AGENDA
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 350 Main Street

The City Council, with certain statutory exceptions, can only take action upon properly posted and listed agenda items. Any writings or documents given to a majority of the City Council regarding any matter on this agenda that the City received after issuing the agenda packet, are available for public inspection in the City Clerk's office during normal business hours. Such Documents may also be posted on the City's website at www.elsegundo.org and additional copies will be available at the City Council meeting.

Unless otherwise noted in the Agenda, the Public can only comment on City-related business that is within the jurisdiction of the City Council and/or items listed on the Agenda during the Public Communications portions of the Meeting. Additionally, the Public can comment on any Public Hearing item on the Agenda during the Public Hearing portion of such item. The time limit for comments is five (5) minutes per person.

Before speaking to the City Council, please come to the podium and state: Your name and residence and the organization you represent, if desired. Please respect the time limits.

Members of the Public may place items on the Agenda by submitting a Written Request to the City Clerk or City Manager's Office at least six days prior to the City Council Meeting (by 2:00 p.m. the prior Tuesday). The request must include a brief general description of the business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. Playing of video tapes or use of visual aids may be permitted during meetings if they are submitted to the City Clerk two (2) working days prior to the meeting and they do not exceed five (5) minutes in length.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact City Clerk, 524-2305. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

5:00 P.M. SESSION CANCELLED – NO ITEMS OF BUSINESS

(REGULAR MEETING TO BE ADJOURNED TO 7:00 P.M.)
5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

CLOSED SESSION:
The City Council may move into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City’s Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City’s Labor Negotiators; as follows:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (Gov’t Code §54956.9(a) -0- matter

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(b): -0- potential case (no further public statement is required at this time); Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(c): -0- matter.

DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS (Gov’t Code §54957): - 0- matters

CONFERENCE WITH CITY'S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54957.6): -0- matters

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54956.8): -0- matters

SPECIAL MATTERS: - 0- matter
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REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2010 - 7:00 P.M.

Next Resolution # 4641
Next Ordinance # 1440

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION – Pastor Justin Beck, Calvary Chapel LAX

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Don Brann
PRESENTATIONS

a. Proclamation announcing National Wear Red Day in support of women and the fight against heart disease.

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

A. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

Consideration of a motion to read all ordinances and resolutions on the Agenda by title only.

Recommendation – Approval.

B. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

1. Consideration and possible action to open a public hearing and receive testimony regarding: 1) an Environmental Assessment of Environmental Impacts for a proposed Negative Declaration; 2) a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office; and 3) a Zone Change from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the Corporate Office (CO) Zone for the site located at 1916 East Imperial Highway (Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-042); and Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-057. Applicant: The City of El Segundo (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – (1) Open the public hearing; (2) Discussion; (3) Reading of Resolution approving Environmental Assessment No. 852 to adopt the Draft Negative Declaration and General Plan Amendment No. 09-01; (4) Introduce, and waive first reading, of Ordinance for Zone Change No. 09-01; (5) Schedule second reading and adoption of Ordinance on February 16, 2010; (6) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Consideration and possible action to declare Rescue Ambulance 33 (Unit #3304) to be a surplus vehicle. Additionally, authorize the surplused Rescue Ambulance 33 to be donated to the Red Cross in Guaymas, Mexico, which is the Sister City of El Segundo. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – (1) Authorize Rescue Ambulance 33 to be declared a surplus vehicle; (2) Authorize the surplused Rescue Ambulance 33 to be donated to the Red Cross in Guaymas, Mexico; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

E. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed are to be adopted by one motion without discussion and passed unanimously. If a call for discussion of an item is made, the item(s) will be considered individually under the next heading of business.

3. Warrant Numbers 2575597 to 2575809 on Register No. 8 in the total amount of $1,098,814.65 and Wire Transfers from 1/8/10 through 1/21/10 in the total amount of $2,464,840.12.

Recommendation – Approve Warrant Demand Register and authorize staff to release. Ratify: Payroll and Employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.


Recommendation – Approval.

5. Consideration and possible action to accept a cash donation totaling $7,500 from DirecTV in support of Super CPR (Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation) Saturday and other Fire Department supplies and equipment. (Fiscal Impact: $7,500)

Recommendation – (1) Accept donation and authorize the City Manager to transfer the monies into the CPR General Fund account ($2,000), and the Suppression supplies account ($5,500); (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.
6. Consideration and possible action regarding (1) the adoption of a Resolution to approve the design and plans and to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Tomark Sports without the need of competitive bidding; (2) the acceptance of a donation from the El Segundo Girls Softball League to pay $10,880.89 to Tomark Sports for wall padding and its installation on the new retaining wall on the Softball Field at Recreation Park. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation — (1) Adopt a Resolution that includes the approval of design and plans, and the authorization for the City Manager to execute a contract in a form approved by the City Attorney with Tomark Sports without the need of competitive bidding; (2) Acceptance of a donation from the El Segundo Girls Softball League to pay $10,880.89 to Tomark Sports for wall padding and its installation on the new retaining wall on the Softball Field at Recreation Park; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

7. Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution establishing a ticket and pass distribution policy in accordance with Fair Political Practice Commission regulations. If adopted, the policy would identify the public purposes that are fulfilled when the City distributes tickets and passes to public officials for attendance at various functions.

Recommendation — (1) Adopt Resolution establishing ticket and pass distribution policy; (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

8. Consideration and possible action regarding authorizing the recording of the Notice of Completion and authorizing the City Manager to accept completion of work for 23 homes related to the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program's Group 31 (Project No. RSI 09-06). (Final Contract Amount: $755,138.37, less liquidated damages as authorized by the City Manager)

Recommendation — (1) Authorize the City Clerk to file the City's Planning and Building Safety Director's Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office; (2) Authorize the City Manager, or designee, to close out Project No. RSI 09-06; (3) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

CALL ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA
F. NEW BUSINESS

G. REPORTS – CITY MANAGER

H. REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY

I. REPORTS – CITY CLERK

J. REPORTS – CITY TREASURER

K. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Brann –

Council Member Fisher –

Council Member Jacobson –

Mayor Pro Tem Busch –

Mayor McDowell –

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – *(Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total)* Individuals who have receive value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.
MEMORIALS –

CLOSED SESSION

The City Council may move into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City’s Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City's Labor Negotiators.

REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION (if required)

ADJOURNMENT

POSTED:

DATE: 1-27-10

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

NAME: [Signature]
Proclamation

City of El Segundo, California

WHEREAS, Diseases of the heart are the nation’s leading cause of death and stroke is the third leading cause of death; and

WHEREAS, Cardiovascular disease claims the lives of nearly 460,000 American females each year, approximately one death per minute; and

WHEREAS, each year, 53% of all deaths due to cardiovascular and 61% of stroke deaths occur in females and too many women die each year because they are unaware that heart disease is their No. 1 killer; and

WHEREAS, in 2010, the direct and indirect cost of cardiovascular diseases in the U.S., including stroke, is estimated to be $503.2 billion; and

WHEREAS, nearly as many die of heart disease, stroke, and all other cardiovascular diseases than the next five leading causes of death combined, including all cancers; and

WHEREAS, only 21% of women consider cardiovascular disease their greatest health risk; and

WHEREAS, February is designated as American Heart Month; and

WHEREAS, Go Red For Women is the American Heart Association’s national call to increase awareness about heart disease – the leading cause of death for women – and to inspire women to take charge of their heart health; and

WHEREAS, all women should learn their own personal risk of heart disease, using tools such as the American Heart Association’s Go Red For Women Heart Check-Up, Go Red For Women Better U and by talking to their healthcare provider; and

WHEREAS, making the right choices relating to proper nutrition, physical activity, and other healthy lifestyle choices are essential to living a heart healthy life.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Mayor and Members of the City Council of the City of El Segundo, California, hereby proclaim Friday, February 5, 2010, as "NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY" in El Segundo and urge all citizens to show their support for women and the fight against heart disease by commemorating this day by the wearing of the color red. By increasing awareness, speaking up about heart disease, and empowering women to reduce their risk for cardiovascular disease, we can save thousands of lives each year.

[Signature]
Mayor Kelly McDowell

[Signature]
Council Member Jim Rudgards
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to open a public hearing and receive testimony regarding: 1) an Environmental Assessment of Environmental Impacts for a proposed Negative Declaration; 2) a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office; and 3) a Zone Change from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the Corporate Office (CO) Zone for the site located at 1916 East Imperial Highway (Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-042); and Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-057. Applicant: The City of El Segundo (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Open the public hearing;
2. Discussion;
3. Reading of Resolution approving Environmental Assessment No. 852 to adopt the Draft Negative Declaration and General Plan Amendment No. 09-01;
4. Introduce, and waive first reading, of Ordinance for Zone Change No. 09-01;
5. Schedule second reading and adoption of Ordinance on February 16, 2010; and/or,
6. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Draft Resolution and Exhibits
2. Draft Ordinance and Exhibits
3. Draft Negative Declaration
4. Letter from State Clearinghouse received January 11, 2010
5. Planning Commission Staff Report, dated January 14, 2010 and attachments

FISCAL IMPACT: None

Amount Budgeted: N/A
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

ORIGINATED BY: Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
REVIEWED BY: Greg Carpenter, Director of Planning and Building Safety
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
On January 14, 2010, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. After receiving testimony and documentary evidence, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 2667, recommending City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. 852, General Plan Amendment No. 09-01, and Zone Change No. 09-01.
I. Project Background

A general plan amendment and zone change from General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO) was approved in September 2009 for Boeing owned property directly to the west and south of the project site. That general plan amendment and zone change facilitated the expansion of Boeing Company operations on the neighboring site. As a result of the general plan amendment and zone change for the neighboring Boeing-owned property, the Satco, Inc. property became the only property in the block bound by East Imperial Highway to the north, Sepulveda Boulevard to the west, East Maple Avenue to the south, and Selby Street to the east with a General Plan Land Use Classification of General Commercial and General Commercial (C-3) zoning. When the City Council deliberated and approved the general plan amendment and zone change for the Boeing-owned property, the Council directed staff to bring back a future general plan amendment and zone change for the Satco, Inc. property in order to ensure consistency for the entire block. The change would make the Satco, Inc. property consistent with the land use designation and zoning of the specific block as well as the designation and zoning of this portion of the Sepulveda corridor.

The 1992 General Plan Land Use Element identifies both the Boeing property and the Satco, Inc. property as areas that should be converted from their current use to commercial and retail uses. Boeing’s Selby Block project committed that site to office uses for the foreseeable future. Accordingly, it is unlikely that the much smaller Satco, Inc. property will be converted to a retail use in the future as anticipated by the 1992 General Plan.

No physical changes to the project site are proposed as part of this City initiated action. Satco, Inc. intends to continue its legal non-conforming air cargo container repair facility operations at the site. The change in general plan designation and zoning will not affect the continued operations of this repair facility in the existing 27,918 square-foot building on the site. On September 23, 2009, Satco, Inc. submitted a letter (Exhibit 5-included as attachment to Planning Commission staff report) confirming that Satco, Inc. has no objections to the proposed rezoning contingent on upon the action having no effect on the current legal non-conforming status of the facility and that the action will not impede Satco’s ability to continue its present day operations.

II. Project Description and Analysis

The project applications include:

1) **Environmental Assessment No. 852 (EA No. 852) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** – A 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 December 3, 2009 and ended on January 4, 2010.

2) **General Plan Amendment (GPA 09-01)** – Change the General Plan designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The requested designation will bring the General Plan designation of the property into consistency with adjacent parcels.

3) **Zone Change (ZC 08-01)** – Rezone the project site from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to Corporate Office (CO) Zone. The City initiated rezoning will be consistent with the requested General Plan Amendment.
III. General Plan Consistency

The proposed project would be consistent with the goals of the City’s adopted General Plan Land Use Element in that a consistent land use designation for the entire block could in the future allow for greater re-development potential for the entire block and thus avoid deterioration and blight if the current non-conforming operation on the site were to cease operation. The Land Use Element also has the specific objective of creating new office and research and development uses. This project would help facilitate a transition of the Project Site to these specifically identified uses if the current use were to cease operation. The Project is also consistent with goals and policies set out in the Economic Development Element. The Project would aid in creating a strong and healthy economic community by facilitating the transition to a more viable economic use of the Site in the future, which in turn will contribute to the City’s future tax base.

The findings of consistency with the General Plan Goals, Policies, and Objectives are generally set forth in the draft Resolution.

IV. Zoning Consistency

If the Zone change is approved, the zoning of the Project Site will be Corporate Office (CO). The project involves no physical changes to the property, so the CO zoning standards will apply to any future new construction on the Project Site and any future uses proposed on the project site. The existing continuing light manufacturing use is considered legal non-conforming. The proposed Project is consistent with the Corporate Office (CO) Zone development standards of the El Segundo Municipal Code as discussed in detail in the attached Planning Commission staff report and as outlined in the attached Ordinance.

V. Environmental Review

The proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts (Exhibit 3) was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code § 15063 (California Environmental Quality Act). A Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA §15070. The draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration were available for public comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010. The State Office of Planning and Research sent an acknowledgement letter dated January 5, 2010 that the State Clearinghouse review has been completed and no State agencies submitted comments during the review period (Exhibit 4). No other letters of comment were received during the public comment period.

The draft Initial Study (IS) and Negative Declaration (ND) concluded that no impacts would occur for the following issue areas: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems. The draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration concluded that impacts would be less than significant for the following issue areas: Geology and Soils, Land Use and Planning, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic. A detailed analysis of environmental impacts is provided in the attached draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts.
VI. Application Findings

In order to approve the project, the City Council must take certain actions related to the environmental review, general plan amendment land use designation, and zone change. The required findings for each application are discussed in detail in the attached Planning Commission staff report (Exhibit 5). Staff believes that the City Council may make the required findings to adopt the negative declaration, and to approve the general plan amendment and zone change as outlined in the draft Resolution and Ordinance.

VII. Planning Commission Hearing and Public Input

The Planning Commission held its public hearing on the proposed project on January 14, 2010. The City of El Segundo was the applicant at the public hearing and presented testimony. The Commission recommended approval.

VIII. Conclusion and Recommendation

Planning staff believes that the proposed Satco, Inc. property general plan amendment and zone change project meets the mandatory findings as set forth in the staff report. Therefore, Planning staff recommends that the City Council adopt the Draft Negative Declaration (Environmental Assessment No. 852), approve General Plan Amendment No. 09-01, and Zone Change No. 09-01, since the required findings for support have been made.
RESOLUTION NO. ___

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 852, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 09-01 AND ZONE CHANGE NO. 09-01 FOR THE SATCO, INC. PROPERTY (1916 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY (ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 4138-005-042) AND ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 4138-005-057).

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On October 22, 2009, the City of El Segundo filed an application for an Environmental Assessment (EA-852), General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 09-01) and Zone Change (ZC No. 09-01) to re-designate and rezone an approximately 1.26-acre property at the southwest corner of Selby Street and Imperial Highway;

B. The applications from the City of El Segundo were reviewed by the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code (“ESMC”);

C. 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);

D. An Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. A Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010;

E. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before the Planning Commission for January 14, 2010;

F. On January 14, 2010, 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 and public testimony;

G. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2667 recommending City Council approval of
Environmental Assessment No. 852, General Plan Amendment No. 09-01, and Zone Change No. 09-01;

H. On February 2, 2010 the City Council held a public hearing and considered the information provided by City staff and public testimony;

I. On February 2, 2010 the City Council introduced Ordinance No. _______ approving Zone Change No. 09-01; and

J. This Resolution and its findings are made based upon the entire administrative record including, without limitation, testimony and evidence presented to the Council at its February 2, 2010 hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

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

A. The 1.26 acre (55,003 square feet) subject property is located in the northeast portion of the City of El Segundo. The site is comprised of two parcels. The first parcel is 1916 East Imperial Highway and the second unaddressed parcel is a former railway right-of-way that is assigned Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-057. The subject property has lot frontages on East Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street to the east.

B. There is one 27,918 square-foot building located on the parcel addressed 1916 East Imperial Highway. This building was constructed in 1958. The site is the current location of an air cargo container repair facility.

C. The parcel directly abutting the project site to the west and south is owned by the Boeing Company and contains existing and under construction office space, and is located in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone. Across Selby Street to the east are buildings occupied by Boeing Company in the Light Industrial (M-1) Zone that contain a mix of office, research and development, and industrial uses. Los Angeles International Airport is located to the north of the Project Site.

D. The proposed General Plan re-designation and rezoning of the Project Site would change the General Plan land use designation from General Commercial to the Corporate Office designation and rezone the area from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the Corporate Office (CO) Zone.

E. The legal non-conforming use of the Project Site as an air cargo container repair facility will not change as a result of this general plan amendment and zone change request. The current use is considered legal non-
conforming within the General Commercial (C-3) Zone and will remain legal non-conforming in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone.

F. The General Plan re-designation and re-zoning will not involve any changes to the existing on-site parking and loading spaces, landscaping, drive aisles, or vehicular access. Vehicular access will continue to be provided from existing curb cuts located on Imperial Highway and Selby Street. The existing 35 parking spaces and loading configuration will remain.

G. The re-zoning and General Plan re-designation would decrease the allowed floor area ratio (FAR) of the Project Site. The FAR will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.8. The 20% reduction in allowable floor area results in a reduction of 11,001 square feet of potential development at the Project Site. The total development that would be permitted with the proposed General Plan re-designation and re-zoning is 44,002 square feet (0.8 FAR). The existing FAR of the Project Site is 0.51. Therefore, the existing 27,918 square-foot industrial building would not exceed the maximum 0.8 FAR allowed in the proposed General Plan re-designation and re-zoning.

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. A Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15070. A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §§ 15072 and 15073, and was available for public comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010.

B. The prepared negative declaration for the Project concludes that all identified environmental impacts that would result from the project would be at a less than significant level.

C. 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.

D. That when considering the whole record for the draft Initial Study and 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 involves no new construction or site alteration. The California Department of Fish and Game approved a "CEQA Filing Fee No Effect Determination" on January 6, 2010.

F. 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 with the City's General Plan as follows:

A. The General Plan contains relevant Goals and Policies in the Economic Development Element. Economic Development Goal ED1 is "to create in El Segundo a strong, healthy economic community in which all diverse stakeholders may benefit." The General Plan land use re-designation will contribute towards this goal by creating a larger contiguous land area with a consistent land use designation. Having a larger area that could potentially be redeveloped as part of a project could aid in future re-utilization and redevelopment of the site in conjunction with adjacent identically zoned parcels. Creating this re-development potential for the greater area contributes towards a strong and healthy economic community.

B. Economic Development Policy ED1-2.2, states the City seeks to "maintain and promote land uses that improve the City's tax base, balancing economic development and quality of life goals." Re-designating this property Corporate Office is consistent with this policy as the action could potentially facilitate future office development at the site that could improve the City's tax base. This action is also consistent with the policy of balancing economic development with quality of life goals as the Project Site is located in a commercial part of the City and thus will have little potential to negatively impact residential uses.

C. Implementation of the proposed project will meet relevant objectives of the Land Use Element. Implementation of the project will help achieve Land Use Element Objective LU1-2, which is to "prevent deterioration and blight throughout the City." A consistent land use designation which is uniform with adjacent parcels could aid in the redevelopment of the site in conjunction with neighboring parcels if the current legal non-conforming light industrial use were to cease operations. Thus designating this property with the same land use as directly abutting properties could avoid future deterioration and blight of this area.
D. Land Use Element Objective LU1-3 allows “for the continued operation and orderly conversion of existing uses as they change to conform with the new land use designations.” This Project allows for the continued operation of the air cargo container repair facility located at the site. The proposed land use designation will contribute to the orderly conversion of the existing use to a use compatible with surrounding parcels as the proposed designation will be consistent with both the land use designation of adjacent parcels and the current uses located on neighboring parcels. The general plan land use re-designation will help facilitate an orderly conversion to a new use if the existing use ceases to operate.

E. Land Use Element Objective LU4-3 provides “for new office and research and development uses.” The proposed land use designation will facilitate future redevelopment of the Project site for both office and research and redevelopment uses.

