Peers Kaku Associates report dated February 17, 2007.

b) Hazards to safety from design features? No

The facility will be constructed to the highest design standards and will not have any design features that will create safety hazards.

c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? No

The site will have two access points from Grand Avenue and be easily accessible to emergency vehicles.
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? No

The project will have 151 parking spaces which exceeds the City’s Code requirements.

e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? No

The proposed site will not create incremental hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists over the pre-existing use of the property.

f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation? No

The site will be LEED certified and will encourage the use of alternative transportation to the site.

g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? No

The project will not rely on rail, water or air. Transportation to and from the site, as well as the delivery of supplies, will be by vehicle.

7. Biological Resources – Impacts to

a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or habitats? No

The site was entirely paved with asphalt and concrete with minimal landscaping. The site was not known to have any rare species or habitats on the site.

b) Locally designated species/heritage trees? No

The site is void of locally designated species/heritage trees.

c) Locally designated natural communities? No

The site is void of any locally designated natural communities.

d) Wetland habitat? No

The site does not contain any wetlands.

e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

The project site is in an urbanized and fully developed area. The site itself has previously been graded and developed and the
buildings that previously existed have since been demolished. There are no protected species or habitats – federal, state, or local. The property is not wetlands and is not used by any wildlife. The property has no biological significance.

f) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful/inefficient manner? No

The project has been designed to receive a Silver LEED designation and is therefore designed in a very environmentally friendly manner.

g) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? No

The site will not utilize any mineral resources that may be present at the site and therefore will not reduce the availability of same.

9. Hazards

a) Risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances? No

The proposed project consists of general and medical offices. The use will not involve hazardous substances except for normal cleaning products.

b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? No

The site does not interfere with any emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The MEPS site may be utilized by the community of El Segundo to enhance any need for emergency responses.

c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?

The proposed site will not create any health or health hazards to the local community. Any medical waste will be disposed of according to accepted practices.

c) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? No

The Grand Avenue site was cleaned up from health hazards that existed and resulted from the prior use of the site.
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass or trees? No

The project site is in a developed, urbanized area. There is no grass, trees or brush in the surrounding area.

10. **Noise**

a) Increases in existing noise levels? No

The previous use of the site was for manufacturing of components for the aerospace industry and created industrial noise levels. The proposed use is for an office / medical facility that will create substantially less noise than the previous manufacturing facility.

b) Exposure of people to sever noise levels? No

The MEPS facility will not generate any industrial noise. It is an office / medical facility that will not expose people to severe noise levels.

11. **Public Services – Impact on or result in a need for new/altered services?**

a) Fire Protection? No

The MEPS facility should reduce the fire protection needs from the previous manufacturing facility in that the office / medical use should be less volatile than the pre-existing industrial use.

b) Police Protection? No

The proposed site will have its own security protection reducing the potential for the need for police protection.

c) Schools? No

The office / medical use will not have any impact to the schools since additional children will not be present at the site.

d) Maintenance of public facilities/roads? No

The MEPS use increases the weekly daily trips by a nominal 45 over the pre-existing use. This nominal increase should not create the need for incremental maintenance of the public facilities/roads.
e) Other governmental services? No

The MEPS use will not increase the need for other governmental services to the City. The MEPS facility should enhance the governmental services provided by assisting the City in times of need.

12. Utilities and Service Systems – need for new systems/supplies/alterations

a) Power or natural gas? No

The proposed project will utilize significantly less power than the previous use at the site. Natural gas is not anticipated to be utilized at this property.

b) Communication systems? No

The local communications infrastructure is adequate to handle the needs of the MEPS facility.

c) Local or regional water treatment/distribution facilities? No

The MEPS facility will generate less waste and therefore reduce the impact to the regional water treatment/distribution facilities.

d) Sewer or septic tanks? No

The proposed project will utilize generate less sewage from the previous use of the site. Septic tanks will not be utilized at the property.

e) Storm water drainage? No

The proposed project will reduce the storm water drainage with its LEED certified storm drain system designed to capture 100% of the sites runoff water.

f) Solid waste disposal? No

The proposed project will generate standard solid waste that will be sorted in recycle bins and minimize the impact to the system.

g) Local or regional water supplies? No
The local water supplies are adequate to support the proposed facility at 1700 E. Grand.

13. **Aesthetics**
   
   a) Affect a scenic vista or highway? No
      
      The project site is located in a developed area that is just west of Sepulveda Boulevard. Neither Grand Avenue nor Sepulveda Boulevard is a scenic highway. There are no scenic vistas involving the project site.

   b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? No
      
      The proposed project is very low-impact, consisting of approximately 33,000 square feet on 4.25 acres. Over 50% of the site will be landscaped. Rather than have a negative effect, the project will create an aesthetic improvement to the area.

   c) Create light or glare? No
      
      The facility is being built without glare impacts to the surrounding community.

14. **Cultural Resources**
   
   a) Disturb paleontological resources? No
      
      The site has previously been graded and developed and there were no paleontological finds on the site.

   b) Disturb archaeological resources? No
      
      The site has previously been graded and developed and there were no archaeological finds on the site.

   c) Affect historical resources? No
      
      The site is currently vacant and was previously developed with industrial uses. There are no historical resources on the site.

   d) Cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? No
      
      The site is currently vacant and was previously developed with industrial uses. It has no ethnic or cultural significance.
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? No

The site is currently vacant and was previously developed with industrial uses. It has no religious significance.

15. Recreation

a) Increase the demand for parks/recreational facilities? No

The site will incorporate a running path and be utilized for office / medical uses. It is not anticipated that the users of the site will impact the demand for parks/recreational facilities in El Segundo.

b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? No

The proposed site will not reduce any of the existing recreational facilities in El Segundo. The site is being developed on a pre-existing manufacturing site that did not supply recreational opportunities to the community.

16. Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) 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 plan or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range or a fare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history/prehistory? No

The pre-existing site or planned site does not contain any of the above mentioned species/plants.

b) Achieve a short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? No

The site is being designed to LEED standards and should positively impact the short-term and long-term environmental goals of the community.

c) Impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? No
The MEPS facility will not create any adverse impacts to the environment either on a individual or cumulative basis.

d) Environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? No

The responses above have not identified any direct or indirect adverse impacts environmental to human beings. The project is being designed to achieve a LEED Silver rating that will have a positive impact to the surrounding environment.
1700 East Grand Avenue, El Segundo
Prior Site Conditions
Exhibit "A"
SMOKY HOLLOW FLOATING ZONE APPLICATION

Environmental Assessment No. 769
GAC Floating Zone Change No. 07-01

Please complete the following by typing or printing legibly with dark ink:

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Project Address: 1700 E. Grand Ave.
   Between Sepulveda Blvd. (street) and Kansas (street)

2. Assessor’s Parcel Number: 4139-006-078 and 4139-007-049

3. Applicant’s Name: Allan W. Mackenzie
   Applicant’s Address: 2050 W. 190th St., Suite 108, Torrance, CA 90504
   Applicant’s Phone: 310-787-4730
   e-mail: allan.mackenzie@marventures.com
   FAX: 310-781-9253

4. Property Owner’s Name: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
   Property Owner’s Address: 2050 W. 190th St., Suite 108, Torrance, CA 90504
   Property Owner’s Phone: 310-787-4730
   FAX: 310-781-9253
   e-mail: allan.mackenzie@marventures.com

5. Architect/Engineer’s Name: Bala Vairavan Architects, Inc.
   Architect/Engineer’s Address: 4915 Coldwater Canyon, Suite 3, Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
   Architect/Engineer’s Phone: 818-487-7057
   FAX: 773-439-2407
   e-mail: bvarch@sbcglobal.net

6. General Plan Land Use Designation: Smoky Hollow Mixed Use

7. Existing Zoning: MM with GAC overlay

B. REQUEST (Use additional sheets if necessary.)

1. Proposed Floating Zone: Activation of Grand Avenue Commercial

City of El Segundo Smoky Hollow Floating Zone Application
C. REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

1. Market survey which demonstrates that the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown.

2. Supplemental environmental information that addresses, land use, traffic, air quality, noise and utilities.

3. Legal description(s) of properties involved in the application.

D. PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Applicants must review the following El Segundo Municipal Code Sections for the various design requirements that may apply to their specific project:

   Chapter 15-6D, Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone,
   Chapter 15-7A and/or B, Overlay Districts, and
   Chapter 15-11, Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.
OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

I, We Allan W. Mackenzie being duly sworn depose and say that I/we am the OWNER of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

[Signature]
Owner's Signature

September 4, 2007
Date

[Signature]
Owner's Signature

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )
County of Los Angeles )ss.

On this ______ day of ________, 20____, before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared ________________________, known to me to be the person whose name subscribe to the instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

SEE ATTACHED
NOTARY CERTIFICATE

Notary Public in and for said County and State

AGENT AUTHORIZATION

I hereby authorize William D. Messori to act for me/us in all matters relevant to this application. I understand that this person will be the exclusive contact on the project and will be sent all information and correspondence.

[Signature]
Owner's Signature

[Signature]
Owner's Signature

City of El Segundo Smokey Hollow Floating Zone Application
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Los Angeles

On 9/4/07 before me, Judith Silva, Name and Title of Officer (e.g., "Jane Doe, Notary Public")

personally appeared Allan W. MacKenzie, Name(s) of Signer(s)

☑ personally known to me

☐ (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence)

to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: Owner's Accident - Smokey Hollow Floating Zone Application

Document Date: 8/31/07 Number of Pages: 12

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above:

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer's Name:
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:

Signer Is Representing:

[Signature]

[Signature of Notary Public]
AGENT AFFIDAVIT

I, We William D. Messeri, being duly sworn, depon and say that I/we am the AGENT of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

Signature

Date 8/31 2007

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles ss.

On this 20 day of , 20 , before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared , known to me to be the person whose name subscribe to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

See attached Notary Certificate

Notary Public in and for said County and State

FOR PLANNING DIVISION USE ONLY

Date Filed: 2007

☐ Application form
☐ Initial study questionnaire
☐ 13 Copies of Plans
☐ Adjacent Property Owner Notification Map
☐ 3 sets of Adjacent Property Owner Labels
☐ 2 sets of Envelopes with Postage
☐ Required Supplemental Info Sheets
☐ Fee Received $
☐ Deposit Received $

Received By:

City of El Segundo Smoky Hollow Floating Zone Application
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Los Angeles


Personally known to me

☐ (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence)

to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature:

JUDITH SILVA
Commission # 1732588
Notary Public - California
Los Angeles County

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: Agent Accident - Smoky Hollow Floating Zone Application

Document Date: 8/31/07

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above:

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer’s Name: ____________________________
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other: ____________________________

Signer Is Representing:

Signer’s Name: ____________________________
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other: ____________________________

Signer Is Representing:

© 2006 National Notary Association • 9350 De Soto Ave., P.O. Box 2402 • Chatsworth, CA 91311-2402 Item No. 8907 v609 Reorder: Call Toll-Free 1-800-676-8827
February 21, 2007

Gary Chicots  
Planning Commission  
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

RE: MEPS Use  
1700 E. Grand Avenue, El Segundo, CA

Dear Mr. Chicots:

The proposed use at 1700 E. Grand Avenue would not in any way compete or erode the commercial market for downtown El Segundo. The proposed use is for an administrative office use and has no retail function whatsoever. It is highly likely that the occupants of the proposed building will take advantage of El Segundo's excellent downtown commercial market for purchases, lunch, dinner, etc.

Additionally, the proposed use for this property requires a 4 acre site in order to satisfy the occupant's requirements. At the time of our search, it did not turn up any potential 4 acre sites in downtown El Segundo.

If I can answer any questions or clarify any of the above, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN R. CRAMER  
Senior Vice President

SRC:ds  
c.c. Bill Messori
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Legal Description of Property

PARCEL 1:

PARCEL 2 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 10427, IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 113 PAGE 25 OF PARCEL MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 288 AND 311, IN BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 22 PAGES 106 AND 107 OF MAPS, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM DORIS O’DONNELL CONNOLLY, RECORDED IN BOOK 24130 PAGE 300, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 340 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM THAT PORTION OF LOT 340, ABOVE DESCRIBED, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE THE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM A. A. MC CRAY AND OTHERS, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1950, IN BOOK 34145 PAGE 120, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOTS 312 AND 313 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM LOTS 312 AND 313, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM A. A. MC CRAY AND OTHERS, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1950, IN BOOK 34145 PAGE 120, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 341, IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM HARLAND E. WILLEY AND WIFE, RECORDED IN BOOK 23438 PAGE 388, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOTS 342, 343, 344, 362 AND 363, IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME AND TO STORE, AND REMOVE THE SAME IN AND FROM ANY SUBSURFACE RESERVOIRS THAT MAY EXIST, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM EDLOU COMPANY, A CORPORATION, RECORDED IN BOOK 24132 PAGE 187, OFFICIAL RECORDS.
ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 434 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, ALL OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS, GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES AS DEFINED IN SECTION 6903 OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE AND ALL OTHER MINERALS, WHETHER SIMILAR TO THOSE HEREIN SPECIFIED OR NOT, WITHIN OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID REAL PROPERTY.

ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 434 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT FROM TIME TO TIME TO DRILL AND MAINTAIN WELLS OR OTHER WORKS INTO OR THROUGH SAID REAL PROPERTY AND THE ADJOINING STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAYS BELOW A DEPTH OF FIVE HUNDRED (500) FEET AND TO PRODUCE, INJECT, STORE AND REMOVE FROM AND THROUGH SAID WELLS OR WORKS, OIL, GAS, WATER AND OTHER SUBSTANCES OF WHATEVER NATURE, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO PERFORM BELOW SAID DEPTH ANY AND ALL OPERATIONS DEEMED NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE EXERCISE OF SUCH RIGHTS.

THE RIGHTS HEREINABOVE EXCEPTED DO NOT INCLUDE AND DO NOT EXCEPT ANY RIGHT OF TO USE THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY OR THE FIRST FIVE HUNDRED (500) FEET BELOW SAID SURFACE OR TO CONDUCT ANY OPERATIONS THEREON OR THEREIN, AS RESERVED BY CHEVRON U.S.A. INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, IN DEED RECORDED MAY 24, 1979 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 79-564434.

PARCEL 2:

THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 364, 365, 366, 367 AND 368, IN BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 22 PAGES 106 AND 107, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, LYING SOUTHWESTERLY OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED LINE:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS ON THE RIM OF A MANHOLE, NO REFERENCE, ACCEPTED AS THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 340, PER SAID MAP BOOK, ALSO ACCEPTED AS A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF GRAND AVENUE, SAID INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS BEING SOUTH 89° 53' 52" WEST, 328.41 FEET MEASURED, 328.50 FEET RECORD, FROM THE INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS ON THE RIM OF MANHOLE, NO REFERENCE, ACCEPTED AS THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 368, ALSO ACCEPTED AS A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF GRAND AVENUE; THENCE NORTH 89° 53' 52" EAST, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 340, 109.58 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THIS DESCRIPTION; THENCE SOUTH 30° 28' 56" EAST, 432.77 FEET TO A POINT IN THE EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 364 PER SAID MAP BOOK.

END OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION

(APN's 4139-006-078 & 4139-007-049)
# MEPS - Project Trip Generation Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Trips Per KSF</th>
<th>Weekday Daily Rate</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Rate</th>
<th>PM Hour Peak Rate</th>
<th>Sat Daily Rate</th>
<th>Saturday Peak Hour Trips Rate</th>
<th>Sat % In</th>
<th>Sat % Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>88% 12%</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>17% 83%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>54% 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPS Existing</td>
<td>32,980</td>
<td>59,546</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>51 45 6</td>
<td>49 8 41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14 7 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(318)</td>
<td>(53) (44) (9)</td>
<td>(52) (15) (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1) (3)</td>
<td>(3) (7) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEMORANDUM

TO: William Messori, Mar Ventures, Inc.
FROM: Netai Basu and Sophia Choi
DATE: February 14, 2007
SUBJECT: Trip Generation Analysis for 1700 East Grand Avenue
          El Segundo, California

This memorandum documents the results of trip generation analysis conducted for the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station (M.E.P.S.) at 1700 East Grand Avenue in El Segundo, California. The project includes the demolition of the existing light industrial, manufacturing and office facilities on the site, and the construction of a new 32,980 square foot (sf) office building with 120 employees.

The purpose of the proposed M.E.P.S. is to perform physical and written examinations and provide administrative support services for new recruits into the Armed Forces before they are sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and from the site by bus. The proposed M.E.P.S. facility is planned to operate during normal business hours on weekdays and on 24 Saturdays each year. Trip Generation, 7th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers [ITE], 2003) was used in the trip generation estimates. Since the proposed development would operate similar to a general office building, the rates for that land use (ITE Code 710) were used. In addition, an estimate of 16 daily bus trips (eight round trips per day) to and from the site was made.

Trips generated by M.E.P.S. were estimated based both on the planned number of employees and the total building square footages, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Although these estimates provide similar results (a difference of seven or fewer trips in either peak hour), the trip estimates based on employees in Table 1 provide a more conservative approach.

Trip generation estimates were calculated for the existing facilities on the site, including a 43,696 sf manufacturing facility, 12,000 sf of office space and 3,850 sf of warehouse space. Rates used for calculation of daily and peak hour trips were obtained from Trip Generation, 7th Edition and are shown at the top of Tables 1 and 2. It is noted that the existing facilities on the site were vacated early in 2007 but because they have been in continuous use for many years, they are considered an existing use for the purpose of this analysis.

Based on the planned number of employees and the estimated bus activity (Table 1), 318 daily trips are generated by the existing facilities, including 53 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 52 in
the p.m. peak hour. A total of 414 daily trips would be generated by the proposed project, including 60 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 57 in the p.m. peak hour. Trip generation estimates based on the square footage of the proposed project (Table 2) are slightly lower: 379 daily trips, including 53 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 51 trips in the p.m. peak hour.

As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the proposed redevelopment of the site would result in a net increase of up to 96 daily trips, including seven or fewer trips during the a.m. peak hour and five or fewer trips during the p.m. peak hour. With this level of change in traffic, the proposed project would not be expected to result in significant traffic impacts in the vicinity of the project site.

Feel free to call us at (310) 458-9916 if there are any questions or comments regarding the contents of this memorandum. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Trip Generation Rates [a]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>P.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>% In</td>
<td>% Out</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (square feet)</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (employees)</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Estimated Trip Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.M. Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Existing Uses on the Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-43,696 sf</td>
<td>-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>-3,850 sf</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>-12,000 sf</td>
<td>-132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposed Use        |          |                |                |                |                |                |
|                     |          | A.M. Peak Hour | P.M. Peak Hour |                |                |
|                     |          | Daily          |                |                |                |
|                     |          | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Office              | 120 employees | 398 | 51  | 7    | 58 | 9   | 46   |
| Bus activity [b]    |            | 16 | 1   | 1    | 2  | 1   | 1    |
| Subtotal            | 414        | 52 | 8   | 60   | 10 | 47  | 57   |

| Net New Trips       |          |                |                |                |                |
|                     |          | A.M. Peak Hour | P.M. Peak Hour |                |                |
|                     |          | Daily          |                |                |                |
|                     |          | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
|                     | 96        | 8  | -1  | 7     | -5 | 10  | 5    |


[b] Bus trips estimated at 8 round trips per day.
### TABLE 2
TRIP GENERATION RATES AND ESTIMATES - BASED ON SQUARE FOOTAGE
1700 EAST GRAND AVENUE, EL SEGUNDO, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Trip Generation Rates [a]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>A.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>P.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>% In</td>
<td>% Out</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Estimated Trip Generation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>A.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>P.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Existing Uses on the Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-43,696 sf</td>
<td>-167</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>-3,850 sf</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>-12,000 sf</td>
<td>-132</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposed Use |          |                           |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Office       | 32,980 sf         | 363                       | 45      | 6        | 51       | 8       | 41       | 49       |
| Bus activity [b] |          | 16                        | 1       | 1        | 2        | 1       | 1        | 2        |
| Subtotal     | 379      | 46                        | 7       | 53       | 9        | 42      | 51       |

| Net New Trips |          |                           |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|              | 61       | 2                         | -2      | 0        | -6       | 5       | -1       |

[b] Bus trips estimated at 8 round trips per day.
APPLICATION FOR A SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION

Environmental Assessment No.: 769
Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Site Plan Review No.: 07-04

Date: September 4, 2007

Applicant:
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

Name (print or type)
2050 W. 190th St., Suite 108

Address
Torrance, CA 90504

City/St/Zip

Check One: Owner Lessee

Property Owner:
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

Name (print or type)
2050 W. 190th St., Suite 108

Address
Torrance, CA 90504

City/St/Zip

310-782-2525
310-781-9253
Phone
Fax
allan.mackenzie@marventures.com

Email

Signature

310-782-2525
310-781-9253
Phone
Fax
allan.mackenzie@marventures.com

Email

Signature
Representative of applicant: (i.e., attorney, expediter, etc.)

William D. Messori

Name (print or type)
2050 W. 190th St., Suite 108

Address
Torrance, CA 90504

City/St/Zip

Phone 310-787-4734
Email william.messori@marventures.com

Fax 310-781-9253

Architect/Engineer:

Bala Vairavan Architects, Inc.

Name (print or type)
4915 Coldwater Canyon, Suite 3

Address
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

City/St/Zip

Phone (818) 487-7057
Email bvarch@abcglobal.net

Fax (773) 439-2407

Property situated at:
See attachment (Exhibit "A")

(Exact legal description. Provide attachment, if necessary.)

General location:
1700 E. Grand Ave. between Sepulveda Blvd. & Kansas

Address (Street/Avenue)
Street/Avenue

Existing Zoning:
MM with GAC Overlay

Requested Zoning:
Activation of GAC Overlay (application filed concurrently)

General Plan Land Use Designation:
Smoky Hollow Mixed Use

El Segundo Municipal Code Section(s) Relating To Request:
Section 15-7B-1; 15-7B-2; 15-11-3

Request: Under the provisions of Title 15, Section 15-11-3H of the Municipal Code, application for consideration of a Site Plan Review for the above described property; petition to activate the Grand Avenue Commercial Overlay Zone filed concurrently herewith.

1. Describe in detail the entire proposed project (type of construction, materials to be used, uses involved (e.g., bank, general office, industrial, restaurant, etc.) including buildings and other equipment necessary to the project.

Project will consist of one 2 story 32,980 s.f. concrete tilt up building on 4.25 acres of land. The building will be leased to the U.S. Government that will house a Military Entrance Processing Station at the site. In accordance with staff's most recent direction, the project is being classified as office rather than as a public facility. The project will be 52% landscaped.
2. Describe the existing development on the site. Include square footages and uses of each building on the site.

The project is currently vacant land. The pre-existing site consisted of four manufacturing/office buildings (approximately 56,000 s.f.), several detached outbuildings, and associated parking lots. The manufacturing buildings were used by Aerojet for the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries. The easternmost building housed the offices and main machine shop. The machining operations utilized various coolants/cutting fluids. The other large building housed the welding operations, site maintenance shop, spin forge machine, parts cleaning operations, and various testing and inspection operations. An outside storage area was used to store empty drums. The heat treating operations were located in a small building adjacent to the northwest corner of the welding building. Other small buildings included the shipping and receiving office in the northwestern corner. Small storage buildings included separate hazardous materials and hazardous waste storage areas. The structures were demolished in May 2007 after issuance of the demolition permit.

3. Explain in detail why this particular site is especially suited for the proposed development.

The U.S. Government has a need for a processing station in this area. Because of security issues a large parcel is required to meet the Government’s set-back requirements. The setback requirements also prohibit the reuse of existing buildings. The General Services Administration has done a thorough examination of property in this area and has determined that this site meets all of the requirements of the proposed MEPS use and no other suitable location have been identified by MEPS. A delay in procuring this site may have an impact to national security.

4. Describe how the proposed project will compare/contrast to the development of adjacent properties and the immediate area and will not have detrimental effects to the adjacent properties or neighborhood. How will potential impacts be mitigated?

The project will significantly improve the gateway to El Segundo along Grand Ave. The new facility replaces an aging non-maintained aerospace manufacturing facility with a facility that provides 52% landscaping and a first class 2-story facility. The pre-existing facility had several environmental issues that have been cleaned-up. The proposed facility will provide direct benefits to the surrounding community in the form of: (1) emergency preparedness, (2) Medical/Military support, (3) incremental revenue, and (4) a positive fiscal impact due to services procured. The traffic impact has been reviewed and determined to have no impact. The proposed use is a 2-story office/medical facility to be utilized by the U.S. Government as a Military Entrance Processing Station. The use will not create any incompatibilities with the existing surround uses and the scale of development will be compatible with the residential uses that have been proposed to the west.

5. Describe the technological processes and equipment employed on-site and their compatibility with existing and potential land uses within the general area.

The MEPS use will consist of primarily office and medical uses. The facility will be compatible with the adjacent International Rectifier, Jim & Jack’s, and the potential redevelopment of the property immediately to the west into senior housing and/or industrial office condominiums. As this is not an industrial use there are no technological processes or equipment used which would be incompatible with surrounding uses.
6. Please indicate if you are requesting implementation of a Floating Zone (GAC or MDR), which one, and how the requested is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Goals, Policies, and Objectives and the Design Guidelines.

Requesting implementation of the GAC Floating Zone based on the City’s determination that this is a commercial office use rather than its previous determination that the use was a public facility (which would have been allowed under Section 15-6D-2H).

1. Pattern of Use -- Goal: Highest and Best Land use
   The Property Owner has examined other property uses and has determined that the best use that can be made of the property is the proposed office/commercial use. This use responds to objective 1.3 of being responsive to market opportunities; the previous use was not a quality use. The proposed development also implements Policy 3 by not creating a massive structure.

2. Condition of Existing Development -- Goal: Quality Development
   In anticipation of the proposed development the abandoned, deteriorating buildings were demolished, responding to objective 2.2. The proposed use also responds to objective 2.3 by meeting the development standards of the GAC Overlay Zone set forth in Section 15-7B-7 through 15-7B-10 of the ESMC. Specifically, the lot area (4.244 acres) is greater than 1 acre (Section 15-7B-7B); the height does not exceed 35’ (Section 15-7B-7C); the setbacks are all greater than 15’ (Section 15-7B-7D); the lot frontage on Grand is greater than 270’ (Section 15-7B-7E); the F.A.R. (.178) is less than the .5 maximum (Section 15-7B-7F); the landscaping covers 52% of the site (Section 15-7B-8); off-street parking is provided in excess of the Code Requirements (Section 15-7B-9); access is taken off of Grand Avenue as property is inaccessible to adjacent side streets (Section 15-7B-10). The proposed development also is responsive to the design guidelines (Section 15-11-3) by creating a richness of surface and texture; contributing to the variety needed throughout Smoky Hollow with attention to color in the design of the building; and surrounding the perimeter with wrought iron rather than a chain link fence or barbed wire while avoiding other elements such as large metal surfaces or exposed concrete block.

   The proposed development implements objectives of this goal by utilizing high quality materials and landscaping. It implements Policy 1 by adhering to the design guidelines.

4. Compatibility of Land Use -- Goal: Compatible Land Uses
   The proposed use is surrounded by: north -- new construction to what was previously Grand Auto Parts & Jim & Jack’s Collision Center; east - SCE substation and nursery south -- dog kennel/training grooming and electronics mfg; west -- electronics mfg with proposed senior housing. The proposed use responds to the objectives by elimination of the previous manufacturing use. The proposed use is compatible with all of the surrounding uses and will be more compatible with the proposed residential development than the previous use. The setbacks will help insure that the use has no impact on surrounding properties as they redevelop. The proposed use meets Policy 2 by being compatible to adjacent uses by methods previously stated and by integrating 52% of landscaping and Policy 3 as the building is an intermediate height, providing for the transition between the high-rise uses and the downtown area.

5. New Uses -- Goal: Effective Integration of New Uses
   The proposed use implements this goal by effectively integrating a new use into the area and implementing objective 5.1 by allowing the property owner to capture the market opportunity.

   This goal is not applicable as the two parcels on which the use is to be developed are under the same ownership. The Property Owner is willing to record a lot tie if necessary.

7. Site Development -- Goal: Standards and Incentives to Stimulate Quality Development
   This goal is not applicable to the proposed development as the two parcels belong to the same Property Owner and incentives/mergers are not required. As explained above, the proposed development implements the development guidelines.

8. Transportation and Traffic -- Goal: Safe and Convenient Pedestrian and Vehicular Access
   This use has minimal impact on traffic patterns. The site has two access points and provides separate pedestrian access.

   The site has 151 parking spaces and exceeds parking code requirements. The proposed site plan has one loading area per code.
NOTE: Separate Affidavits must be submitted if there are multiple owners.

**OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT**

I, We ____________________________ being duly sworn depose and say that I/we am the OWNER of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )
County of Los Angeles )ss.

On this ____________ day of ____________, 20___ , before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared ____________________________, known to me to be the person whose name ____________________________ subscribe to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

SEE ATTACHED

NOTARY CERTIFICATE

Notary Public in and for said County and State

SEP 05 2007
PLANNING DIVISION

EA-769
1700 E. Grand Ave.
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Los Angeles

On 9/4/07 before me, Judith Silva
Name and Title of Officer (e.g., "Jane Doe, Notary Public")

personally appeared Allan W. MacKenzie
Name(s) of Signer(s)

Personally known to me

☐ (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence)

To be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the
within instrument and acknowledged to me that
he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized
capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on
the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of
which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Place Notary Seal Above

Signature of Notary Public

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document
and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: Owner's Affidavit - Study - Hollow Specific Plan Site Plan Review Application

Document Date: 9/4/07
Number of Pages: 10

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above:

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer's Name:
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:

Signer Is Representing:

Signer's Name:
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:

Signer Is Representing:
AGENT AUTHORIZATION

I hereby authorize ____________________________ to act for me/us in all matters relevant to this application. I understand that this person will be the exclusive contact on the project and will be sent all information and correspondence.

Owner's Signature: ____________________________

Date: 9/4/2007

AGENT AFFIDAVIT

I, We ____________________________ being duly sworn deposite and say that I/we am the AGENT of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

Signature: ____________________________

Date: 9/4/2007

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )
County of Los Angeles )ss.

