



# El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2023010196

*Prepared for:*

**City of El Segundo**

350 Main Street  
El Segundo, California 90245

*Prepared by:*

**EcoTierra Consulting, Inc.**

633 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071

April 1, 2024

# Table of Contents

---

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	I-1
II.	RESPONSE TO COMMENTS.....	II-1
III.	ERRATA .....	III-1
IV.	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.....	IV-1

## APPENDICES

- Appendix A Draft EIR Comment Letters

# I. Introduction

---

As defined by Section 21087 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC), which codifies the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of El Segundo is the Lead Agency for the Project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15089, the City of El Segundo (City), must prepare a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) before approving a project. The purpose of the Final EIR is to provide an opportunity for the lead agency to respond to comments made by the public and governmental agencies in regard to the El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan Update Draft EIR. The Final EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, is comprised of revisions to the Draft EIR; a list of persons, organizations, and agencies that provided comments on the Draft EIR; responses to comments received regarding the Draft EIR; an errata to the Draft EIR, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The EIR is comprised of two parts and the Final EIR constitutes the second part, with the Draft EIR constituting the first part. The Draft EIR was released for public comment on January 31, 2024. The comment period ended on March 18, 2024 (48 days duration), which met the minimum 45-day review period required by CEQA. The Draft EIR is incorporated by reference and bound separately.

## 1. Organization of the Final EIR

This Final EIR is organized in the following sections:

### I. Introduction

This section provides a summary of the Project description and CEQA requirements.

### II. Responses to Comments

This section includes a list of public agencies, organizations, and individuals who submitted comments on the Draft EIR, and detailed responses to the comment letters submitted to the City in response to the Draft EIR. The original comment letters in their entirety are included in **Appendix A**.

### III. Errata

This section provides a complete overview of the revisions to the Draft EIR that have been incorporated into the Final EIR in response to the comments submitted during the public review period or that were initiated by staff. These changes do not add significant new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. More specifically, CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to PRC Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5) but before the EIR is certified. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 specifically states that “[n]ew information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’

unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. 'Significant new information' requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that "[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR... A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record."

As demonstrated in this Final EIR, neither the comments submitted on the Draft EIR, the responses to these comments, nor the corrections and additions presented in **Section III, Errata**, of this Final EIR, constitute new significant information warranting recirculation of the Draft EIR as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Rather, the Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

#### **IV. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

This section includes a list of the project design features and required mitigation measures and includes detailed information with respect to the City's policies and procedures for implementation of the project design features and mitigation measures. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) identifies the monitoring phase, the enforcement phase, and the applicable department or agency responsible for ensuring that each feature or measure is implemented.

The Final EIR also includes the following appendices:

**Appendix A: Draft EIR Comment Letters** – This appendix to the Final EIR includes copies of all written comment letters received on the Draft EIR.

## **2. Public Review Process**

In compliance with the CEQA Guidelines, the City has taken steps to provide opportunities for public participation in the environmental process. During the preparation of the Draft EIR, the City

contacted various federal, State, regional, and local government agencies and other interested parties to inform the public of the Project and to solicit comments on the scope of environmental review. The City prepared an Initial Study and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, the Los Angeles County Clerk, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on January 12, 2023 for a 30-day public review period. Additionally, a public Scoping Meeting was held on February 2, 2023. The Initial Study, NOP, and NOP comment letters are included in **Appendix A** of the Draft EIR.

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and 15105, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research. The public review period commenced on February 2, 2024, and ended on March 18, 2024 for a total of 46 days. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(d), a Notice of Completion and Availability of the Draft EIR was filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk. The Draft EIR was also made available for review on the City's website, at the local public library, at the City Planning Division. Following the Draft EIR public comment period, this Final EIR has been prepared and includes responses to the comments raised regarding the Draft EIR.

## II. Response to Comments

---

The CEQA review process provides opportunities for public participation, including periods for public review and comment on the adequacy of the Draft EIR prior to certification. Section 15088(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and prepare a written response to comments received during the comment period. Section 15204(a) of the CEQA Guidelines clarifies that the lead agency is not required to accept every suggestion it is given, provided that the lead agency explains why specific comments/suggestions were not accepted and responds to significant environmental issues with substantial evidence and makes a good faith effort at disclosure. Reviewers of the Draft EIR are encouraged to examine the sufficiency of the environmental document, particularly in regard to significant effects, and to suggest specific mitigation measures and project alternatives. Furthermore, Section 15204(c) of the CEQA Guidelines advises reviewers that comments should be accompanied by factual support.

**Section II.B, Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**, includes a table that summarizes the environmental issues raised by each commenter regarding the Draft EIR. The City Planning Division received a total of four comment letters on the Draft EIR during the designated public review period (between February 2, 2024 and March 18, 2024). Each comment letter has been assigned a corresponding number, and comments within each comment letter are also numbered. The organizations/persons that provided written comments on the Draft EIR to the City Planning Division are listed in the summary table below, which also indicates the issue areas on which each organization/person commented.

**Section II.C, Comment Letters and Responses**, provides detailed responses to all comments related to the environmental review and acknowledges comments and opinions relating to the support of or opposition to the Project. Copies of the original comment letters are provided in **Appendix A** of this Final EIR.

## II. Responses to Comments

### A. Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR

Table II-1  
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS EI Segundo Downtown Specific Plan	Letter Number	Project Description	Impacts Less than Significant	Aesthetics	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Energy	Geology and Soils	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Land Use and Planning	Noise	Population and Housing	Public Services	Transportation/Traffic	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities	Alternatives	Other	Explanation of "Other"
<b>Organizations and Individuals</b>																				
Los Angeles Conservancy	1					•														
Tony Levitan	2														•					
Stephanie Ms	3														•				•	Climate Action Plan
Stephanie Ms	4			•							•			•	•					

## **II. Responses to Comments**

---

### **B. Comment Letters and Responses**

#### **Comment Letter No. 1**

Los Angeles Conservancy  
Adrian Scott Fine, President and CEO  
523 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 826  
Los Angeles, CA 90014

#### Comment No. 1-1

Please see the L.A. Conservancy's attached comments responding to the DEIR for the El Segundo DSP Update. Do not hesitate to reach out with any questions.

#### Response to Comment No. 1-1

The comment is an introduction and, as such, is acknowledged for the record and will be considered by the City's decision-making bodies prior to determining any action on the Project. Specific comments raised in the remainder of the comment letter are addressed in Responses to Comments 1-2 through 1-7.

#### Comment No. 1-2

On behalf of the Los Angeles Conservancy, I am writing to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) Update. The proposed update is a revision to the existing El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan, which serves as the land use and zoning for properties within the boundaries of the DSP area. The project would revise the existing DSP planning districts, amend General Plan and zoning designations on eight parcels, and include mobility enhancements. Additionally, it would include public improvements and streetscape guidelines, private urban form criteria, permitted land uses, development standards, mobility and infrastructure improvements, an implementation plan, and administration processes.

#### Response to Comment No. 1-2

The comment is an introduction and, as such, is acknowledged for the record and will be considered by the City's decision-making bodies prior to determining any action on the Project.

#### Comment No. 1-3

The DEIR identifies several eligible historic resources within the DSP area. 105 W. Grand Avenue in the Main Street District and 140 Richmond Street, 203 Richmond Street, and 218 – 220



Richmond Street in the Richmond Street District were found to be eligible for individual listing on the El Segundo Register. A collection of properties on the 100 and 200 blocks of Richmond in the Richmond Street District were identified as an eligible historic district on the El Segundo Register. We are concerned that the proposed mitigation measures to protect these resources are not sufficient. In our comments we propose ways to strengthen these measures and support the holistic preservation of historic and cultural resources in El Segundo.

**I. Stronger mitigation measures for identified historic resources.**

The eligible historic resources reflect the formative institutional and commercial development in downtown El Segundo in the 1920s. The significant buildings are summarized below.