SECTION 5: Approvals. The City Council makes the following approvals:

A. The City Council adopts the Findings of Fact as set forth in Exhibit “A” which are incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

B. The City Council amends the proposed Land Use Plan (“Northeast Quadrant” subsection) of the Land Use Element of the General Plan to reflect the change of the Project Site, which fronts East Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street to the east, from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Land Use Element as set forth in attached Exhibit “B,” which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

C. The City Council amends the 1992 General Plan Summary of Existing Trends Buildout (Exhibit LU-3) of the Land Use Element to reflect the change of the Project Site, which fronts Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street to the east, from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Land Use Element as set forth in attached Exhibit “C,” which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

D. The City Council amends the General Plan Land Use Map to reflect the change of the Project Site, which fronts Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street to the east, from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Land Use Map as set forth in attached Exhibit “D,” which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

E. As set forth in Ordinance No. _______, the City Council amends the current Zoning Map to reflect a change of the Project Site, which fronts Imperial Avenue to the north and Selby Street to the east, from General
Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Zoning Map are set forth in Exhibit “A” to Ordinance No. _________.

SECTION 6: 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 7: 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 lack of 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 8: 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 9: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 10: A copy of this Resolution must be mailed to Satco Inc., and to any other person requesting a copy.
SECTION 11: This Resolution is the City Council's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 2nd day of FEBRUARY 2010.

______________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

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

I, Cindy Mortensen, 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 2nd day of February 2010, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Cindy Mortensen, City Clerk

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

By: ____________________________
    Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. ____

Exhibit A

After receiving, reviewing, and considering all the information in the administrative record for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 852), General Plan Amendment No. 09-01, and Zone Change No. 09-01, 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 Satco Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment 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 decision-making body can 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 Negative Declaration and the record of proceedings for the Satco Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment project do not identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant environmental effects of the Satco Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment project with respect to the areas listed below.

1. Aesthetics.
2. Agricultural Resources.
3. Air Quality.
4. Biological Resources.
5. Cultural Resources.
11. Recreation.

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 Negative Declaration, and the record of proceedings for the Satco Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment project do not identify or contain substantial evidence identifying significant environmental effects of the Satco Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment project with respect to the areas listed below.

1. Geology and Soils.
2. Land Use and Planning.
4. Transportation and Traffic.

C. **Insignificant Cumulative Impacts.**

The City Council finds that the 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 Satco Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment 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
16. Utilities and Service Systems

VI. **SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.**

The City Council finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Negative Declaration, which are 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.
El Segundo General Plan Land Use Element Excerpt - Page 3-11

Proposed Land Use Plan
Northeast Quadrant

On the 1992 Land Use Plan, the majority of the northeast quadrant is designated either Corporate Office (218.4 ac) or Urban Mixed-Use (232.5 ac). The Corporate Campus Specific Plan (46.5 ac) also allows a mixture of office and commercial uses. Corporate Office allows a mixture of office uses with retail in the lobby. This designation covers the "Superblock Area" and will allow uses similar to those currently in that area. (Ord. 1345, GPA 01-2, 1/2/02)
1992 General Plan
Summary of Existing Trends Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>357.2</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family Residential</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Residential</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>85&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Commercial</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>383,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>1,618,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Office</td>
<td>218.4</td>
<td>247&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12,600,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoky Hollow</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2,019,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mixed-Use North</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,166,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mixed-Use South</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,997,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Street Specific Plan</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Specific Plan</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>232&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,145,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Campus Specific Plan</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>356.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,529,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and Railroad R.O.W</td>
<td>442.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3,494.3</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>$57,088,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Projection 17,287

<sup>1</sup> Existing construction and recently constructed, renovated commercial centers and legal non-conforming residential uses at densities that are currently higher than allowed by the land use designations in this plan will not realistically be converted to mixed commercial/residential uses and these buildings are expected to remain for the life of the Plan.

<sup>2</sup> The heavy industrial shown on this plan includes the Chevron Refinery and former Southern California Edison Generation Station. These facilities have processing equipment and tanks rather than buildings and are expected to remain for the life of the Plan. Therefore, no estimated building square footage is shown.
ORDINANCE NO. ___

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE NO. 09-01 FOR THE SATCO, INC PROPERTY (1916 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY (ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 4138-005-042) AND ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 4138-005-057).

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On October 22, 2009, the City of El Segundo filed an application for an Environmental Assessment (EA-852), General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 09-01) and Zone Change (ZC No. 09-01) to re-designate and rezone an approximately 1.26-acre property at the southwest corner of Selby Street and Imperial Highway;

B. The applications from the City of El Segundo were reviewed by the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

C. 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);

D. An Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. A Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010;

E. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before the Planning Commission for January 14, 2010. Following the January 14th public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt this Ordinance;

F. On February 2, 2010 the City Council held a public hearing and considered the information provided by City staff and public testimony; and
G. This Ordinance and its findings are made based upon testimony and evidence presented to the Council at its February 2, 2010 hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Department of Planning and Building Safety.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings and Conclusions. The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. The factual findings and conclusions set forth in Resolution No. _____, adopted on February 2, 2010, are incorporated as if fully set forth.

SECTION 3: Zone Change Findings.

A. Based on the factual findings and conclusions of this Ordinance, the proposed Zone Change is necessary to carry out the proposed project because the proposed General Plan Amendment would change the land use classification on portions of the project site from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The proposed Zone Change is necessary to maintain consistency with the proposed General Plan land uses designation of Corporate Office.

B. ESMC Title 15 is intended to be the primary tool for implementing the goals, objectives and policies of the El Segundo General Plan. The zone change will maintain consistency with the proposed change in General Plan land use designation to Corporate Office and also is consistent with the General Plan goals, objectives and policies discussed in Section 4 of Resolution No. _____, adopted on February 2, 2010, which is incorporated as if fully set forth.

Section 4: Approvals. The City Council amends the current Zoning Map to reflect a change of the Project Site, which fronts East Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street to the east, from General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO). The corresponding changes to the Zoning Map as set forth in attached Exhibit “A,” which is incorporated into this Ordinance by reference.

SECTION 5: Environmental Assessment. Resolution No. _____ adopted an Negative Declaration 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 6: 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 7: 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 8: 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 9: Effective Date. This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first (31st) day following its passage and adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 2nd day of February 2010.

__________________________
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 ____ day of February 2010, 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 ____ day of February, 2010, 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
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1916 E. Imperial Highway
Proposed Zone Change
Zoning Map

City of El Segundo
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
PLANNING AND BUILDING SAFETY DEPARTMENT
El Segundo, CA  90245

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

PROJECT No. EA 852

I. BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: Proposed SATCO property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California, 90245

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Masa Alkire, AICP, Principal Planner; (310) 524-2371

4. Project Location: As shown in Figure 1, Regional and Project Vicinity Map, the site is comprised of parcels APN 4138-005-042 (49,658 sf.) and 4138-005-057 (5345 sf.) including a total of 55,003 square feet. The larger parcel has an address of 1916 East Imperial Highway. The Project Site is located at the southwest corner of East Imperial Highway and North Selby Street. It is adjacent to the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) to the north, Selby Street to the east and a portion of the Boeing Company campus to the west and south. The Project Site is located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of downtown El Segundo. Regional access to the Project Site and vicinity is provided from the Century Freeway (I-105), located north of the Project Site. Major arterials providing access to the Project Site include Sepulveda Boulevard and Imperial Highway located to the west and north of the Project Site, respectively.

This area of El Segundo is characterized by dense urban development including a mix of commercial, office, and manufacturing land uses. The Project Site is a SATCO Inc. air freight container repair facility. It primarily repairs shipping containers for commercial haulers. The site is developed with a 27,918 sf. structure built in 1958. Refer to Figure 1 Project Location Map and Figures 2 and 3, Views of the Project Site.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California, 90245

6. General Plan Designation: General Commercial

7. Zoning: General Commercial (C3)
8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including without limitation later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)

A general plan amendment from General Commercial to Corporate Office and a zone change from General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO) was approved in September 2009 for Boeing owned property directly to the west and south of the Project Site. This zone change and general plan amendment has facilitated the expansion of Boeing Company operations on the neighboring Boeing owned property. The Boeing Company is now in the process of converting and expanding existing buildings on the neighboring property into additional office space.

The subject property is the only property on the block bounded by Sepulveda Boulevard to the West, Imperial Boulevard to the North, Selby Street to the East and Walnut Avenue to the South with a General Commercial General Plan land use designation and a General Commercial (C-3) zoning designation as a result of the Boeing Company zone change and general plan re-designation. The 1992 General Plan Land Use Element had identified both the Boeing site and the subject site as an area that is currently used for office but the General Commercial Designation would allow the site to be used for retail commercial use. Now that the Boeing Company is in the process of substantially remodeling its site as corporate office, it is unlikely that the subject site would convert from its legal non-conforming industrial use into a retail commercial use. The City initiated the general plan amendment and zoning re-designation for the subject site to accomplish zoning uniformity for parcels on the southern corner of the Imperial Highway and Sepulveda Boulevard intersection. The proposed re-designation would change the General Plan designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office and the zoning from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the Corporate Office (CO) Zone. The General Plan and Zoning Designation would be consistent for all property in the entire block bounded by Sepulveda Boulevard, Imperial Avenue, Selby Street, and Walnut Avenue.

This Project application includes:

- Environmental Assessment
- General Plan Amendment from General Commercial to Corporate Office
- Zone Change from C3 to CO

No physical changes to the Project Site are proposed as part of this application. SATCO intends to continue its legal non-conforming air cargo container repair facility operations at the site. The change is zoning and general plan designation will not have an effect on the continued operations of this repair facility in the existing 27,918 square-foot building on the site.

The current General Commercial General Plan designation and General Commercial (C-3) zoning allows for general office (not exceeding 5,000 square feet), hotels/motels, medical-dental offices and facilities, public uses, recreational facilities, restaurants/cafes, and retail uses (excluding off-site alcohol sales). The C-3 Zone has a minimum required lot size is 10,000 square feet, the maximum building height is 200 feet and the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) is 1:1. The proposed Corporate Office General Plan designation and Corporate Office (CO) zoning allows for general office, medical-dental offices, public uses, recreational facilities, research and development uses (east of Sepulveda Blvd.) and restaurant/cafes. The CO designation allows for a mixture of office and food serving uses in single and multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in building lobbies. The CO Zone has a minimum required lot size is 10,000 square-feet, the maximum building height is 200 feet and the maximum FAR of 0.8:1.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings)*

This area of El Segundo is characterized by dense urban development including a mix of commercial, office, manufacturing, and residential land uses. The areas to the west, southwest, and south of the Project Site are zoned Corporate Office (CO); the area east of the Project Site is zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1). LAX is directly north of the Project Site, across East Imperial Highway. Abutting the Project Site to the west and south is the recently rezoned Boeing site. Further west of that site, on the northeast corner of Sepulveda Boulevard and East Imperial Highway, is an office building occupied by AIS Auto Insurance and an office building containing ground level retail consisting mainly of casual dining restaurants with Cars Direct occupying the offices on the upper floors. South of the neighboring Boeing site, on the southeast corner of East Walnut Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard, is an office building owned by the Trammell Crow Company. East of this office building is a multi-level parking structure. All other buildings located along the south side of Walnut Avenue and all uses located on the east side of Selby Street, directly east of the Project Site are Boeing properties containing offices, various associated buildings, and parking facilities. Figures 4 and 5 depict views of the land uses surrounding the Project Site.

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

The City of El Segundo is the lead agency for the Project. Responsible agencies may include, without limitation:

- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Caltrans
- Los Angeles World Airports
- City of Los Angeles
- County of Los Angeles / Airport Land Use Commission
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- West Basin Municipal Water District
Figure 1 - Project Location Map with Zoning Designations

ZONING DESIGNATIONS

COMMERCIAL
- Downtown Commercial (C-RS)
- Neighborhood Commercial (C-2)
- General Commercial (C-3)
- Commercial Center (C-4)
- Corporate Office (CO)
- Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N)
- Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S)
- Parking (P)

INDUSTRIAL
- Light Industrial (M-1)
- Heavy Industrial (M-2)
- Small Business (SB)
- Medium Manufacturing (MM)

PUBLIC USE
- Public Facilities (P-F)

RESIDENTIAL
- Single-Family Residential (R-1)
- Two-Family Residential (R-2)
- Multi-Family Residential (R-3)

OPEN SPACE
- Open Space (O-S)
Figure 2 – View of the Northeast Corner of the Project Site.

Figure 3 – View from Northwest corner of the Project Site.
Figure 4 – View to the North of the Project Site towards Imperial Highway and the elevated Interstate 105 Freeway.

Figure 5 – View of properties to the East of the Project Site.
II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AffECTED:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. DETERMINATION:

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

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Kimberly Christensen, AICP  
Planning Manager  
Planning and Building Safety Department  
City of El Segundo  

December 2, 2009
IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

(a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

(b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

(c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
V. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. AESTHETICS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
The Project Site itself does not contain any unique natural or urban features or views which could be considered especially valuable. The Project Site is located in a highly developed portion of the Los Angeles metropolitan region within the City of El Segundo. The Project Site does not afford views of scenic vistas due to its location in a relatively flat area of the City of El Segundo and surrounding development. The Santa Monica Mountains are located to the north of the Project Site, the Baldwin Hills are located to the northeast of the Project Site, while the Palos Verdes Hills are located south of the Project Site. However, views of these topographic features are entirely obstructed by area development, including the Century Freeway (I-105), the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), and multi-story development in the Project vicinity. Consequently, these topographic features do not present scenic vistas. Public areas in the vicinity of the Project Site are limited to area roadways. The Project Site is currently developed with a single-story industrial building. The zone change and general plan amendment will not affect the continued use or configuration of the existing building. Any subsequent development of the site would require CEQA review. Under the proposed zoning, the maximum allowed Floor Area Ratio will be reduced and the maximum height of the building will remain the same as allowed in the C-3 Zone. The proposed Project does not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, without limitation trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
The Project Site is not located along a State scenic highway. The Project does not alter the appearance of the Project Site. The Project Site and the surrounding area are completely urbanized, the Project Site does not contain rock outcroppings. There is no vegetation on the Project Site. Additionally, as discussed below in the response to Question 5(a), there are no historic buildings existing on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not impact scenic resources, including, without limitation, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
The visual character of the Project area is that of a highly developed urban area. Single- and multi-story commercial, warehouse, and industrial buildings, as well as transportation infrastructure, are present within the vicinity of the Project Site. Imperial Highway and Interstate I-105, an elevated freeway structure, are located north of the Project Site. LAX is located further north and consists of runways, airport equipment and machinery, and terminal buildings. The buildings of the area range from multi-story commercial and office buildings to low-rise industrial and office structures with relatively large building footprints. The building on the Project Site is a one-story industrial building. No construction impacts will occur from this project as there is no construction associated with this project that could potentially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. There are no changes to the operations of the facility proposed as
part of the Project. The existing industrial facility will continue to operate at the site. If, at a future
date, the site is re-developed consistent with the proposed Corporate Office Zone, environmental
evaluation consistent with CEQA will be required. The Project, as proposed, would not impact the
visual character or quality of the site and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or
nighttime views in the area?

Shade/Shadow
There would be no change in the size, mass, and height of any structure on the Project Site.
Accordingly, there will be no additional shade or shadow generated by the Project. CEQA review
is required for any future development on the site. The Project would not create a new source of
shadow and no mitigation measures are required.

Glare/Artificial Light
The will be no change in building materials or light sources on the Project Site as no new
development is proposed. Therefore, the Project would not result in any glare or create a new
source of substantial light and no mitigation measures are required.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

| In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
The Project Site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of El Segundo and is not developed for agricultural use and is not zoned for agricultural use. Nor is the Project Site designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection; the Project Site is located in an area designated as Urban and Built Up Land. Therefore, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. Thus, the Project would not result in impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

---

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
The Project Site is zoned General Commercial (C3) which does not permit agricultural uses and is not under contract pursuant to the Williamson Act. The Project would rezone the site Corporate Office (CO), a zoning designation which also does not permit agricultural uses. Thus, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. Thus, the Project would not result in impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
As noted, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City of El Segundo and does not contain any agricultural uses, nor are any agricultural uses located in the vicinity of the Project Site. Thus, development of the Project would not convert any farmland to non-agricultural uses. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. AIR QUALITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with applicable Air Quality Management Plans or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. In the case of projects proposed within the City of El Segundo, the applicable plan is the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which is prepared by the South Coast Air Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. The most recent AQMP adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on June 1, 2007. Criteria for determining consistency with the 2007 AQMP are defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook. There are two key indicators of consistency, discussed below:

- **Criterion No. 1.** The Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.

The Project does not involve new construction or any change in operation of the existing facility, therefore the Project would not result in new impacts with respect to construction and operation. The Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards. Therefore, the Project would comply with Criterion No. 1.
- **Criterion No. 2.** The Project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2010 or increments based on the year of project build-out phase.

This criterion requires that the Project would not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP, which are based on Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) 2004 Regional Transportation Plan population, housing, and employment projections. SCAG forecasts that, by the year 2010, the City of El Segundo will provide employment for 66,699 persons. By the year 2015, SCAG projects that the City will provide employment for 68,213 persons, an increase of 2.3 percent over the year 2010 forecast. Further, SCAG forecasts employment for 69,682 persons by the year 2020.\(^2\) The Project does not involve new construction or any change to the current operation of the facility. Furthermore, the proposed zoning for the site would reduce the total development allowed on the site from a floor area ratio of 1.0 to 0.8, which would reduce the future potential build-out of the Project Site. Any future development at the Project Site would be subject to a full CEQA analysis. Thus, the Project would be within SCAG’s growth forecasts included in the AQMP and as such, would comply with Criterion No. 2.

b) **Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.**

*Construction and Operational Emissions*

The Project does not involve new construction or any change in operation of the existing facility, thus the Project will not by itself violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

*Global Climate Change*

State of California regulations seek to reduce the effects of global climate change in statutes and Executive Orders: Executive Order S-3-05: Health and Safety Code Section 38500, *et seq.*, and Health and Safety Code §§ 42823 and 43018.5. These regulations recognize global climate change as a significant threat to California and therefore certain guidelines must be enacted to limit the production of greenhouse gases. The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Health and Safety Code §§ 38500, *et seq.*) became effective on January 1, 2007. It seeks to reduce California’s greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Project involves no construction or change in operations to the existing facility. Thus the proposed zoning change would not generate any new emissions and therefore not contribute to the production of greenhouse gasses. If, at a future date, a project is proposed under the Corporate Office (CO) Zone, the Project would be subject to a full CEQA analysis including a review of any climate change impacts.

c) **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

A significant impact may occur if the Project would add a considerable cumulative contribution to federal or State non-attainment pollutants. The SCAQMD states that if an individual development project generates less than significant construction or operational emissions then the development project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment. The Project would not generate any construction or operational emissions and there is not a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of the pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment.

d) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors are populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the population at large. The SCAQMD

\(^2\) *Local Review Form, Socioeconomic Trend Projections for the 2004 RTP for El Segundo City, SCAG, November 2002.*
identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. Currently, land uses immediately surrounding the Project Site include commercial, manufacturing, office, and parking uses. These uses are not sensitive receptors. Furthermore, the Project will not contribute to the production of new pollutants as no new construction or changes to existing operations at the site are proposed. Therefore, it can be determined that the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
A significant impact may occur if objectionable odors occur which would adversely impact sensitive receptors. Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. As the Project involves only a change in zoning and general plan designation, and does not involve construction or any new operations at the site, no new objectionable odors will result from approval of the Project. Therefore it can be determined that there are no Project impacts associated with objectionable odors and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. The Project Site does not contain any

---

3 South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993, pages 5-1.
species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.\(^4\) Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Wildlife Service? The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. No known riparian habitat or other locally or regionally designated sensitive natural communities exist on or adjacent to the Project Site.\(^5\) Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, without limitation, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. No federally protected wetlands (e.g., marsh, vernal pool, coastal) occur on or in the vicinity of the Project Site.\(^6\) Therefore, the Project would not result in the direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption of a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. There is no native habitat on the Project Site, nor does the Project Site function as part of a wildlife corridor due to its urbanized development. Therefore, the Project would not interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinances? The Project Site does not contain any protected biological resources or tree species that are considered sensitive. Additionally, no alterations to street trees are proposed thus there is no conflict with the City's adopted Street Tree Policies. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting or preserving biological resources. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.