On this ____________________________ day of ____________________________ 20 ____, before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared ____________________________ known to me to be the person whose name ____________________________ subscribe to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public in and for said County and State

SEE ATTACHED NOTARY CERTIFICATE
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Los Angeles

On 9/4/07 before me, Judith Silva, Name and Title of Officer (e.g., "Jane Doe, Notary Public")
personally appeared William D. Messier
Name(s) of Signer(s)

☐ personally known to me

☐ (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence)

to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Place Notary Seal Above

Signature of Notary Public

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: Agent Authorization-Smoky Hill Specific Plan Site Plan Review Application
Document Date: 9/4/07
Number of Pages: 10
Signer(s) Other Than Named Above:

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer’s Name:
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:

Signer Is Representing:

Signer’s Name:
☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:

Signer Is Representing:
Procedures for filing application

1. Submit the properly completed application to the office of the Planning Division. Signature of the owner, owners, lessee, and/or agent shall be notarized before a Notary Public.

2. File application properly completed in the office of the Planning and Building Safety Dept. along with completed Initial Study Applicant Questionnaire. Signature of the owner/owners, lessee (if applicant), and/or agent shall be required on all applications.

3. Applicant shall provide all information, drawings, and other materials as requested by the Planning Department as indicated.

4. Pay filing fee. (see fee schedule)

5. Applicant and affected property owners will be notified of time of hearing.

6. Applicant must be present at the hearing and may offer additional evidence to support his/her support.

7. There shall be an additional fee for filing an appeal.

8. A map of all properties within a 300-foot radius of the subject property, key to a list of names and address of the current property owner(s). Planning Staff can assist in the preparation of the radius map. The names and addresses of the property owner(s) can be obtained by contacting: Los Angeles County Assessors Office, 6120 Bristol Parkway, Culver City, CA 90230. Telephone Number: (310) 665-5300.

9. Certification that the names and addresses provided are those of the property owner(s) currently listed in the latest available Tax Assessor's records. (Your hearing may be delayed if an excessive number of notices are returned).

10. Unaddressed business envelopes with no return address, stamped with first class postage, of sufficient number to contact every property owner within the 300-foot radius map. The subject property owner(s), the applicant(s), and any other interested party which the applicant wants notified (sufficient for two mailings).

11. Two sets of adhesive mailing labels and one copy of a list of names and addresses, both keyed into The radius map in item #1 with the names and addresses of every person indicated in item #3.

12. Provide eight (8) sets of plans (site plans, floor plans, and elevations), preliminary title report (new construction only), and all other information request by the Planning Division. All plans must be folded to a maximum of 8 ½” x 11”.

13. Signature page of application must be notarized, as noted on the fee schedule.

14. Fish and Game Document Handling fee - $50.00 (all projects). County of Los Angeles Public Hearing Notice posting fee - $50.00 (for projects with an Initial Study and Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report. Not required for projects which are exempt from CEQA). Two separate checks, each made payable to the County of Los Angeles.
15. Any other information as determined necessary by the Director of Planning and Building Safety.
16. Applicant will be notified within five (5) working days as to the completeness of application.

17. Applicant must be present at the hearing and may offer additional evidence to support his/her request.

18. There shall be an additional fee for filing an appeal.

19. The Director of Planning and Building Safety will approve or deny the application within ten (10) working days from the date the application is deemed complete.

20. The Director's decision will be set for the next available agenda of the Planning Commission meeting as a receive and file item, and noticed through the Public Notice process. Any Planning Commission may request that an item be discussed. The decision of the Director is not final until received and filed or acted upon by the Planning Commission or upheld on appeal. filed or acted upon by the Planning Commission or upheld on appeal.

Planning Staff to complete

Date Received: ___________________________  EA No: __________

Planner: (print name) ___________________________  Smoky Hollow Site

Plan Review No: __________

Signature: ___________________________  Fee Paid: __________

Rev. 03-01-07
P:\VBS\FORMS - PLANNING\APPS\Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Site Plan Review Application.doc
EXHIBIT “A”

Legal Description of Property

PARCEL 1:

PARCEL 2 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 10427, IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 113 PAGE 25 OF PARCEL MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 288 AND 311, IN BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 22 PAGES 106 AND 107 OF MAPS, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM DORIS O’DONNELL CONNOLLY, RECORDED IN BOOK 24130 PAGE 300, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 340 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM THAT PORTION OF LOT 340, ABOVE DESCRIBED, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE THE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM A. A. MC CRAY AND OTHERS, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1950, IN BOOK 34145 PAGE 120, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOTS 312 AND 313 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM LOTS 312 AND 313, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM A. A. MC CRAY AND OTHERS, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1950, IN BOOK 34145 PAGE 120, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 341, IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM HARLAND E. WILLEY AND WIFE, RECORDED IN BOOK 23438 PAGE 388, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOTS 342, 343, 344, 362 AND 363, IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME AND TO STORE, AND REMOVE THE SAME IN AND FROM ANY SUBSURFACE RESERVOIRS THAT MAY EXIST, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM EILDOU COMPANY CORPORATION, RECORDED IN BOOK 24132 PAGE 187, OFFICIAL RECORDS.
ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 434 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, ALL OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS, GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES AS DEFINED IN SECTION 6903 OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE AND ALL OTHER MINERALS, WHETHER SIMILAR TO THOSE HEREIN SPECIFIED OR NOT, WITHIN OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID REAL PROPERTY.

ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 434 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT FROM TIME TO TIME TO DRILL AND MAINTAIN WELLS OR OTHER WORKS INTO OR THROUGH SAID REAL PROPERTY AND THE ADJOINING STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAYS BELOW A DEPTH OF FIVE HUNDRED (500) FEET AND TO PRODUCE, INJECT, STORE AND REMOVE FROM AND THROUGH SAID WELLS OR WORKS, OIL, GAS, WATER AND OTHER SUBSTANCES OF WHATEVER NATURE, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO PERFORM BELOW SAID DEPTH ANY AND ALL OPERATIONS DEEMED NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE EXERCISE OF SUCH RIGHTS.

THE RIGHTS HEREINABOVE EXCEPTED DO NOT INCLUDE AND DO NOT EXCEPT ANY RIGHT OF TO USE THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY OR THE FIRST FIVE HUNDRED (500) FEET BELOW SAID SURFACE OR TO CONDUCT ANY OPERATIONS THEREON OR THEREIN, AS RESERVED BY CHEVRON U.S.A. INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, IN DEEDRecordED MAY 24, 1979 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 79-564434.

PARCEL 2:

THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 364, 365, 366, 367 AND 368, IN BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 22 PAGES 106 AND 107, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, LYING SOUTHWESTERLY OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED LINE:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS ON THE RIM OF A MANHOLE, NO REFERENCE, ACCEPTED AS THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 340, PER SAID MAP BOOK, ALSO ACCEPTED AS A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF GRAND AVENUE, SAID INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS BEING SOUTH 89° 53’ 52” WEST, 328.41 FEET MEASURED, 328.50 FEET RECORD, FROM THE INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS ON THE RIM OF MANHOLE, NO REFERENCE, ACCEPTED AS THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 368, ALSO ACCEPTED AS A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF GRAND AVENUE; THENCE NORTH 89° 53’ 52” EAST, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 340, 109.58 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THIS DESCRIPTION; THENCE SOUTH 30° 28’ 56” EAST, 432.77 FEET TO A POINT IN THE EASTERNLY LINE OF LOT 364 PER SAID MAP BOOK.

END OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION

(APN’s 4139-006-078 & 4139-007-049)
City of El Segundo

Planning and Building Safety Dept.
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 524-2344; FAX (310) 524-4167
www.elsegundo.org

APPLICATION FOR A SPECIFIC PLAN OR SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT

Environmental Assessment No. EA769 Specific Plan No.: OB 02

Date: 3/25/2008

Applicant:
Mar Canyon Grand LLC
Name (print or type)
2050 W. 190th Street, Suite 108
Address
Torrance, CA 90504
City/St/Zip

Owner x Lessee

Property Owner:
Mar Canyon Grand LLC
Name (print or type)
2050 W. 190th Street, Suite 108
Address
Torrance, CA 90504
City/St/Zip

Representative of Applicant: (i.e., attorney, expeditor, etc.)
William D. Messori
Name (print or type)
2050 W. 190th Street, Suite 108
Address
Torrance, CA 90504
City/St/Zip

Phone 310.787.4730 Fax 310.781.9253
Email william.messori@marventures.com

Owner x Lessee

Signature

Phone 310.787.4730 Fax 310.781.9253
Email allan.mackenzie@marventures.com

Signature
Property situated at: See Attachment ("Legal Description").
(Exact legal description. Provide attachment if necessary)

General
Location: Sepulveda Blvd. between Indiana St. and Washington St.
Address and Street, Avenue

Existing Zoning: MM with GAC Overlay

General Plan Land Use Designation: Smokey Hollow Mixed Use

El Segundo Municipal Code Section(s) Relating to Request:
Request to amend sections 15-11-2 E.1.c.2 and 15-11-3 D.2 of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan
to provide for activation of only limited uses of the GAC overlay zone. Applicant believes that
City desires to also make amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to make technical
changes with relation to CEQA law and clarify procedures.

1. Describe in detail the entire proposed project (type of construction, materials to be
used, uses involved (e.g. bank, general office, industrial, restaurant, etc.) including
buildings and other equipment necessary to the project.

The amendment to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan will allow the City to activate only the general
and medical/dental offices portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay zone, which will
allow the development of the MEPS facility without activating all other possible uses for the
property at issue.

Specifically, the MEPS facility will consists of one 2-story 32,980 s.f. concrete tilt up building on
4.25 acres of land and will consist of both medical and general offices. The building will be
leased to the U.S. Government that will house a Military Entrance Processing Station at the site.
The project will be 52% landscaped.

2. Describe the existing development on the site. Include square footages and uses of
each building on the site.

The project is currently vacant land which has undergone remediation. The pre-existing site
consisted of four manufacturing/office buildings (approximately 56,000 s.f.), several detached
outbuildings, and associated parking lots. The manufacturing buildings were used by Aerojet for
the machining of steel and titanium parts for the aerospace and defense industries. The
easternmost building housed the offices and main machine shop. The structures were
demolished in May 2007 after issuance of the demolition permit from the City and environmental
clearances have been provided by the City’s Fire Department.

Architect/Engineer:
Bala Vairavan Architects
Name (print or type)
4915 Coldwater Canyon, Suite 3
Address
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
City/St/Zip

818.487.7057  773.439.2407
Phone  Fax
bvarch@sbcglobal.net
Email
Bala  Vairavan
Signature

Profile: See Attachment ("Legal Description").
3. Explain in detail why this particular site is especially suited for the proposed development.

The U.S. Government has a need for a processing station in this area. Because of security issues, a large parcel is required to meet the Government's set-back requirements. The setback requirements also prohibit the reuse of existing buildings at other locations. The General Services Administration has done a thorough examination of property in this area and has determined that this site meets all of the requirements of the proposed MEPS use and no other suitable location has been identified. A delay in this site may have an impact to national security.

Developing this use at this location will not create any detrimental impact to downtown El Segundo.

4. Describe how the proposed project will compare/contrast to the development of adjacent properties and the immediate area and will not have detrimental effects to the adjacent properties or neighborhood. How will potential impacts be mitigated?

The MEPS project will significantly improve the gateway to El Segundo along Grand Avenue. The new facility replaces an aging non-maintained aerospace manufacturing facility and will provide 52% landscaping as well as a first class 2-story facility. There has already been clean-up of the site. The proposed facility will provide direct benefits to the surrounding community in the form of: (1) emergency preparedness; (2) medical/military support; (3) incremental revenue; and (4) a positive fiscal impact due to service procured. An initial study has been conducted and there will not be any significant impacts to adjacent properties or neighborhoods which cannot be mitigated; mitigation will be as set forth in the MND that has been prepared for the project.

5. Describe the technological processes and equipment employed on-site and their compatibility with existing and potential land uses within the general area.

The MEPS use will consist of primarily office and medical uses. The facility will be compatible with the adjacent International Rectifier, Jim & Jack's, and the potential redevelopment of the property immediately to the west into senior housing and/or industrial office condominiums. As this is not an industrial use, there are no technological processes or equipment which would be incompatible with surrounding uses.
OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

I, We Allan W. Mackenzie, the undersigned, depose and say that I/We am the OWNER(S) of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information on all documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

[Signature]  3/28/2008

State of California, )
County of Los Angeles ) ss.

On March 28, 2008 before me, Judith Silva, Notary Public,
personally appeared Allan W. Mackenzie, who proved to me on the
basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he executed the same in his authorized
capacity, and that by his signature on the instrument the person, or the entity upon behalf
of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the
foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

[Signature]

[Notary Public Stamp]
AGENT AUTHORIZATION

I hereby authorize William D. Messori to act for me/us in all matters relevant to this application. I understand that this person will be the exclusive contact on the project and will be sent all information and correspondence.

[Signature]

Owner's Signature

Date

3/28/2008

AGENT AFFIDAVIT

I, We William D. Messori being duly sworn depose and say that I/we am the AGENT of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

[Signature]

Signature

Date

3-28-08

State of California,
County of Los Angeles ) ss.

On March 28, 2008 before me, Judith Silva, Notary Public, personally appeared William D. Messori, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he executed the same in his authorized capacity, and that by his signature on the instrument the person, or the entity upon behalf of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

[Signature]

JUDITH SILVA
Commission # 1732588
Notary Public - California
Los Angeles County
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

PARCEL 1:

PARCEL 2 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 10427, IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 113 PAGE 25 OF PARCEL MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 288 AND 311, IN BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 22 PAGES 106 AND 107 OF MAPS, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM DORIS O’DONNELL CONNOLLY, RECORDED IN BOOK 24130 PAGE 300, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 340 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM THAT PORTION OF LOT 340, ABOVE DESCRIBED, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE THE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM A. A. MC CRAY AND OTHERS, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1950, IN BOOK 34145 PAGE 120, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOTS 312 AND 313 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM LOTS 312 AND 313, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM A. A. MC CRAY AND OTHERS, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1950, IN BOOK 34145 PAGE 120, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 341, IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM HARLAND E. WILLEY AND WIFE, RECORDED IN BOOK 23438 PAGE 388, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOTS 342, 343, 344, 362 AND 363, IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE INTEREST IN ALL MINERALS, OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID LAND, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REMOVE SAME AND TO STORE, AND REMOVE THE SAME IN AND FROM ANY SUBSURFACE RESERVOIRS THAT MAY EXIST, WHICH WAS RESERVED IN DEED FROM EDELLOU COMPANY, A CORPORATION, RECORDED IN BOOK 24132 PAGE 187, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT FROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 434 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, ALL OIL, GAS AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS, GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES AS DEFINED IN SECTION 6903 OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE AND ALL OTHER MINERALS, WHETHER SIMILAR TO THOSE HEREIN SPECIFIED OR NOT, WITHIN OR THAT MAY BE PRODUCED FROM SAID REAL PROPERTY.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

(continued)

ALSO EXCEPT THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING WITHIN LOT 434 IN SAID BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT FROM TIME TO TIME TO DRILL AND MAINTAIN WELLS OR OTHER WORKS INTO OR THROUGH SAID REAL PROPERTY AND THE ADJOINING STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAYS BELOW A DEPTH OF FIVE HUNDRED (500) FEET AND TO PRODUCE, INJECT, STORE AND REMOVE FROM AND THROUGH SAID WELLS OR WORKS, OIL, GAS, WATER AND OTHER SUBSTANCES OF WHATEVER NATURE, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO PERFORM BELOW SAID DEPTH ANY AND ALL OPERATIONS DEEMED NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE EXERCISE OF SUCH RIGHTS.