- 105 W. Grand Avenue, built in 1928, is a rare remaining example of a mixed-use commercial building and is prominently situated at the corner of Grand Avenue and Main Street. It appears to be eligible for listing on the El Segundo Register.
- 140 Richmond Street, built in 1921, is a rare remaining example of a theater in El Segundo. It was originally a live performance venue called the State Theater, then adapted for motion picture viewing before it closed in the mid-1930s. In 1944, it reopened as the El Segundo Theater and in 1957 the State Theater name was restored. It has operated as the Old Town Music Hall since 1968 and specializes in concerts and silent films accompanied live on a Mighty Wurlitzer pipe organ. It appears to be eligible for listing on the El Segundo Register.
- 203 Richmond Street, built in 1925, was the former location of the first El Segundo City Hall and Library. The building retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance as the City Hall Annex. It is over 50 years of age and reflects the institutional development of the City. The property appears to be eligible for listing in the National, California, and El Segundo Registers and is a contributor to a potential historic district on Richmond Street.
- 218 – 220 Richmond Street, built in 1915, is one of the few remaining examples of a mixed-use commercial building from downtown’s growth in the 1910s. It appears to be eligible for listing in the National, California, and El Segundo Registers and is a contributor to a potential historic district on Richmond Street. The Status Code is 3S/3CS/5Ss3/5D3.
- The Richmond Historic District on the 100 and 200 blocks of Richmond Street reflects the earliest commercial development in El Segundo. Constructed between 1915 and 1947, the buildings are one and two stories in height and mostly unreinforced masonry construction. Of the 27 parcels in the Potentially Eligible Historic District, there are 16 contributing properties and 11 noncontributing properties. Nine of the non-contributing properties 9 are occupied by buildings and two are surface parking lots. The non-contributing properties were constructed in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, but are compatible with the height, scale, and massing of the contributing properties.

The DEIR proposed to mitigate adverse impacts to these historic resources by requiring owners proposing an alteration, addition, or demolition to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a Historical Resources Assessment Report (HRAR). The consultant shall produce a Memorandum to the City evaluating the proposed work's alignment with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If the proposed work is not compliant, the consultant will include recommendations to bring the project into compliance.

However, these measures do not have any mechanisms to ensure the City follows the recommendations in the Memorandum, leaving the buildings and district vulnerable to incompatible alterations or demolitions.

While we appreciate the proposed land use updates that would celebrate the historic nature of the area and guidelines maintaining the existing scale, massing, and character of the area, we encourage stronger protections for the historic resources that contribute to the character of downtown.

We encourage the city to incorporate language promoting the preservation of historic buildings. One way of doing so is to initiate the process to list these properties on the El Segundo Register. While the City approved a Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1993, over 30 years later it has yet to add any properties to the Register. The DSP offers a prescient reason to utilize the City's existing historic preservation program and strengthen protections for these rare examples of El Segundo's development.

Recommendation: Incorporate language within the DSP Update that emphasizes historic preservation and consider local designation of individual resources and the Richmond Historic District.

#### Response to Comment No. 1-3

As noted in the Draft EIR, the proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update Project could result in intensification of land uses beyond the existing Specific Plan uses and boundary that could potentially affect the historical resources and potential historic district identified in the comment. Depending on design characteristics and construction activities associated with future development projects, these projects may potentially have a significant effect on the environment.

As indicated in the Draft EIR, Specific Plan Chapter 2.H establishes policies and guidance for preservation of historic resources within the Specific Plan area. Moreover, the City's General Plan includes specific goals, policies and objectives related to historic preservation. The Specific Plan Update includes a process that requires review and approval of a Discretionary Downtown Design Review (DDR) for substantial, permanent exterior alterations to a building, building additions, or demolitions. The DDR would determine consistency with district development standards and would require findings concerning project consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan policies related to historic preservation.

As indicated in the Draft EIR, Specific Plan Chapter 7, the Administrative Discretionary Demolition Permit requires that the demolition of structures on properties identified individually as potential historic resources or contributing to a potential historic district requires review and approval of an

Administrative Discretionary Demolition Permit. This permit is subject to the review process in the El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) Chapter 15-23. In addition, before an Administrative Discretionary Demolition Permit may be issued, the decision making authority must find that demolition of the subject structure(s) will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Furthermore, preparation of project-specific technical reports as required by Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1 would serve as a tool for the City's decision makers in making these findings and requiring changes in proposed projects if deemed necessary under the City's authority as the lead agency for the Downtown Specific Plan Update. This process would ensure that potential impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

As noted, in the Draft EIR, listing a property or historic district in the El Segundo Register requires the consent of the property owner. The City would process any nomination for listing that is consistent with the Ordinance.

The comment is acknowledged for the record and will be considered by the City's decision-making bodies prior to determining any action on the Project.

#### Comment No. 1-4

### **II. Creation of a legacy businesses program**

Beyond the physical built environment, the City of El Segundo should consider developing a legacy business program for the historic downtown commercial area. Legacy businesses are long-standing neighborhood anchors that contribute to a sense of place. Often 20 years of operation is the minimum threshold for a legacy business.

In recent years, cities including San Francisco, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Long Beach have adopted programs that either provide financial incentives or create a promotional program that attracts patrons. The Conservancy played an important role in the formation of the City of Los Angeles's program and would be interested in discussing such a program with the City of El Segundo.

#### Response to Comment No. 1-4

This comment is noted for the administrative record and has been incorporated into this Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to any action on the Project. Since businesses are not considered historic resources under CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of a legacy business program would not be required in order to address a potentially significant impact. Nevertheless, the comment is acknowledged for the record and will be considered by the City's decision-making bodies prior to determining any action on the Project.

---

Comment No. 1-5**III. Conclusion**

In summary, the Conservancy recommends the following as potential ways to mitigate any significant impacts to historic resources.

- Incorporate language that promotes historic preservation
- Creation of a legacy business program.

Response to Comment No. 1-5

This comment is noted for the administrative record and has been incorporated into this Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to any action on the Project. Please see responses to Comment Nos. 1-3 and 1-4.

Comment No. 1-6**About the Los Angeles Conservancy:**

The Los Angeles Conservancy is the largest local historic preservation organization in the United States, with nearly 5,000 members throughout the Los Angeles area. Established in 1978, the Conservancy works to preserve and revitalize the significant architectural and cultural heritage of Los Angeles County through advocacy and education.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 430-4203 or [afine@laconservancy.org](mailto:afine@laconservancy.org) should you have any questions or concerns.

Response to Comment No. 1-6

The comment includes closing remarks, and provides contact information. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration prior to any action on the Project.

## **Comment Letter No. 2**

Tony Levitan

### Comment No. 2-1

I wanted to provide some feedback on the proposed plans for the downtown El Segundo. The ideas are great, but I think the implementation needs a lot of work specially around the roadways.

### Response to Comment No. 2-1

This comment expresses an opinion about the roadway improvements proposed under the DSP Update and is not a comment on the adequacy of the EIR. Thus, no further response is required.

### Comment No. 2-2

In chapter 3 (page 3-13 onwards) the concepts indicate the need to have separate lanes for bike, parking, and travel. At the moment we already have this, and the roads are shared between residents. We have seen in Culver City and Mar Vista that having a separate bike lane and reducing travel lane cases additional traffic and traffic accidents. I've often sat in Culver City and seen a long line of cars waiting to move but no bikes or buses. In Mar Vista I have seen cyclists having to take evasive direction changes, so they are not hit by vehicles. Added to this, just think how many ubers, door dash and similar type vehicles will land up parked in the bike lanes.

El Segundo is unique in that few travelers drive through it to get somewhere quicker, and therefore most traffic is that of residents. If the roads are changed per the design I suspect we will have a lot more traffic through the residential areas.

Please reconsider the need to change the roads.

### Response to Comment No. 2-2

This comment expresses the thought that the Project's proposed roadway concepts would create traffic congestion and unsafe traffic conditions.

Under CEQA, traffic congestion is no longer used as a manner of assessing transportation impacts of a project. As outlined in the EIR on page IV.L-20, a project's transportation impacts are based on whether the project would do the following:

- Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities;
- Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) (i.e., would the project generate vehicle miles traveled in excess of a significance threshold);
- Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); and

- Result in inadequate emergency access.