f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
The Project Site is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. No locally designated natural communities are known to occur on or adjacent to the Project Site. No Habitat Conservation or Natural Conservation Community Plans exist in the City of El Segundo. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with provisions of any such plans. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?
According to Los Angeles County Tax Assessor records, the building on the Project Site was built in 1959. Consequently, the building meets the minimum fifty-year age requirement for consideration as a landmark at the national or state levels. However, due to design, use, and condition, it appears that the building would not be eligible for landmark designation at the national, state, or local levels due to a lack of architectural character. Additionally, no alteration of the building is proposed as a result of this Project. Therefore, no impacts with respect to historical resources will occur as a result of this Project and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
The Project Site is located in an urbanized area which was previously disturbed by past development. Any surficial archaeological resources which may have existed at one time have likely been previously unearthed or disturbed. Four surveys and/or excavations were conducted within the City boundaries, including an area encompassing the northern boundary of the Project Site. Only one of the four areas surveyed, located on LAX property approximately 1.35 miles northwest of the Project Site, was determined to be of archaeological significance. This site was found to contain shell remains, however, no tools or other prehistoric cultural debris were discovered. Thus, the Project Site is not located in a designated archaeologically sensitive area. No excavation or grading will occur as a result of this project therefore there no substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource will occur as a result of this project and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
The Project does not involve excavation or grading thus the project will not result in the uncovering significant paleontological materials. The Project will not directly or indirectly destroy

---


8 City of El Segundo General Plan EIR, Figure 4.11-1, Archaeologically Sensitive Areas, EIP Associates, December 1991.

a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
As discussed above, no excavations are associated with the Project therefore there is no likelihood of encountering human remains as part of this Project. The Project will not disturb human remains and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

iv) Landslides?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Be located on expensive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risk to life or property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The Project Site is located within the seismically active Southern California region and is subject to similar risks as other structures in the vicinity of the Project Site. According to the City of El Segundo General Plan EIR (General Plan EIR), no known active or potentially active faults are located on or near the Project Site. The closest known fault is the Charnock fault, which is related to the Newport-Inglewood fault system, located approximately 1.5 miles east of the Project Site. Further, the City of El Segundo does not contain any Alquist-Priolo

---

10 FEIR, Boeing Selby Block Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment, October 2009.
Earthquake Fault Zones. The Project does not involve any new construction or remodeling of existing buildings. Therefore, impacts associated with risk of surface rupture due to faulting would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
The Project Site is located within the seismically active Southern California region and is subject to similar risks as other locations in the vicinity of the Project Site. The Project Site could experience effects of ground shaking resulting from activity on Southern California fault systems. No new construction is proposed as part of this Project. Any future construction project would require CEQA review and would be subject to the California Building Code which regulates the design of buildings to resist forces generated by major earthquakes. Since the Project involves no new construction, potential ground shaking impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
Liquefaction is a condition in which soil undergoes continued deformation at a constant low residual stress due to the build-up of high porewater pressures. The possibility of liquefaction occurring at a given site is dependent upon the occurrence of a significant earthquake in the vicinity, sufficient groundwater to cause high pore pressures, and on the grain size, relative density, and confining pressures of the soil at the site. The General Plan EIR indicates that the Project Site has a low liquefaction potential. Since the Project involves no new construction, potential liquefaction associated with the Project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

(iv) Landslides?
The Project Site and surrounding areas are relatively flat and are completely developed. According to the Los Angeles County Seismic Hazards Map the Project Site is not located in an area identified as having potential for landslides. Therefore, no impacts with respect to landslides are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
The Project Site is relatively flat and developed with a building and paving. No construction or ground disturbance is proposed as part of the Project. Therefore, no impacts with respect to soil erosion are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
The relatively flat Project Site is already developed with a building and paving. No new construction or ground disturbance is proposed as part of the Project. Therefore, no impacts to a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and no potential result of an on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
The relatively flat Project Site is already developed with a building and paving. The existing soil composition may contain soil with the potential to be expansive. However, since the Project

---

involves no new construction or change of use, potential location on expansive soil associated with the project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? The Project involves no new construction. The existing structure on the Project Site is connected to the existing sewer infrastructure. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?**
The Project does not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials as the Project does not involve any new construction or change in the existing business operations at the site. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?**
The Project only involves a general plan amendment and changing the zoning of the Project Site. This Project involves no physical transportation of materials that could lead to an accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? The Project only involves a general plan amendment and changing the zoning designation of the Project Site. The Project involves no physical use or transportation of hazardous materials that could lead emission near a school. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? Government Code § 65962.5 requires various State agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized releases from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells, and solid waste facilities from which there is known migration of hazardous waste and submit such information to the Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. The Project Site is not located on the Department of Toxic Substance Control EnviroStor database. As the site is not included on the hazardous materials sites database no impact will occur and no mitigation measures are required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Site? The Project Site is located within the boundaries of the LAX Planning Boundary. The general plan amendment and zone change do not involve any change in allowable building height. CEQA review is required for any future development at the site which would analyze safety in light of the site’s proximity to LAX. No impacts will occur and no mitigation measures are required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not result in airport-related safety hazards related to private airstrips for the people residing or working in the area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? As the Project involves no physical change to the Project Site, the Project will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? The Project Site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of El Segundo, which does not contain any wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

There is no new construction associated with the Project therefore there are no construction impacts that could affect water quality standards or waste discharge. The Project will not affect the existing operations of the site so no new long-term operational impacts to water quality or waste discharge will occur as a result of this Project. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The Project involves no construction that could lead to degradation of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Additionally the Project Site is almost completely covered with impermeable surfaces (building and paved surfaces). Thus, almost all on-site stormwater drains into the City stormwater drainage system and does not enter the groundwater supply. Similarly, no groundwater wells are located on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would neither increase the amount of stormwater entering the groundwater table, nor deplete groundwater through wells. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

The Project involves no construction and will not alter the existing drainage pattern. Water would continue to drain to the street and existing storm drains to avoid Project Site flooding. There are no impacts associated with the siltation and/or erosion due to altered drainage patterns and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?

The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and is served by existing City storm drain infrastructure. The Project Site is not located adjacent to any stream or river, and project runoff would continue to drain into existing City storm drain infrastructure. The Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern and would not increase the amount of impermeable surfaces on the site. Therefore, the Project will not result in flooding due to altered drainage patterns and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

The Project does not involve construction or earthmoving activities therefore there are no construction related polluted run-off impacts associated with the Project and no mitigation measures are required. The general plan amendment and zone change actions will not change the operation of the existing facility at the site therefore the general plan amendment and zone change actions will have no operational impacts regarding polluted run-off and no mitigations are required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

There are no physical alterations to the environment associated with this Project. Accordingly, there will be no substantial degradation to water quality associated with this Project. Mitigation measures are not required.

g) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

The Project does not include the construction of housing and the new proposed zoning designation and general plan land use designation do not allow housing. Furthermore, the Project Site is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

The Project Site is not located in a FEMA 100-year floodplain. As such, the Project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, the Project would not introduce structures to an area of high flood risk such that flows would be impeded or redirected, and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

There are no levees or dams in the Project vicinity. Additionally, the Project Site is not located in a FEMA 100-year floodplain. Therefore, no impact associated with flooding, including flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam, would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

---

j) **Inundation by selche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

The Project Site is located at approximately 100 feet above sea level, and is thus, not at risk of being inundated by a tsunami. Additionally, the Project Site is located approximately 0.5 miles east of the Tsunami High Water Mark and Danger Area, as delineated on the Tsunami Run-Up Map contained in the City of El Segundo Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.\(^{17}\) The closest body of water to the Project Site is the Pacific Ocean, which is located approximately 2.3 miles west of the Project Site. Since the Project Site is not located in close proximity to a contained body of water, there is no potential impact associated with a selche or tsunami. With respect to the potential impact from a mudflow, the Project Site is relatively flat and is surrounded by urban development; it does not contain any sources of mudflow. There are no major hills or steep slopes in the project vicinity. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to risk of loss, injury, or death by selche, tsunami, or mudflow. No mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 LAND USE AND PLANNING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

The size of the Project Site is not of the scale that could physically divide an established community. The Project Site is located within an urban area and is consistent with the existing physical arrangement of the properties within the vicinity of the Project Site. There would be no alteration to the vehicle or pedestrian network as a result of this Project. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the Project. The Project will make the zoning designation and general plan land use designation consistent with directly abutting sites. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

b) **Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, without limitation the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

The Project Site is subject to the development regulations and policies set forth in the El Segundo General Plan and zoning regulations (ESMC Title 15). The General Plan Land Use Map designates the Project Site as General Commercial. This designation permits all retail uses, including hotel uses, and medical and dental facilities, with a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1:1. Consistent with the General Plan, the Project Site is currently zoned General Commercial (C3) under the ESMC. The C3 designation allows for general office (not exceeding 5,000 square feet), hotels/motels, medical-dental offices and facilities, public uses, recreational facilities, restaurants/cafes, and retail uses (excluding off-site alcohol sales). The minimum required lot area is 10,000 square feet with a maximum building height of 200 feet. Consistent with the General Commercial land use designation under the General Plan, the maximum FAR under the C3 zoning designation is 1:1.

The full scope of the Project is a zone change from General Commercial (C3) to Corporate Office (CO) and a corresponding General Plan land use designation change from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The Corporate Office land use designation under the General Plan permits a mixture of office and food serving uses in single- or multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in the lobby area. Research and development uses are also permitted east of Sepulveda Boulevard. The maximum allowable FAR under this designation is 0.8:1. Permitted uses within the CO Zone include general office, medical-dental offices, public uses, recreational facilities, research and development uses, and restaurants/cafes. The minimum required lot area for this zone is 10,000 square feet with a maximum building height of 200 feet. Consistent with the Corporate Office land use designation under the General Plan, the maximum FAR under the CO zoning designation is 0.8:1.

The City initiated the zone change and general plan land use designation change for this site would make the zoning and general plan designations uniform with the rest of the block bounded by Selby Street, Imperial Highway, Walnut Avenue, and Sepulveda Boulevard. The intent of the Project is to have consistent zoning applied to the general area in which the Project Site is located. Therefore, with approval of the proposed CO zone change and the corresponding land use designation change, the Project would not conflict with the City of El Segundo General Plan or the ESMC and would be in compliance with all ESMC requirements. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community’s conservation plan?
The Project is located within an urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and paved surfaces. As discussed in 4(a), the Project Site is not identified as being within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan; as such, the Project would not conflict with any such plans. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 MINERAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
The Project Site is currently developed with industrial uses and paved surfaces. No classified or designated mineral deposits of regional or statewide significance are known to occur on the Project Site.\(^{18}\) No oil wells exist or are known to have previously existed on the Project Site.\(^{19}\) Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.


\(^{19}\) City of El Segundo GIS records, Oil and Gas Well Locations.
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

The Project Site is not delineated as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site on any City plans.20 Further, as discussed in the response to Question 10(a) above, no oil wells exist or are known to have previously existed on the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 NOISE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

The general plan amendment and zone change involve no construction or operational changes at the site. Therefore the Project will not by itself result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of City adopted standards. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

The general plan amendment and zone change involve no construction or operational changes at the site. Therefore the Project will not by itself result in exposure of persons to groundborne vibration or noise levels. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The general plan amendment and zone change will not change the operation of the current industrial facility at the site thus would not contribute to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels and no mitigation measures are required.

---

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
There is no construction associated with the Project and no changes to the current operations of the industrial facility will occur as a result of the Project. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Site to excessive noise levels?
The Project Site is located immediately south of LAX on Imperial Highway. However, the Project would not introduce any permanent populations to the Project Site that could be affected by excessive noise levels from aircraft. The Project would amend the general plan and change the zoning designation from one commercial zoning designation to another zoning designation with a very similar set of allowed uses. Thus, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Site to excessive noise levels?
The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
The Project does not include any residential land uses and, therefore, would not result in a direct population increase from construction of new homes. Further, the Project does not include the extension of roads or other infrastructure. Since the Project does not involve any new construction or expand the total floor area allowed to be constructed at the site (FAR is being reduced), the Project will not lead to an indirect population increase by intensifying the amount of commercial development in the City. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
There are no existing residential uses on the Project Site. No housing would be displaced by development of the Project and no impact is anticipated. No mitigation measures are required.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
As discussed in the response to Question 12(b) above, there are currently no residential uses on the Project Site. As such, no persons would be displaced as a result of implementation of the Project. Therefore, no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
### 13 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) **Fire protection?**

Fire-protection services at the Project Site are provided by the El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD). The ESFD maintains two stations; Station No. 1 - located on 314 Main Street, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project Site, and Station No. 2 - located on 2161 El Segundo Boulevard, approximately 1 mile south of the Project Site. Additionally, a new station is being built on the El Segundo Campus site, approximately 0.5 miles southeast of the Project Site. Furthermore, the ESFD has mutual aid agreements with the Cities of Los Angeles, Torrance, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, and Manhattan Beach, and the County of Los Angeles.21 The Project will not change the operations of the current facility and involves no new construction. There are no impacts to current fire protection service and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Police protection?**

Police protection is provided to the Project Site and the surrounding area by the El Segundo Police Department (ESPD). The ESPD Headquarters, which serves the project area, is located at 348 Main Street, approximately 1.6 mile southeast of the Project Site. The Project will not result in any increase in the number of employees at the Project Site and will not generate an increase in the number of service calls from the Project Site. The Project will not create any new impacts to current police protection services and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Schools?**

The Project Site is located within the Wiseburn School District (WSD), which is roughly bounded by Imperial Highway to the north, Inglewood Avenue to the east, Marine Avenue to the south, and Sepulveda Boulevard to the west. In general, the demand for school services is the result of an area's residential population. The Project Site currently does not contain any residential units and would not generate any additional residents, which directly generate school-aged children and a demand for school services. As there is no construction involved

---

with the Project there will be no effect on the enrollment at WSD schools. There are no impacts to school facilities and no impact on school facilities and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?
The City of El Segundo Recreation and Parks Department (ESRPD) manages all municipally owned and operated recreation and park facilities within the City. In general, residential development directly generates demand for recreation and parks facilities. As discussed above, the Project would not generate any additional residents. No new employees at the Project Site will be generated as a result of the Project. The Project would not result in any additional demand for parks and recreational services and, therefore, would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. There is no impact on neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities. No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?
Library services for the Project Site are provided by the El Segundo Public Library, located at 111 W. Mariposa Avenue. In general, residential development results in a direct increase in demand on library services. The Project would not generate new residents; therefore, the Project would not generate an additional need for library space or volumes of permanent collection. There is no impact on library services and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 RECREATION</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

As discussed above, in general, residential development directly generates demand for recreation and parks facilities. No residential development would occur under the Project. Thus, the Project would not intensify the usage of the available park and recreational facilities, and would not create a potentially significant impact. Therefore there are no impacts on existing neighborhood or regional parks and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
The Project does not include construction of on-site recreational amenities. As discussed above, the Project would not result in any additional demand for parks and recreational services and, therefore, would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Cause an Increase in the traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

The Project will not change the operation of the existing industrial facility at the Project Site and therefore there will be no increase in traffic to the Project Site as a result of this Project. The general plan amendment and zone change will decrease the total floor area allowed to be developed at the site from 55,002 square feet to 44,002 square feet. This could potentially reduce the traffic this site could generate in the future, depending on the type and intensity of future development at the site. CEQA review is required for any future development at the site. The Project has a less than significant impact on traffic loads and capacity of the street system and no mitigation measures are required.

**b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) was established to reduce traffic congestion and to provide a mechanism for coordinating land use and development decisions. The Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard intersection in the vicinity of the Project Site is listed as a CMP Arterial Monitoring Station. An impact is considered significant if a project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM Peak Hours. The Project will not change the operation of the existing industrial facility at the Project Site and therefore there will be no increase in traffic to the Project Site as a result of this Project. The zone change will decrease the total floor area allowed to be developed at the site from 55,002 square feet to 44,002 square feet. This could potentially reduce the traffic this site could generate in the future, depending on the type and intensity of future development at the site. CEQA review is required for any future development at the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

The Project Site does not contain any aviation-related uses and the Project does not include development of any aviation-related uses. Due to the nature and scope of the Project, development of the Project would not have the potential to result in a change in air traffic patterns.
at the LAX airport or any other airport in the area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or Incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**
The Project design does not include any sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses. No change in vehicular access to the Project Site will occur. Therefore there are no hazards from design features or incompatible uses and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**
As discussed above, no change to Project Site access will occur. Therefore there is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

f) **Result in inadequate parking capacity?**
No change in operations at the site will occur as a result of this Project, therefore there will be no impact on parking capacity and no mitigation measures are required.

g) **Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**
The Project would not conflict with any adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation. There are no impacts on any policies or programs supporting alternative transportation and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 <strong>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</strong></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**
As the Project involves no construction or physical changes to the current industrial operation therefore no new wastewater will be generated as a result of the Project. There is no impact on the regional water quality control board wastewater treatment requirements and no mitigation measures are required.
b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The City of El Segundo Water Division provides water service to the Project Site. The City purchases water from the West Basin Municipal Water District, a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District from which 100 percent of the City’s potable water is received.\textsuperscript{22} Wastewater treatment in the City is split between the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC), District No. 5. The Project involves no change in the current use of the site and no construction therefore there is no impact on water supply or wastewater treatment facilities and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Stormwater facilities for the portion of the City east of Sepulveda Boulevard, the area in which the Project Site is located, are operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.\textsuperscript{23} The Project will not change the physical configuration of the Project Site, including the amount of impermeable surface. Thus the Project will not change the amount of storm water flows from the site and not require or result in the construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

The Project would not require new or expanded entitlements and therefore the Project will result in no change to the water supply needs for the Project Site. The Project has no impacts and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

The Project involves no construction or change in use at the site and will not generate any wastewater increase. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures would be required.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

The project does not change the current industrial operation of the site therefore there will be no additional solid waste disposal needs associated with the Project. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The site will continue to adhere to all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. There are no impacts from the general plan amendment and zone change and no mitigation measures are required.

\textsuperscript{22} City of El Segundo Water Division, Water, Water Supplies, website: http://www.elsegundo.org/depts/works/water/supplies/default.asp.

\textsuperscript{23} City of El Segundo General Plan EIR, EIP Associates, December 1991.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Does the project:**

a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [X]

b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [X]

c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [X]

---

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?**

The Project is located in a developed and populated urban area. There are no candidate, sensitive, or special status species existing on or adjacent to the Project Site. Additionally, no vegetation, fish, or wildlife habitat exists on the Project Site. Furthermore the Project involves no construction or change in existing use at the site, therefore the Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause such species to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals. There are no structures or artifacts related to California history or prehistory found on the Project Site. No impact would occur.

b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?** ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

A significant impact may occur if a project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the Project Site, would result in impacts, which are less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together. The Project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The Project is consistent with the AQMP and will not hinder the region's ability to meet clean air standards (see Response 3). The Project does not involve any change to the current vehicle traffic to and from the site and will reduce the total potential building development at the site in the future by reducing the allowable floor area on the site. The Project will not result in any construction noise and will not change the operations therefore not result in any additional operational noise at the site. Remaining impacts associated with the Project would either result in no impacts or be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
As noted in the responses to Questions 1 through 16 above, the Project would not result in any significant impacts. Thus, the Project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. No impact would occur.
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January 5, 2010

Masa Alkire
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Subject: Proposed SATCO Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment
SCH#: 2009121005

Dear Masa Alkire:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on January 4, 2010, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Acting Director, State Clearinghouse
**SCH#** 2009121005  
**Project Title** Proposed SATCO Property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment  
**Lead Agency** City of El Segundo, City of

**Type** Neg  
**Description** The proposed project is to change the zoning and general plan designation of the subject property from the General Commercial General Plan designation to Corporate Office and the zoning designation from General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO). The zone change would reduce the allowed Floor Area ratio from 1.0 to 0.8. The intent of this change is to bring the subject property into zoning and general plan consistency with a neighboring property that recently underwent the same zone change and general plan amendment.