THE RIGHTS HEREINABOVE EXCEPTED DO NOT INCLUDE AND DO NOT EXCEPT ANY RIGHT OF TO USE THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY OR THE FIRST FIVE HUNDRED (500) FEET BELOW SAID SURFACE OR TO CONDUCT ANY OPERATIONS THEREON OR THEREIN, AS RESERVED BY CHEVRON U.S.A. INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, IN DEED RECORDED MAY 24, 1979 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 79-564434.

PARCEL 2:

THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 364, 365, 366, 367 AND 368, IN BLOCK 123 OF EL SEGUNDO, IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 22 PAGES 106 AND 107, OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, LYING SOUTHWESTERLY OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED LINE:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS ON THE RIM OF A MANHOLE, NO REFERENCE, ACCEPTED AS THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 340, PER SAID MAP BOOK, ALSO ACCEPTED AS A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF GRAND AVENUE, SAID INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS BEING SOUTH 89° 53' 52" WEST, 328.41 FEET MEASURED, 328.50 FEET RECORD, FROM THE INTERSECTION OF FOUND PUNCH MARKS ON THE RIM OF MANHOLE, NO REFERENCE, ACCEPTED AS THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 368, ALSO ACCEPTED AS A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF GRAND AVENUE; THENCE NORTH 89° 53' 52" EAST, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 340, 109.58 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THIS DESCRIPTION; THENCE SOUTH 30° 28' 56" EAST, 432.77 FEET TO A POINT IN THE EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 364 PER SAID MAP BOOK.

END OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Procedures for filing application

1. Submit the properly completed application to the office of the Planning Division. Signature of the owner, owners, lessee, and/or agent shall be notarized before a Notary Public.

2. File application property completed in the office of the Planning and Building Safety Dept. along with completed Initial Study Applicant Questionnaire. Signature of the owner/owners, lessee (if applicant), and/or agent shall be required on all applications.

3. Applicant shall provide all information, drawings, and other materials as requested by the Planning Department as indicated.

4. Pay filing fee. (see fee schedule)

5. Applicant and affected property owners will be notified of time of hearing.

6. Applicant must be present at the hearing and may offer additional evidence to support his/her support.

7. There shall be an additional fee for filing an appeal.

8. A map of all properties within a 300-foot radius of the subject property, keyed to a list of names and address of the current property owner(s). Planning Staff can assist in the preparation of the radius map. The names and addresses of the property owner(s) can be obtained by contacting: Los Angeles County Assessors Office, 6120 Bristol Parkway, Culver City, CA 90230. Telephone Number: (310) 665-5300.

9. Certification that the names and addresses provided are those of the property owner(s) currently listed in the latest available Tax Assessor's records. (Your hearing may be delayed if an excessive number of notices are returned).

10. Unaddressed business envelopes with no return address, stamped with first class postage, of sufficient number to contact every property owner within the 300-foot radius map. The subject property owner(s), the applicant(s), and any other interested party which the applicant wants notified (sufficient for two mailings).

11. Two sets of adhesive mailing labels and one copy of a list of names and addresses, both keyed into The radius map in item #1 with the names and addresses of every person indicated in item #3.

12. Provide eight (8) sets of plans (site plans, floor plans, and elevations), preliminary title report (new construction only), and all other information request by the Planning Division. All plans must be folded to a maximum of 8 ½" x 11".

13. Signature page of application must be notarized, as noted on the fee schedule.

14. Fish and Game Document Handling fee – consult with staff for current fee (all projects). County of Los Angeles Public
Hearing Notice posting fee – consult with staff for current fee (for projects with an Initial Study and Negative Declaration.
Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report. Not required for projects which are exempt from CEQA). Two separate checks, each made payable to the County of Los Angeles.
15. Any other information as determined necessary by the Director of Planning and Building Safety.
16. Applicant will be notified within five (5) working days as to the completeness of application.

17. Applicant must be present at the hearing and may offer additional evidence to support his/her request.

18. There shall be an additional fee for filing an appeal.

19. The Director of Planning and Building Safety will approve or deny the application within ten (10) working days from the date the application is deemed complete.

20. The Director's decision will be set for the next available agenda of the Planning Commission meeting as a receive and file item, and noticed through the Public Notice process. Any Planning Commission may request that an item be discussed. The decision of the Director is not final until received and filed or acted upon by the Planning Commission or upheld on appeal. filed or acted upon by the Planning Commission or upheld on appeal.

Planning Staff to complete

Date Received: ___________________________  EA No: _______
Planner: (print name) ___________________________  SP No: _______
Signature: ___________________________  Fee Paid: _______

Rev: 03-01-07
P:\PBS\FORMS - PLANNING\APP\Specific Plan Application.doc
ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA
AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC
PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION
OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED
COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL
CHANGES IN CONFORMANCE TO CONFORM
WITH THE CALIFORNIA LAW.

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: General Findings. The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan was adopted in the mid-1980s. The goals of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan include: without limitation, allowing growth to occur in the area where market forces are evident; allowing commercial uses in specified areas upon removal of the existing uses; depending on private market decisions to stimulate development in the area; and allowing decisions about uses of property in the Specific Plan area to remain with the individual property owner.

B. On September 5, 2007, applications were filed by Mar Canyon Grand LLC (“MCG”), the property owner and applicant, to activate the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay zone in accordance with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and for Site Plan Review for a Military Entrance Processing Station (“MEPS”).

C. Both the City and MCG agree that in order to permit the MEPS proposed use, it is only necessary to activate a limited portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial zone. In order to allow a limited activation of uses, it is necessary to create a procedural mechanism in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. Accordingly, a supplemental application was filed by MCG to implement a procedure to allow activation of only limited uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial zone. Additional technical changes are also being made to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to conform with State law and to insure that the procedures set forth in the Specific Plan clearly reflect the City’s actual procedures in processing applications.
D. An Initial Study was prepared in accordance with CEQA for the Specific Plan amendments, activation of a limited portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial zone, specifically general and medical-dental office uses as specified in El Segundo Municipal Code section ("ESMC") § 15-7B-2(B), and the site plan for the MEPS (collectively, the "Project"). The Initial Study found no substantial evidence that the Project would have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the environment that could not be mitigated. Accordingly, a mitigated negative declaration was prepared. The notice of intent to adopt the mitigated negative declaration was circulated for public review and comment between April 28, 2008 and May 28, 2008.

E. On June 12, 2008, the Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the Project. This Ordinance and its findings are based upon the testimonial and documentary evidence set forth in the entire administrative record including, without limitation, information submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department in the staff report and information provided by MCG. Following the public hearing, the Commission considered the evidence and adopted Resolution No. ____, recommending that the City Council approve: Environmental Assessment No. ____; this Ordinance amending the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and activating limited general and medical-dental offices in a portion of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area already covered by the GAC overlay designation; and the site plan for the MEPS. Public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

F. On July 15, 2008, the City Council held a public hearing and considered documentary and verbal testimony, including, without limitation, the staff report.

G. Prior to adopting this Ordinance, the City Council adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this Ordinance and the site plan review pursuant to Resolution No. ____, on July 15, 2008.

H. This Ordinance and the findings made herein are based upon the testimonial and documentary evidence presented to the City Council at its July 15, 2008 hearing.

Section 2. SECTION 2: Land Use Findings.

A. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the City’s General Plan as the
Land Use Map designates the property as Smoky Hollow Mixed Use, which specifically provides for offices uses and commercial uses under the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone.

B. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the provisions of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as follows:

1. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specifically recognizes that individual property owners and market forces should determine what growth should occur in the area. (ESMC § 15-11-2(A), § 15-11-2(B).)

2. Both the procedural amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as well as the activation of a portion of the Grand Avenue to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan including, but not limited to:

   a. Objective 1.3 – providing maximum possible responsiveness to market opportunities within the desire development intensification; and

   b. Objective 5.1 – Providing for maximum possible capture of market opportunities by property owners.

3. As the Property is covered by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the Property is consistent.

C. Based upon the entirety of the record including, without limitation, correspondence from Colliers International in accordance with Sections ESMC §§ 15-7B-13 and 15-11-2(E.1.)(1)(c)(2) of the El Segundo Municipal Code, the City Council finds that because only the office uses set forth in Section ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) are being activated on the Property, the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses. This finding is confirmed by the realtor’s letter submitted by MCG, which suffices as a market survey.

Section 3. Section ESMC § 15-11-2-E.1.a.2 of the El Segundo Municipal Code is hereby(E)(1)(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

E. Land Use Plan

224
c. Floating-Or Overlay Districts:

“(2) A commercial district is provided along the south edge of Grand Avenue for limited commercial development if it can be demonstrated that erosion of downtown commercial potential will not thereby occur. Subject to the discretionary approval of the City Council, an application may be filed with the City requesting that only some of the permitted uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Overlay Zone be activated.”

Section 4. Section § 15-11-3-D.2 of the El Segundo Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

D. Floating Zones:

“2. Procedure: The City Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission, giving written notice to adjacent property owners and holding a public hearing may activate either of these floating zones. The Council or the Commission may initiate such change by petition of the property owner(s). If petitioned for by the property owner, only limited uses in the Grand Avenue Commercial Overlay Zone may be activated, in which case the property shall receive a designation of “GAC – limited/allowed uses.” Before such petition can be considered, the owner(s) must submit a focused supplemental EIR addressing land use, traffic, utilities, noise and air quality. The City shall ultimately determine which supplemental potential impacts must be addressed. Fees for such a procedure shall be established by the City Council.”

Section 5. Section § 15-11-3-D of the El Segundo Municipal Code is hereby amended by revising Exhibit III-2 to show the limited activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone for General and Medical/Dental Office Uses (GAC Limited/General and Medical/Dental Office) as specified in Section § 15-7B-2B of the El Segundo Municipal Code for the property located at 1700 E. Grand Avenue and more specifically described/identified on attached Exhibit A hereeto “A,” which is incorporated by reference.

[NEW MAP TO BE INSERTED]

Section 6. Section § 15-11-3-H.2.b of the El Segundo Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

H. Site Plan Review Procedures
“b. Applicability: Approval of a site plan shall be required prior to or concurrent with a tentative tract or parcel map for all proposed projects within the specific plan area. Where no tentative tract or parcel map is required, approval of a site plan shall occur prior to issuance of building permits. Authority for approval of a site plan shall rest with the Planning and Building Safety Director of Community, Economic and Development Services for projects under fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet in floor area (appealable to the Planning Commission) and with the Planning Commission for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of a floating or overlay zone, the Director or Planning Commission shall make a recommendation and the authority for approval shall rest with the City Council.”

Section 7. Section 7: ESMC § 15-11-3 H.2.d.3 of the El Segundo Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

H. Site Plan Review Procedures

b. Procedures: “(3) For projects which are fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area, upon determination that the site plan complies with the provisions of the Specific Plan and the review factors described in the design guidelines, the staff shall prepare a staff report with recommendations which shall be submitted along with the site plan to the Planning Commission at the earliest possible regular meeting. The Planning Commission shall approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of a floating or overlay zone, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation and the City Council shall approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan.”

Section 8. Section 8: ESMC § 15-11-3 H.2.e of the El Segundo Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

H. Site Plan Review Procedures

e. Environmental Determination: The site plan review process is discretionary, not ministerial, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). However, in light of the Master EIR established as part of this Specific Plan, only a focused EIR or mitigated negative declaration will be required for uses permitted in the base districts and then only where it is demonstrated that public facilities are inadequate and improvements beyond the project site may be required. A full supplemental EIR will be required for activation of any portion of the floating zones.”
SECTION 9: Environmental Assessment. Resolution No. XXXX adopted an MND for this Project which, among other things, properly assesses the environmental impact of this Ordinance, and the Project, in accordance with CEQA. This Ordinance incorporates by reference the findings and analysis set forth in Resolution No. XXXX.

SECTION 10: Repeal or amendment of any provision of the ESMC will not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before this Ordinance's effective date. Any such repealed part will remain in full force and effect for sustaining action or prosecuting violations occurring before the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 11: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this Ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo's book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

Section 9, SECTION 12: Severability. If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the city council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Section 10, SECTION 13: Effective Date. This Ordinance will take effect on the 31st day following its final passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August, 2008

Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO )
I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Ordinance No. _________ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 15th day of July, 2008, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 5th day of August, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

_________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_________________________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

_________________________
By:
ORDINANCE NO. ___

ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL CHANGES TO CONFORM WITH CALIFORNIA LAW.

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: General Findings. The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. The goals of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan include, without limitation, allowing growth in the area where market forces are evident; allowing commercial uses in specified areas upon removal of the existing uses; depending on private market decisions to stimulate development in the area; and allowing decisions about uses of property in the Specific Plan area to remain with the individual property owner.

B. On September 5, 2007, applications were filed by Mar Canyon Grand LLC ("MCG"), the property owner and applicant, to activate the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay zone in accordance with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and for Site Plan Review for a Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS").

C. In order to allow the proposed use, it is only necessary to activate a limited portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial zone. To allow a limited activation of uses, it is necessary to create a procedural mechanism in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. Accordingly, a supplemental application was filed by MCG to implement a procedure to allow activation of only limited uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial zone. Additional technical changes are also being made to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to conform with State law and to insure that the procedures set forth in the Specific Plan clearly reflect the City’s actual procedures in processing applications.

D. An Initial Study was prepared in accordance with CEQA for the Specific Plan amendments, activation of a limited portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial zone, specifically general and medical/dental office uses as specified in El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") § 15-7B-2(B), and the site plan for the MEPS (collectively, the "Project"). The Initial Study found no substantial
evidence that the Project would have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the environment that could not be mitigated. Accordingly, a mitigated negative declaration was prepared. The notice of intent to adopt the mitigated negative declaration was circulated for public review and comment between April 28, 2008 and May 28, 2008.

E. This Ordinance and its findings are based upon the testimonial and documentary evidence set forth in the entire administrative record including, without limitation, public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

SECTION 2: Land Use Findings.

A. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the City’s General Plan as the Land Use Map designates the property as Smoky Hollow Mixed Use, which specifically provides for offices uses and commercial uses under the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone.

B. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the provisions of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as follows:

1. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specifically recognizes that individual property owners and market forces should determine what growth should occur in the area. (ESMC § 15-11-2(A), § 15-11-2(B).)

2. Both the procedural amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as well as the activation of a portion of the Grand Avenue to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan including, without limitation:

   a. Objective 1.3 – providing maximum possible responsiveness to market opportunities within the desire development intensification; and

   b. Objective 5.1 – Providing for maximum possible capture of market opportunities by property owners.

3. As the Property is covered by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general and
medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the Property is consistent.

C. Based upon the entirety of the record including, without limitation, correspondence from Colliers International, in accordance with ESMC §§ 15-7B-13 and 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2), the City Council finds that because only the office uses set forth in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) are being activated on the Property, the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses.

SECTION 3: ESMC § 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A commercial district is provided along the south edge of Grand Avenue for limited commercial development if it can be demonstrated that erosion of downtown commercial potential will not thereby occur. Subject to the discretionary approval of the City Council, an application may be filed with the City requesting that only some of the permitted uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Overlay Zone be activated."

SECTION 4: ESMC § 15-11-3(D)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"2. Procedure: The City Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission, giving written notice to adjacent property owners and holding a public hearing may activate either of these floating zones. The Council or the Commission may initiate such change by petition of the property owner(s). If petitioned for by the property owner, only limited uses in the Grand Avenue Commercial Overlay Zone may be activated, in which case the property shall receive a designation of "GAC - limited/allowed uses." Before such petition can be considered, the owner(s) must submit a focused supplemental EIR addressing land use, traffic, utilities, noise and air quality. The City shall ultimately determine which supplemental potential impacts must be addressed. Fees for such a procedure shall be established by the City Council."