Additionally, this comment cites personal observations in other cities with different roadway characteristics, such as Culver City and Los Angeles, which include high-volume arterial roadways. Such wide, high-vehicle-throughput roadway types found in the Westside area of Los Angeles are not present in Downtown El Segundo. In general, research shows that the installation of bike lanes is an effective countermeasure to reduce the number of collisions on a roadway (CMF Clearinghouse, 2021). Under Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines, an effect shall be considered significant only if backed by substantial evidence. Thus, no further response to this comment is required. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration prior to any action on the Project.

**Comment Letter No. 3**

Stephanie Ms

Comment No. 3-1

How are you?

Am sending off some quick emails to you in different emails. Hopefully, some of the points can still be considered and am honestly not fully informed of everything but because of today's deadline, here it goes:

Response to Comment No. 3-1

The comment is an introduction and, as such, is acknowledged for the record and will be considered by the City's decision-making bodies prior to determining any action on the Project. Specific comments raised in the remainder of the comment letter are addressed in Responses to Comments 3-2 through 3-3.

Comment No. 3-2

P.IV.L-39

Please explain or advise on the following on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR):

I don't understand how the city can widen sidewalks and block streets (on Richmond and Grand Ave) for purposes of providing increased eating area that benefits those businesses only and identify it as providing pedestrian comfort when the whole purpose of doing such is to provide sit down eating areas to patrons of those particular privately owned businesses which are located here.

The crowds will block the travel/drive/walking of pedestrians who live in this area and that is not comfortable to those of us living here and paying taxes. You are giving part of our community over to benefit individual business owners and bringing noise to our community for which the residents in return are getting blocked from full use of the roads in our town.

If you are keeping the EIR analysis separate from the low income housing plans planned for that same street in the future, it doesn't seem that walkability should even be a consideration in the EIR report. We residents can already walk to Richmond street easily as it is tucked away from the Main Street area. And why would low income residents need walkability to the private restaurants on the Richmond street anyway? If they can't afford to pay for their own housing it doesn't seem like eating out would be on their to do list.

We all would guess that closing Richmond street is in hopes of catering to workers of office buildings that may be built in the future close to this Richmond Street location. So the Richmond Street location is not really needed for resident walkability but to cater to future office workers. The Richmond street closure is not a requirement to facilitate walkability or even to develop low

income housing. It is a bone being thrown to the restaurant owners. And this is environmentally unhealthy for all the residents who already live in the area.

If a restaurant owner wants more restaurant space he needs to buy a bigger building. He shouldn't be given city property to conduct private business from which he keeps the profits and whereby resident taxes are confiscated to benefit a non city purpose.

Appropriate locations for community events are the city park where everyone enjoys the park equally. And no one person has a right to receive pecuniary benefit off the land kept up by the residents who pay taxes here.

The question is who is the main beneficiary of this activity and it certainly isn't the residents in general. So that's a problem from my standpoint because residents should not feel like the city is allowing private individuals unfair or inappropriate use of city property.

#### Response to Comment No. 3-2

The commenter expresses concern about the widening of sidewalks which will block local vehicular access and local pedestrian access on Richmond Street and Grand Avenue. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update includes improvements related to pedestrian access including:

- (1) general sidewalk improvements, including visibility and ADA-compliant upgrades;
- (2) walkability enhancements at mid-block crosswalks, including visibility improvements and pedestrian signals;
- (3) walkability enhancements at controlled intersections, including ADA-compliant upgrades and pedestrian countdown heads; and
- (4) paseo enhancements, including a wayfinding program and pedestrian amenities.

These improvements are designed to enhance pedestrian access throughout the downtown area and promote street-level activity and vibrancy in the area. To the extent that these improvements facilitate outdoor dining, which would be consistent with these goals, such enhanced activity would be accompanied by wider sidewalks that would increase pedestrian capacity and would not occur at the expense of pedestrian circulation. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

With respect to housing, the proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update does not directly address the provision of affordable housing, which is addressed through other City plans, including the Housing Element. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.



Comment No. 3-3

HOWEVER, if the purpose here is to begin to propagate El Segundo's Climate Action plan...If it is to have El Segundo foster the live where you work (even if you can't afford) and walk everywhere/dine out like you earn enough to do it; then that is more communism and the 15 minute city concept pushed by the Climate Change Narrative being pushed by globalists/United Nations which seeks a One World Government. <https://www.youtube/watch?v=Obs9Xh875Lg>

We aren't communists/Marxists etc. We are Americans and we all have the chance to achieve as much or as little as you want to in American. We as individuals should be resisting the march toward coming under a one world government and the deceptive fraudulent Climate Change Hoax.

Please consider the decade long history and progression of Climate Action Plans. Here are three climate action plans over our land, air, and sea. These were used to:

- 1) **Cripple our energy self sufficiency** by stifling our coal and gas production/usage. (Barak Obama's 2013 Climate action plan)
- 2) Deceive us into accepting ever increasing restrictions to stop global warming. (This is a ruse because they are maliciously and "secretly" **geoengineering** the skies simultaneously which destroys the ozone and creates the greatest cause of accelerated global warming leading to our destruction. [https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/2021-11/Aviation Climate Action Plan.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/2021-11/Aviation%20Climate%20Action%20Plan.pdf) ; <https://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/> and
- 3) Create a solution that includes a built- in **global government structure** over our waters/oceans/land which is a threat to our national security and independence. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Ocean-Climate-Action-Plan Final.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Ocean-Climate-Action-Plan-Final.pdf)

The Climate Action mythology is a farce to take our government and freedoms from us. We should not mindlessly follow suit. **I request you strongly consider eliminating as much of this subject matter as you can from influencing your final EIR decision.**

If you have a hard time believing that nonsense has invaded our city/state/federal government, please remember that during the primary election held on March 5, 2024 in our very own El Segundo Public Library sat a written notice informing us that identification would not be checked during our voting activities.

We are living in treacherous times and we should take every step to avoid participating in measures designed to ruin our way of life/our country.

Response to Comment No. 3-3

The commenter expresses concern over El Segundo's Climate Action Plan. The proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update does not establish any policies or programs related to climate change. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would be consistent with plans, policies and programs designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including the City's Climate Action Plan. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the

adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

**Comment Letter No. 4**

Stephanie Ms

Comment No. 4-1

Well, here is my second comment that hopefully makes your March 18 deadline. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 4-1

The comment is an introduction and, as such, is acknowledged for the record and will be considered by the City's decision-making bodies prior to determining any action on the Project. Specific comments raised in the remainder of the comment letter are addressed in Responses to Comments 4-2 through 4-10.

Comment No. 4-2

Environmental Impact Report 2<sup>nd</sup> comment 3/18/24

**LOW INCOME HOUSING AND PARKING**

Renters tend to bring occupants to live with them (after the lease is signed), especially low income renters. **New units should all have at least two parking spots (or more) for each new unit whether 1 or 2 bedrooms.** New construction should be required to build their own parking within their housing structure. Why? Because....

Low income renters tend to come from less affluent areas where they handle parking difficulties with their own set of rules. When parking is unavailable to them they will "create" parking. This may involve parking on red curbs, parking on private driveways and blocking exits, double parking in the street – yes, even during rush hour.

They don't like to be confronted if you have a problem with their creative parking methods. Because if you cause a stink, they can be ready to challenge you in the street or follow you home.

Low income/subsidized renters also have friends and relatives that like to visit. They understand they may have to park a distance away and are ok with walking a distance to find a spot. However, if they have to park a few blocks away in your neighborhood, that is the time that some of them use to scout what's in your car or home and don't be surprised if they take that opportunity to take what they like from you. Now, unless you know where they came from, forget about trying to get your things back. They're gone. They were just visiting for the day.

My point: make sure low income housing has enough parking for tenants, their guests, and extra so they can park in the building where they live. Besides, any unit, having only one parking will not normally attract to income tenants who could pay the higher rent. It's best not to artificially depressed front because you failed to provide adequate parking for tenant.