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th>Masa Alkire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone</strong></td>
<td>310-524-2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td>Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>350 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zip</strong></td>
<td>90245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>County</strong></th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td>33° 55' 48&quot; N / 118° 23' 42&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Streets</strong></td>
<td>Imperial Highway and Selby Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel No.</strong></td>
<td>4138-005-042, 057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Township** | Range  
| **Section** |  
| **Base** |  |

**Proximity to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Highways</strong></th>
<th>North Sepulveda (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airports</strong></td>
<td>LAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Railways</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterways</strong></td>
<td>Pacific Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td>Center St ES, El Segundo MS, St Anthony Catholic, Richmond St ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>C3 and General Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Issues**

Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Recreation/Parks; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Cumulative Effects; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife

**Reviewing Agencies**

Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission

**Date Received** 12/03/2009  
**Start of Review** 12/03/2009  
**End of Review** 01/04/2010

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING: January 14, 2010

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment (EA) No. 852, General Plan Amendment (GPA 09-01) and Zone Change (ZC 09-01)

APPLICANT: The City of El Segundo

PROPERTY OWNER: Satco Inc.

REQUEST: Change the Zoning of the project site from the General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO) Zone and amend the General Plan Land Use Designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office.

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 1916 East Imperial Highway (Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-042); and Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-057.

I. Introduction

A zone change and general plan amendment from General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO) was approved in September 2009 for Boeing owned property directly to the west and south of the project site. That zone change and general plan amendment facilitated the expansion of Boeing Company operations on the neighboring site. As a result of the zone change and general plan amendment for the neighboring Boeing-owned property, the Satco property has become the only property in the block bound by East Imperial Highway to the north, Sepulveda Boulevard to the west, East Maple Avenue to the south, and Selby Street to the east with a General Plan Land Use Classification of General Commercial and General Commercial (C-3) zoning. When the City Council deliberated and approved the zone change and general plan amendment for the Boeing-owned property, the Council directed staff to bring back a future zone change and general plan amendment for the Satco property in order to ensure consistency for the entire block. The change would make the Satco property consistent with the land use designation and zoning of the
specific block as well as the designation and zoning of this portion of the Sepulveda corridor.

The 1992 General Plan Land Use Element identifies both the Boeing property and the Satco property as areas that should be converted from their current uses to commercial and retail uses. Boeing’s Selby Block project committed that site to office uses for the foreseeable future. Accordingly, it is unlikely that the much smaller Satco property will be converted to a retail use in the future as anticipated by the 1992 General Plan.

No physical changes to the project site are proposed as part of this City initiated action. Satco Inc. intends to continue its legal non-conforming air cargo container repair facility operations at the site. The change in general plan designation and zoning will not have an effect on the continued operations of this repair facility in the existing 27,918 square-foot building on the site. On September 23, 2009, Satco submitted a letter (Exhibit C) confirming that Satco Inc. has no objections to the proposed rezoning contingent on upon the action having no affect on the current legal non-conforming status of the facility and that the action will not impede Satco’s ability to continue its present day operations.

Project Description

The following applications are proposed:

1) Environmental Assessment No. 852 (EA No. 852) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – A 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 December 3, 2009 and ended on January 4, 2010. (Exhibit B).

2) General Plan Amendment (GPA 09-01) – The City has initiated the change request of the General Plan designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The requested designation will bring the General Plan designation of the property into consistency with adjacent parcels (Exhibit D – Applications).

3) Zone Change (ZC 09-01) – Rezone the project site from the General Commercial (CO) Zone to Corporate Office (CO) Zone. The City initiated rezoning will be consistent with the requested General Plan Amendment (Exhibit D – Applications).

The three requests require review by the Planning Commission for recommendations to the City Council.
II. Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider the facts in this report and public testimony, conduct a public hearing, and adopt Resolution No. 2667, recommending that the City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. 852, General Plan Amendment GPA 09-01, Zone Change ZC 09-01, with conditions.

III. Background

Site Description

The project site is located at the southwest corner of Selby Street and Imperial Highway. The relatively flat site has one industrial building located on it. According to Los Angeles County records, the building is currently 27,918 square-feet in size. The exterior surfaces of the Project Site are paved and are currently used for vehicle parking and for staging trucks and air freight containers undergoing repair.

The existing building was built in 1958 by the Horowitz family specifically for food manufacturing. When the building was constructed, the site was zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1). The site has been continuously operated as a light industrial facility since the construction of the building. The building was first uses as a food manufacturing facility until the late 1970s. Then the facility was used by the Hughes Aircraft Company for engineering research offices and as an aerospace manufacturing facility until 1996. Since 1996 the facility has been the site of the current air freight container repair facility. The light industrial use of the site became legal non-conforming in 1992 when the site was rezoned General Commercial as part of the City's General Plan Update.

Surrounding Land Uses

The parcel directly abutting the project site to the west and south is the Boeing property that was rezoned to Corporate Office (CO) in September 2009 and is currently under construction with an expansion of office uses. Across Selby Street to the east of the project site are Boeing Company occupied buildings in the Light Manufacturing (M-1) Zone that contain a mix of office, research and development and industrial uses.

Surrounding land uses are as described in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Imperial Highway (State Route 90) and LAX</td>
<td>City of LA - Airport Airside Zoning (LAX - A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Boeing building S15, Boeing parking lot P15</td>
<td>Light Industrial (M-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Boeing building S21</td>
<td>Corporate Office (CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Boeing building S30; Boeing parking lot P30</td>
<td>Corporate Office (CO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Analysis

The entire block bounded by Sepulveda Boulevard, Imperial Highway, Selby Street and Walnut Avenue was re-zoned General Commercial (C-3) on March 9, 1993 when the City adopted amendments to the City’s zoning regulations to provide consistency with the General Plan the City adopted for the years 1992 to 2010. Prior to this action the Sepulveda facing portion of the block was zoned General Commercial (C-3) and the Selby Street portion of the block was zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1). The approval of the Boeing Selby block project ended the uniform zoning of the block in 2009. The proposed action would again make the entire block have one consistent zoning designation, Corporate Office (CO).

The current General Commercial General Plan designation and General Commercial (C-3) zoning allows for general office (not exceeding 5,000 square feet), hotels/motels, medical and dental offices and facilities, public uses, recreational facilities, restaurants/cafes, and retail uses (excluding off-site alcohol sales) by right. The C-3 Zone has a minimum required lot size of 10,000 square feet, maximum building height of 200 feet, and maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1:1.

The proposed Corporate Office land use designation and zoning would permit a mixture of office and food serving uses in single-tenant or multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in the lobby area. Research and development uses are also permitted east of Sepulveda Boulevard. The maximum allowable FAR under this designation is 0.8:1. Permitted uses within the CO Zone include general office, medical and dental offices, public uses, recreational facilities, research and development uses, and restaurants/cafes. The minimum required lot area for this zone is 10,000 square feet with a maximum building height of 200 feet. Consistent with the Corporate Office land use designation under the General Plan, the maximum FAR under the CO zoning designation is 0.8:1.
The proposed General Plan re-designation and re-zoning would result in a range of uses at the project site that would not conflict with the adjacent uses located on neighboring parcels, which can be characterized as high technology offices, research and manufacturing. The zone change would actually result in a range of uses more consistent with existing surrounding uses than the current C-3 zoning, a zone oriented towards the provision of retail and other consumer-oriented establishments.

The requested zone change is not projected to increase the intensity of potential development at the project site. The re-zoning and General Plan re-designation would actually decrease the allowed floor area ratio (FAR) of the site, reducing it from 1.0 to 0.8. This 20% reduction in allowable floor area results in a reduction of 11,001 square-feet of potential development at the Project Site.

**General Plan Consistency**

If the General Plan Amendment is approved, the land use designation for the project site will be Corporate Office. The project would be consistent with the goals of the City’s adopted General Plan Land Use Element in that a consistent land use designation for the entire block could in the future allow for greater re-development potential for the entire block and thus avoid deterioration and blight if the current non-conforming operation on the site were to cease operation. The Land Use Element also has the specific objective of creating new office and research and development uses. This project would help facilitate a transition of the Project Site to these specifically identified uses if the current use were to cease operation. The Project is also consistent with goals and policies set out in the Economic Development Element. The Project would aid in creating a strong and healthy economic community by facilitating the transition to a more viable economic use of the Site in the future, which in turn will contribute to the City’s future tax base.

The findings of consistency with the General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives are generally set forth in the draft Resolution.

**Zoning Consistency**

If the Zone change is approved, the zoning of the Project Site will be Corporate Office (CO). The project involves no physical changes to the property, so the CO zoning standards will apply to any future new construction on the Project Site and any future uses proposed on the project site. The existing continuing light manufacturing use is considered legal non-conforming. The proposed Project is consistent with the Corporate Office (CO) Zone development standards of the El Segundo Municipal Code. Key aspects of the Corporate Office (CO) zoning that
apply to the two parcels that make up the Project Site are described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>CO ZONE STANDARDS</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>General Offices; Medical-Dental offices; Public uses, including, but not limited to, Fire and Police stations, Post Offices and Libraries; Recreational Facilities (public and private); Research and Development uses, located east of Sepulveda only; Restaurants and Cafes. ESMC §15-5D-2</td>
<td>Existing Legal Non-Conforming Manufacturing Use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>10,000 square-foot minimum. ESMC §15-5D-7(B)</td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-042 49,658 square feet Complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-057 5,345 square feet Legal Non-conforming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>200 feet maximum. ESMC §15-6D-7(C)</td>
<td>One story structure. Complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>25-foot front yard setback required. ESMC §15-5D-7(D)(1)</td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-042 Selby Street Front yard Legal non-conforming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-057 Imperial Highway front yard No structure – not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setbacks</td>
<td>If side setback adjoins a public street, 25-foot setback.</td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-042 Imperial Highway street facing side yard Legal non-conforming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior setbacks - Minimum 15 feet ESMC §15-5D-7(D)(2)</td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-042 South Side setback complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-057 No structure - not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>10 feet required. ESMC §15-5D-7(D)(3)</td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-042 Complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel 4138-005-057 No structure – not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Minimum Lot Frontage | 100 foot requirement. ESMC § 15-5D-7(E) | Parcel 4138-005-042 407.28 feet – Complies.  
| | | Parcel 4138-005-057 20 feet – Legal non-conforming. |
| Floor Area Ratio | 0.8 maximum FAR  
ESMC § 15-5D-7(F) | Parcel 4138-005-042 .56 FAR – complies.  
Parcel 4138-005-057 No structure – complies. |
| Landscaping | Landscaping:  
Purpose of the landscape section is to ensure adequate landscape areas in vehicular use areas, setbacks, building perimeter and property perimeter are provided for all new development.  
ESMC § 15-5D-8 and §15-2-14 | Existing legal non-conforming parking areas and landscaped setback areas exist at the project site. |
| Parking Spaces | Manufacturing - 1 space for each 500 s.f. – 56 spaces  
ESMC §§ 15-5D-9 and 15-15-3(B) | Legal non-conforming parking requirement – 1 space per each 800 s.f. based on 1958 ESMC § 1410. 35 spaces. The approved site plan on file provides more than 35 spaces. |
| Loading Spaces | Two 13’ by 50’ loading spaces are required for CO buildings between 25,001 and 100,000 square feet.  

V. **Environmental Review**

The proposed project has been analyzed for its environmental impacts and an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts was prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code § 15063 (California Environmental Quality Act). A Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA §15070. The draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (Exhibit B) were available for public comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010. No letters of comment were received during the public comment period.

The draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration concluded that no impacts would occur for the following issue areas: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral
Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation and Utilities and Service Systems. The draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration concluded that impacts would be less than significant for the following issue areas: Geology and Soils, Land Use and Planning, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic. A detailed analysis of environmental impacts is provided in the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts.

VI. Application Findings

General Plan Amendment Findings

There are no required findings for a General Plan Amendment. However, an amendment must be internally consistent with the rest of the General Plan. As discussed earlier in the staff report, the proposed Commercial Office General Plan Designation is consistent with the elements of the General Plan. The proposed change in land use designation should also be consistent with the build-out assumptions of the General Plan, including the updated Circulation Element, in that the allowable floor area at the site will be reduced under the proposed land use designation.

Zone Change Findings

The amendments chapter of the ESMC requires the Planning Commission to make the findings that, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, approval of the proposed Zone Change will carry out the general purpose of Title 15 – Zoning Regulations (ESMC §15-26-3B). The purpose section of Title 15 – Zoning Regulations states that “This Title is the primary tool for implementing the goals, objectives and policies of the El Segundo General Plan” (ESMC §15-1-1).

Staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Zone change to the City Council because the project is consistent with the general purpose of Title 15 – Zoning Regulations, as set forth in the draft Resolution.

VII. Conclusion

Based on the analysis contained in this report, staff recommends that the Commission adopt Resolution No. 2667 recommending to the City Council to approve the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for Environmental Assessment No. 852, General Plan Amendment No. 09-01, and Zone Change No. 09-01, subject to the conditions contained therein.
VIII. **Exhibits**

A. Draft Planning Commission Resolution No. 2667 and attachments  
B. Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (ND)  
C. Letter from Satco Inc. dated September 23, 2009  
D. Applications

Prepared by: Masa Alkire, AICP, Principal Planner

Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager  
Planning and Building Safety Department

Greg Carpenter, Director  
Planning and Building Safety Department
RESOLUTION NO. 2667

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 852, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 09-01, AND ZONE CHANGE NO. 09-01 FOR THE SATCO INC. PROPERTY (1916 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY).

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

SECTION 1: The Planning Commission finds and declares that:

A. On October 22, 2009, the City of El Segundo filed an application for an Environmental Assessment (EA-852), General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 09-01) and Zone Change (ZC No. 09-01) to re-designate and rezone an approximately 1.26-acre property at the southwest corner of Selby Street and Imperial Highway.

B. The applications from the City of El Segundo were reviewed by the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

C. 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);

D. An Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. A Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010;

E. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before the Planning Commission for January 14, 2010;

F. On January 14, 2010, 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 and public testimony; and,

G. This Resolution and its findings are made based upon the testimony and evidence presented to the Commission at its January 14, 2010 hearing.
including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

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

A. The 1.26 acre (55,003 square feet) subject property is located in the northeast portion of the City of El Segundo. The site is comprised of two parcels. The first parcel is 1916 East Imperial Highway and the second unaddressed parcel is a former railway right-of-way that is assigned Assessor Parcel Number 4138-005-057. The subject property has lot frontages on East Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street to the east.

B. There is one 27,918 square-foot building located on the parcel addressed 1916 East Imperial Highway. This building was constructed in 1958. The site is the current location of an air cargo container repair facility.

C. The parcel directly abutting the project site to the west and south is owned by the Boeing Company and contains existing and under construction office space, and is located in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone. Across Selby Street to the East are buildings occupied by Boeing Company in the Light Industrial (M-1) Zone that contain a mix of office, research and development, and industrial uses. Los Angeles International Airport is located to the north of the Project Site.

D. The proposed General Plan re-designation and rezoning of the Project Site would change the General Plan land use designation from General Commercial to the Corporate Office designation and rezone the area from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the Corporate Office (CO) Zone.

E. The legal non-conforming use of the Project Site as an air cargo container repair facility will not change as a result of this general plan amendment and zone change request. The current use is considered legal non-conforming within the General Commercial (C-3) Zone and will remain legal non-conforming in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone.

F. The General Plan re-designation and re-zoning will not involve any changes to the existing on-site parking and loading spaces, landscaping, drive aisles, or vehicular access. Vehicular access will continue to be provided from existing curb cuts located on Imperial Highway and Selby Street. The existing 35 parking spaces and loading configuration will remain.

G. The re-zoning and General Plan re-designation would decrease the allowed floor area ratio (FAR) of the Project Site. The FAR will be
reduced from 1.0 to 0.8. The 20% reduction in allowable floor area results in a reduction of 11,001 square feet of potential development at the Project Site. The total development that would be permitted with the proposed General Plan re-designation and re-zoning is 44,002 square feet (0.8 FAR). The existing FAR of the Project Site is 0.51. Therefore, the existing 27,918 square-foot industrial building would not exceed the maximum 0.8 FAR allowed in the proposed General Plan re-designation and re-zoning.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. The Planning Commission 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 an 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. A Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15070. A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §§ 15072 and 15073, and was available for public comment from December 3, 2009 to January 4, 2010.

B. The prepared negative declaration for the Project concludes that all identified environmental impacts that would result from the project would be at a less than significant level. 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 with the City's General Plan as follows:

A. The General Plan contains relevant Goals and Policies in the Economic Development Element. Economic Development Goal ED1 is "to create in El Segundo a strong, healthy economic community in which all diverse stakeholders may benefit." The General Plan land use re-designation will contribute towards this goal by creating a larger contiguous land area with a consistent land use designation. Having a larger area that could potentially be redeveloped as part of a project could aid in future re-utilization and redevelopment of the site in conjunction with adjacent identically zoned parcels. Creating this re-development potential for the greater area contributes towards a strong and healthy economic community.

B. Economic Development Policy ED1-2.2, states the City seeks to "maintain and promote land uses that improve the City's tax base, balancing economic development and quality of life goals." Re-designating this
property Corporate Office is consistent with this policy as the action could potentially facilitate future office development at the site that could improve the City's tax base. This action is also consistent with the policy of balancing economic development with quality of life goals as the Project Site is located in a commercial part of the City and thus will have little potential to negatively impact residential uses.

C. Implementation of the proposed project will meet relevant objectives of the Land Use Element. Implementation of the project will help achieve Land Use Element Objective LU1-2, which is to "prevent deterioration and blight throughout the City." A consistent land use designation which is uniform with adjacent parcels could aid in the redevelopment of the site in conjunction with neighboring parcels if the current legal non-conforming light industrial use were to cease operations. Thus designating this property with the same land use as directly abutting properties could avoid future deterioration and blight of this area.

D. Land Use Element Objective LU1-3 allows "for the continued operation and orderly conversion of existing uses as they change to conform with the new land use designations." This Project allows for the continued operation of the air cargo container repair facility located at the site. The proposed land use designation will contribute to the orderly conversion of the existing use to a use compatible with surrounding parcels as the proposed designation will be consistent with both the land use designation of adjacent parcels and the current uses located on neighboring parcels. The general plan land use re-designation will help facilitate an orderly conversion to a new use if the existing use ceases to operate.

E. Land Use Element Objective LU4-3 provides "for new office and research and development uses." The proposed land use designation will facilitate future redevelopment of the Project site for both office and research and redevelopment uses.

SECTION 5: Zone Change Findings.

A. Based on the factual findings of this Resolution, the proposed Zone Change is necessary to carry out the proposed project because the proposed General Plan Amendment would change the land use classification of the project site from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The proposed Zone Change is necessary to maintain consistency with the proposed General Plan land uses designation of Corporate Office.

B. The purpose of Title 15 – Zoning Regulations is the primary tool for implementing the goals, objectives and policies of the El Segundo General Plan. The zone change is consistent with the General Plan goals, objectives and policies discussed in Section 4 of this resolution.
SECTION 6: Recommendations. The Planning Commission makes the following recommendations:

A. The City Council should adopt the Draft Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts for Environmental Assessment No. 852, General Plan Amendment No. 09-01, and Zone Change No. 09-01.

B. The City Council should amend the 1992 General Plan Summary of Existing Trends Buildout (Exhibit LU-3) of the Land Use Element to reflect the change of the Project Area, which fronts East Imperial Highway to the north and Selby Street on the east, from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Land Use Element as set forth in attached Exhibit “A,” which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

C. The City Council should amend the General Plan Land Use Map to reflect the change of the Project Area, which fronts Imperial Highway on the north and Selby Street on the east, from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Land Use Map as set forth in attached Exhibit “B,” which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

D. The City Council should adopt an ordinance amending the current Zoning Map to reflect the change to the Project Area, which fronts East Imperial Highway on the north and Selby Street on the east, from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The corresponding changes to the Zoning Map are set forth in attached Exhibit “C,” which is incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

SECTION 7: 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 8: 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 lack of 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 9: 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 10: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 11: A copy of this Resolution must be mailed to Satco, and to any other person requesting a copy.

SECTION 12: This Resolution is the Planning Commission's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 14th day of January 2010.

David Wagner, Chairperson
City of El Segundo Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Greg Carpenter, Secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellhauer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuentes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

By:
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
# 1992 General Plan
## Summary of Existing Trends Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>357.2</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family Residential</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Residential</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>85&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Commercial</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>383,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>1,618,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Office</td>
<td>218.4</td>
<td>217.4</td>
<td>12,560,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoky Hollow</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2,019,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mixed-Use North</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,166,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mixed-Use South</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,997,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Street Specific Plan</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Specific Plan</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>232&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,145,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Campus Specific Plan</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>356.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,529,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and Railroad R.O.W</td>
<td>442.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3,494.3</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>57,088,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Projection</strong></td>
<td>17,287</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,099,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Existing construction and recently constructed, renovated commercial centers and legal non-conforming residential uses at densities that are currently higher than allowed by the land use designations in this plan will not realistically be converted to mixed commercial/residential uses and these buildings are expected to remain for the life of the Plan.