SECTION 5: ESMC § 15-11-3(D) is amended by revising Exhibit III-2 to show the limited activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone for General and Medical/Dental Office Uses (GAC Limited/General and Medical/Dental Office) as specified in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) for the property located at 1700 E. Grand Avenue and more specifically identified on attached Exhibit "A," which is incorporated by reference.

[NEW MAP TO BE INSERTED]
SECTION 6: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(b) is amended to read as follows:

“b. Applicability: Approval of a site plan is required before or concurrent with a tentative tract or parcel map for all proposed projects within the specific plan area. Where no tentative tract or parcel map is required, approval of a site plan shall occur prior to issuance of building permits. Authority for approval of a site plan rests with the Planning and Building Safety Director for projects under fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet in floor area (appealable to the Planning Commission) and with the Planning Commission for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area. **If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of a floating or overlay zone, the Director or Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the authority for approval rests with the City Council.**”

SECTION 7: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) **For projects which are fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area,** Upon determination that the site plan complies with the provisions of the Specific Plan and the review factors described in the design guidelines, the Director must prepare a report with recommendations which must be submitted along with the site plan to the Planning Commission at the earliest possible regular meeting. The Planning Commission must approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan. **If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of a floating or overlay zone, the Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the City Council must approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan.**”

SECTION 8: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(e) is amended to read as follows:

“e. Environmental Determination: The site plan review process is discretionary, not ministerial, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) [20]. However, in light of the Master EIR established as part of this Specific Plan, only a focused EIR or mitigated negative declaration will be required for uses permitted in the base districts and then only where it is demonstrated that public facilities are inadequate and improvements beyond the project site may be required. A full supplemental EIR will be required for activation of any portion of the floating zones.”

SECTION 9: Environmental Assessment. Resolution No. XXXX adopted an MND for this Project which, among other things, properly assesses the environmental impact of this Ordinance, and the Project, in accordance with CEQA. This Ordinance incorporates by reference the findings and analysis set forth in Resolution No. XXXX.
SECTION 10: Repeal or amendment of any provision of the ESMC will not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before this Ordinance’s effective date. Any such repealed part will remain in full force and effect for sustaining action or prosecuting violations occurring before the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 11: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this Ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo’s book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

SECTION 12: Severability. If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the city council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 13: Effective Date. This Ordinance will take effect on the 31st day following its final passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August, 2008

__________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO )

I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Ordinance No. ________ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 15th day of July, 2008, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 5th day of August, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:
AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2638

Exhibit A

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City of El Segundo’s approval of a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 769), Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02), and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04) ("Project Conditions").

Planning and Building Safety Department

1. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit plans that demonstrate substantial compliance with the plans and conditions of approval on file with the Planning and Building Safety Department. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved, including the site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscaping and materials, must be referred to the Planning and Building Safety Director of the Planning and Building Safety Department to determine for a determination regarding the need for whether the Planning Commission should review of the proposed modification.

2. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must obtain all the necessary approvals, licenses and permits and pay all the appropriate fees as required by the City-of-El-Segundo.

3. All mitigation measures in the Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") project are incorporated by this reference into these conditions of approval. All mitigation measures must be listed on the plans submitted for plan check and on the plans for which a building permit is issued.

4. Any changes to the colors and materials of the exterior façade of the building and the color of the new perimeter wrought iron fencing and masonry wall must be approved to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Department Director in compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines set forth in ESMC Chapter 15-11.
Materials and Design

5. Before the City issues issuance of the Building Permits, the applicant must submit Final Working drawings to the Planning and Building Safety Director for design review for compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines. The design review must include, without limitation, the following:

A. All colors, textures, and materials on exterior elevations must be coordinated to achieve a continuity of design;

B. At least two primary exterior building materials (including without limitation, stucco, brick and stone) must be used;

C. Building materials must be of non-reflective coatings and glazings;

D. All buildings must utilize energy efficient floor plans and controlled HVAC and heat generating equipment to reduce energy use for cooling and ventilation;

E. All roof-mounted mechanical equipment and communications devices must be hidden behind architecturally integrated building parapets or screens to screen these devices from view of adjacent public rights-of-way;

F. Loading areas must be screened from view with opaque walls and landscaping. The walls must be architecturally integrated with the building design; and

G. Chain-link fences are not permitted except as temporary construction fencing.

6. A maximum of one entry sign along the Grand Avenue frontage and one building wall sign facing the side property line must be permitted. The sign design must be architecturally compatible with the building design. Signs must be constructed of durable materials.

7. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit final landscaping and irrigation plans to the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department and the Parks and Recreation Department for review and approval to demonstrate compliance with the City’s Water Conservation regulations and Guidelines for Water Conservation in Landscaping (ESMC §§ 10-2-1 et seq.). The plant materials used in landscaping must be compatible with
the El Segundo climate pursuant to Sunset Western Garden Book’s Zone 24 published by Sunset Books Inc, Revised and Updated 2001 edition, which is available for review at the Planning and Building Safety Department. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must demonstrate compliance with the Smoky Hollow Design Guidelines and the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) development standards. The landscaping and irrigation must be completely installed before the City issues a final prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and/or a final building permit. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must comply with the following:

a. Reclaimed water must be used as the water source to irrigate landscaped areas, if feasible. To that end, dual water connections must be installed to allow for landscaping to be irrigated by reclaimed water, if feasible.

b. Efficient irrigation systems must be installed which minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water which will reach plant roots (e.g., drip irrigation, automatic sprinklers equipped with moisture sensors).

c. Automatic sprinkler systems must be set to irrigate landscaping during early morning hours or during the evening to reduce water losses from evaporation. Sprinklers must also be reset to water less often in cooler months and during the rainfall season so that water is not wasted by excessive landscaping irrigation.

d. Selection of drought-tolerant, low-water consuming plant varieties must be used to reduce irrigation water consumption, in compliance with ESMC §§ 10-2-1 et seq.

8. The two parcels of the project site must be merged into one lot through a lot line adjustment or tentative map.

9. The applicant must provide a sufficient number of bicycle racks to accommodate the storage of at least 8 bicycles.

10. Employees must be provided current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site; telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators; ridesharing promotional materials; and bicycle route and facility information.

10. On-site dining facilities must remain incidental to the primary general office and medical-dental office uses and may not be open to the general public. The on-
site dining facilities must be limited to employees, recruits and visitors by invitation.

11. A trash and recycling enclosure must be provided and shown on the site plan that is sufficiently large enough to store the necessary bins required for the regular collection of commercial solid waste and recyclable materials. The site plan with the location and dimensions of the trash and recycling enclosure and an elevation view of the enclosure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval before the City issues building permits.

12. Ground level mechanical equipment, refuse collectors, storage tanks, monitoring wells, generators, and other similar facilities must be screened from view with dense landscaping and walls of materials and finishes compatible with adjacent buildings.

13. Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare.

14. The building must be designed to comply with the El-Segundo Municipal Code ESMC standards for the attenuation of interior noise.

15. The building must be designed, constructed, and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the United States Department of Defense.

Building Division Conditions

16. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit a geotechnical plan that is not more than one year old to the Director of Planning and Building Safety Director for review and approval.

17. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a soils report to the Director of Planning and Building Safety Director for review and approval.

18. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a grading plan to the Director of Planning and Building Safety Director for review and approval.

20. Before building permits are issued, plans must show compliance with accessibility requirements per Chapter 11 of the 2007 California Building Code, as amended by the ESMC.

Fire Department Conditions

21. The project must comply with all applicable requirements in the California Building and Fire Codes, adopted by the ESMC.

22. A chemical inventory of the types of chemicals used at the facility must be submitted to the Fire Department.

Public Works Department Conditions

23. All onsite utilities including without limitation, water, electricity, gas, sewer and storm drains, must be installed underground.

24. The applicant must dedicate 10 feet along the entire Grand Avenue frontage of the subject property and provide an irrevocable offer to dedicate an additional 9 feet along the entire Grand Avenue frontage of the subject property to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department and the City Attorney. The City has the right to exercise its right to accept the property subject to the offer of dedication on or after the earlier of September 1, 2024, or 15 years after the date on which the final certificate of occupancy was issued for the facility. The City is required to pay fair market value for the property subject to the offer of dedication if, and only if, the City actually takes possession of the property. If the City amends its Circulation Element such that property that is subject to the offer of dedication is no longer required for public right-of-way purposes, then the offer to dedicate is deemed null and void and the City will execute the documents necessary to void the offer to dedicate.

25. The applicant must ensure that all curb, gutters, and driveway aprons fronting Grand Avenue will be replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

26. All damaged or off-grade curb, sidewalk and pavement must be removed and replaced as required by the Public Works Department.
27. The applicant must ensure that encroachment permits are secured from the Public Works Department before commencing any work in the public right-of-way.

28. The project must comply with the latest NPDES requirements and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) for sediment control, construction material control and erosion control.

**Police Department Conditions**

29. **Before the City issues issuance of a building permit**, the applicant must submit a photometric light study to the Police Department for review and approval. The photometric study must be point-by-point and include the light loss factor (.7). Lighting levels must be adjusted to meet the minimum footcandle requirements within each area of the site.

30. Lighting devices must be enclosed and protected by weather and vandal resistant covers.

31. The addressing, open parking lot and trash dumpster must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. A wall pack must be placed over the receiving door and must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness. Aisles, passageways and recesses related to and within all sides of the building complex must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of .25 foot-candles on the ground surface during hours of darkness.

32. An exterior camera plan must be provided that includes the height of installation and area of coverage. Camera locations must be designed so that they face the points of entry to the property and that the cameras are installed at such a height that when trees are grown to maturity they will not block the viewing angle. Additionally, an exterior camera must facing the Grand Avenue entrance to the access road that runs along the east property line to capture vehicle license plate numbers and facial images as cars enter this road.

33. Front entry gates must have access control and be viewed by CCTV.

34. Buses must enter the facility either by interior controls or by access card.

35. Deliveries must enter the facility by interior controls/intercom.
36. Security cameras must cover both the interior of the building and all of the exterior property. MEPS—The applicant must have web based capabilities for CCTV access.

37. Digital cameras must maintain a minimum of 30 days of video storage.

38. An alarm system must be installed in the building must be alarmed facility.

39. The MEPS facility applicant must notify the City of El Segundo Police Department when they have advanced notice of any planned public demonstrations or if a public demonstration occurs on or in front of the property.

40. MEPS—The applicant must maintain a 25-foot standoff distance to the east perimeter fencing.

41. Perimeter fencing must be extended to a total height of eight feet and pickets must be outwardly curved with a triple pointed pale head.

Construction Conditions

42. Before any construction occurs the perimeter of the property must be fenced with a minimum 6-foot high fence. The fence must be covered with a material approved by the Planning and Building Safety Department to prevent dust from leaving the site.

43. Public sidewalks must remain open at all times.

44. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems must be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a coating after each day’s activities cease.

45. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, streets and sidewalks within 150 feet of the site perimeter must be swept and cleaned a minimum of twice weekly.

46. Soil stockpiled for more than two days must be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

47. On-site stockpile of debris, dirt or rusty materials must be covered or watered at least twice daily.
48. All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials must either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard.

49. During construction, water truck or sprinkler systems must be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.

50. Operations on any unpaved surfaces must be suspended when winds exceed 25 mph.

51. All unpaved roads, parking and staging areas must be watered at least once every two hours of active operation.

52. NOx emissions during construction must be reduced by limiting the operation of heavy-duty construction equipment to no more than 5 pieces of equipment at any one time.

53. Staging of construction vehicles and vehicle entry and egress to the site must occur on Grand Avenue.

54. Construction vehicles must not use any route except the City's designated Truck Routes.

55. The applicant must develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the City of El Segundo Public Works Department, which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD:

A. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.

B. Provide temporary traffic controls during all phases of construction activities to maintain traffic flow (e.g., flag person).

C. Re-route construction trucks away from congested streets.

D. Consolidate truck deliveries when possible.

E. Maintain equipment and vehicles engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize dust emissions.
F. Suspend use of all construction equipment during second stage smog alerts. Contact SCAQMD at (800) 242-4022 for daily forecasts.

G. Use electricity from temporary power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.

H. Diesel-powered equipment such as booster pumps or generators should be replaced by electric equipment, if feasible.

I. Catalytic converters must be installed, if feasible.

J. Equipment must be equipped with two-to-four-degree engine time retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.

K. Use methanol or natural gas powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.

L. Use propane or butane powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.

56. During construction and operations, all waste must be disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Toxic wastes must be discarded at a licensed, regulated disposal site by a licensed waste hauler.

57. 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.

58. If materials spills occur, they must be cleaned up in a way that will not affect the storm drain system.

59. The project must comply with ESMC Chapter 5-4, which establishes storm water and urban pollution controls.

60. Before anticipated rainfall, construction dumpsters must be covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.

61. 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.
62. The owner or contractor must conduct daily street sweeping and truck wheel cleaning to prevent dirt in the storm drain system.

63. The applicant must construct pavement, retaining walls and landscaped areas on-site to be maintained in order to prevent future soil erosion.

64. Storm drain system must be safeguarded at all times during construction.

65. All diesel equipment must be operated with closed engine doors and must be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

66. Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

67. For all noise-generating construction activity on the project site, additional noise attenuating techniques must be employed to reduce noise levels that meet ESMC requirements. Such techniques may include, without limitation, the use of sound blankets on noise generating equipment and the construction of temporary sound barriers, including walls or other sound attenuating features, between construction sites and nearby sensitive receptors.

68. The applicant must provide a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with the construction noise. The number must be posted on the project site and must be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

69. During construction, the contractor must store and maintain equipment as far as possible from the adjacent receptor property locations to the west of the site.

70. As stated in ESMC Chapter 7-2, construction related noise is restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or a Federal holiday.

Service Fee Conditions

71. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time library services mitigation fee of $0.03 per gross square-foot of building floor area.

72. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time fire services fee of $0.14 per gross square-foot of building floor area.
73. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time police services mitigation fee of $0.11 cents per gross square-foot of building floor area.

74. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay the required sewer connection fees (as specified in ESMC Title 12-3).

75. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before the City issues certificates of occupancy, the applicant must pay the required traffic mitigation fees as calculated in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 4443.

71. Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must pay a Police Service Mitigation Fee based upon the applicable Police Service Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Currently, the fee is $0.11 per gross square foot of floor area, but the fee is subject to change. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

72. Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must pay a Fire Service Mitigation Fee based upon the applicable Fire Service Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Currently, the fee is $0.14 per gross square foot of floor area, but the fee is subject to change. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

73. Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must pay a Library Service Mitigation Fee based upon the applicable Library Service Mitigation Fee in effect at the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Currently, the fee is $0.03 per gross square foot of floor area, but the fee is subject to change. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

74. The applicant must provide payment to the City—El Segundo for the Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fee Program per ESMC Chapter 15-27A before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, as a “fair-share contribution” toward programmed roadway improvements in order to assist in addressing future cumulative traffic deterioration. The current fee for this project is $105 per PM peak-hour trip generated. Compliance with this measure must be verified by the Planning and Building Safety Director before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
Miscellaneous

Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney's fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City's approval of Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04). Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA No. 08-02) and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review (SHSP No. 07-04), Mar Canyon Grand, LLC., agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section "the City" includes the City of El Segundo's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

By signing this document, William Messori and Allan Mackenzie on behalf of Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, certifies that they have read, understood, and agree to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

Allan Mackenzie
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC

William Messori
Mar Canyon Grand, LLC
City of El Segundo
Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS)
Errata Sheet

Chapter 2, Section 2.8, Page 22, 1st & 2nd Paragraphs

The proposed project will consist of one 32,980 square-foot concrete tilt up building on 4.25 acres of land. The proposed project would have a floor-to-area ratio of 0.18 and would be two stories (35 feet) high. The building will be leased to the United States Government by the applicant (Mar Canyon Grand, LLC) and will house a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS). The MEPS facility will consist primarily of office and medical uses. The purpose of the proposed MEPS facility is to perform medical, physical and written examinations and provide administrative support services for new recruits into the armed forces before they are sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and from the project site by bus. Official office hours for the proposed MEPS facility would be from 7:00 4:30 A.M. to 6:00 8:30 P.M. Monday through Friday with the later part of the day (after 4:30 P.M.) restricted for personnel that come to the facility for nighttime testing. The MEPS facility would open at 4:30 A.M. for standard security checks and associated activities, and close to recruits, etc. at 4:30 P.M., however, staff preparation may begin as early as 5:00 A.M. daily. The facility will also be open from 8:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. on 13 Saturdays per year. The MEPS facility would employ approximately 120 military and civilian personnel.

Access to the project site would be provided by one public access driveway and one secure driveway, both of which would be located along Grand Avenue. The proposed project would provide 151 parking spaces on-site. The proposed project would include 98,000 83,510 sf of private recreation outdoor space. A perimeter security fence would be erected around the entire project site. The fence would mainly consist of a six-foot tall prefinished wrought iron fence, except along the southwest portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound attenuation wall.

Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Page 25-26 – Figure 9 Conceptual Site Plan has been revised to reflect a New Conceptual Site Plan.

Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Page 35-36 – Figure 14 Conceptual Landscape Plan has been revised to reflect a New Conceptual Landscape Plan.

Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3 Air Quality, Item b), Page 42, 1st Paragraph

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is located within the SCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. The proposed project would involve the development of a two-story 32,980 square-foot concrete Military Entrance Processing Station with 151 surface parking spaces on 4.25 acres of land. Further, the project site would also include 98,000 83,510 square feet of private recreation and open space.
Chapter 3, Section 3.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Item b), Page 63, 1st Paragraph

The MEPS facility is a privately owned building that is proposed to be leased to the federal government which makes it an attractive and could be a potential target for terrorist activity. It is not possible to estimate the probability of a terrorist attack. However, based on law enforcement’s role in combating terrorism, the City has identified critical sites and has assessed the vulnerability of these sites to a terrorist attack. Venues likely to suffer the impact of terrorism include government facilities, military facilities, entertainment and cultural facilities, including the business district, and the popular hotels.

Chapter 3, Section 3.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Item b), Page 63, MM HZ-4

MM HZ-4 The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense. The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which is a reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards and has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.

Chapter 3, Section 3.3.13 Public Services, Item a), Page 88, 1st Paragraph

Terrorism is a continuing threat throughout the world and within the United States (see Item 3.3.13(b) below). The MEPS facility is a privately owned building that is proposed to be leased by the federal government which makes it an attractive and could be a potential target for terrorist activity. The Department of Defense (DoD) has mandatory antiterrorism standards for the construction and operation of federal facilities. These standards provide effective ways to minimize the likelihood of mass casualties from terrorist attacks against DoD personnel in the buildings in which they work and live. Although the building will not be owned by the federal government, its use by the federal government as a MEPS facility make it a potential target for terrorist activity. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure MM HZ-4 (Section 3.3.7 above) will ensure potential impacts from bioterrorism for MEPS personnel and recruits are less than significant.

Chapter 4, Section 4.1, Table 4-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Page 109
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Page 2
The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense. The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which is a reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards and has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.
Viewpoint 10

This viewpoint consists of views to the east, looking along Grand Avenue from the northeast corner of the project site. The streetscape along Grand Avenue dominates the foreground. Mid-range views consist of high-voltage towers and landscaping along the power line right-of-way. Background views include a high-rise office building and retail uses located at the corner of Grand Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard, approximately 200 feet east of the project site.

2.7 GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

The project site has a General Plan designation of Smoky Hollow Mixed Use. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan allows for primarily light industrial uses including light manufacturing, research and development, warehousing, and office uses. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for newly constructed projects is 0.6.

The Specific Plan provides four separate zoning districts. Theses districts include the Small Business (SB), Medium Manufacturing (MM), Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zones, of which the latter two zones are considered floating zones. The project site currently has a zoning designation of MM. The project site also has a floating zone overlay designation of the GAC Overlay that can be activated instead of the MM zone through a Zone Change Request, if applied for and approved by the City Council. The purpose of the MM zone is to provide a transitional land use area between the high intensity aircraft/aerospace office uses east of Sepulveda Boulevard and the small single parcel industrial businesses of the westerly portion of the Smoky Hollow area. The purpose of the GAC Overlay is to provide for limited commercial development along Grand Avenue.

2.8 PROPOSED PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project will consist of one 32,980 square-foot concrete tilt up building on 4.25 acres of land. The proposed project would have a floor-to-area ratio of 0.18 and would be two stories (35 feet) high. The building will be leased to the United States Government by the applicant (Mar Canyon Grand, LLC) and will house a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS). The MEPS facility will consist primarily of office and medical uses. The purpose of the proposed MEPS facility is to perform medical, physical and written examinations and provide administrative support services for new recruits into the armed forces before they are sent to basic training. The recruits will be housed at a nearby hotel and transported to and from the project site by bus. Official hours for the proposed MEPS facility would be from 4:30 A.M. to 8:30 P.M. Monday through Friday with the later part of the day (after 4:30 P.M.) restricted for personnel that come to the facility for nighttime testing. The MEPS facility would open at 4:30 A.M. for standard security checks and associated activities, and close to recruits, etc. at 4:30 P.M. The facility will also be open on 13 Saturdays per year. The MEPS facility would employ approximately 120 military and civilian personnel.

Access to the project site would be provided by one public access driveway and one secure driveway, both of which would be located along Grand Avenue. The proposed project would provide 151 parking spaces on-site. The proposed project would include 83,510 sf of private recreation outdoor space. A perimeter security fence would be erected around the entire project site. The fence would mainly consist
of a six-foot tall prefinished wrought iron fence, except along the southwest portion of the site, where the fence would consist of an 8-foot tall concrete masonry sound attenuation wall.

Figure 9 [Conceptual Site Plan] provides the conceptual site plan, depicting the location of the MEPS building areas, parking and open space areas, as well as access to the project site. The conceptual plans for the first and second floors are illustrated in Figures 10 and 11 [Conceptual First Floor and Second Floor Plans], while conceptual elevations are shown in Figures 12 and 13 [Conceptual Elevations]. Additionally, Figure 14 [Conceptual Landscape Plan] illustrates the general location and type of proposed landscaping on the project site.

2.9 INTENDED USES OF THE IS/MND

In order to proceed with the MEPS project, it is necessary to obtain review and approval of several planning applications through the City’s Planning and Building Safety Department as outlined below. Under the assumption that the City agrees with the findings presented in this IS/MND, approvals from the following local, regional, or state agencies may be required for development of the proposed project:

- City of El Segundo
- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
- Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources

Additionally, in order to construct and operate the proposed project, a number of approvals would be necessary. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Zone Change, activating the GAC Overlay Zone
- Specific Plan Amendment
- Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review

The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan is a regulatory plan which serves as the zoning ordinance for properties within its boundary. Proposed development plans or agreements, tentative tract or parcel maps and any other development approval must be consistent with the Specific Plan. Projects consistent with this Specific Plan will be automatically deemed consistent with the General Plan. The Grand Avenue Commercial Overlay Zone is considered a type of "floating zone"; once a need has been identified, this zone can be applied to the proposed project site as defined by the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. The zone is activated when an application is filed consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan, which would also include the preparation of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. Additionally, the proposed project would require a Specific Plan Amendment to further limit the uses to general, medical and dental office uses with incidental and customary ancillary uses only. The proposed office and medical uses would be consistent with the permitted uses identified in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan once the GAC overlay is activated. The proposed project would be required to adhere to the development standards identified for the GAC Overlay District.
2.10 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

CEQA Guidelines §§15355 defines “cumulative impacts” as “two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts.” In general, these impacts occur in conjunction with other related development whose impacts might compound or interrelate with those of the project under review. The IS/MND considers twenty area projects that have been identified by the City (see Appendix J for details).
2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is SCAQMD’s ongoing program for meeting federal and state air quality standards within the South Coast Air Basin.

The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on the AQMP. Development of the proposed project is subject to the requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). A project is deemed inconsistent with air quality plans if it results in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. While the proposed project would increase vehicular trips and intensify the use of the project site (currently vacant), the project would not result in increased population as the project does not involve a residential component. Further, no substantial increase in employment above that planned in the AQMP would occur as the proposed project would employ a maximum of 120 civilian and military personnel. The proposed project site is located within the boundaries of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan, which allows for primarily light industrial uses including light manufacturing, research and development, warehousing, and office uses. As the proposed project is consistent with the existing land use designation for the site and does not include the development of residential land uses, the proposed project would be consistent with population and employment growth projections for the region. The 2007 AQMP is based on population and employment projections identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) 2007 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), which in turn is based on the population and employment projections provided by individual cities’ General Plans.¹ As the proposed project would be consistent with the City of El Segundo General Plan, the proposed project would be considered consistent with the growth projections of the AQMP. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the implementation of the SCAQMD’s 2007 AQMP. No mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is located within the SCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. The proposed project would involve the development of a two-story 32,980 square-foot concrete Military Entrance Processing Station with 151 surface parking spaces on 4.25 acres of land. Further, the project site would also include 83,510 square feet of private recreation and open space.

The proposed project would generate air pollutants as a result of construction and operation-related emissions. The majority of construction emissions are generated by construction equipment and from dust stirred up during construction activity, whereas operational emissions are primarily associated with

¹ SCAG is currently in the process of updating its 1996 RCPG. Draft updates are available, but have not been finalized. Thus, this document relied on the 1996 RCPG.
involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during project operation is considered less than significant.

The MEPS facility is a privately owned building that is proposed to be leased to the federal government and could be a potential target for terrorist activity. It is not possible to estimate the probability of a terrorist attack. However, based on law enforcement’s role in combating terrorism, the City has identified critical sites and has assessed the vulnerability of these sites to a terrorist attack. Venues likely to suffer the impact of terrorism include government facilities, military facilities, entertainment and cultural facilities, including the business district, and the popular hotels.

Effective design of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems can significantly reduce the potential for chemical, biological or radiological agents being distributed throughout the buildings. The Department of Defense (DoD) has mandatory antiterrorism standards for the construction and operation of federal facilities.10 Although the building will not be owned by the federal government, its use by the federal government as a MEPS facility makes it a potential target for terrorist activity. These standards provide effective ways to minimize the likelihood of mass casualties from terrorist attacks against DoD personnel in the buildings in which they work and live. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure MM HZ-4 will ensure potential impacts from bioterrorism for MEPS personnel and recruits are less than significant.

**MM HZ-4**

The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which is a reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards and has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**Discussion**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** El Segundo Middle School, located at 332 Center Street, is located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project site. Hazardous emissions could occur during construction of the proposed project. However, these emissions would be within the accepted levels as established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Further, emissions related to construction are not considered acutely hazardous. As required by mitigation measure MM HZ-1, the developer would be required to adhere to all regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. Once operational, the most common hazardous material associated with the proposed project would be medical waste. This waste would be properly disposed of, as required by mitigation measure

---

MM HZ-2. Therefore, the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous material within one-quarter mile of an existing school would be less than significant. As required by mitigation measure MM HZ-4, the proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense. Therefore, potential impacts from bioterrorism would be less than significant. No mitigation measures beyond those outlined under 3.3.7.a are required.

c) 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant Impact
- Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

### Discussion

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A database search for sites listed on various federal and state databases within one mile of the project site was obtained from EDR Environmental and is included as an appendix to the Phase I report (refer to Appendix G). As discussed above, the project site is included on several regulatory databases for hazardous materials and is located in the vicinity of several known and suspected contamination sites. The property appears on the EDR database report (by past owners) as listed below. No violations were reported for the project site for any of these databases.

- **Aerojet El Segundo** (CA WDS)—The CA WDS database tracks facilities that treat and/or dispose of liquid or semisolid wastes from the production processes. Aerojet was characterized as a facility that had no solid waste treatment system or which complied with best management practices. This listing refers to the collection and off-site disposal of process wash water.

- **Spin Forge, A Division of DMC** (RCRA-SQG, FINDS, HAZNET, CA WDS)—Spin Forge was a generator of RCRA and non-RCRA hazardous wastes. No violations were reported. The CA WDS listing again refers to the collection and off-site disposal of process wash water.

- **Arite, A Dover Sargent Company** (FINDS, RCRA-SQG)—Arite was listed in the RCRA Information System and Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System, both indicators of hazardous waste generation activities. No violations were reported.

- **Spin Forge, Inc.** (Los Angeles County HMS)—This facility has a Los Angeles County Department of Public Works file. The file is empty and no waste transfer or waste-related activities occurred at the site.

- **A and A Waste Roll-Off Services, Inc.** (SWF/LF)—The site is a solid waste facility. This is in reference to the sub-leasing of a portion of the parking lot to A and A Roll-Off for storage of roll-off containers. No actual waste transfer or other solid waste-related activities occur on the property.

In addition to the project site, six sites of concern are located within 0.25 mile of the project site. Properties located beyond 0.25 mile are not anticipated to impact the project site significantly. A discussion of each site is listed below:
- **City of El Segundo**, 150 Illinois Street, El Segundo (0.1 mile south) (LUST, Cortese, UST)—A release from an underground storage tank was reported in 1986. The initial investigations indicated that the contamination was confined to site soils, and no further investigations have been completed on the site. Due to the nature of soils in the area (sands), the lower elevation compared to the project site, and the depth to groundwater, no impacts to the project site are anticipated from this release.

- **International Rectifier**, 233 Kansas Street, El Segundo (approximately 500 feet southwest) (found on a number of databases)—This site uses a variety of hazardous materials, including solvents, acids, and metal solutions. The facility has reported releases of solvent from an underground tank and metal-containing wastewaters from a plating line. The facility is currently under the oversight of the LARWQCB. Because the site is under active regulatory agency oversight, the U.S. EPA determined that no further federal assessment is needed. The solvent-release investigation case has been closed. The Department of Toxics Substances Control (DTSC) has recommended additional assessment at the site to determine if there are other potential releases. Although the site occupies the adjoining property to the south and southwest of the project site, this particular portion of the International Rectifier site lies on the west side of Kansas Street approximately 500 feet southwest of the project site and at a lower elevation. Given the porous soils in the area, it is unlikely that any releases have impacted the project site directly. Vapors from the solvent release may have contributed to the solvent vapors detected on the project site, although the likelihood of a significant impact is low.

- **Jim & Jack Auto Body**, 307 North Sepulveda Boulevard, El Segundo (0.1 mile east-northeast) (LUST, Cortese)—A release of waste oil from an underground tank at this site was reported in 1989. Only site soils were impacted and the case is currently closed. No impacts to the project site are anticipated from this release.

- **Chevron #9-7879**, 101 South Sepulveda Boulevard, El Segundo (0.15 mile southeast) (LUST, Cortese, UST)—A release of hydrocarbon fuels from an underground storage tank was reported in 1993. Only site soils were impacted and the case is currently closed. No impacts to the project site are anticipated from this release.