Response to Comment No. 4-2

The commenter expresses concerns regarding housing and parking. The proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update does not directly address the provision of affordable housing, which is addressed through other City plans, including the Housing Element. The Proposed Specific Plan includes strategies for addressing and providing adequate parking supply throughout the Project Area, including street parking, shared parking, parking structures and parking supply within new projects. These strategies are designed to ensure that parking supply will be available for residents, employees and visitors to the downtown area. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-3

**Not every low income person is a problem.** But the likelihood and scale of problems goes up, proportionately to the number of low income people you bring into the city. Now we have mostly nice workers in our city. But who is to say that the low income housing will only go to them and not to the general population at large?

(\*\*In Hawthorne, the police used to take part in reviewing housing applicants before they were approved as a tenant. This is important because it is more efficient to keep a bad apple out of the city in the first place, then to let them in and then have to chase them and their cohorts around for the next three years.)

Response to Comment No. 4-3

The commenter expresses concerns regarding housing and potential future residents in the City. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-4**BUS TERMINALS**

Buses can be useful for workers. But they also carry homeless people and criminals to destination points...Long Beach suffered a surge and homeless wanderer when buses force them to disembark after the buses stopped running. Don't be like long Beach.

**Expanding bus line activity to destination, El Segundo is a very bad idea in the face of serving homelessness** and the U.S. border invasion. Because you don't know who is going to enter your town at night when they step off the bus.

Response to Comment No. 4-4

The commenter expresses concerns regarding potential effects of expanding bus service. The proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update does not include any expansion of bus service in the City of El Segundo. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the

adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration

Comment No. 4-5

**CLOSING OFF RICHMOND STREET for RESTAURANT DINING/GATHERING**

Contained areas such as that envisioned with a blocked off Richmond Street restaurant area with low lights, chairs, benches, trash cans – especially if next to a bus stop where homeless can get off is just asking for trouble. It is exactly what homeless people like – an area to set up for the night, rummage through trash, sleep on benches, LOW LIGHT.

And don't think you can just shoo them away in the morning. No, after a while, the urine not only smells, but it actually sticks to your shoes and leaves a dark spot on the wall and white sidewalk. But the fecal matter on the side of the building will require a little more elbow grease and holding your nose. Hopefully they don't bring a dirty mattress...

Lastly, the streets need to stay open as the planned increase in offices and units is going to slow traffic down in the city. If you reduce the street lanes here and main street, etc, it's going to drastically slow down downtown traffic the same as it is experienced in downtown Pasadena, downtown Santa Monica, and downtown Long Beach.

Response to Comment No. 4-5

The commenter expresses concerns regarding potential effects of community improvements to Richmond Street. Please see Response to Comment No. 3-3. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-6

**BRIGHT LIGHTS**

Whoever tells you that you can plan for low income housing, bus terminals drop off points, private areas with nice furniture and *low lights*...well, they're *lying* to you.

All these things increase the opportunity for crime and homeless activities, and eventually the business owners are going to be pleading for you for help. Because vagrants, unsanitary conditions and crime are bad for business.

So this is where you are going to have to bring in the flood lights. Flood lights in the open spaces where homeless are hanging. Why? Because nobody wants to sleep under a flood light.

If the planned parking structures are catering to homeless and low incomes, you will likely at some point have to worry about assaults and break ins there too. So you'll have to put flood lights in all levels of your parking structures.

So forget the decorative low lights and budget in the crime fighting floodlights in all the areas where you are planning to promote us to the outside world.

Response to Comment No. 4-6

The commenter expresses concern that the decorative lighting will not benefit the City. The commenter states that floodlights are required throughout the City to deter crime in the City. The proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update includes provisions for adequate lighting to promote safety and security throughout the Specific Plan area. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-7**MURALS ARTWORK ON BUILDINGS STREETSCAPE**

Please don't. What you think is nice may not be what I or others think is nice. Why do developers think we want to look at the same loud neon colored graphic on a building wall day after day? They have such loud art in Santa Monica and Long Beach. When you think of those places do you think of a small town atmosphere or a busy place filled with crime? We all know it's the latter. Please don't start labeling the flowers to educate the public. Some months ago you could see flags at the high school with words on them like little mantras. No thank you.

Three other reasons to avoid public artwork and streetscape "education": 1) Other cities like Long Beach use it to promote leftist ideology; 2) It can be an eyesore 3) It's more expensive to clean and fix than graffiti'd. And when you build your city to look and act like Santa Monica and Long Beach, expect more graffiti.

Response to Comment No. 4-7

The commenter expresses concern regarding the addition of murals to the streetscape. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-8**Signage**

The only sign I'd like to see is a big:

**"WELCOME TO EL SEGUNDO".**

Why is all the main street sign making our city name as diminutive as possible as if we are trying to hide our city name.

Response to Comment No. 4-8

The commenter expresses that they would like to see larger welcome signage. The proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update includes provisions for new signage to promote downtown El Segundo and provide safety and directional signage for residents and visitors. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-9

**Keeping the unique small town “village” atmosphere**

For all the issues mentioned above, the idea promoted in the EIR that these changes are going to keep our unique small town village atmosphere is not possible. The developmental changes and consequences are not unique. They’ve already been applied in nearby cities such as Long Beach, Santa Monica, etc. and none of them have a small town village. These cities are busy and not safe.

Our small town atmosphere comes from being small and saf(er). The changes discussed in the EIR will do anything but keep us small and safe. I don’t even like the decorative grates around trees in the sidewalks. It’s busy looking. Paying for new murals, grates, and pretty plants will not maintain a small town environment. It never has and never will. It’s just a costly sales pitch of empty promises.

So do what you have to do. Bu please don’t feel obligated to buy the ugly murals and bronze plant education sidewalk signs.

Response to Comment No. 4-9

The commenter expresses support for the small town village atmosphere that presently characterizes the City. The Proposed Downtown Specific Plan Update includes development standards designed to preserve and enhance the small town atmosphere that presently characterizes the downtown area. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. 4-10

Probably drop any mention that these changes will cause a vibrant economy. Because it’s becoming less realistic as the Fake federal government drags us deeper and deeper into debt with runaway inflation.

Other than that, I appreciate all your time and consideration.

Response to Comment No. 4-10

The commenter expresses that the Project should remove mention of a vibrant economy. The comment does not state any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the comment will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

## III. Errata

---

This section of the Final EIR provides changes to the Draft EIR that have been made to revise, clarify, or correct the environmental impact analysis for the El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan Update (Project). Such changes are the result of proposed refinements to the Project proposed by the Applicant, public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR, and/or additional information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. The changes described in this section do not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in any significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR.

This section is divided into two parts: **Section III.A, Errata to the Draft EIR and Appendices;** and **Section III.B, Effect of Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections.**

### A. Errata to the Draft EIR and Appendices

These revisions, clarifications, and corrections are the result of the responses to public and agency comments received on the Draft EIR, new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR, or due to recognition of inadvertent errors or omissions. The revisions, clarifications, and corrections provided in this section do not add significant new information or support a conclusion that the Project would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts as compared to those disclosed in the circulated Draft EIR. Deletions are shown in strikethrough text and additions are shown in underlined text. Such changes are presented in this EIR Section.

There are no revisions, clarifications, or corrections to the El Segundo Specific Plan Update Draft EIR or the appendices.

### B. Effect of Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections

CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states:

- (a) *“New information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. ‘Significant new information’ requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:*
  - (1) *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*



- (2) *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
  - (3) *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.*
  - (4) *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded."*
- (b) *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

There are no revisions, clarifications, or corrections to the El Segundo Specific Plan Update Draft EIR or the appendices. Thus, there are no changes that result in new significant impacts or increase the impacts of the Project. Thus, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 are met, and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

# **IV. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

---

## **1. Introduction**

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires a Lead Agency to adopt a “reporting or monitoring program for changes to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” In addition, Section 15097(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a public agency adopt a program for monitoring or reporting mitigation measures and project revisions, which it has required to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. This MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The City of El Segundo is the Lead Agency for the Project and therefore is responsible for administering and implementing the MMRP. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity that accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed, the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.