2. The heavy industrial shown on this plan includes the Chevron Refinery and former Southern California Edison Generation Station. These facilities have processing equipment and tanks rather than buildings and are expected to remain for the life of the Plan. Therefore, no estimated building square footage is shown.
1916 E. Imperial Highway
Proposed General Plan Amendment
Land Use Map

City of El Segundo
Proposed change to Corporate Office (CO)
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

PROJECT No. EA 852

BACKGROUND

1. **Project Title:** Proposed SATCO property Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California, 90245

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Masa Alkire, AICP, Principal Planner; (310) 524-2371

4. **Project Location:** As shown in Figure 1, Regional and Project Vicinity Map, the site is comprised of parcels APN 4138-005-042 (49,658 sf.) and 4138-005-057 (5345 sf.) including a total of 55,003 square feet. The larger parcel has an address of 1916 East Imperial Highway. The Project Site is located at the southwest corner of East Imperial Highway and North Selby Street. It is adjacent to the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) to the north, Selby Street to the east and a portion of the Boeing Company campus to the west and south. The Project Site is located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of downtown El Segundo. Regional access to the Project Site and vicinity is provided from the Century Freeway (I-105), located north of the Project Site. Major arterials providing access to the Project Site include Sepulveda Boulevard and Imperial Highway located to the west and north of the Project Site, respectively.

This area of El Segundo is characterized by dense urban development including a mix of commercial, office, and manufacturing land uses. The Project Site is a SATCO Inc. air freight container repair facility. It primarily repairs shipping containers for commercial haulers. The site is developed with a 27,918 sf. structure built in 1958. Refer to Figure 1 Project Location Map and Figures 2 and 3, Views of the Project Site.

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:** City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California, 90245

6. **General Plan Designation:** General Commercial

7. **Zoning:** General Commercial (C3)
8. **Description of Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including without limitation later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)

A general plan amendment from General Commercial to Corporate Office and a zone change from General Commercial (C-3) to Corporate Office (CO) was approved in September 2009 for Boeing owned property directly to the west and south of the Project Site. This zone change and general plan amendment has facilitated the expansion of Boeing Company operations on the neighboring Boeing owned property. The Boeing Company is now in the process of converting and expanding existing buildings on the neighboring property into additional office space.

The subject property is the only property on the block bounded by Sepulveda Boulevard to the West, Imperial Boulevard to the North, Selby Street to the East and Walnut Avenue to the South with a General Commercial General Plan land use designation and a General Commercial (C-3) zoning designation as a result of the Boeing Company zone change and general plan re-designation. The 1992 General Plan Land Use Element had identified both the Boeing site and the subject site as an area that is currently used for office but the General Commercial Designation would allow the site to be used for retail commercial use. Now that the Boeing Company is in the process of substantially remodeling its site as corporate office, it is unlikely that the subject site would convert from its legal non-conforming industrial use into a retail commercial use. The City initiated the general plan amendment and zoning re-designation for the subject site to accomplish zoning uniformity for parcels on the southern corner of the Imperial Highway and Sepulveda Boulevard intersection. The proposed re-designation would change the General Plan designation from General Commercial to Corporate Office and the zoning from the General Commercial (C-3) Zone to the Corporate Office (CO) Zone. The General Plan and Zoning Designation would be consistent for all property in the entire block bounded by Sepulveda Boulevard, Imperial Avenue, Selby Street, and Walnut Avenue.

This Project application includes:

- Environmental Assessment
- General Plan Amendment from General Commercial to Corporate Office
- Zone Change from C3 to CO

No physical changes to the Project Site are proposed as part of this application. SATCO intends to continue its legal non-conforming air cargo container repair facility operations at the site. The change is zoning and general plan designation will not have an effect on the continued operations of this repair facility in the existing 27,918 square-foot building on the site.

The current General Commercial General Plan designation and General Commercial (C-3) zoning allows for general office (not exceeding 5,000 square feet), hotels/motels, medical-dental offices and facilities, public uses, recreational facilities, restaurants/cafes, and retail uses (excluding off-site alcohol sales). The C-3 Zone has a minimum required lot size is 10,000 square feet, the maximum building height is 200 feet and the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) is 1:1. The proposed Corporate Office General Plan designation and Corporate Office (CO) zoning allows for general office, medical-dental offices, public uses, recreational facilities, research and development uses (east of Sepulveda Blvd.) and restaurant/cafes. The CO designation allows for a mixture of office and food serving uses in single and multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in building lobbies. The CO Zone has a minimum required lot size is 10,000 square-feet, the maximum building height is 200 feet and the maximum FAR of 0.8:1.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings)*

This area of El Segundo is characterized by dense urban development including a mix of commercial, office, manufacturing, and residential land uses. The areas to the west, southwest, and south of the Project Site are zoned Corporate Office (CO); the area east of the Project Site is zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1). LAX is directly north of the Project Site, across East Imperial Highway. Abutting the Project Site to the west and south is the recently rezoned Boeing site. Further west of that site, on the northeast corner of Sepulveda Boulevard and East Imperial Highway, is an office building occupied by AIS Auto insurance and an office building containing ground level retail consisting mainly of casual dining restaurants with Cars Direct occupying the offices on the upper floors. South of the neighboring Boeing site, on the southeast corner of East Walnut Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard, is an office building owned by the Trammell Crow Company. East of this office building is a multi-level parking structure. All other buildings located along the south side of Walnut Avenue and all uses located on the east site of Selby Street, directly east of the Project Site are Boeing properties containing offices, various associated buildings, and parking facilities. Figures 4 and 5 depict views of the land uses surrounding the Project Site.

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

The City of El Segundo is the lead agency for the Project. Responsible agencies may include, without limitation:

- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Caltrans
- Los Angeles World Airports
- City of Los Angeles
- County of Los Angeles / Airport Land Use Commission
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- West Basin Municipal Water District
Figure 1 - Project Location Map with Zoning Designations

ZONING DESIGNATIONS

COMMERCIAL
- Downtown Commercial (C-RS)
- Neighborhood Commercial (C-2)
- General Commercial (C-3)
- Commercial Center (C-4)
- Corporate Office (CO)
- Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N)
- Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S)
- Parking (P)

INDUSTRIAL
- Light Industrial (M-1)
- Heavy Industrial (M-2)
- Small Business (SB)
- Medium Manufacturing (MM)

PUBLIC USE
- Public Facilities (P-F)

RESIDENTIAL
- Single-Family Residential (R-1)
- Two-Family Residential (R-2)
- Multi-Family Residential (R-3)

OPEN SPACE
- Open Space (O-S)
Figure 2 – View of the Northeast Corner of the Project Site.

Figure 3 – View from Northwest corner of the Project Site.
Figure 4 – View to the North of the Project Site towards Imperial Highway and the elevated Interstate 105 Freeway.

Figure 5 – View of properties to the East of the Project Site.
II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. DETERMINATION:

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

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potential significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Kimberly Christensen, AICP
Planning Manager
Planning and Building Safety Department
City of El Segundo

Date

090
IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

(a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

(b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

(c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
V. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. AESTHETICS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**
The Project Site itself does not contain any unique natural or urban features or views which could be considered especially valuable. The Project Site is located in a highly developed portion of the Los Angeles metropolitan region within the City of El Segundo. The Project Site does not afford views of scenic vistas due to its location in a relatively flat area of the City of El Segundo and surrounding development. The Santa Monica Mountains are located to the north of the Project Site, the Baldwin Hills are located to the northeast of the Project Site, while the Palos Verdes Hills are located south of the Project Site. However, views of these topographic features are entirely obstructed by area development, including the Century Freeway (I-105), the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), and multi-story development in the Project vicinity. Consequently, these topographic features do not present scenic vistas. Public areas in the vicinity of the Project Site are limited to area roadways. The Project Site is currently developed with a single-story industrial building. The zone change and general plan amendment will not affect the continued use or configuration of the existing building. Any subsequent development of the site would require CEQA review. Under the proposed zoning, the maximum allowed Floor Area Ratio will be reduced and the maximum height of the building will remain the same as allowed in the C-3 Zone. The proposed Project does not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Substantially damage scenic resources, including, without limitation trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**
The Project Site is not located along a State scenic highway. The Project does not alter the appearance of the Project Site. The Project Site and the surrounding area are completely urbanized, the Project Site does not contain rock outcroppings. There is no vegetation on the Project Site. Additionally, as discussed below in the response to Question 5(a), there are no historic buildings existing on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not impact scenic resources, including, without limitation, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**
The visual character of the Project area is that of a highly developed urban area. Single- and multi-story commercial, warehouse, and industrial buildings, as well as transportation infrastructure, are present within the vicinity of the Project Site. Imperial Highway and Interstate I-105, an elevated freeway structure, are located north of the Project Site. LAX is located further north and consists of runways, airport equipment and machinery, and terminal buildings. The buildings of the area range from multi-story commercial and office buildings to low-rise industrial and office structures with relatively large building footprints. The building on the Project Site is a one-story industrial building. No construction impacts will occur from this project as there is no construction associated with this project that could potentially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. There are no changes to the operations of the facility proposed as
part of the Project. The existing industrial facility will continue to operate at the site. If, at a future
date, the site is re-developed consistent with the proposed Corporate Office Zone, environmental
evaluation consistent with CEQA will be required. The Project, as proposed, would not impact the
visual character or quality of the site and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or
nighttime views in the area?

Shade/Shadow
There would be no change in the size, mass, and height of any structure on the Project Site.
Accordingly, there will be no additional shade or shadow generated by the Project. CEQA review
is required for any future development at the site. The Project would not create a new source of
shadow and no mitigation measures are required.

Glare/Artificial Light
The will be no change in building materials or light sources on the Project Site as no new
development is proposed. Therefore, the Project would not result in any glare or create a new
source of substantial light and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
The Project Site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of El Segundo and is not developed for agricultural use and is not zoned for agricultural use. Nor is the Project Site designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection; the Project Site is located in an area designated as Urban and Built Up Land. Therefore, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. Thus, the Project would not result in impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

---

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
The Project Site is zoned General Commercial (C3) which does not permit agricultural uses and
is not under contract pursuant to the Williamson Act. The Project would rezone the site
Corporate Office (CO), a zoning designation which also does not permit agricultural uses. Thus,
the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act
Contract. Thus, the Project would not result in impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature,
could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
As noted, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City of El Segundo and does not
contain any agricultural uses, nor are any agricultural uses located in the vicinity of the Project
Site. Thus, development of the Project would not convert any farmland to non-agricultural uses.
No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. AIR QUALITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulative or considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with applicable Air Quality
Management Plans or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the
policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. In the case of projects proposed within the City of El
Segundo, the applicable plan is the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which is prepared by
the South Coast Air Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD develops rules and
regulations, establishes permitting requirements, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such
measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. The most recent AQMP
adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on June 1, 2007. Criteria for determining consistency
with the 2007 AQMP are defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's
CEQA Air Quality Handbook. There are two key indicators of consistency, discussed below:

• Criterion No. 1. The Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of
  existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely
  attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the
  AQMP.

The Project does not involve new construction or any change in operation of the existing facility,
therefore the Project would not result in new impacts with respect to construction and operation.
The Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality
violations, contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards.
Therefore, the Project would comply with Criterion No. 1.
• **Criterion No. 2.** The Project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2010 or increments based on the year of project build-out phase.

This criterion requires that the Project would not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP, which are based on Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) 2004 Regional Transportation Plan population, housing, and employment projections. SCAG forecasts that, by the year 2010, the City of El Segundo will provide employment for 66,699 persons. By the year 2015, SCAG projects that the City will provide employment for 68,213 persons, an increase of 2.3 percent over the year 2010 forecast. Further, SCAG forecasts employment for 69,882 persons by the year 2020.² The Project does not involve new construction or any change to the current operation of the facility. Furthermore the proposed zoning for the site would reduce the total development allowed on the site from a floor area ratio of 1.0 to 0.8, which would reduce the future potential build-out of the Project Site. Any future development at the Project Site would be subject to a full CEQA analysis. Thus, the Project would be within SCAG’s growth forecasts included in the AQMP and as such, would comply with Criterion No. 2.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

*Construction and Operational Emissions*

The Project does not involve new construction or any change in operation of the existing facility, thus the Project will not by itself violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

*Global Climate Change*

State of California regulations seek to reduce the effects of global climate change in statutes and Executive Orders: Executive Order S-3-05: Heath and Safety Code Section 38500, *et seq.* and Health and Safety Code §§ 42823 and 43018.5. These regulations recognize global climate change as a significant threat to California and therefore certain guidelines must be enacted to limit the production of greenhouse gases. The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Health and Safety Code §§ 38500, *et seq.*) became effective on January 1, 2007. It seeks to reduce California’s greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Project involves no construction or change in operations to the existing facility. Thus the proposed zoning change would not generate any new emissions and therefore not contribute to the production of greenhouse gasses. If, at a future date, a project is proposed under the Corporate Office (CO) Zone, the Project would be subject to a full CEQA analysis including a review of any climate change impacts.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitave thresholds for ozone precursors)?

A significant impact may occur if the Project would add a considerable cumulative contribution to federal or State non-attainment pollutants. The SCAQMD states that if an individual development project generates less than significant construction or operational emissions then the development project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment. The Project would not generate any construction or operational emissions and there is not a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of the pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

A significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors are populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the population at large. The SCAQMD

² Local Review Form, Socioeconomic Trend Projections for the 2004 RTP for El Segundo City, SCAG, November 2002.
identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities.\textsuperscript{3} Currently, land uses immediately surrounding the Project Site include commercial, manufacturing, office, and parking uses. These uses are not sensitive receptors. Furthermore, the Project will not contribute to the production of new pollutants as no new construction or changes to existing operations at the site are proposed. Therefore, it can be determined that the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and no mitigation measures are required.

\textbf{e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?}

A significant impact may occur if objectionable odors occur which would adversely impact sensitive receptors. Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. As the Project involves only a change in zoning and general plan designation, and does not involve construction or any new operations at the site, no new objectionable odors will result from approval of the Project. Therefore it can be determined that there are no Project impacts associated with objectionable odors and no mitigation measures are required.

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES} & \textbf{Potentially Significant Impact} & \textbf{Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation} & \textbf{Less Than Significant Impact} & \textbf{No Impact} \\
\hline
\textit{Would the project:} & & & & \\
\hline
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?}

The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. The Project Site does not contain any

\footnote{South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993, pages 5-1.}
species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.\textsuperscript{4} Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Wildlife Service?**

The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. No known riparian habitat or other locally or regionally designated sensitive natural communities exist on or adjacent to the Project Site.\textsuperscript{5} Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, without limitation, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. No federally protected wetlands (e.g., marsh, vernal pool, coastal) occur on or in the vicinity of the Project Site.\textsuperscript{6} Therefore, the Project would not result in the direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption of a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

The Project Site is located in a commercially zoned urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. There is no native habitat on the Project Site, nor does the Project Site function as part of a wildlife corridor due to its urbanized development. Therefore, the Project would not interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

The Project Site does not contain any protected biological resources or tree species that are considered sensitive. Additionally, no alterations to street trees are proposed thus there is no conflict with the City's adopted Street Tree Policies. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting or preserving biological resources. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

\textsuperscript{4} City of El Segundo General Plan EIR, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, EIP Associates, December 1991.

\textsuperscript{5} City of El Segundo General Plan EIR, Section 4.3, Biological Resources, EIP Associates, December 1991.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
The Project Site is currently developed with an industrial use and associated paved surfaces. No locally designated natural communities are known to occur on or adjacent to the Project Site. No Habitat Conservation or Natural Conservation Community Plans exist in the City of El Segundo. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with provisions of any such plans. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?
According to Los Angeles County Tax Assessor records, the building on the Project Site was built in 1959. Consequently, the building meets the minimum fifty-year age requirement for consideration as a landmark at the national or state levels. However, due to design, use, and condition, it appears that the building would not be eligible for landmark designation at the national, state, or local levels due to a lack of architectural character. Additionally, no alteration of the building is proposed as a result of this Project. Therefore, no impacts with respect to historical resources will occur as a result of this Project and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
The Project Site is located in an urbanized area which was previously disturbed by past development. Any surficial archaeological resources which may have existed at one time have likely been previously unearthed or disturbed. Four surveys and/or excavations were conducted within the City boundaries, including an area encompassing the northern boundary of the Project Site.7 Only one of the four areas surveyed, located on LAX property approximately 1.35 miles northwest of the Project Site, was determined to be of archaeological significance. This site was found to contain shell remains, however, no tools or other prehistoric cultural debris were discovered.8 Thus, the Project Site is not located in a designated archaeologically sensitive area. No excavation or grading will occur as a result of this project therefore there no substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource will occur as a result of this project and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
The Project does not involve excavation or grading thus the project will not result in the uncovering significant paleontological materials. The Project will not directly or indirectly destroy

---

8 City of El Segundo General Plan EIR, Figure 4.11-1, Archaeologically Sensitive Areas, EIP Associates, December 1991.
a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**
As discussed above, no excavations are associated with the Project therefore there is no likelihood of encountering human remains as part of this Project. The Project will not disturb human remains and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risk to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The Project Site is located within the seismically active Southern California region and is subject to similar risks as other structures in the vicinity of the Project Site. According to the City of El Segundo General Plan EIR (General Plan EIR), no known active or potentially active faults are located on or near the Project Site. The closest known fault is the Charnock fault, which is related to the Newport-Inglewood fault system, located approximately 1.5 miles east of the Project Site. Further, the City of El Segundo does not contain any Alquist-Priolo

---

10 FEIR, Boeing Selby Block Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment, October 2009.
Earthquake Fault Zones. The Project does not involve any new construction or remodeling of existing buildings. Therefore, impacts associated with risk of surface rupture due to faulting would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
The Project Site is located within the seismically active Southern California region and is subject to similar risks as other locations in the vicinity of the Project Site. The Project Site could experience effects of ground shaking resulting from activity on Southern California fault systems. No new construction is proposed as part of this Project. Any future construction project would require CEQA review and would be subject to the California Building Code which regulates the design of buildings to resist forces generated by major earthquakes. Since the Project involves no new construction, potential ground shaking impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
Liquefaction is a condition in which soil undergoes continued deformation at a constant low residual stress due to the build-up of high porewater pressures. The possibility of liquefaction occurring at a given site is dependent upon the occurrence of a significant earthquake in the vicinity, sufficient groundwater to cause high pore pressures, and on the grain size, relative density, and confining pressures of the soil at the site. The General Plan EIR indicates that the Project Site has a low liquefaction potential. Since the Project involves no new construction, potential liquefaction associated with the Project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

(iv) Landslides?
The Project Site and surrounding areas are relatively flat and are completely developed. According to the Los Angeles County Seismic Hazards Map the Project Site is not located in an area identified as having potential for landslides. Therefore, no impacts with respect to landslides are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
The Project Site is relatively flat and developed with a building and paving. No construction or ground disturbance is proposed as part of the Project. Therefore, no impacts with respect to soil erosion are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
The relatively flat Project Site is already developed with a building and paving. No new construction or ground disturbance is proposed as part of the Project. Therefore, no impacts to a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and no potential result of an on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
The relatively flat Project Site is already developed with a building and paving. The existing soil composition may contain soil with the potential to be expansive. However, since the Project