- **Global Solutions**, 1955 Grand Avenue, El Segundo (0.25 miles east) (LUST Cortese)—A release from an underground tank at this site impacted site soils. The case was closed in 1998. No impacts to the property are anticipated from this release.

- **Hughes Aircraft Company**, 2000 East El Segundo Boulevard, El Segundo (0.25 mile east-southeast) (LUST, Cortese)—A release of solvents from an underground storage tank at this site was reported in 1986. Vapor extraction was employed to remediate contaminated soils, and a pump and treat system was used to remove dissolved contaminants from the groundwater. The site is currently occupied by Raytheon. The case was closed in 1996. No impacts to the project site are anticipated from this release.

Although the project site and nearby properties are included on one or more regulatory databases, no impacts to the project site are anticipated. As discussed above, all potential impacts associated with the historical release of hazardous materials at the project site and at surrounding properties has been mitigated or is currently being remediated/monitored. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.
**MM PS-2**  
A fire life safety plan, which must include definitive plans and specifications, shall be submitted to the El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) for review and approval prior to commencement of construction of any portion of the proposed development.

**MM PS-3**  
The applicant shall provide fire access roadways to and throughout the property and submit a layout plan to the ESFD for approval.

**MM PS-4**  
The applicant shall provide water flow and on-site fire hydrants as required by the ESFD.

**MM PS-5**  
The applicant shall submit separate plans for ESFD approval. The following installations require separate ESFD approval:
- Automatic fire sprinklers;
- Fire alarm system;
- Underground fire service mains;
- Fire pumps;
- Emergency generators; and
- Any aboveground or underground storage tanks including elevator sumps and condensation tanks.

Terrorism is a continuing threat throughout the world and within the United States (see Item 3.3.13(b) below). The MEPS facility is a privately owned building that is proposed to be leased by the federal government and could be a potential target for terrorist activity. The Department of Defense (DoD) has mandatory antiterrorism standards for the construction and operation of federal facilities.15 These standards provide effective ways to minimize the likelihood of mass casualties from terrorist attacks against DoD personnel in the buildings in which they work and live. Although the building will not be owned by the federal government, its use by the federal government as a MEPS facility makes it a potential target for terrorist activity. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure MM HZ-4 (Section 3.3.7 above) will ensure potential impacts from bioterrorism for MEPS personnel and recruits are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Police protection?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed project would receive police protection services from the City of El Segundo Police Department. Implementation of the proposed development would generate new activity on the project site and increase traffic, both of which could increase demand on police protection services and could result in a potentially significant impact. An act of terrorism, according to the United States Code, The U.S. Department of Justice, and the FBI, is defined by the following components: (1) a criminal action; (2) the action must include violence against

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure(s)</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials</td>
<td>MM HZ-1 The applicant and construction contractor shall comply with existing hazardous materials regulations, which are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the California Code of Regulations, and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. In addition, the applicant and construction contractor shall comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous waste, including, but not limited to, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations and as implemented by Title 13 of the CCR. MM HZ-2 The United States Government (MEPS) shall comply with all City and County regulations applying to the use and disposal of medical-based hazardous waste. Furthermore, MEPS personnel shall ensure that all bio-hazardous waste produced at the proposed project site is properly disposed of.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project could 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</td>
<td>MM HZ-3 Upon completion of the vapor barrier installation, the project applicant or construction contractor shall contact the City of El Segundo Fire Department to request that an inspection and smoke test be performed to confirm that the vapor barrier was properly installed. MM HZ-4 The proposed MEPS facility shall be designed, constructed and operated in compliance with the antiterrorism standards set forth by the Department of Defense (DOD), except with respect to the east side setback distance of 24 feet between the building and the adjoining property to the east which is a reduction from the 33 feet set forth in the DOD standards and has already been approved by GSA and MEPCOM.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>MM NOI-1 The project applicant’s construction contractor shall require by contract specifications that the following construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels: • The project’s construction contractor shall provide advance notification to adjacent property owners and post notices at the Proposed Project site with regards to the schedule of construction activities. • All construction equipment with a high noise generating potential, including all equipment powered by internal combustion engines, shall be muffled or controlled. • All noise-generating construction equipment and construction staging areas shall be placed away from sensitive uses, where feasible. • High noise-producing activities shall be scheduled between the hours of 8 A.M. and 5 P.M. to minimize disruption to sensitive uses and delivery of materials and equipment shall occur between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. • Noise attenuation measures shall be implemented to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets. • Machinery, including motors, shall be turned off when not in use.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure MM NOI-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure MM NOI-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA  

June 26, 2008

Chair Frick called the El Segundo Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the El Segundo City Hall’s Council Chambers, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California.

Chair Frick led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

PRESENT: FRICK, WAGNER, ROTOLO, FUENTES, and FELLHAUER

ABSENT:

None.

Chair Frick presented the Consent Calendar.

None.

Vice Chair Wagner moved, seconded by Commissioner Fellhauer, to approve the June 12, 2008, Minutes as submitted. Motion carried (5-0).

Planning Manager Kimberly Christensen read into the record several items pertaining to Agenda Item H-4, including a letter dated June 23, 2008 from Myron Harpole, Chairman, Hacienda Hotel, an E-mail dated June 26, 2008, at 1:47 pm, from John Parsons, an Errata Sheet for the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, revised Conditions of Approval with minor language changes provided in strike-out underline format, and Revised Ordinance provided in two formats (clean and strike-out/underline).

Chair Frick presented Agenda Item H-2, Environmental Assessment No. 785 and Subdivision No. 08-03, and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Site Plan Review No. 08-01 project. Applicant: CRS, LLC, (Matt Crabs). Address: 215 California Street.

Assistant Planner Bryan Fernandez presented the staff report (of record.)

Planning Manager Christensen stated that there is a correction on stamped page 27 of the Planning Commission Resolution No 2637 Conditions of Approval to Condition No. 7 reads that “The project must comply with ESMC Chapter 11B for accessibility requirements” and that it should state that the “The project must comply with (2007) California Building Code Chapter 11B for accessibility requirements”. Ms. Christensen requested the Commission makes that modification.

Elizabeth Srour, representing for the applicant

Ms. Srour indicated that the applicant has accepted the modification to the
Conditions of Approval addressed by staff and is present to answer any questions.

Vice-Chair Wagner moved, Commissioner Rotolo seconded to approve Resolution 2637 approving Environmental Assessment No. 785 and Subdivision No. 08-03, and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Site Plan Review No. 08-01 project, to allow the construction of the 12-unit commercial and or industrial condominium development at 215 California Street as amended with the correction Exhibit “A” (MOTION) Condition No. 7. Motion carried (5-0).

Chair Frick presented Agenda Item H-3; Environmental Assessment No. EA-765 (Pedestrian Bridge Project). Address: 2350 East El Segundo Boulevard. Applicant: Aerospace Corporation c/o Daniel S. Barbee Los Angeles Air Force Base c/o Joseph H. Schwarz, Colonel, USAF.

City Attorney Carl Berger stated for the record that Commissioner Fuentes needed to recuse herself from participating in Agenda Item H-3 for potential conflict of interest reasons. She left the Council Chambers.

Contract Planner Louis Morales presented the staff report (of record.) Mr. Morales states that there is a correction to Resolution No. 2635 to Condition No. 22 of the Condition of Approval.

Vice Chair Wagner questioned staff where east of the bridge does El Segundo Boulevard drop from ten lanes to nine lanes.

Mr. Morales’ answer that the reduction in lanes will occur approximately hundred and fifty feet beyond the bridge. He stated that the reason is that the ten lanes from the bridge going west of the intersection includes two left turn pockets for the west bound traffic that will be heading southbound on Douglas. He stated that it will not be needed on the other portion because the street tends to be narrow in some areas and wider in others.

Michael Laughlin, with Psomas

Mr. Laughlin thanked staff for all their participation on the project and states that he is available for any questions.

Commissioner Rotolo questioned if the logos shown on the drawings are proposed signage.

Gilbert Fisher, representative of the Aerospace Corporation

Mr. Fisher replied to the question that Aerospace wishes to add these signs to the bridge but understands that is processed through another application.

Commissioner Rotolo commented that he likes the future possibility of having a two left hand turn pockets south onto Douglas Street.

Commissioner Rotolo moved, seconded by Commissioner Fellhauer to approve Resolution 2635 approving Environmental Assessment No. 765 to allow Aerospace Corporation to construct a pedestrian bridge over El Segundo Boulevard from 2350 East El Segundo Boulevard to the Los Angeles Air Force Base property located at 483 North Aviation Boulevard, as amended with the (MOTION)
correction to Condition No. 22. Motion carried (4-0).

Commissioner Fuentes returned to the dais.

Chair Frick presented Agenda Item H-4; Environmental Assessment No. EA-769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, and Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02 (Military Entrance Processing Station Project). Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand LLC. Address: 1700 East Grand Avenue.

Commissioner Rotolo recused himself from the remainder of the Planning Commission meeting because of a potential conflict relating to Item H-4.

Contract Senior Planner Trayci Nelson presented the staff report (of record.)

Char Frick opened public communications.

**Lieutenant Colonel Dave Philips, MEPS Commander for Los Angeles**

Lt. Colonel Philips acknowledged Colonel Mariano C. Campus, Jr. the USAF MEPS Commander for the entire country along with Captain Keith Barton from the western sector in the Council Chambers. Mr. Philips gave a brief PowerPoint presentation to explain the history and function of MEPS.

Vice Chair Wagner asked about the fiscal impact of 7.7 million dollars and if that is over a period of time.

Lt. Colonel Philips clarified that is the annual impact to the communities.

Commissioner Fuentes questioned whether MEPS has ever had protesters outside the facility and if any other location has been explored such as Ontario or Orange County.

Lt. Colonel Philips replied that he has never seen a protester. He believes that it has been explored two other times previously. He stated that it has never been viable to be pushed out to Ontario because of the volume of recruits processed being the nation largest and with the large number of flights needed.

**Allan Mackenzie, Applicant**

Mr. Mackenzie presented a brief PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the site history, the project, the applicant's community outreach efforts, and the community benefits that the project will provide. He stated the project sponsorship owners are Mar Canyon Grand LLC (Ownership entity for Mar Ventures, Inc.) Mr. Mackenzie stated that he is currently looking to complete the Military Entrance Processing Station 1700 East Grand Avenue as a 32,980 square-foot two-story office/medical facility. Mr. Mackenzie stated that the owners will be donating $500,000 to the City’s aquatics program.

**Lisa Broderick, Boeing Company with Space Intelligence System**

Ms. Broderick is an employee of Boeing and a member of the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce. She stated that she has been briefed on this project and wanted to express her support of the project. She felt that it will bring more jobs to the City along with more medical personnel at that it will bring more
security to El Segundo.

**Jim Rosa, Retired Military Commander**

Mr. Rosa stated is a retired military Commander of 25 years. He stated that his last duty was as the Commander of Los Angeles MEPS from 2001-2003. He states in the last 10 years there hasn’t been any crime the facility. Mr. Rosa live in San Pedro and currently works for the Los Angeles Air Force Base for the past 10 years. He stated how it will be good for the community and that he is in support of the MEPS project in the City of El Segundo.

**Sally Martin, resident of El Segundo**

Ms. Martin is not in favor of the MEPS project. She is concerned about the protestors and that there has been protestors at various MEPS sites that our posted on the internet. Ms. Martin disagreed with the location of the project and feels very strongly about potential terrorist attacks.

**Ron Swanson, President & CEO of S&S Hardware on 111 East Grand**

Mr. Swanson is a supporter of the project. He commented on the fact that Mar Ventures was providing a generous donation to aquatics in El Segundo.

**Mario Tapitis, resident of 10 years**

Mr. Tapitis stated that after reading Mayor Kelly McDowell’s column in the Herald requesting the public view the website regarding MEPS and after carefully viewing of the web-site he is in support of the project.

**Seda Williams, resident on Virginia Street**

Ms. Williams is concerned about the congestion that it will have on the corner of Sepulveda and she would like to see a facility that will offer more jobs to the community. Ms. Williams opposed the idea of the MEPS project in El Segundo.

Chair Frick closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Fellhauer comments that she had the opportunity to tour the MEPS facility in Los Angeles and meet with Lieutenant Colonel Philips and that she has worked for law enforcement for 12 years. Ms. Fellhauer stated that she patrolled that area of the MEPS facility in Los Angeles for 3 years and never witnessed any problems but isn’t speaking on behalf of the police department. She stated that she is not sure what the statistics are.

Vice Chair Wagner questioned what happens to the recruits that do not complete the recruitment process.

Chair Frick questioned staff what happens to the applicants that do not make it through processing.

Planning Manager Christensen replied that the information that was provided to staff as part of the application indicated that there will be transportation by busses to and from the facility whether they pass or failed.

Chair Frick reopened the public hearing.
Lt. Colonel Phillips stated that applicants that are qualified or disqualified are escorted by a recruiter in their government vehicles or sedans and sometimes are accompanied by their parents.

Mr. Wagner questioned regarding the afternoon buses if MEPS has a motor pool and how many passengers does the bus hold.

Lt. Colonel Phillips replied that they contract for one bus that departs at 4:00 pm to the hotel and also at 5:00 pm and again at 6:00 pm that holds 42 to 43 passengers per vehicle.

Ms. Fuentes asked for clarification that the contract is currently with the Radisson Hotel and inquired when it would expire.

Lt. Colonel Phillips replied “yes” and that the contract will need to be renewed in approximate 4 ½ years.

Ms. Frick closed the public hearing again.

Ms. Frick commented that it will be attractive location, she is supportive of the military; and that it will be a great addition for the city.

Commissioner Fellhauer moved, Vice-Chair Wagner seconded to approve Resolution 2638 recommending approval to the City Council Environmental Assessment No. 769, Zone Change (Floating Zone) No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04, to rezone a 4.25 acre parcel to Grand Avenue Commercial to amend the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to limit the permitted uses to general office and medical-dental office uses only; to allow the construction of a 32,980 square foot commercial office building for a Military Entrance Processing Station Project, at 1700 East Grand Avenue; and to adopt the revised Conditions of Approval and Ordinance. Motion carried (4-0).

None.

Planning Manager Kimberly Christensen stated that there will be items scheduled for the next two Planning Commission meetings on July 10, 2008 and July 24, 2008. She stated that the Planning Commission meeting for July 10, 2008 will include the election of a new Commission Chair and Vice-Chair. Ms. Christensen wished farewell to Chair Frick, whose term end on June 30, 2008 and thanked her for her service. Ms. Christensen announced the appointment of a new commissioner, Ryan Baldino, a real estate attorney, by the City Council.

Vice Chair Wagner, Commissioner Fellhauer, and Commissioner Fuentes thanked Chair Frick for her time serving on the Planning Commission and stated that she would be missed.

None.
Chair Frick made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried (4-0).

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

PASSED AND APPROVED ON THIS 26th DAY OF JUNE 2008

Gary Chicots, Secretary of the Planning Commission and Director of The Planning and Building Safety Department

Cheryl Frick, Madame Chair
Planning Commission
City of El Segundo, California
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June 3, 2008

The Honorable Kelly McDowell  
Mayor  
City of El Segundo  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, California 90245  

Dear Mayor McDowell:

SUBJECT: LA MEPS RELOCATION

I understand that the MEPS' proposed facility in the City of El Segundo will be presented to the City Council in July. Several months ago, my staff and I were given a presentation by the Commander of the LA MEPS, Lt Col David Phillips, on the MEPS operation and the importance of its relocation to your City. As you may be aware, the existing MEPS facility on Rodeo Road no longer meets its mission to the United States Government and their timely relocation is critical.