An EIR has been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts of the Project. The evaluation of the Project’s impacts takes into consideration project design features and identifies mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potentially significant environmental impacts. This MMRP is designed to monitor implementation of the project design features and mitigation measures identified for the Project.

## **2. Purpose**

It is the intent of this MMRP to:

1. Verify compliance with the project design features and mitigation measures identified in the EIR;
2. Provide a framework to document implementation of the identified project design features and mitigation measures;
3. Provide a record of mitigation requirements;
4. Identify monitoring and Enforcement Agencies;

5. Establish and clarify administrative procedures for the clearance of project design features and mitigation measures;
6. Establish the frequency and duration of monitoring; and
7. Utilize the existing agency review processes wherever feasible.

### 3. Organization

As shown on the following pages, each required project design feature and mitigation measure for the Project is listed and categorized by impact area, with an accompanying identification of the following:

- **Monitoring Phase:** The phase of the Project during which the project design feature or mitigation measure shall be monitored;
- **Enforcement Agency:** The department or agency with the power to enforce the project design feature or mitigation measure;
- **Monitoring Agency:** The department or agency to which reports involving feasibility, compliance, implementation and development are made;
- **Monitoring Frequency:** The frequency at which the project design feature or mitigation measure shall be monitored; and
- **Action Indicating Compliance:** The action of which the Enforcement or Monitoring Agency indicates that compliance with the required project design feature or mitigation measure has been implemented.

### 4. Administrative Procedures and Enforcement

This MMRP shall be enforced throughout all phases of the Project. The Applicant shall be responsible for implementing each project design feature and mitigation measure and shall be obligated to provide verification, as identified below, to the appropriate monitoring and Enforcement Agencies that each project design feature and mitigation measure has been implemented. The Applicant shall maintain records demonstrating compliance with each project design feature and mitigation measure listed below. Such records shall be made available to the City upon request.

During the construction phase and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall retain an independent Construction Monitor (either via the City or through a third-party consultant), approved by the City of El Segundo, who shall be responsible for monitoring implementation of project design features and mitigation measures during construction activities consistent with the monitoring phase and frequency set forth in this MMRP.

The Construction Monitor shall also prepare documentation of the Applicant's compliance with the project design features and mitigation measures during construction every 90 days in a form satisfactory to the City Planning Division. The documentation must be signed by the Applicant and Construction Monitor and be included as part of the Applicant's Compliance Report. The

Construction Monitor shall be obligated to immediately report to the Enforcement Agency any non-compliance with mitigation measures and project design features within two businesses days if the Applicant does not correct the non-compliance within a reasonable time of notification to the Applicant by the monitor or if the non-compliance is repeated. Such non-compliance shall be appropriately addressed by the Enforcement Agency.

## **5. Program Modification**

The Project shall be in substantial conformance with the project design features and mitigation measures contained in this MMRP. The Enforcing Agencies may determine substantial conformance with project design features and mitigation measures in the MMRP in their reasonable discretion. If the agency cannot find substantial conformance, a project design feature or mitigation measure may be modified or deleted as follows: the enforcing department or agency, or the decision maker for a subsequent discretionary project related approval, complies with CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15164, including by preparing an addendum or subsequent environmental clearance to analyze the impacts from the modifications to or deletion of the project design features or mitigation measures. Any addendum or subsequent CEQA clearance shall explain why the project design feature or mitigation measure is no longer needed, not feasible, or the other basis for modifying or deleting the project design feature or mitigation measure. Under this process, the modification or deletion of a project design feature or mitigation measure shall not require a modification to any project discretionary approval unless the Director of Planning also finds that the change to the project design features or mitigation measures results in a substantial change to the Project or the non-environmental conditions of approval.

## 6. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementation Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
<b>Cultural Resources</b>								
<b>MM CUL-1</b> For properties identified in the Historic Report ( <b>Appendix D.1</b> ) individually as potential historic resources or as contributing to a potential historic district and which are subject to a Downtown Design Review for: a) substantial, permanent exterior alterations to a building, b) additions, or c) demolitions, the applicant shall be required to prepare a Historical Resources Assessment Report (HRAR). The HRAR shall be prepared by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in architectural history or history. The qualified professional shall conduct an intensive-level evaluation in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State Office of Historic Preservation. The qualified professional shall review the project for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Standards). The findings of the qualified professional shall be documented in a Memorandum at the schematic design phase. If the project does not comply with the Standards, the Memorandum shall include recommendations for changing the plans to bring the project into compliance. The purpose of the Memorandum is to ensure that the project complies with the Standards in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to historical resources, such that no further environmental review is required. The Memorandum shall be submitted to the City for review and concurrence with the findings and recommendations. All evaluated properties shall	Pre-Construction	Planning Division	Planning Division	Once at Project plan check	Plan check approval and issuance of applicable building permit			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementation Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
be documented on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 Forms. The HRAR shall be submitted to the City for review and concurrence with the findings.								
<b>MM CUL-2</b> Prior to commencement of construction activities for all phases of future development implementation, the project applicants shall retain a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology, to prepare a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). The WEAP shall be submitted to the City of El Segundo for review and approval. All construction personnel and monitors shall be presented at the WEAP training prior to the start of construction activities. The WEAP shall be prepared to inform all personnel working on a project about the archaeological sensitivity of the area, to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials that may be identified during construction, to explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources, and to outline the actions to be taken in the event of a discovery of cultural resources. The WEAP shall define "tribal cultural resources" and include appropriate management requirements relating to inadvertent discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and archaeological monitor.	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	To be determined by consultation with archaeologist if resource(s) are discovered	Field inspection sign-off			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementa- tion Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
<p><b>MM CUL-3</b> If potential archaeological resources (i.e., sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for a project, the City shall be notified and all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. The archaeologist shall be empowered to temporarily stop or redirect grading activities to allow removal of abundant or large artifacts. Depending upon the significance of the find under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (14 CCR 15064.5[f]; PRC, Section 21082), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan and data recovery, may be warranted. The archaeologist shall also be required to curate any discovered specimens in a repository with permanent retrievable storage and submit a written report to the City of El Segundo for review and approval prior to occupancy. Once approved, the final report shall be filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).</p>	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	To be determined by consultation with archaeologist if resource(s) are discovered	Field inspection sign-off			
<b>Geology and Soils</b>								
<p><b>PDF GEO-1</b> Site design-specific geotechnical and engineering reports are required to be prepared by a California-licensed geotechnical engineer, California-certified engineering geologist, and civil engineer with expertise in geotechnical issues registered in the State of California during Project design and prior</p>	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	Field inspection(s) during construction	Field inspection sign-off			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementation Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
to Project construction in compliance with the most current City of El Segundo Department of Public Works guidelines. The investigation is required to address the proposed Project foundation and structure design to minimize effects from adverse soil conditions including any liquefiable or otherwise unstable/consolidation-prone soils; bedrock characteristics; subsidence; earthquake ground shaking; slope instability; subsurface gas; groundwater; and/or other geotechnical and engineering geologic hazards. The design and construction recommendations will be incorporated into the foundation and structural design of proposed project components, implemented in accordance with the design, and subjected to on-going inspection by the relevant entities/agencies. Prior to Grading Plan approval and issuance of permits, all construction/development plans will be approved by the City for construction of such improvements. All site-specific construction will occur in accordance with the approved plans.								
<b>MM GEO-1</b> For excavations that are greater than 5 feet below the existing ground level or in the event that paleontological materials are found during any grading or excavation activity, a qualified paleontologist meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) Standards shall be retained by the Project applicant/developer prior to the approval of demolition or grading permits. The paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) for the Project for review and approval by the City. The PRIMP shall be consistent with the SVP (2010) guidelines and shall outline requirements for preconstruction meeting attendance and worker environmental	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	To be determined by consultation with paleontologist if resource(s) are discovered	Field inspection sign-off			