12 City of El Segundo General Plan EIR, Figure 4.1-3, Liquefaction Potential, EIP Associates, December 1991.

involves no new construction or change of use, potential location on expansive soil associated with the project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
The Project involves no new construction. The existing structure on the Project Site is connected to the existing sewer infrastructure. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the public or the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the routine transport,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use, or disposal of hazardous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the public or the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through reasonably foreseeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset and accident conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving the release of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous materials into the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handle hazardous or acutely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous materials, substances,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or waste within one-quarter mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an existing or proposed school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is included on a list of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous materials sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compiled pursuant to Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Section 65962.5 and, as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result, would it create a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant hazard to the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an airport land use plan or,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where such a plan has not been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopted, within two miles of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public airport or public use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airport, would the project result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a safety hazard for people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residing or working in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicinity of a private airstrip,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would the project result in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety hazard for people residing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically interfere with an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopted emergency response plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a significant risk of loss,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injury or death involving wildland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fires, including where wildlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are adjacent to urbanized areas or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where residences are intermixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?
The Project does not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials as the Project does not involve any new construction or change in the existing business operations at the site. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?
The Project only involves a general plan amendment and changing the zoning of the Project Site. This Project involves no physical transportation of materials that could lead to an accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
   The Project only involves a general plan amendment and changing the zoning designation of the Project Site. The Project involves no physical use or transportation of hazardous materials that could lead emission near a school. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
   Government Code § 65962.5 requires various State agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized releases from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells, and solid waste facilities from which there is known migration of hazardous waste and submit such information to the Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. The Project Site is not located on the Department of Toxic Substance Control EnviroStor database. As the site is not included on the hazardous materials sites database no impact will occur and no mitigation measures are required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Site?
   The Project Site is located within the boundaries of the LAX Planning Boundary. The general plan amendment and zone change do not involve any change in allowable building height. CEQA review is required for any future development at the site which would analyze safety in light of the site's proximity to LAX. No impacts will occur and no mitigation measures are required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
   There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not result in airport-related safety hazards related to private airstrips for the people residing or working in the area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

g) Impair Implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
   As the Project involves no physical change to the Project Site, the Project will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
   The Project Site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of El Segundo, which does not contain any wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

---

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

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

There is no new construction associated with the Project therefore there are no construction impacts that could affect water quality standards or waste discharge. The Project will not affect the existing operations of the site so no new long-term operational impacts to water quality or waste discharge will occur as a result of this Project. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The Project involves no construction that could lead to degradation of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Additionally the Project Site is almost completely covered with impermeable surfaces (building and paved surfaces). Thus, almost all on-site stormwater drains into the City stormwater drainage system and does not enter the groundwater supply. Similarly, no groundwater wells are located on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would neither increase the amount of stormwater entering the groundwater table, nor deplete groundwater through wells. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
   The Project involves no construction and will not alter the existing drainage pattern. Water would continue to drain to the street and existing storm drains to avoid Project Site flooding. There are no impacts associated with the siltation and/or erosion due to altered drainage patterns and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?
   The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and is served by existing City storm drain infrastructure. The Project Site is not located adjacent to any stream or river, and project runoff would continue to drain into existing City storm drain infrastructure. The Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern and would not increase the amount of impermeable surfaces on the site. Therefore, the Project will not result in flooding due to altered drainage patterns and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
   The Project does not involve construction or earthmoving activities therefore there are no construction related polluted run-off impacts associated with the Project and no mitigation measures are required. The general plan amendment and zone change actions will not change the operation of the existing facility at the site therefore the general plan amendment and zone change actions will have no operational impacts regarding polluted run-off and no mitigations are required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
   There are no physical alterations to the environment associated with this Project. Accordingly, there will be no substantial degradation to water quality associated with this Project. Mitigation measures are not required.

g) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
   The Project does not include the construction of housing and the new proposed zoning designation and general plan land use designation do not allow housing. Furthermore, the Project Site is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
   The Project Site is not located in a FEMA 100-year floodplain. As such, the Project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, the Project would not introduce structures to an area of high flood risk such that flows would be impeded or redirected, and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
   There are no levees or dams in the Project vicinity. Additionally, the Project Site is not located in a FEMA 100-year floodplain. Therefore, no impact associated with flooding, including flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam, would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

---

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
The Project Site is located at approximately 100 feet above sea level, and is thus, not at risk of being inundated by a tsunami. Additionally, the Project Site is located approximately 0.5 miles east of the Tsunami High Water Mark and Danger Area, as delineated on the Tsunami Run-Up Map contained in the City of El Segundo Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The closest body of water to the Project Site is the Pacific Ocean, which is located approximately 2.3 miles west of the Project Site. Since the Project Site is not located in close proximity to a contained body of water, there is no potential impact associated with a seiche or tsunami. With respect to the potential impact from a mudflow, the Project Site is relatively flat and is surrounded by urban development; it does not contain any sources of mudflow. There are no major hills or steep slopes in the project vicinity. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to risk of loss, injury, or death by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 LAND USE AND PLANNING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?
The size of the Project Site is not of the scale that could physically divide an established community. The Project Site is located within an urban area and is consistent with the existing physical arrangement of the properties within the vicinity of the Project Site. There would be no alteration to the vehicle or pedestrian network as a result of this Project. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the Project. The Project will make the zoning designation and general plan land use designation consistent with directly abutting sites. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

b) Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, without limitation the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
The Project Site is subject to the development regulations and policies set forth in the El Segundo General Plan and zoning regulations (ESMC Title 15). The General Plan Land Use Map designates the Project Site as General Commercial. This designation permits all retail uses, including hotel uses, and medical and dental facilities, with a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1:1. Consistent with the General Plan, the Project Site is currently zoned General Commercial (C3) under the ESMC. The C3 designation allows for general office (not exceeding 5,000 square feet), hotels/motels, medical-dental offices and facilities, public uses, recreational facilities, restaurants/cafes, and retail uses (excluding off-site alcohol sales). The minimum required lot area is 10,000 square feet with a maximum building height of 200 feet. Consistent with the General Commercial land use designation under the General Plan, the maximum FAR under the C3 zoning designation is 1:1.

The full scope of the Project is a zone change from General Commercial (C3) to Corporate Office (CO) and a corresponding General Plan land use designation change from General Commercial to Corporate Office. The Corporate Office land use designation under the General Plan permits a mixture of office and food serving uses in single- or multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in the lobby area. Research and development uses are also permitted east of Sepulveda Boulevard. The maximum allowable FAR under this designation is 0.8:1. Permitted uses within the CO Zone include general office, medical-dental offices, public uses, recreational facilities, research and development uses, and restaurants/cafes. The minimum required lot area for this zone is 10,000 square feet with a maximum building height of 200 feet. Consistent with the Corporate Office land use designation under the General Plan, the maximum FAR under the CO zoning designation is 0.8:1.

The City initiated the zone change and general plan land use designation change for this site would make the zoning and general plan designations uniform with the rest of the block bounded by Selby Street, Imperial Highway, Walnut Avenue, and Sepulveda Boulevard. The intent of the Project is to have consistent zoning applied to the general area in which the Project Site is located. Therefore, with approval of the proposed CO zone change and the corresponding land use designation change, the Project would not conflict with the City of El Segundo General Plan or the ESMC and would be in compliance with all ESMC requirements. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community's conservation plan?

The Project is located within an urbanized area and is currently developed with an industrial use and paved surfaces. As discussed in 4(a), the Project Site is not identified as being within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan; as such, the Project would not conflict with any such plans. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 MINERAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The Project Site is currently developed with industrial uses and paved surfaces. No classified or designated mineral deposits of regional or statewide significance are known to occur on the Project Site.\(^{18}\) No oil wells exist or are known to have previously existed on the Project Site.\(^{19}\) Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.


\(^{19}\) City of El Segundo GIS records, Oil and Gas Well Locations.
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
The Project Site is not delineated as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site on any City plans. Further, as discussed in the response to Question 10(a) above, no oil wells exist or are known to have previously existed on the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 NOISE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
The general plan amendment and zone change involve no construction or operational changes at the site. Therefore the Project will not by itself result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of City adopted standards. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?
The general plan amendment and zone change involve no construction or operational changes at the site. Therefore the Project will not by itself result in exposure of persons to ground borne vibration or noise levels. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
The general plan amendment and zone change will not change the operation of the current industrial facility at the site thus would not contribute to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels and no mitigation measures are required.

---

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
There is no construction associated with the Project and no changes to the current operations of the industrial facility will occur as a result of the Project. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Site to excessive noise levels?
The Project Site is located immediately south of LAX on Imperial Highway. However the Project would not introduce any permanent populations to the Project Site that could be affected by excessive noise levels from aircraft. The Project would amend the general plan and change the zoning designation from one commercial zoning designation to another zoning designation with a very similar set of allowed uses. Thus, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Site to excessive noise levels?
The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
The Project does not include any residential land uses and, therefore, would not result in a direct population increase from construction of new homes. Further, the Project does not include the extension of roads or other infrastructure. Since the Project does not involve any new construction or expand the total floor area allowed to be constructed at the site (FAR is being reduced), the Project will not lead to an indirect population increase by intensifying the amount of commercial development in the City. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
There are no existing residential uses on the Project Site. No housing would be displaced by development of the Project and no impact is anticipated. No mitigation measures are required.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
As discussed in the response to Question 12(b) above, there are currently no residential uses on the Project Site. As such, no persons would be displaced as a result of implementation of the Project. Therefore, no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
### 13 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project: result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) **Fire protection?**
   Fire-protection services at the Project Site are provided by the El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD). The ESFD maintains two stations; Station No. 1 - located on 314 Main Street, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project Site, and Station No. 2 - located on 2161 El Segundo Boulevard, approximately 1 mile south of the Project Site. Additionally, a new station is being built on the El Segundo Campus site, approximately 0.5 miles southeast of the Project Site. Furthermore, the ESFD has mutual aid agreements with the Cities of Los Angeles, Torrance, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, and Manhattan Beach, and the County of Los Angeles.\(^{21}\) The Project will not change the operations of the current facility and involves no new construction. There are no impacts to current fire protection service and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Police protection?**
   Police protection is provided to the Project Site and the surrounding area by the El Segundo Police Department (ESPD). The ESPD Headquarters, which serves the project area, is located at 348 Main Street, approximately 1.6 mile southeast of the Project Site. The Project will not result in any increase in the number of employees at the Project Site and will not generate an increase in the number of service calls from the Project Site. The Project will not create any new impacts to current police protection services and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Schools?**
   The Project Site is located within the Wiseburn School District (WSD), which is roughly bounded by Imperial Highway to the north, Inglewood Avenue to the east, Marine Avenue to the south, and Sepulveda Boulevard to the west. In general, the demand for school services is the result of an area's residential population. The Project Site currently does not contain any residential units and would not generate any additional residents, which directly generate school-aged children and a demand for school services. As there is no construction involved

---

with the Project there will be no effect on the enrollment at WSD schools. There are no impacts to school facilities and no impact on school facilities and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?
The City of El Segundo Recreation and Parks Department (ESRPD) manages all municipally owned and operated recreation and park facilities within the City. In general, residential development directly generates demand for recreation and parks facilities. As discussed above, the Project would not generate any additional residents. No new employees at the Project Site will be generated as a result of the Project. The Project would not result in any additional demand for parks and recreational services and, therefore, would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. There is no impact on neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities. No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?
Library services for the Project Site are provided by the El Segundo Public Library, located at 111 W. Mariposa Avenue. In general, residential development results in a direct increase in demand on library services. The Project would not generate new residents; therefore, the Project would not generate an additional need for library space or volumes of permanent collection. There is no impact on library services and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 RECREATION</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
As discussed above, in general, residential development directly generates demand for recreation and parks facilities. No residential development would occur under the Project. Thus, the Project would not intensify the usage of the available park and recreational facilities, and would not create a potentially significant impact. Therefore there are no impacts on existing neighborhood or regional parks and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
The Project does not include construction of on-site recreational amenities. As discussed above, the Project would not result in any additional demand for parks and recreational services and, therefore, would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

The Project will not change the operation of the existing industrial facility at the Project Site and therefore there will be no increase in traffic to the Project Site as a result of this Project. The general plan amendment and zone change will decrease the total floor area allowed to be developed at the site from 55,002 square feet to 44,002 square feet. This could potentially reduce the traffic this site could generate in the future, depending on the type and intensity of future development at the site. CEQA review is required for any future development at the site. The Project has a less than significant impact on traffic loads and capacity of the street system and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) was established to reduce traffic congestion and to provide a mechanism for coordinating land use and development decisions. The Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard intersection in the vicinity of the Project Site is listed as a CMP Arterial Monitoring Station. An impact is considered significant if a project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM Peak Hours. The Project will not change the operation of the existing industrial facility at the Project Site and therefore there will be no increase in traffic to the Project Site as a result of this Project. The zone change will decrease the total floor area allowed to be developed at the site from 55,002 square feet to 44,002 square feet. This could potentially reduce the traffic this site could generate in the future, depending on the type and intensity of future development at the site. CEQA review is required for any future development at the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The Project Site does not contain any aviation-related uses and the Project does not include development of any aviation-related uses. Due to the nature and scope of the Project, development of the Project would not have the potential to result in a change in air traffic patterns.
at the LAX airport or any other airport in the area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?
The Project design does not include any sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses. No change in vehicular access to the Project Site will occur. Therefore there are no hazards from design features or incompatible uses and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
As discussed above, no change to Project Site access will occur. Therefore there is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
No change in operations at the site will occur as a result of this Project, therefore there will be no impact on parking capacity and no mitigation measures are required.

g) Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
The Project would not conflict with any adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation. There are no impacts on any policies or programs supporting alternative transportation and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
As the Project involves no construction or physical changes to the current industrial operation therefore no new wastewater will be generated as a result of the Project. There is no impact on the regional water quality control board wastewater treatment requirements and no mitigation measures are required.
b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
The City of El Segundo Water Division provides water service to the Project Site. The City purchases water from the West Basin Municipal Water District, a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District from which 100 percent of the City's potable water is received. Wastewater treatment in the City is split between the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC), District No. 5. The Project involves no change in the current use of the site and no construction therefore there is no impact on water supply or wastewater treatment facilities and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
Stormwater facilities for the portion of the City east of Sepulveda Boulevard, the area in which the Project Site is located, are operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The Project will not change the physical configuration of the Project Site, including the amount of impermeable surface. Thus the Project will not change the amount of storm water flows from the site and not require or result in the construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
The Project would not require new or expanded entitlements and therefore the Project will result in no change to the water supply needs for the Project Site. The Project has no impacts and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
The Project involves no construction or change in use at the site and will not generate any wastewater increase. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures would be required.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
The project does not change the current industrial operation of the site therefore there will be no additional solid waste disposal needs associated with the Project. There are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?
The site will continue to adhere to all applicable federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. There are no impacts from the general plan amendment and zone change and no mitigation measures are required.

---


17 **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?**

The Project is located in a developed and populated urban area. There are no candidate, sensitive, or special status species existing on or adjacent to the Project Site. Additionally, no vegetation, fish, or wildlife habitat exists on the Project Site. Furthermore, the Project involves no construction or change in existing use at the site, therefore the Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause such species to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals. There are no structures or artifacts related to California history or prehistory found on the Project Site. No impact would occur.

b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?**

(“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

A significant impact may occur if a project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the Project Site, would result in impacts, which are less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together. The Project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The Project is consistent with the AQMP and will not hinder the region’s ability to meet clean air standards (see Response 3). The Project does not involve any change to the current vehicle traffic to and from the site and will reduce the total potential building development at the site in the future by reducing the allowable floor area on the site. The Project will not result in any construction noise and will not change the operations therefore not result in any additional operational noise at the site. Remaining impacts associated with the Project would either result in no impacts or be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

As noted in the responses to Questions 1 through 16 above, the Project would not result in any significant impacts. Thus, the Project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. No impact would occur.

VI. SOURCE LIST


B) Christopher Joseph and Associates, Boeing Selby Block Final EIR, October 2009

C) City of El Segundo Fire Department Website: www.elsegundo.org/depts/fire/faq.asp

D) City of El Segundo General Plan


F) City of El Segundo GIS records, Oil and Gas Well Locations

G) City of El Segundo Municipal Code, Title 15, Zoning Regulations

H) City of El Segundo Water Division, Water Supplies website: www.elsegundo.org/depts/works/water/supplies/default.asp

I) City of El Segundo Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, Tsunami Run-Up Map

J) County of Los Angeles, 2008 Draft General Plan, LA County Seismic Hazards Map, website: http://planning.lacounty.gov/generalplan

K) County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning. Los Angeles County Airport Commission. Website: http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-lax.pdf.


M) State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor on-line database website: www.envirostor.dtes.ca.gov

N) Southern California Association of Governments, Local Review Form, Socioeconomic Trend Projections for the 2004 RTP for El Segundo City, November 2002

O) South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993

Mr. Greg Carpenter  
Director, Planning & Building Safety  
City of El Segundo  
City Hall  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245-3813  

Subject: Rezone Satco Property  

Dear Mr. Carpenter:  

Thank you and Musa Alkire for visiting Satco earlier this week to discuss efforts underway to by the City of El Segundo to rezone the property in and around Satco’s building commonly know as 1910 E Imperial Highway. I understand from our meeting that the City desires to grant Boeing’s request to rezone it property from the current General Commercial (C-3) zoning to Corporate Office (CO) zoning.  

I am writing to confirm Satco’s desire to continue its current air cargo container repair operations in our facility and confirm the fact that I have been assured by you that the rezoning would in no way affect our current legal non-conforming status and would not impede Satco’s ability to continue it present day operations.  

Contingent on the above being true and accurate Satco has no objections to the proposed rezoning in the subject area.  

I would greatly appreciate being kept appraised of developments in the matter and request that I be given the opportunity of discuss any changes or new developments with your department regards to this matter.  

Best regards,  

[Signature]  

Peter Looker  
Executive Vice President
APPLICATION FOR A ZONE CHANGE

Environmental Assessment No.: 852 Zone Change No.: 09-01

Date: October 22, 2009

Applicant: City of El Segundo

Masa Alkire
Name (print or type)
350 Main Street
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/St/Zip

Check One: Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Agent ☐

Property Owner: Satco

Peter Looker
Name (print or type)
1601 East El Segundo Boulevard
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/St/Zip

Representative of Applicant: (i.e., attorney, expeditor, etc.)

Name (print or type)

Address

City/St/Zip

310-524-2371 310-322-4167
Phone Fax
malkire@elsegundo.org
Email

Signature

310-322-4719 310-322-1480
Phone Fax

Email

Signature

117
Property situated at: 4138-005-042 = C F 218 – Por of NW ¼ of Sec 7 T 3S R 14W
4138-005-057 = SUB of POR of the Sausal Redondo RO SCC 11629, POR of NW ¼ of SEC 7 T3S R14W
(Exact legal description. Provide attachment, if necessary.)

General Location: __1916 East Imperial Highway____ and __Selby Street________________
Address (Street/Avenue)

Street, Avenue

Existing Zoning: _______General Commercial____ Proposed Zoning: ___Corporate Office____

Request: Under the provisions of Chapter 15-26 of the Municipal Code, application for consideration of a Zone
Change for the above described property.

1. Does public necessity require the proposed change? Is there a real need in the community for more
of the types of uses permitted by the Zone requested that can be accommodated in the areas already
for such zones? (Fully explain your answer, considering the surrounding property as well as the
property proposed to be reclassified.)
The City initiated the zone change in order to achieve the public goal of rational distribution of zoning
designations in the City. If the zone change were not to occur a small area of C-3 zoning would remain
isolated on Imperial Boulevard, and this zoning would not be contiguous with like zoning. Changing the
zoning to CO would achieve a public goal of consistent Corporate Office zoning for the entire
block on which the two parcels in question are located.

2. Is the property involved in the proposed reclassification more suitable for the purposes permitted in
the proposed zone than for the purposes permitted in the present classification? (Answer
completely; give all reason for your answer.
The property is more suitable for CO zoning as nearby parcels on Sepulveda are all within this
zoning designation and are all used for office purposes. There is no retail oriented commercial
in this area of the City. The parcels in question would not be well suited to retail oriented
commercial as they are isolated from any other retail districts of the City. The CO classification
would allow for redevelopment of the site in conjunction with adjacent properties, if
redevelopment were to occur at the project site.
3. Would the uses permitted by the proposed zone change be detrimental in any way to the surrounding property? (Explain reasons supporting your answers.)
The uses permitted by the zone change would not be detrimental to surrounding properties. The uses within the CO zone are identical to the directly abutting properties.

4. What were the original deed restrictions, if any, concerning the type and class of uses on the property involved? Give expiration date of these restrictions. (You may attach a copy of these restrictions, after properly underscoring the portions that are in answer to this question.)
The City is not aware of any deed restrictions affecting the property.