We view the addition of this facility to the Fourth District as a plus: (1) good new jobs in the district; (2) environmentally clean activity; and (3) additional economic activity for the surrounding community. We have also reviewed the prospects that this office building would be an attractive terrorist target. Based on information we have, this facility does not represent any greater terrorist risk than any other office building in the area.

A positive vote for this facility will affirm the City's support of the United States Government, our military forces and the Veterans who have served this nation.

Sincerely,

DON KNABE  
Chairman Pro-Tem  
Supervisor, Fourth District  
County of Los Angeles

DK:lr  
c: Each Councilmember
June 4, 2008

Mayor Kelly McDowell
Council Members
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: LA MEPS Relocation

Dear Mayor McDowell and Council Members:

I understand that the LA MEPS' proposed facility in the City of El Segundo will be presented to the City Council in July. The LA MEPS is an integral operation for Manpower and Personnel within the Department of Defense. To quote their organization's motto, "Freedom's Front Door," its' vital importance cannot be stressed enough. I realize you have been informed that their current facility does not meet their mission needs and requires timely relocation to your City.

Voting for the LA MEPS to relocate to El Segundo not only sends an important message to your citizens but also acknowledges the City’s support in maintaining Force Readiness for the Department of Defense and our Nation.

Sincerely,

Theodore W. Paulson
Major General AUS, (Ret.)

TWP/sk
Mayor Kelly McDowell  
Council Members  
City of El Segundo  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245  

Re: LA MEPS Relocation  

June 9, 2008  

Dear Mayor McDowell and Council Members: 

As a past Commander of the Space and Missile Systems Center, Los Angeles Air Force Base, I am very familiar with the importance and operation of the Military Entrance and Processing Station (MEPS) here in Los Angeles. I firmly believe that the MEPS facility proposed relocation to the City of El Segundo will benefit both our military and your outstanding city.  

Many people tend to focus on deployed soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines when you see the signs “Support our Troops.” In fact, the key to becoming a military member begins at the MEPS. They are “Freedom’s Front Door.” As their current facility does not meet their needs, they need your endorsement to allow them to relocate to your City. I understand the proposed new facility will be presented to the City Council in July.  

I commend the City of Segundo’s continued support of the military. Voting yes for the LA MEPS relocation will surely pay long term benefits to El Segundo and ensure our Nation’s ability to maintain Force Readiness.  

Very respectfully,  

June 11, 2008

Mayor Kelly McDowell
Council Members
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: LA MEPS Relocation

Dear Mayor McDowell and Council Members:

Our Chapter of the Military Officers Association of America ("MOAA"), met with Lt Col David Phillips of the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Station ("MEPS") to discuss their relocation plans to the City of El Segundo.

The proposed facility for the LA MEPS in the City of El Segundo will be presented to the City Council in July. Signs displaying a message such as "Support Our Troops" remind local residents of the many deployed soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. In fact, the key to becoming a military member first coalesces at the MEPS. They are "Freedom’s Front Door." As their current facility in Los Angeles does not meet their needs, they would like to utilize a larger facility in El Segundo but they need your endorsement to allow them to relocate to your city.

I commend the City of El Segundo’s continued support of the military. Voting yes for the LA MEPS relocation will surely pay long-term benefits to El Segundo and ensure our Nation’s ability to maintain Force Readiness.

Sincerely,

Peter V Dabbieri, Captain, USN (Ret.)
Chapter President

Cc: Lt Col David Phillips
June 17, 2008

Mr. Allan W. Mackenzie  
President  
Mar Ventures, Inc.  
2050 W. 190th Street, Suite 108  
Torrance, CA  90504  

Re: Military Entrance Processing Station, 1700 E. Grand Avenue, El Segundo  

Dear Mr. Mackenzie:

Thank you for your letter of June 12, 2008. We appreciate your consideration in inviting us to attend the Monday, June 23rd briefing on the use of the proposed Military Entrance Processing Station facility. It is with regret that I must decline your invitation due to a prior commitment.

Please be advised that the El Segundo Unified School District has been and continues to be very supportive of the military facilities, and their personnel who work in El Segundo and many of whose children attend our schools by way of an inter-district permit. I support your project and wish you the best of success.

Sincerely,

Geoff Yantz, Ed.D.  
Superintendent of Schools
June 23, 2008

Ms. Cheryl Frick
Honorable Member of the El Segundo Planning Commission
El Segundo City Hall
El Segundo, California 90245

Dear Ms. Frick:

I strongly urge approval of the proposed establishment of the United States Military Entrance Processing Station in El Segundo.

There are strong grounds for this approval the foremost of which is the opportunity to meaningfully assist our armed forces when they need our help. I have seen the proposed MEPS design and location. In addition to enabling El Segundo’s Air Force Base to better conduct its assigned oversight of the MEPS operation, the design and operation should be fine for the location. I’m reliably informed that the Commanding General of that base, who is tasked with oversight of MEPS, hopes that the close El Segundo location will be approved.

My voice is one that might be heard. Distinguished from the night-time residents with the vote, as CEO of the Hacienda Hotel I’m effectively a 34 year day-time resident of El Segundo with a long and continuing concern for the City and its citizens not limited by a long shot to the substantial taxes contributed yearly. At the Hacienda, we love El Segundo.

Over 63 years ago in my 17th year, I was processed in that era’s version of the MEPS on 5th Street in Los Angeles. After taking a sort of SAT test, being thumped and listened to by the doctors, giving fluids, and asked if I liked girls (I did), I swore to defend our country and its constitution and was enlisted in the United States Navy. This was one of the best moves of my life, and I’ve benefited ever since. I could not possibly fail to urge you to approve establishing the MEPS in a city that I truly love.

My navy enlistment was transferred to the Marine Corps. I’ve trained to be a SeaBee, a Navy deck officer, a Marine infantry platoon leader, a military lawyer and civil affairs officer, and a basic artillery officer with acquaintance in amphibious and command and staff skills. In short, I’ve tried to be ready and able to serve our country if called and had great satisfaction of associating with others of a like view. On the side, I’ve benefited from WWII and Korea GI Bills, and from a small pension and medical benefits from my active and reserve years. It all started with a 1944 version of the MEPS. And I am not alone. There are many who have given much greater service.

There has been El Segundo publicity about the volunteering for national military service by the fine son of former El Segundo councilman John Gaines. Where was young Gaines processed and enlisted? At MEPS, of course. As have other fine sons of El Segundo, Frank Godoy’s son Matt, was similarly enlisted and is very proud of his service. Another who went through the MEPS
processing is my law partner's grandson, George Witter, who just completed four Ranger years and multiple tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. He will be in great demand by employers. Young men who are going to West Point, Annapolis, Kings Point and the Air Force Academy may be processed at MEPS as may be those receiving JAG assignments or officer training scholarships at colleges and universities. In today's high-tech military, the MEPS enlistees are almost all from the top quartiles of high school graduates and many, such as Matt and George, are college graduates wanting to give a few years of service to their country. How could we not want these fine young men and women volunteering for our Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard to receive a welcome in our City at the time of their enlistment? What better way to extend that welcome than approving the attractive MEPS facility proposed for El Segundo? What would be worse than to turn our City's back on them?

I have past personal experience with the local MEPS operation. For a time when we owned and operated the Cockatoo Inn in Hawthorne, we housed the young men and women of MEPS while they awaited transportation to their starting bases. Housing the MEPS kids for 24 hours per day is a different story than processing them under the strict surveillance and beginning discipline they receive for a few hours of two or three days within the MEPS station. They are an active and alive group. Just like the 17, 18 and 19 year olds of El Segundo would be in their first time away from home. They were still fine young persons (again, enlistees are restricted by and large to the top fraction of the population), and we would house them again. However, housing MEPS in El Segundo is not proposed. The local MEPS are being housed on Century Boulevard in another hotel under a long-term contract and would be bused to and from the proposed MEPS station. They will not be buying ice cream cones on Main Street.

You will be presented with other benefits to the City from having the MEPS station in El Segundo. MEPS base corps of physicians and medical technicians will be physically present in the City if emergency needs arise. There is no current similar group physically here. The persons Manning the station will be of high caliber, some of whom may become night-time residents. The members of our armed forces are desirable citizens; I hope we can all agree on that.

Little other than extending a welcome to the young men and women volunteering for our armed forces would lead me to writing such a letter. The welfare of my hotel is not involved. The census data is that El Segundo's high percentage of veterans is 50% greater than the County average. With two major Air Force and defense facilities, we must have a substantial number of currently on-duty military. Additionally, there is a large number actively engaged in vital national defense work. I'm not clear on similar experience at various levels of the City but certainly my views are shared by most of the "silent majority" of the citizenry. Upon thoughtful reflection, hosting the United States armed forces Military Entrance Processing Station in El Segundo near our Air Force Base is a highly desirable thing to do.

Best regards to each of you for your service to our City.

Myron Harpole,
Chairman, Hacienda Hotel
-----Original Message-----
From: Domann, Cathy
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2008 7:45 AM
To: Chicots, Gary; Christensen, Kimberly
Subject: FW: Planning Commission MEPS Hearing

-----Original Message-----
From: John Parsons [mailto:johnparsons@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2008 1:47 AM
To: Mortesen, Cindy
Cc: Domann, Cathy
Subject: Planning Commission MEPS Hearing

Please forward this email to the Planning Commission for the June 26, 2008 Meeting

Planning Commissioners:

I strongly recommend the approval of the MEPS project at 1700 E. Grand Ave. This project is good for both the residential and business communities. El Segundo will get a well designed and landscaped project that is LEED certified. Besides a very "clean" working environment the MEPS project will provide high wage jobs. As you know, this facility is not for recruiting. MEPS is for assessment and testing for personnel that will arrive and depart by military contracted transportation.

I'm happy to join the broad group of supporters for this project. I've lived in the South Bay all of my life, part of that time in El Segundo. I have also worked in El Segundo in the aerospace business for many years. During these many decades, El Segundo has been a leader in creating the environment for a strong defense industry. El Segundo provided great leadership in the development of the new LA Air Force Base facilities. I proudly supported that effort and I proudly led the Base retention effort during the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. By approving the MEPS project El Segundo will continue providing great leadership.

--
John J. Parsons
310-729-5498 cell 310-542-7820 fax
MailTo:JohnParsons@att.net
Lt. Gen. Brian A. Arnold, USAF, Retired  
527 W. 36th Street,  
San Pedro, CA 90731

26 June 2008

Mayor Kelly McDowell  
El Segundo City Council Members  
City of El Segundo  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245

Subject: LA MEPS Relocation

Dear Mayor McDowell and El Segundo City Council Members:

As you recall I was a former Commander of Space and Missile Systems Center, Los Angeles Air Force Base in El Segundo. I was very fortunate to have had great support from the City of El Segundo and the City Council when we completed the SAMs Project to help save Los Angeles Air Force Base from the BRAC. Clearly the base has been a key economic center for the City.

I am now calling on your support once again to back our men and women in uniform by strongly endorsing the Military Entrance and Processing Station (MEPS) relocation to El Segundo.

El Segundo has a long history of supporting our troops and this is another opportunity for you and the City Council to show your great support for the military. I strongly urge voting yes for the LA MEPS relocation to the City of El Segundo when this is presented to the City Council in July.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian A. Arnold,  
Lt. Gen., USAF, Retired
June 30, 2008

The Honorable Kelly McDowell
Mayor
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, California 90245

Dear Mayor McDowell:

SUBJECT: LA MEPS RELOCATION

I understand that the MEPS’ proposal facility in the City of El Segundo will be presented to the City Council in July. As you may be aware, the existing MEPS facility on Rodeo Road no longer meets its mission to the United States Government. Their timely relocation to an El Segundo site is critical to the force readiness of our military. Surely, the addition of this facility to the Fourth District will not only support our troops but also provide: (1) good new jobs in the district, (2) an environmentally clean activity, and (3) additional economic activity for the surrounding community.

I also understand that the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles has reviewed the prospects of this office building as being a potential terrorist target. Based on information they have furnished, this facility does not represent any greater terrorist risk than any other office building in the area.

A positive vote for this facility will affirm the City’s support of the United States Government, our military forces and the Veterans who have served this nation. Voting YES for LA MEPS relation will pay long-term benefits to El Segundo, and ensure our military’s ability to maintain force readiness.

Sincerely,

J. J. Quinn
Rear Admiral
United States Navy (Ret.)

cc: Eric Busch, Mayor Pro Tem
    Carl Jacobson, Council Member
    Bill Fisher, Council Member
    Don Brann, Council Member
    Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk
    Ralph Lanphere, Treasurer
July 1, 2008

Kelly McDowell
Eric Busch
Bill Fisher
Don Bran
Carl Jacobson

Gentlemen:

I am a member of the Military Officers Association of America ("MOAA") because I am the widow of Lt Col Michael G Buchen. We purchased our home in El Segundo in 1977 because of the schools, community and proximity to Los Angeles Air Force Base.

I have received a letter from Mar Ventures, Inc. William Messori, Senior Vice President with attachments about the Los Angeles Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS). In the same packet I also received a letter from Peter V Dabbieri, Captain, USN, (Ret) MOAA Chapter President requesting a yes for the LA MEPS move to El Segundo.

After reading the Information Paper on LA MEPS I want the El Segundo elected officials to approve the acceptance of this facility. I also worked in Contracting at the Air Force Base and know that this delay is costing taxpayer money.

Sincerely,

Cecelia (Bebe) Buchen
861 Eucalyptus Drive
El Segundo, CA 90245
310-640-8909
July 1, 2008

Mayor Kelly McDowell
City Council Members
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: 1700 E. Grand Avenue

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

I am an El Segundo resident and became aware of the proposed MEPS facility on Grand Avenue through information received through their website, the El Segundo Herald, and the June 25th Planning Commission meeting.

The proposed MEPS building and its use will be a significant improvement for Grand Avenue and be a catalyst for further improvements to Smoky Hollow.

We urge you to support this proposed facility at the July 15th City Council Meeting.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Steve McDonald
608 W. Holly Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245
July 2nd, 2008

Mayor Kelly McDowell
City Council Members
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: 1700 E. Grand Avenue

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

I am an El Segundo resident & business owner. I became aware of the proposed MEPS facility on Grand Avenue through information received through their website, the El Segundo Herald, and the June 25th Planning Commission meeting.

The proposed MEPS building and use will be a significant improvement for Grand Avenue and be a catalyst for further improvements to Smoky Hollow.

We urge you to support this proposed facility at the July 15th City Council Meeting.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kirk Lebowe
339 Loma Vista
El Segundo, CA 90245
July 3, 2008

RE: Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS)

Mayor Kelly McDowell
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mayor,

I have recently learned of proposed plans to develop a MEPS facility on Grand Avenue. I wanted to personally contact you and the Council to express my support for such a facility. As an El Segundo resident and eight year Navy veteran, I would be delighted to see such development plans come to fruition. One of my fondest memories from the time I spent in the service is the day I was processed through MEPS. It marked a true milestone in my life.

I often boast to friends and family about living in El Segundo. To me, El Segundo provides a true sense of community and family. I cannot think of a more fitting theme for a young man or woman about to embark on one of their biggest journeys.

I commend your support of our young service members and the proposed MEPS facility.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Kirner

cc: El Segundo City Council
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