**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementa tion Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
awareness training, where monitoring is required within the Project Site below a depth of 5 feet below the existing ground surface or depth of documented artificial fill (based on construction plans and/or geotechnical reports), procedures for adequate paleontological monitoring and discoveries treatment, and paleontological methods (including sediment sampling for microvertebrate fossils), reporting, and collections management. At a minimum, the PRIMP shall require that a qualified paleontologist attend the preconstruction meeting and a qualified paleontological monitor be on-site during all rough grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities (including augering) in previously undisturbed deposits. In the event that paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are unearthed during grading, the PRIMP shall require that a paleontological monitor temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity to allow recovery of paleontological resources.								
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>								
<b>MM HAZ-1</b> The following process shall be followed prior to issuance of a grading permit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Phase I ESA shall be conducted by a qualified environmental professional in accordance with State standards/guidelines and current professional standards, including the ASTM Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments.</li> <li>If the Phase I ESA identifies a REC and/or if recommended in the Phase I ESA, a Phase II ESA (subsurface investigation) shall be conducted by a qualified environmental professional to</li> </ul>	Pre-Construction	Planning Division	Planning Division	Once at Project plan check	Plan check approval and issuance of applicable building permit			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementa tion Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
determine whether the identified potential sources have resulted in soil, groundwater, or soil vapor contamination exceeding regulatory action levels. If the Phase II ESA identifies contamination exceeding regulatory action levels, additional assessment, remediation, or corrective action (e.g., removal of contamination, in-situ treatment, soil capping) shall be conducted under the oversight of State and/or local agency officials (as necessary) and in full compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. If remediation is determined to be necessary, the grading permit shall not be issued until the applicable regulatory agency has indicated that further remedial action is not required by issuing a No Further Action letter or that any remedial action can be implemented in conjunction with excavation and/or grading.								
<b>Public Services-Fire Protection</b>								
<b>PDF PS-1</b> Provide an automatic fire sprinkler system throughout every proposed mid-rise building, installed in accordance with El Segundo Municipal Code Chapter 9 and the currently adopted edition of the NFPA 13.	Pre-Construction, Construction	El Segundo Fire Department; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	Field inspection(s) during construction	Field inspection sign-off			
<b>PDF PS-2</b> Provide a manual fire alarm system throughout each building, installed in accordance with El Segundo Municipal Code Chapter 9 and the currently adopted edition of NFPA 72.	Pre-Construction, Construction	El Segundo Fire Department; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	Field inspection(s) during construction	Field inspection sign-off			
<b>MM PS-1</b> The Project shall implement a Construction Management Plan (CMP) that would include street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes and a staging plan. The CMP would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	Field inspection(s) during construction	Field inspection sign-off			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementation Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
community. The CMP shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site and shall include, but not limited to: prohibition of construction worker parking on nearby residential streets; worker parking would be provided on-site or in designated off-site public parking areas; temporary traffic control during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag men); scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., so as to occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible, to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding streets; construction-related vehicles shall not park on surrounding public streets; and safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers as appropriate, especially as it pertains to maintaining safe routes to schools.								
<b>Public Services-Police Protection</b>								
<b>MM PS-1</b> The Project shall implement a Construction Management Plan (CMP) that would include street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes and a staging plan. The CMP would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The CMP shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site and shall include, but not limited to: prohibition of construction worker parking on nearby residential streets; worker parking would be provided on-site or in designated off-site public parking areas; temporary traffic control during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	Field inspection(s) during construction	Field inspection sign-off			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementation Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag men); scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., so as to occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible, to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding streets; construction-related vehicles shall not park on surrounding public streets; and safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers as appropriate, especially as it pertains to maintaining safe routes to schools.								
<b>Tribal Cultural Resources</b>								
<b>MM TCR-1</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit for future projects, the future project Applicants shall retain a qualified Native American Monitor (Monitor) from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation to monitor all grading and excavation activities within the Project Site. The Monitor shall photo-document the grading and excavation activities and maintain a daily monitoring log that contains descriptions of the daily construction activities, locations and mappings of the graded areas, soils, and documentation of any identified tribal cultural resources. On-site monitoring shall end when the Project Site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and Monitor have indicated that the Project Site has a low potential for archaeological resources. If tribal cultural resources are encountered during monitoring, all ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease and the Monitor shall evaluate the significance of the find, and if significant, recommend a formal treatment plan and appropriate measure(s) to mitigate impacts. Such measure(s) may include avoidance, preservation in place, archaeological data	Pre-Construction, Construction	Planning Division; Building and Safety Division	Building and Safety Division	To be determined by consultation with archaeologist if resource(s) are discovered	Field inspection sign-off			

**Table IV-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring					Verification of Compliance		
	Implementa tion Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Agency Responsible for Monitoring Implementation	Monitoring Frequency	Action of Compliance	Initial	Date	Comments
recovery and associated laboratory documentation, or other appropriate measures. The City shall determine the appropriate and feasible measure(s) that will be necessary to mitigate impacts, in consideration of the measure(s) recommended by the Monitor. The Applicant shall implement all measure(s) that the City determined necessary, appropriate, and feasible. Within 60 days after grading and excavation activities are completed, the Monitor shall prepare and submit a final report to the City and the California Native American Heritage Commission. The report shall include documentation of any recovered tribal cultural resources, the significance of the resources, and the treatment of the recovered resources. In addition, the Monitor shall submit the monitoring log and photo documentation, accompanied by a photo key, to the City.								



# **El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report Appendices**

**State Clearinghouse No. 2023010196**

*Prepared for:*

**City of El Segundo**

350 Main Street  
El Segundo, California 90245

*Prepared by:*

**EcoTierra Consulting, Inc.**

633 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071

April 1, 2024

# APPENDICES

---

Appendix A Draft EIR Comment Letters

# **APPENDIX A: DRAFT EIR COMMENT LETTERS**

---



**El Segundo DSP Update DEIR Comments**

Lindsay Mulcahy <LMulcahy@laconservancy.org>

Fri 3/15/2024 4:31 PM

To:Samaras, Paul <PSamaras@elsegundo.org>

Cc:Adrian Fine <afine@laconservancy.org>

📎 1 attachments (2 MB)

El Segundo DSP Update DEIR Comments LAC 3.15.24.docx.pdf;

Dear Mr. Samaras,

Please see the L.A. Conservancy's attached comments responding to the DEIR for the El Segundo DSP Update. Do not hesitate to reach out with any questions.

1

Best,  
Lindsay

**Lindsay Mulcahy**

Neighborhood Outreach Coordinator

Los Angeles Conservancy

523 West Sixth Street, Suite 826

Los Angeles, CA 90014

(520) 307-6265 | [lmulcahy@laconservancy.org](mailto:lmulcahy@laconservancy.org)

Pronouns: She / Her / Hers

[laconservancy.org](http://laconservancy.org)

[E-News](#) – [Facebook](#) – [Twitter](#) – [Instagram](#)

**Membership starts at just \$40**

[Join the Conservancy today.](#)

March 15, 2024

**Submitted Electronically**

Paul Samaras  
City of El Segundo Planning Division  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245  
Email: [psamaras@elsegundo.org](mailto:psamaras@elsegundo.org)

**RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan Update**

Dear Paul Samaras:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Conservancy, I am writing to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) Update. The proposed update is a revision to the existing El Segundo Downtown Specific Plan, which serves as the land use and zoning for properties within the boundaries of the DSP area. The project would revise the existing DSP planning districts, amend General Plan and zoning designations on eight parcels, and include mobility enhancements. Additionally, it would include public improvements and streetscape guidelines, private urban form criteria, permitted land uses, development standards, mobility and infrastructure improvements, an implementation plan, and administration processes.

2

The DEIR identifies several eligible historic resources within the DSP area. 105 W. Grand Avenue in the Main Street District and 140 Richmond Street, 203 Richmond Street, and 218 – 220 Richmond Street in the Richmond Street District were found to be eligible for individual listing on the El Segundo Register. A collection of properties on the 100 and 200 blocks of Richmond in the Richmond Street District were identified as an eligible historic district on the El Segundo Register. We are concerned that the

3



proposed mitigation measures to protect these resources are not sufficient. In our comments we propose ways to strengthen these measures and support the holistic preservation of historic and cultural resources in El Segundo.