Planning Staff to complete

Date Received: 10/22/09  
E.A. No: 852

Planner:  
Zone Change No: 09-01

Signature:  
Fee Paid:  


APPLICATION FOR A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Environmental Assessment No.: 852 General Plan Amendment No.: 09-01

Date: October 22, 2009

Applicant: City of El Segundo

Name (print or type)
Masa Alkire
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/St/Zip

Check One: Owner [] Lessee []

Property Owner: Satco

Name (print or type)
Peter Looker
1601 East El Segundo Boulevard
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/St/Zip

Phone 310-322-4719
Fax 310-322-1480
Email

Property Situated at: 4138-005-042 = C F 218 – Por of NW ¼ of Sec 7 T 3S R 14W
4138-005-057 = SUB of POR of the Sausal Redondo RO SCC 11629, POR of NW ¼ of SEC 7 T3S R14W

(Exact legal description. Provide attachment, if necessary.)
General Location: 1916 East Imperial and Selby Street
corner of Highway Address or St/Ave

St/Ave 120
1. Describe the proposed amendment and/or proposed land use redesignation that is requested with this application.

The request is a General Plan land use designation change from General Commercial to Corporate Office. No physical changes to the project site are proposed as part of this City Initiated action. Satco intends to continue its legal non-conforming air cargo container repair facility operations at the site.

2. Does public necessity require the proposed amendment and/or proposed land use redesignation? (Fully explain your answer, considering the surrounding properties as well as the subject property)

The goal is to provide a consistent general plan designation for the entire block bounded by Sepulveda Blvd., Imperial Avenue, Selby Street and Walnut Avenue. This would alleviate a situation where one property does not share the land use designation of directly adjacent property as well as the designation common to the greater area located along the Sepulveda corridor. Consistent and rational treatment of the land use designations is the goal and public purpose of the requested action.

3. Is the property involved in the proposed land use redesignation and/or amendment more suitable and consistent with the purposes, objectives, goals and policies, of the applicable General Plan Elements than the present designation? (Answer completely. Give all reasons for your answer and specifically cite applicable General Plan sections.)

The proposed land use re-designation is more suitable with the purpose, objectives and goals and policies of the General Plan. 1st, the re-designation is will contribute towards the Economic Development Goals of creating a strong, healthy economic community in which all diverse stakeholders may benefit and maintaining and promoting land uses that improve the City’s tax base, balancing economic development with quality of life. These Goals will be achieved by creating a larger area that could potentially be redeveloped in the future, which could aid in future redevelopment and reutilization of the site. This future development would occur in a commercial part of the City which would minimize negative impacts on residential areas. 2nd, Land Use Element Objectives that the project is consistent with include: a) prevention of deterioration and blight, by creating a larger area with redevelopment potential, and b) the objective of allowing for continued operation and orderly conversion of existing uses to new land use designations. This re-designation will aid in orderly conversion of the site as it will allow the site to be re-developed in conjunction with adjacent sites. The project is also consistent with the Land Use Element objective of providing for new office and research and development uses, both of which are allowed in the proposed land use designation.

4. Would the use(s) permitted by the proposed land use redesignation and/or amendment be detrimental in any way to the surrounding properties? (Explain reasons supporting your answers.)

The re-designation will not be detrimental to surrounding properties. First, the current operations at the site will not change as a result of the project. All current impacts will remain with no change and the action will not change any existing conditions. Second, the future redevelopment will match or be compatible with the uses allowed on directly abutting sites. There should be no detrimental impact from having a consistent land use designation in this city block. Third, the amount of potential development will be reduced by the reduction in FAR. The reduction of total development should reduce any external impacts of a future development project at the site, compared to the amount of development allowed under the current land use designation.
5. Are there any deeds or other restrictions concerning the type and class of uses on the property involved? If so, give expiration date of the restrictions and attach a copy of the restrictions.

There are no deeds or other restrictions concerning the type and class of uses on the property involved with this project.

6. Explain how the proposed redesignation and/or amendment would be integrated, internally consistent and compatible with all of the Elements of the General Plan, as a whole. (Cite specific applicable General Plan sections.)

As stated in question 3, the project will be consistent with applicable goals of the Economic Development and Land Use Elements of the General Plan. Furthermore, the reduction of total future development at the project site should ensure consistency with the traffic projections included in the City’s adopted Circulation Element.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to declare Rescue Ambulance 33 (Unit #3304) to be a surplus vehicle. Additionally, authorize the surplus Rescue Ambulance 33 to be donated to the Red Cross in Guaymas, Mexico, which is the Sister City of El Segundo. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Authorize Rescue Ambulance 33 to be declared a surplus vehicle;
2. Authorize the surplus Rescue Ambulance 33 to be donated to the Red Cross in Guaymas, Mexico;
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Commercial Truck Trader Ad Listing ID: 95248317

FISCAL IMPACT: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Kevin S. Smith, Fire Chief

REVIEWED BY: Kevin S. Smith, Fire Chief

APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The El Segundo Fire Department recently placed into service a new rescue ambulance. The Fire Department has historically maintained two rescue ambulances in front line service and one additional rescue ambulance is kept in reserve to be used when a front line rescue ambulance is out of service for maintenance or when the Fire Department elects to staff an additional ambulance for special events or large incidents. With the recent acquisition of the new rescue ambulance there are now four rescue ambulances assigned to the Fire Department. The Department recommends surpling the oldest rescue ambulance in our fleet which is Rescue Ambulance 33 (Unit #3304). The ambulance is a 1996 Freightliner FL60 which has reached the end of its intended service life of fifteen years. Additionally, the ambulance has been used in reserve status only over the last three years but has experienced a number of mechanical issues in recent years making it a vehicle that is not reliable for consistent use as an emergency response vehicle. The Fire Department does not see an operational need to maintain another rescue ambulance in the fleet and this particular ambulance is not in an operating condition that would make it desirable for other professional fire departments to use or purchase. The Red Cross in Guaymas, Mexico has indicated that they are in need of additional ambulances to serve the City of Guaymas. The likely sales price of this vehicle is estimated to be between $10,000 and $12,000.
1996 FREIGHTLINER FL-60

$9,750.00

SELLER INFORMATION
Mayer Equipment Inc
4235 W Capitol Ave
West Sacramento, CA 95691

- Toll Free: (888) 291-4268
- http://www.mayerequipment.com

VEHICLE DETAILS
Year: 1996
Make: FREIGHTLINER
Model: FL-60
Location: West Sacramento, CA
Type: CLASS 6 (GVW 19501 - 26000)

SELLER DESCRIPTION
1996 FREIGHTLINER FL-60,
Ambulance
Wheeled coach ambulance package
Whelen light package w/ sirens
Sigtronics intercom system
Air dump suspension
Ex-municipal unit
## TOTAL BAIERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENSION</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVINGS</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1/2/2023

**State of California**

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**CITY OF SAN MARINO**

Date of Approval: 2/2/2023

Register #: 367790

As of February 2, 2010
### CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
#### PAYMENTS BY WIRE TRANSFER
**1/8/10 THROUGH 1/21/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2010</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>79,284.90</td>
<td>State Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2010</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>345,503.91</td>
<td>Federal Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/2010</td>
<td>State of CA EFT</td>
<td>1,310.16</td>
<td>Child support payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/2010</td>
<td>Nationwide EFT</td>
<td>70,736.22</td>
<td>457 payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/2010</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>4,632.44</td>
<td>PARS payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/2010</td>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; Traders</td>
<td>159,898.56</td>
<td>457 payment Vantagepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2010</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Bank</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>Employee Savings Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2010</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Bank</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>Employee Savings Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2010</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>1,189.13</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2010</td>
<td>West Basin</td>
<td>1,303,333.18</td>
<td>H2O payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2010</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>98,234.04</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2010</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>604.53</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/2010</td>
<td>Lane Donovan Golf Ptr</td>
<td>19,785.52</td>
<td>Payroll Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/2010</td>
<td>La Salle</td>
<td>43,725.00</td>
<td>ABAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2010</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>64,167.57</td>
<td>State Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2010</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>249,879.71</td>
<td>Federal Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11-1/21/10</td>
<td>Workers Comp Activity</td>
<td>22,205.25</td>
<td>SCRMA checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,464,840.12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE OF RATIFICATION: 2/02/10**
**TOTAL PAYMENTS BY WIRE:**

Certified as to the accuracy of the wire transfers by:

**Deputy City Treasurer**

**Date: 1/22/10**

**Director of Finance**

**Date: 1/22/10**

**City Manager**

**Date: 1/26/10**

Information on actual expenditures is available in the City Treasurer's Office of the City of El Segundo.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010 – 5:00 P.M.

5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor McDowell

ROLL CALL

Mayor McDowell – Present
Mayor Pro Tem Busch – Present
Council Member Brann – Present
Council Member Fisher – Present
Council Member Jacobson – Present

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

City Attorney Mark Hensley announced that Council would be meeting in closed session pursuant to items on the agenda and that the Government Code §54956.9(b) item related to the Firefighter Association.

CLOSED SESSION:
The City Council moved into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City’s Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City’s Labor Negotiators; as follows:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (Gov’t Code §54956.9(a) -1- matter


CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(b): -1- potential case (no further public statement is required at this time); Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(c): -1- matter.

DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS (Gov’t Code §54957): - 0- matters
CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54957.6): 1 - matters
Represented Group: Police Support Services Employees Association (PSSEA)
Negotiators: Jack Wayt, Bob Hyland and Rich Kreisler

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54956.8): 0 - matters

SPECIAL MATTERS: 1 - matter

1. Interview of candidates and potential appointments to the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee, Investment Advisory Committee, Community Cable Advisory Committee, and Senior Citizen Housing Corp. [Note: the interviews will commence at approximately 5:45 p.m. and take place in the West Conference Room in City Hall]

Council consensus to re-appoint A.J. Paz to the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee, to a full term expiring 11/30/13; re-appoint William Bue to the Investment Advisory Committee, to a full term expiring 8/30/13; appoint Martin Stone to the Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board to a partial term expiring 6/30/12; and appoint Geoff Nathanson to the Community Cable Advisory Committee to a full term expiring 10/31/13.

Council recessed at 6:40 p.m.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor McDowell at 7:00 p.m.

INVOCATION – City Clerk Mortesen

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Mayor Pro Tern Eric Busch

PRESENTATIONS

a. Council Presented Lighting Up the Community Certificates of Appreciation to:

Daniel Lambert & Richard Royce
Gary & Peggy Powell
The Goodyear Family
Michael, Amanda, Ashley and Sean De Francesco
James and Margaret Stone
The Mortesen Family, Cindy, Kevin, Steve, Gage and Friends
Merri Degraff
Craig Nichols
Mike Rotolo
Joseph Riordan
Jay Fodor
Brian Brandlin
Lance & Sonja McClogon
Christian Knoll
Michelle Gordon
Lori Martinez

b. Julie Warner, El Segundo Chamber of Commerce, presented awards to Holiday Parade Recipients:

1-800 Got Junk
Eagles Nest Pre School
Best Musical Band Trash
Legacy Dance Academy
El Segundo United Methodist Church
Britts BBQ
Broadway in the Park
Boy Scout Troup 762
El Segundo Elementary Band
Will Rogers Middle School Marching Band
El Segundo High School Band
El Segundo Elementary Band
ROLL CALL

Mayor McDowell - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Busch - Present
Council Member Brann - Present
Council Member Fisher - Present
Council Member Jacobson - Present

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed. - NONE

A. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

Consideration of a motion to read all ordinances and resolutions on the Agenda by title only.

MOTION by Council Member Jacobson, SECONDED by Council Member Brann to read all ordinances and resolutions on the Agenda by title only. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

B. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

1. Consideration and possible action to announce the appointment of candidates of the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee, Investment Advisory Committee, Community Cable Advisory Committee and Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Mayor McDowell announced the re-appointment of A.J. Paz to the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee, to a full term expiring 11/30/13; re-appointment of William Due to the Investment Advisory Committee, to a full term expiring 8/30/13; the appointment of Martin Stone to the Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board to a partial term expiring 6/30/12; and the appointment of Geoff Nathanson to the Community Cable Advisory Committee to a full term expiring 10/31/13.

E. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed are to be adopted by one motion without discussion and passed unanimously. If a call for discussion of an item is made, the item(s) will be considered individually under the next heading of business.
2. Approved Warrant Numbers 2574959 to 2575144 on Register No. 6 in the total amount of $2,133,639.04 and Wire Transfers from 12/04/09 through 12/23/09 in the total amount of $1,127,908.13. Warrant Numbers 2575415 to 2575596 on Register No. 7 in the total amount of $1,282,617.61 and Wire Transfers from 12/24/09 through 1/7/10 in the total amount of $1,459,067.11. Authorized staff to release. Ratified: Payroll and Employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.


4. Accepted the work as complete on the Washington Park Irrigation Replacement Project at Washington Street between Palm and Maple Avenues – Project No. PW 09-06. (Fiscal Impact: $49,000) Authorized the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office.

5. Accepted the work as complete on the replacement of a water main on Lairport Street. Project No.: PW 09-04 (Fiscal Impact: $190,789.00) Authorized the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office.

6. Approved Agreement No. 4036 with Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railways (BNSF) to construct a concrete rail crossing over 120th Street just west of the intersection with Aviation Boulevard – Project No. PW 09-16 (Fiscal Impact: $50,000)

7. Approved the elimination of the Senior Administrative Specialist position in the Recreation and Parks Department and addition of an Administrative Specialist position. (Fiscal Impact: $30,010)

8. Adopted Resolution No. 4640 that authorizes the City Manager or designee to 1) enter into an agreement with the California Energy Commission in a form approved by the City Attorney; 2) to apply for a grant from the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG); 3) to receive grant monies from the EECBG; 4) amend the City Budget for Fiscal Year 2010 to 2011 to appropriate these monies to implement the El Segundo Efficiency Measures; and 5) to spend these grant monies. (Fiscal Impact: Potentially $90,691)

9. Rejected the Bid from DAB Construction, waived minor irregularity in the Bid from S&L Specialty Contracting, Inc. and awarded Contract No. 4037 to S&L Specialty Contracting, Inc. for construction related to Group 39 (24 homes) of the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program (Project No. RSI 10-01). (Estimated construction costs and retention: $716,705) Authorized the City Manager to execute the contract in a form approved by the City Attorney.
10. Waived minor irregularity in the Bid and awarded Contract No. 4038 to S&L Specialty Contracting, Inc. for construction related to Group 40 (20 homes) of the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program (Project No. RSI 10-02). (Estimated construction costs and retention: $571,395) Authorized the City Manager to execute the contract in a form approved by the City Attorney.

11. Approved request from the American Cancer Society to waive field and facility rental fees in the amount of $1,170.00 for the 2010 Relay for Life event at Recreation Park's Softball Field on June 12 -13. Relay for Life is requesting the rental fees be waived for the use of Softball Field and Joslyn Center. (Fiscal Impact: None)

MOTION by Council Member Brann, SECONDED by Council Member Fisher to approve Consent Agenda items, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

CALL ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

F. NEW BUSINESS

12. Consideration and possible action to direct staff to commence negotiating a contract with the South Bay Regional Public Communications Authority (SBRPCA) to provide Fire and Police communications services (Fiscal Impact: N/A).

Dave Cummings, Police Chief, gave a report.

MOTION by Council Member Brann, SECONDED by Council Member Jacobson to direct staff to commence negotiating a contract with the SBRPCA and return to Council at a future Council Meeting with an update on negotiations and/or a proposed contract for potential Council approval. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

REPORTS – CITY MANAGER - NONE

REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY - NONE

REPORTS – CITY CLERK - NONE

REPORTS – CITY TREASURER

REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Brann - NONE

Council Member Fisher - NONE

Council Member Jacobson - NONE
Mayor Pro Tem Busch –

13. Consideration and possible action to declare Rescue Ambulance 33 (Unit #3304) to be a surplus vehicle. Additionally, authorize the surplused Rescue Ambulance 33 to be donated to the Red Cross in Guaymas, Mexico, which is the Sister City of El Segundo. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Council consensus to have staff return with information on the current value of the vehicle and a marketability analysis.

Also spoke on upcoming Recreation and Parks Drama Production.

Mayor McDowell – Spoke on his upcoming surgery.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have receive value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed. - NONE

MEMORIALS – John R. Bowler

CLOSED SESSION – NONE

ADJOURNMENT at 7: 45 p.m.

______________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to accept a cash donation totaling $7,500 from DirecTV in support of Super CPR (Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation) Saturday and other Fire Department supplies and equipment. (Fiscal Impact: $7,500)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Accept donation and authorize the City Manager to transfer the monies into the CPR General Fund account ($2,000), and the Suppression supplies account ($5,500);
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

None

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted</th>
<th>$7,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>001-300-0000-3850 - $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-400-3202-5204 - $5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Lisa LeCates, Sr. Management Analyst
REVIEWED BY: Kevin S. Smith, Fire Chief
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Since 1996, the El Segundo Fire Department, in conjunction with the American Red Cross, has sponsored an annual Super CPR Saturday event. This event offers FREE Adult CPR training to the community at large and traditionally trains approximately 350 citizens in one day. Over the past fourteen years, the event has trained several thousand people from all over the South Bay in the necessary skills to perform CPR and perhaps save a life. This event cannot be conducted without the generous support and contributions from community groups and local business and industry. DirecTV has been one of our strongest supporters. Four years ago they expressed a desire to increase their support to other areas of our department and have generously offered to do so again this year. The funds will go to maintain their annual support of Super CPR Saturday ($2,000); and the remainder to cover the costs of supplies and equipment that would not otherwise be budgeted, such as outfitting certified members with safety standard-approved Wildland boots.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding (1) the adoption of a Resolution to approve the design and plans and to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Tomark Sports without the need of competitive bidding; (2) the acceptance of a donation from the El Segundo Girls Softball League to pay $10,880.89 to Tomark Sports for wall padding and its installation on the new retaining wall on the Softball Field at Recreation Park. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Adopt a Resolution that includes the approval of design and plans, and the authorization for the City Manager to execute a contract in a form approved by the City Attorney with Tomark Sports without the need of competitive bidding.

2. Acceptance of a donation from the El Segundo Girls Softball League to pay $10,880.89 to Tomark Sports for wall padding and its installation on the new retaining wall on the Softball Field at Recreation Park.

3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Resolution.
2. Description of wall padding material and quote from Tomark Sports.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Mark Trujillo, Parks Superintendent
REVIEWED BY: Bob Cummings, Director of Recreation and Parks
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Mrs. Colleen Glynn-Rich contacted the Recreation and Parks Department on behalf of the El Segundo Girls Softball League indicating that the organization would like to donate wall padding and its installation to the new retaining wall on the Softball Field at Recreation Park. El Segundo Girls Softball League representatives feel that the padding will provide a safety barrier in the event a player comes in contact with the concrete wall.

The wall padding will be ordered and paid for by the El Segundo Girls Softball League under the recommendation of City Staff. Tomark Sports (Contractor) will not receive any public funds for completing the project, and will be required to meet all of the City’s requirements.
BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION (Continued)

The El Segundo Girls Softball League understands and agrees that the City will not be responsible for the maintenance, repair or replacement of the padding.
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE DESIGN AND PLANS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF WALL PADDING ON THE SOFTBALL FIELD AT RECREATION PARK PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE § 830.6 AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH TOMARK SPORTS WITHOUT THE NEED FOR COMPETITIVE BIDDING AS OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. On January 14, 2010, the City received a proposal by TOMARK SPORTS ("CONTRACTOR") to design and build a WALL PADDING MATERIAL ON THE RETAINING WALL (the "Project");

B. The Project consists of installing custom stadium pads on the south concrete wall of the existing softball field;

C. EL SEGUNDO GIRLS SOFTBALL LEAGUE proposes to donate all materials and labor to construct the Project by paying CONTRACTOR. The City would not incur any cost;

D. Based upon information supplied by Recreation and Parks Department staff, the Council understands and believes that the total value of the project would be $10,880.89;

E. Ordinarily, the City would need to comply with the competitive bidding requirements set forth in the California Public Contracts Code for this type of project;

F. The purpose of such bidding requirements is to guard against favoritism, improvidence, extravagance, fraud and corruption, to prevent waste of public funds, and to obtain the best economic result for the public;

G. The facts and circumstances of this Project, however, demonstrate that competitive bids would be unavailing or would not produce an advantage, and the advertisement for competitive bid would thus be undesirable and impractical for the following reasons:

1. There is, at most, only a nominal cost to the public for the reason that EL SEGUNDO GIRLS SOFTBALL LEAGUE will donate all materials and labor;

2. TOMARK SPORTS will not receive any public funds for completing the Project;
3. TOMARK SPORTS AND EL SEGUNDO GIRLS SOFTBALL LEAGUE’s only motivation in constructing the Project is to accomplish charitable works for the City;

4. It is improbably that any other private contractor can construct the Project for a lesser amount; and

5. To complete the Project, TOMARK SPORTS will still be required to comply with the City’s standard contract requirements.

H. In waiving the competitive bid requirements otherwise required by the SPMC, the City Council takes note of the analysis and decisions set forth in Graydon v. Pasadena Redevelopment Agency (1980) Cal.App.3d 631; Hodgeman v. City of San Diego (1942) 53 Cal. App.2nd 610; Orange County Water Dist. v. Bennett (1958) 156 Cal. App.2nd 745; and Los Angeles G&E Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1922) 188 Cal. 307;

I. The City Council wishes to obtain the immunities set forth in Government Code § 830.6 with regard to the plans and construction of the Project; and

J. In accepting EL SEGUNDO GIRLS SOFTBALL LEAGUE’s donation of the Project, the City notes that Labor Code § 1720.4 specifically exempts work performed by volunteers from payment of prevailing wages. In addition, the Department of Industrial Relations (“DIR”) has determined that prevailing wages need not be paid for the Project (see DIR Decision No. 98-004 dated June 10, 1998 [donated pergola on city property]; and DIR Decision No. 99-058 dated January 7, 2000 [volunteer labor]). Accordingly, the Project is not a “public work” under the Labor Code and volunteers need not be paid prevailing wages.

SECTION 2: Design Immunity.

A. The design and plans for the Project are determined to be consistent with the City’s standards and are approved.

B. The design approval set forth in this Resolution occurred before actual work on the Project construction commenced.

C. The approval granted by this Resolution conforms with the City’s General Plan.

D. The approval and authorization granted by this Resolution is intended to avail the City of the immunities set forth in Government Code § 830.6.

SECTION 3: Authorizations.

A. The City Engineer, or designee, is authorized to act on the City’s behalf in
approving any alterations or modifications of the design and plans approved by this Resolution.

B. The City Manager is authorized to execute a contract with TOMARK SPORTS for construction of the Project in a form approved by the City Attorney.

SECTION 4: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution.

SECTION 5: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this day of , 20 .

______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:

______________________________
City Manager
Sold To: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
1030989
350 MAIN ST
EL SEGUNDO CA 90245-3813

This is NOT a Bill - DO NOT PAY.

Ship To: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
401 SHELDON ST
EL SEGUNDO CA 90245-4012

Payer: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
1030989
350 MAIN ST
EL SEGUNDO CA 90245-3813

We deliver according to the following terms and conditions:
Terms of payment: Net 30

Mark Trujillo 301 524 2716 fax 310 647 4223

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
<th>Delivery Dtg(s)</th>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>Del Qty</th>
<th>Order Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Program ID</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NSPINNOTAX</td>
<td>NSPINNOTAX</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>999.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>999.00</td>
<td>999.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Installation Non-Tax
TOMARK TO INSTALL CUSTOM STADIUM PADS ON THE SOUTH CONCRETE WALL (1ST BASE SIDE) OF THE EXISTING SOFTBALL FIELD, PADS TO START ON THE LOWER WALL FROM RIGHT FIELD FENCE TO THE NEW WALL, INCLUDES 1 EA CUTOUT FOR THE LOWER DRAIN HOLE. PADS TO GO UP TO THE SIDES OF FOUL POLE (DO NOT COVER THE FOUL POLE), INSTALL PADS FROM THE LEFT CORNER WALL ALL THE WAY TO THE WEST WALL ON A CONTINUOUS HEIGHT UNTIL 6FT HEIGHT IS REACHED. THE BOTTOM OF ALL PADS TO BE AT THE TOP OF THE EXISTING DRAINS ON WALL, PROCEEDING ON THE WALL THAT ANGLES OUT 5FT TO BE 6FT HEIGHT. ON THE REMAINING 15 FT OF WALL THAT WILL END ALONG THE 1ST BASE LINE APPROX 15 FT FROM THE CORNER. 1 NEW FENCE TO BE INSTALLED BY CITY IN SAME APPROX LOCATION WHERE PADS END.
THE CITY WILL NEED TO TURN THE WATER OFF APPROX 2-3 DAYS PRIOR TO THE WORK SO TRUCK CAN BE DRIVEN ON TO THE FIELD WITH THE PADS AND EQUIPMENT TO INSTALL THE PADS.
INSTALL 1 EA POST PAD ON THE LIGHT POLE IN CENTER FIELD
OPENING DAY IS FEB 28TH & TOMARK WILL TRY & MEET THIS DATE

03/17/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
<th>Delivery Dtg(s)</th>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>Del Qty</th>
<th>Order Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Program ID</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NSPS085</td>
<td>NSPS085</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>7,999.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,999.00</td>
<td>7,999.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(flot price) CUSTOM STADIUM PADDING
Stadium padding 3" thick with 3/4" plywood and 2-clips
1 section of wall where foul pole is approx 12'-2"
50" H and slopes to approx 8" Dark Green is the color
1 section south wall 99'-2" 72" H and slopes to 50"
1 section corner 6'H x 5' W, 1 end section 1st base line 6'H x 15'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>Delivery Dt(s)</th>
<th>Del Qty</th>
<th>Order Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Program ID</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NSPDS085</td>
<td>NSPDS085</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custom Light Pole Pad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>color: dark Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/23/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>NSPDS085</td>
<td>NSPDS085</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>585.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>585.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custom Order Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 line charge for custom design of custom order padding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/23/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|              |                      |         |                |         |           |            |            |                |
| MDSE Total   | $                     | 10,003.00|                |         |           |            |            |                |
| Shipping & Handling | $               | 0.00    |                |         |           |            |            |                |
| Sales Tax    | $                     | 877.89  |                |         |           |            |            |                |
| Final Amount | $                     | 10,880.89|                |         |           |            |            |                |
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution establishing a ticket and pass distribution policy in accordance with Fair Political Practice Commission regulations. If adopted, the policy would identify the public purposes that are fulfilled when the City distributes tickets and passes to public officials for attendance at various functions.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Adopt Resolution establishing ticket and pass distribution policy.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Draft Resolution

FISCAL IMPACT: None
Amount Budgeted: $N/A
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

ORIGINATED BY: Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk
REVIEWED BY: Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The Fair Political Practices Commission ("FPPC") promulgated 2 California Code of Regulations § 18944.1 ("Rule") to regulate how complimentary tickets or passes given to an agency, and then distributed by the agency to its employees or officers, are reported within the meaning of the Political Reform Act ("PRA"). The Rule requires cities to adopt a written policy governing the distribution of complimentary tickets and passes and make various disclosures. In order for the City to continue to accept and distribute complimentary tickets or passes, it must adopt a written policy that complies with the Rule. A proposed resolution is attached for Council consideration and adoption.

In summary, the Rule requires that any distribution of tickets be made pursuant to an adopted written policy of the City Council and that the ticket distribution be disclosed within 30 days on the City's website using a form provided by the FPPC, or on a form which complies with the Rule.
Under the Rule, the City’s policy must contain three provisions:

“(1) a provision setting forth the public purposes of the agency to be accomplished by the distribution of tickets or passes;

“(2) a provision requiring that the distribution of any ticket or pass by the agency to, or at the behest of, an official accomplish a public purpose of the agency; and

“(3) a provision prohibiting the transfer by any official of any ticket or pass, distributed to such official pursuant to the agency policy, to any other person, except to members of the official’s immediate family solely for their personal use.”

The proposed resolution contains each of these provisions. The Rule does not define what public purposes are acceptable. Rather, the Rule recognizes the City’s ability to identify its own public purposes. Section 4 of the attached resolution contains the proposed public purposes which may be served by the distribution of tickets and passes under the policy.

To help accomplish the mandated disclosure of ticket distributions, the FPPC prepared Form 802, a copy of which is attached to this report. The disclosure must be posted in a “prominent fashion” on the City’s website. The FPPC provides no guidance on what it would consider “prominent” placement on a website.

The gift exemption applies only to the value of the event admission and the items included with admission. The exemption does not apply, “to any other benefits the official may receive that are not included with the admission, such as food or beverages, or any other item presented to the official at the event.” Section 7 of the proposed policy contains a reminder of this limit.
**Tickets Provided by**
**Agency Report**

1. **Agency Name**

   Division, Department, or Region *(if applicable)*

   Street Address

   Area Code/Phone Number  E-mail

   **Agency Contact** *(name and title)*  

   **Date of Original Filing:** *(month, day, year)*

2. **Event For Which Tickets Were Distributed**

   **Date(s) of Event:** __________/________/________  **Description of Event:** ____________________________

   __________/________/________  **Face Value of Ticket:** $ __________

   **Agency Event**  
   □ Yes  □ No *(Identify source of tickets below.)*

   **Name of Outside Source of Ticket(s) Provided to Agency:** ____________________________

   **Number of Tickets Received:** __________  **Ticket(s) Provided to Agency:**  
   □ Gratuitously  □ Pursuant to Contract

3. **Agency Official(s) Receiving Ticket(s) (use a continuation sheet for additional names)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Official <em>(Last, First)</em></th>
<th>Number of Tickets</th>
<th>State Whether the Distribution is Income to the Official or Describe the Public Purpose for the Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Individual or Organization Receiving Ticket(s) (Provided at the behest of an agency official.)**

   **Name of Behesting Agency Official:** ____________________________

   **Name of Individual or Organization:** ____________________________  **Number of Tickets:** __________

   **Description of Organization:** ____________________________

   **Address of Organization:**  
   Number and Street  City  State  Zip Code

   **Purpose for Distribution:** *(Describe the public purpose for the distribution to the organization.)*

5. **Verification**

   *I have determined that the distribution of tickets set forth above is in accordance with the provisions of FPPC Regulation 18944.1.*

   **Signature of Agency Head or Designee**

   **Print Name**  **Title**  

   **(month, day, year)**

   **Comment:** *(Use this space or an attachment for any additional information including amendment explanation.)*
Tickets Provided by Agency Report

A Public Document

This form is for use by all state and local government agencies to disclose the distribution of tickets or passes that allow admission to facilities, events, shows, or performances for entertainment, amusement, recreational, or similar purposes. The agency must complete Form 802 identifying agency officials who receive tickets or passes from the agency as well as other individuals and organizations that receive tickets or passes at the behest of agency officials. Form 802 must be posted in a prominent fashion on the agency’s website.

Gifts of Tickets or Passes to Public Officials
FPPC Regulation 18944.1 sets out the circumstances under which an agency's distribution of tickets or passes to or at the behest of an official in the agency does not result in a gift to the official. (Regulation 18944.1 is available on the FPPC website at www.fppc.ca.gov.) Even though the distribution of tickets or passes to a public official under the regulation is not a gift to the official, the agency must disclose the distribution on Form 802. The official does not have to disclose tickets or passes received or distributed under the regulation on his or her Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700), but tickets or passes received or distributed by the official that do not fall under the regulation may be subject to disclosure on the official's Form 700 and subject to gift limits.

Posting Form 802
The Form 802 must be posted on the agency’s website within 30 days after the distribution. If the agency does not maintain a website, the form must be maintained by the agency as a public record, be available for public inspection and copying, and be forwarded to the FPPC for posting on its website.

Part 1. Agency Identification
List the agency’s name, address and the name of an agency contact. Mark the amendment box if changing any information on a previously filed form and include the date of the original filing.

Part 2. Event For Which Tickets Were Distributed
Provide the date(s) of the event, a description of the event, and the face value (i.e. the cost to the public) of the ticket or pass. Check the box indicating whether the event was an "agency event" (such as a county fair, or an event for which the agency purchased tickets). If the agency received the tickets from an outside source, identify the source, the number of tickets received, and check the box to identify whether the tickets or passes were provided to the agency:

- Gratuitously; or
- Pursuant to a contract.

Part 3. Agency Official(s) Receiving Ticket(s)
Disclose the name of each agency official that received a ticket or pass and the number of tickets or passes the official received. Also state whether the distribution is income to the official or describe the public purpose for which the official received the tickets or passes.

Part 4. Individual or Organization Receiving Ticket(s)
If tickets or passes were distributed to an individual or organization outside the agency, at the behest of an official of the agency, provide the name of the official. Disclose the name(s) of the individuals(s) who received the tickets or passes and the number of tickets or passes provided. If the tickets or passes were provided to an organization, the agency may post the name, address, a description of the organization, and the number of tickets or passes provided to the organization in lieu of posting the name of each individual that received a ticket or pass. Also, describe the public purpose for the distribution to the individual or organization.

Part 5. Verification
The agency head or his or her designee must sign the form.

Privacy Information Notice
Information requested on all FPPC forms is used by the FPPC to administer and enforce the Political Reform Act (Government Code Sections 81000-91014 and California Code of Regulations Sections 18109-18997). All information required by these forms is mandated by the Political Reform Act. Failure to provide all of the information required by the Act is a violation subject to administrative, criminal, or civil prosecution. All reports and statements provided are public records open for public inspection and reproduction.

If you have any questions regarding this Privacy Act Notice, please contact the FPPC.

General Counsel
Fair Political Practices Commission
428 J Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 322-5660
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RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A POLICY FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF TICKETS AND PASSES RECEIVED BY THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO PURSUANT TO 2 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS § 18944.1.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds as follows:

A. The Fair Political Practices Commission ("FPPC") require the City to set forth a written policy regarding the distribution of tickets and passes received by the City;

B. The FPPC recognizes the discretion of local agency governing bodies, including the City Council, to determine if the distribution of tickets and passes serves the agency's legitimate public purpose;

C. The receipt of such tickets and passes is a resource of the City and not of its officials or employees;

D. The City desires to distribute this resource in a manner that furthers the public purposes of the City, as described herein; and

E. The City has a strong public purpose in ensuring the quality and continued improvement of events and attractions in the City.

SECTION 2: Definitions. Unless specifically stated to the contrary, all terms in this Resolution are defined as set forth in California Government Code §§ 82000, et seq., and 2 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18944.1.

SECTION 3: Purpose. The purpose of this policy is to ensure all tickets and passes received by the City are distributed in furtherance of the City's stated public purposes and in accordance with 2 CCR § 18944.1.

SECTION 4: Application. This Resolution applies only to tickets or passes distributed by the City to, or at the behest of, public officials. This includes distribution of any tickets or passes received under contract or agreement where the consideration to the City includes a certain number of tickets or passes to the event which is the subject of the contract or agreement. Tickets or passes received by an official from sources other than the City will be treated in
accordance with applicable law including, without limitation, the Political Reform Act and FPPC regulations.

**SECTION 5: Public Purposes.** Tickets and passes may be distributed by the City only in furtherance of any or all of the following public purposes:

A. Promoting local events, tourism, or public facilities;

B. Promoting City programs, facilities, and resources;

C. Promoting programs and resources available to the City's residents from sources other than the City;

D. Promoting or acknowledging achievements or accomplishments of residents or businesses of the City;

E. Employee recognition or retention;

F. A public purpose identified by written resolution adopted by the City Council at the time of distributing tickets or passes; and

G. As an incident to the above public purposes, allowing for the immediate family of public officials to accompany the officials to events to accomplish any of the purposes listed in this Resolution.

**SECTION 6: Limitations.** Tickets or passes distributed to a public official under this policy are solely for the personal use of the official or his or her immediate family. Any unused ticket or pass distributed to a public official under this policy must be returned to the City for redistribution if the ticket or pass remains valid. Under no circumstances may the ticket or pass be sold or further distributed by the official, except to the official's immediate family for their personal use.

**SECTION 7: Other Benefits Not Included.** Recipient officials are advised to review 2 CCR § 18944.1(f) which limits the ticket or pass gift exemption to only the value of the ticket or pass, and does not include other benefits received at the event, including food or beverages.

**SECTION 8: Ticket or Pass Distribution.** The City Manager, or designee, is responsible for distribution of tickets or passes in accordance with this policy. The City Council authorizes the City Manager to exercise the City's discretion in determining if distribution of the tickets or passes complies with this policy, including any distribution to the City Manager or his or her immediate family.
SECTION 9: Posting of Policy. This policy must be posted on the City’s website in a prominent fashion, as required by 2 CCR § 18944.1(c).

SECTION 10: Posting of Ticket or Pass Distribution. In accordance with 2 CCR § 18944.1(d), any distribution of passes or tickets under this policy must be posted in a prominent fashion on the City’s website within thirty (30) days of the distribution. The posting must contain all information required by 2 CCR § 18944.1(d). The posting must use FPPC Form 802, or any form approved for this purpose by the City Manager.

SECTION 11: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution; record this Resolution in the book of the City’s original resolutions; and make a minute of the adoption of the Resolution in the City Council’s records and the minutes of this meeting.

SECTION 12: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of __________, 2009.

_______________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor
ATTEST:

____________________________________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
MARK D. HENSLEY, City Attorney

By: ________________________________

Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: February 2, 2010

AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding authorizing the recording of the Notice of Completion and authorizing the City Manager to accept completion of work for 23 homes related to the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program's Group 31 (Project No. RSI 09-06). (Final Contract Amount: $755,138.37, less liquidated damages as authorized by the City manager)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Authorize the City Clerk to file the City's Planning and Building Safety Director's Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office;

2. Authorize the City Manager, or designee, to close out Project No. RSI 09-06; and/or

3. Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

List of homes included in Groups 31
Planning and Building Safety Director’s Notice of Completion

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amounts Budgeted: $854,434
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): 116-400-0000-8960

ORIGINATED BY: James S. O'Neill, Program Manager

REVIEWED BY: Greg Carpenter, Director of Planning and Building Safety

APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

This project is part of the City's Residential Sound Insulation (RSI) Program financed by federal grants from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the settlement agreement with Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA).

The RSI Program offers modifications to owners of qualifying residential property in the City of El Segundo that reduce interior sound levels of noise generated by air traffic from neighboring Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

At its meeting on May 20, 2009 the City Council awarded a construction contract to Professional Building Contractors, Inc. (PBC) for construction for 23 homes, commonly referred to as Group 31 of the RSI Program.

The work has now been completed and the final contract amount is $755,138.37, less liquidated damages as authorized by the City Manager.
Exhibit A

Residential Sound Insulation Program
Group 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSI Number</th>
<th>Project Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>844 Sheldon Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>846 Sheldon Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>735 W. Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>310 W. Imperial Ave., #06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>660 W. Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>740 W. Sycamore Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.07</td>
<td>912 Sheldon St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>527 W. Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.09</td>
<td>837 Loma Vista St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>825 Hillcrest St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>210 W. Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>627 W. Elm Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>225 W. Sycamore Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>314 W. Oak Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>125 W. Sycamore Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>223 E. Walnut Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>630 Hillcrest St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>515 E. Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>429 W. Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>316 W. Sycamore Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>415 W. Oak Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>770 W. Imperial Ave., #09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>770 W. Imperial Ave., #32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Project Name: Residential Sound Insulation Program – Group 31
Project No.: RSI 09-06

Notice is hereby given pursuant to State of California Civil Code Section 3093 et seq. that:

1. The undersigned is an officer of the owner of interest stated below in the property hereinafter described.

2. The project owner's name is: City of El Segundo

3. The full addresses of the project are: attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference

4. The nature of the interest of the owner is:

5. A work of improvement on the property hereinafter described was field reviewed by City representatives on: see attached Exhibit A

6. The work done was: Residential Sound Insulation Program Improvements

7. On February 2, 2010, City Council of the City of El Segundo accepted the work of this contract as being complete and directed the recording of this Notice of Completion in the Office of the County Recorder.

8. The name of the Contractor for such work of improvement was: Professional Building Contractors, Inc.

9. The property on which said work of improvement was completed is in the City of El Segundo, County of Los Angeles, State of California, and is described as follows: Private Residence(s) listed in Exhibit A

10. The street address of said properties are: set forth in Exhibit A

Dated: February 3, 2010

Greg Carpenter
Planning and Building Safety Director

VERIFICATION

I, the undersigned, say: I am the Director of Planning and Building Safety of the City El Segundo, the declarant of the foregoing Notice of Completion; I have read said Notice of Completion and know the contents thereof; the same is true of my own knowledge.

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 3, 2010 at El Segundo, California.

Greg Carpenter
Planning and Building Safety Director