**I. Stronger mitigation measures for identified historic resources.**

The eligible historic resources reflect the formative institutional and commercial development in downtown El Segundo in the 1920s. The significant buildings are summarized below.

- 105 W. Grand Avenue, built in 1928, is a rare remaining example of a mixed-use commercial building and is prominently situated at the corner of Grand Avenue and Main Street. It appears to be eligible for listing on the El Segundo Register.
- 140 Richmond Street, built in 1921, is a rare remaining example of a theater in El Segundo. It was originally a live performance venue called the State Theater, then adapted for motion picture viewing before it closed in the mid-1930s. In 1944, it reopened as the El Segundo Theater and in 1957 the State Theater name was restored. It has operated as the Old Town Music Hall since 1968 and specializes in concerts and silent films accompanied live on a Mighty Wurlitzer pipe organ. It appears to be eligible for listing on the El Segundo Register.
- 203 Richmond Street, built in 1925, was the former location of the first El Segundo City Hall and Library. The building retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance as the City Hall Annex. It is over 50 years of age and reflects the institutional development of the City. The property appears to be eligible for listing in the National, California, and El Segundo Registers and is a contributor to a potential historic district on Richmond Street.
- 218 – 220 Richmond Street, built in 1915, is one of the few remaining examples of a mixed-use commercial building from downtown’s growth in the 1910s. It appears to be eligible for listing in the National, California, and El Segundo Registers and is a contributor to a potential historic district on Richmond Street. The Status Code is 3S/3CS/5Ss3/5D3.
- The Richmond Historic District on the 100 and 200 blocks of Richmond Street reflects the earliest commercial development in El Segundo. Constructed between 1915 and 1947, the buildings are one and two stories in height and mostly unreinforced masonry construction. Of the 27 parcels in the Potentially Eligible Historic District, there are 16 contributing properties and 11 noncontributing properties. Nine of the non-contributing properties 9 are occupied by buildings and two are surface parking lots. The non-contributing properties were constructed in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, but are compatible with the height, scale, and massing of the contributing properties.

3 cont.

The DEIR proposed to mitigate adverse impacts to these historic resources by requiring owners proposing an alteration, addition, or demolition to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a Historical Resources Assessment Report (HRAR). The consultant shall produce a Memorandum to the City evaluating the proposed work’s alignment with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. If the proposed work is not compliant, the consultant will include recommendations to bring the project into compliance.



However, these measures do not have any mechanisms to ensure the City follows the recommendations in the Memorandum, leaving the buildings and district vulnerable to incompatible alterations or demolitions.

While we appreciate the proposed land use updates that would celebrate the historic nature of the area and guidelines maintaining the existing scale, massing, and character of the area, we encourage stronger protections for the historic resources that contribute to the character of downtown.

We encourage the city to incorporate language promoting the preservation of historic buildings. One way of doing so is to initiate the process to list these properties on the El Segundo Register. While the City approved a Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1993, over 30 years later it has yet to add any properties to the Register. The DSP offers a prescient reason to utilize the City's existing historic preservation program and strengthen protections for these rare examples of El Segundo's development.

3 cont.

Recommendation: Incorporate language within the DSP Update that emphasizes historic preservation and consider local designation of individual resources and the Richmond Historic District.

## II. Creation of a legacy businesses program

Beyond the physical built environment, the City of El Segundo should consider developing a legacy business program for the historic downtown commercial area. Legacy businesses are long-standing neighborhood anchors that contribute to a sense of place. Often 20 years of operation is the minimum threshold for a legacy business.

4

In recent years, cities including San Francisco, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Long Beach have adopted programs that either provide financial incentives or create a promotional program that attracts patrons. The Conservancy played an important role in the formation of the City of Los Angeles's program and would be interested in discussing such a program with the City of El Segundo.

## III. Conclusion

In summary, the Conservancy recommends the following as potential ways to mitigate any significant impacts to historic resources.

- Incorporate language that promotes historic preservation
- Creation of a legacy business program

5

## About the Los Angeles Conservancy:

The Los Angeles Conservancy is the largest local historic preservation organization in the United States, with nearly 5,000 members throughout the Los Angeles area. Established in 1978, the Conservancy works to preserve and revitalize the significant architectural and cultural heritage of Los Angeles County through advocacy and education.

6



Please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 430-4203 or [afine@laconservancy.org](mailto:afine@laconservancy.org) should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

*Adrian Scott Fine*

Adrian Scott Fine  
President & CEO



Downtown El Segundo Plans

tonylevitan@gmail.com <tonylevitan@gmail.com>

Fri 3/15/2024 12:47 PM

To:Samaras, Paul <PSamaras@elsegundo.org>

Hi Paul,

I wanted to provide some feedback on the proposed plans for downtown El Segundo. The ideas are great, but I think the implementation needs a lot of work specially around the roadways.



1

In chapter 3 (page 3-13 onwards) the concepts indicate the need to have separate lanes for bike, parking, and travel. At the moment we already have this, and the roads are shared between all residents. We have seen in Culver City and Mar Vista that having a separate bike lane and reducing travel lane causes additional traffic and traffic accidents. I've often sat in Culver City and seen a long line of cars waiting to move but no bikes or buses. In Mar Vista I have seen cyclists having to take evasive direction changes, so they are not hit by vehicles. Added to this, just think how many ubers, door dash and similar type vehicles will land up parked in the bike lanes.



2

El Segundo is unique in that few travelers drive through it to get somewhere quicker, and therefore most traffic is that of residents. If the roads are changed per the design I suspect we will have a lot more traffic through the residential areas.

Please reconsider the need to change the roads.

Thanks  
Tony Levitan

EIR Richmond Street Closure seems like a taking away from the Residents

Stephanie Ms <stephanie.ms@aol.com>

Mon 3/18/2024 11:53 AM

To:Samaras, Paul <PSamaras@elsegundo.org>

Hi Mr. Samaras,

How are you?

Am sending off some quick emails to you in different emails. Hopefully, some of the points can still be considered and am honestly not fully informed of everything but because of today's deadline, here it goes:

1

P.IV.L-39

Please explain or advise on the following on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR):

I don't understand how the city can widen sidewalks and block streets (on Richmond and Grand Ave) for purposes of providing increased eating area that benefits those businesses only and identify it as providing pedestrian comfort when the whole purpose of doing such is to provide sit down eating areas to patrons of those particular privately owned businesses which are located there.

The crowds will block the travel/drive/walking of pedestrians who live in this area and that is not comfortable to those of us living here and paying taxes. You are giving part of our community over to benefit individual business owners and bringing noise to our community for which the residents in return are getting blocked from full use of the roads in our town.

If you are keeping the EIR analysis separate from the low income housing plans planned for that same street in the future, it doesn't seem that walkability should even be a consideration in the EIR report. We residents can already walk to Richmond street easily as it is tucked away from the Main Street area. And why would low income residents need walkability to the private restaurants on Richmond street anyway? If they can't afford to pay for their own housing it doesn't seem like eating out would be on their to do list.

2

We all would guess that closing Richmond street is in hopes of catering to workers of office buildings that may be built in the future close to this Richmond Street location. So the Richmond Street location is not really needed for resident walkability but to cater to future office workers. The Richmond street closure is not a requirement to facilitate walkability or even to develop low income housing. It is a bone being thrown to the restaurant owners. And this is environmentally unhealthy for all the residents who already live in this area.

If a restaurant owner wants more restaurant space he needs to buy a bigger building. He shouldn't be given city property to conduct private business from which he keeps the profits and whereby resident taxes are confiscated to benefit a non city purpose.

Appropriate locations for community events are the city park where everyone enjoys the park equally. And no one person has a right to receive pecuniary benefit off the land kept up by the residents who pay taxes here.

The question is who is the main beneficiary of this activity and it certainly isn't the residents in general. So that's a problem from my standpoint because residents should not feel like the city is allowing private individuals unfair or inappropriate use of city property.

HOWEVER, if the purpose here is to begin to propagate El Segundo's Climate Action plan... If it is to have El Segundo foster the live where you work (even if you can't afford it) and walk everywhere/dine out like you earn enough to do it; then that is more like communism and the 15 minute city concept pushed by the Climate Change Narrative being pushed by the globalists/United Nations which seeks a One World Government.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Obs9Xh875Lg>

We aren't communists/marxists etc. We are Americans and we all have the chance to achieve as much or as little as you want to in American. We as individuals should be resisting the march toward coming under a one world government and the deceptive fraudulent Climate Change Hoax.

Please consider the decade long history and progression of Climate Action Plans. Here are three climate action plans over our land, air, and sea. These were used to:

1) **Cripple our energy self sufficiency** by stifling our coal and gas production/usage. (Barak Obama's 2013 Climate action plan)

2) Deceive us into accepting ever increasing restrictions to stop global warming. (This is a ruse because they are maliciously and "secretly" **geoengineering** the skies simultaneously which destroys the ozone and creates the greatest cause of accelerated global warming leading to our destruction.

[https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/2021-11/Aviation\\_Climate\\_Action\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/2021-11/Aviation_Climate_Action_Plan.pdf) ;  
<https://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/> and

3) Create a solution that includes a built-in **global government structure** over our waters/oceans/land which is a threat to our national security and independence.

[https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Ocean-Climate-Action-Plan\\_Final.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Ocean-Climate-Action-Plan_Final.pdf)

The Climate Action mythology is a farce to take our government and freedoms from us. We should not mindlessly follow suit. **I request you strongly consider eliminating as much of this subject matter as you can from influencing your final EIR decision.**

If you have a hard time believing that nonsense has invaded our city/state/federal government, please remember that during the primary election held on March 5, 2024 in our very own El Segundo Public Library sat a written notice informing us that identification would not be checked during our voting activities.

We are living in treacherous times and we should take every step to avoid participating in measures designed to ruin our way of life/our country.

Respectfully,

S/Resident



Downtown Specific Plan update and EIR

Stephanie Ms <stephanie.ms@aol.com>

Mon 3/18/2024 11:39 PM

To:Samaras, Paul <PSamaras@elsegundo.org>

Hi Mr. Samaras,

Well, here is my second comment that hopefully makes your March 18 deadline. Thank you.

1

Environmental Impact Report 2<sup>nd</sup> comment 3/18/24

**LOW INCOME HOUSING AND PARKING**

Renters tend to bring other occupants to live with them (after the lease is signed), especially low income renters. **New units should all have at least two parking spots (or more) for each new unit whether 1 or 2 bedrooms.** New construction should be required to build their own parking within their housing structure. Why? Because....

Low income renters tend to come from less affluent areas where they handle parking difficulties with their own set of rules. When parking is unavailable to them they will "create" parking. This may involve parking on red curbs, parking on private driveways and blocking exits, double parking in the street –yes, even during rush hour.

They don't like to be confronted if you have a problem with their creative parking methods. Because if you cause a stink, they can be ready to challenge you in the street or follow you home.

2

Low income/subsidized renters also have friends and relatives that like to visit. They understand they may have to park a distance away and are ok with walking a distance to find a spot. However, if they have to park a few blocks away in your neighborhood, that is the time that some of them use to scout what's in your car or home and don't be surprised if they take that opportunity to take what they like from you. Now, unless you know where they came from, forget about trying to get your things back. They're gone. They were just visiting for the day.

My point: make sure low income housing has enough parking for tenants, their guests, and extra so they can park in the building where they live. Besides, any unit having only one parking will not normally attract two income tenants who could pay the higher rent. It's best not to artificially depress rent because you fail to provide adequate parking for tenants.

**Not every low income person is a problem.** But the likelihood and scale of problems goes up proportionately to the number of low income people you bring into your city. Now we have mostly nice workers in our city. But who is to say that the low income housing will only go to them and not to the general population at large?

3

(\*\*In Hawthorne, the police used to take part in reviewing housing applicants before they were approved as a tenant. This is important because it is more efficient to keep a bad apple out of the city in the first place than to let them in and then have to chase them and their cohorts around for the next three years. )

## **BUS TERMINALS**

Buses can be useful for workers. But they also carry homeless people and criminals to destination points...Long Beach suffered a surge in homeless wanderers when busses forced them to disembark after the busses stopped running. Don't be like long Beach.

4

**Expanding bus line activity to destination El Segundo is a very bad idea in the face of surging homelessness** and the U.S. border invasion. Because you don't know who is going to enter your town at night when they step off the bus.

## **CLOSING OFF RICHMOND STREET for RESTAURANT DINING/GATHERING**

Contained areas such as that envisioned with a blocked off Richmond Street restaurant area with low lights, chairs, benches, trash cans—especially if next to a bus stop where homeless can get off is just asking for trouble. It is exactly what homeless people like—an area to set up for the night, rummage through trash, sleep on benches, LOW LIGHT.

And don't think you can just shoo them away in the morning. No, After a while the urine not only smells, but it actually sticks to your shoes and leaves a dark spot on the wall and white sidewalk. But the fecal matter on the side of the building will require a little more elbow grease and holding your nose. Hopefully they don't bring a dirty mattress ...

5

Lastly, the streets need to stay open as the planned increase in offices and units is going to slow traffic down in the city. If you reduce the street lanes here and main street, etc, it's going to drastically slow down downtown traffic the same as is experienced in downtown Pasadena, downtown Santa Monica, and downtown Long Beach.

## **BRIGHT LIGHTS**

Whoever tells you that you can plan for low income housing, bus terminals drop off points, private areas with nice furniture and *low lights*...well, they're *lying* to you.

All these things increase the opportunity for crime and homeless activities and eventually the business owners are going to be pleading for you for help. Because vagrants, unsanitary conditions and crime are bad for business.

So this is where you are going to have to bring in the flood lights. Flood lights in the open spaces where the homeless are hanging. Why? Because nobody wants to sleep under a flood light.

5

If the planned parking structures are catering to homeless and low incomes, you will likely at some point have to worry about assaults and break ins there too. So you'll have to put flood lights in all levels of your parking structures.

So forget the decorative low lights and budget in the crime fighting floodlights in all the areas where you are planning to promote us to the outside world.

## **MURALS ARTWORK ON BUILDINGS STREETSCAPE**

7

Please don't. What you think is nice may not be what I or others think is nice. Why do developers think we want to look at the same loud neon colored graphic on a building wall day after day? They have such loud art in Santa Monica and Long Beach. When you think of those places do you think of a small town atmosphere or a busy place filled with crime? We all know it's the latter. Please don't start labeling the flowers to educate the public. Some months ago you could see flags at the high school with words on them like little mantras. No thank you.

7 cont.

Three other reasons to avoid public artwork and streetscape "education": 1) Other cities like Long Beach use it to promote leftist ideology ; 2) It can be an eyesore 3) It's more expensive to clean and fix when graffiti'd . And when you build your city to look and act like Santa Monica and Long Beach, expect more graffiti.

### **Signage**

The only sign I'd like to see is a big:

**“WELCOME TO EL  
SEGUNDO”.**

8

Why is all the main street sign making our city name as diminutive as possible as if we are trying to hide our city name?

### **Keeping the unique small town “village” atmosphere**

For all the issues mentioned above, the idea promoted in the EIR that these changes are going to keep our unique small town village atmosphere is not possible. The developmental changes and consequences are not unique. They've already been applied in nearby cities such as Long Beach, Santa Monica, etc. and none of them have a small town village feel. These cities are busy and not safe.

9

Our small town atmosphere comes from being small and safe(er). The changes discussed in the EIR will do anything but keep us small and safe. I don't even like the decorative grates around trees in the sidewalks. It's busy looking. Paying for new murals, grates, and pretty plants will not maintain a small town environment. It never has and never will. It's just a costly sales pitch of empty promises.

So do what you have to do. But please don't feel obligated to buy the ugly busy murals and bronze plant education sidewalk signs.

Probably drop any mention that these changes will cause a vibrant economy. Because it's becoming less realistic as the Fake federal government drags us deeper and deeper into debt with runaway inflation.

10

Other than that, I appreciate all your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

/s/ Resident.