CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE DRAFT IS/MND

The following corrections and additions are set forth to update the Draft IS/MND in response to comments received during and after the public review period, as well as City staff directed changes. Changes are listed by the corresponding Draft IS/MND Section, subsection, if applicable, and page number. Additions and corrections to the Draft IS/MND are provided in underline and ~~strikeout~~ text (as shown) to indicate additions and deletions to the Draft IS/MND, respectively.

I. Background

1. Description of Project, Page 9, Table 3, Proposed On-Site Parking, modify the table as follows:

Table 3
Proposed On-Site Parking

Area	Existing Spaces	Proposed Spaces	Difference
Area North of S30 Building	98	62	8
Area west of S30	7	Removed	(7)
Area between S21 and S22	40	27	(14)
Area south and east of S22	38	36	(2)
Area south of S31	37	25	(35)
Total	**220**	**150**	**(~~71~~70)**
Loading Spaces	***6***	***3***	***(3)***

V. Answers to Initial Study Questions

Question 8, Hydrology and Water Quality

2. Response 8(a), Short-term Construction Impacts, Page 63, modify the second paragraph as follows:

~~In addition, the contractor would file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) before any construction activity. Implementation of the BMPs in the project SWPPP and compliance with the City's discharge requirements (i.e., ESMC 5-4-1, *et seq.*) would ensure that project construction would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Adherence to these regulations would ensure that project-related water quality impacts during construction would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.~~Although the lot size of the project site is approximately 5.89 acres, the Project would not entail extensive construction (i.e., grading) across the entire site. Instead, construction activities associated with the Project would only occur on 0.51 acres of the 5.89-acre site, as the Project would only entail the addition of a new structure in the center of the project site that would provide additional office space. As the total construction area would be 0.51 acres in size, the Project would not be required to meet the NPDES requirements for storm water discharges requiring the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) associated with construction activity.[1] Construction activities associated with the Project would be subject to City inspection and implementation of BMPs, which are described above. Further, construction projects that include grading activities during the rainy season must also develop a

[1] *National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity, State Water Resources Control Board, Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ, August 19, 1999.*

Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan (WWECP). Notwithstanding, as discussed above in Question 6(b), the Project would comply with ESMC 5-4-8 and 5-4-9, which address BMPs and construction activity storm water measures. Compliance with ESMC 5-4-8 and 5-4-9 would ensure that construction would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the Project's construction-related water quality impacts would be less than significant.

3. Response 8(e), Operational Impacts, Page 65, delete Mitigation Measure HY-3 as follows:

~~**MM HY-3.** *The Applicant must submit a Water Quality Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Planning Division and the Public Works Department.*~~

Question 13, Public Services

4. Response 13(a), Fire protection, Page 82, modify Mitigation Measure PS-1 as follows:

MM PS-1. *The Applicant is responsible for paying a Fire Service Mitigation Fee to the ESFD for the provision of fire-protection services. Per the ESMC, the current fee is levied at ~~0.11~~ 0.14 cents per square foot of net new building area for commercial and industrial uses.*

Question 15, Transportation/Traffic

5. Page 85, add the following paragraph:

An Addendum to the June 2009 traffic study was completed. Additional detailed information regarding the cumulative projects list has been attained that alters the findings of the original traffic study, and results in the removal of one significant traffic-related impact. The revised findings are included in this analysis. The Addendum to the traffic study is included as Appendix A to this Final Initial Study.

Response 15(a)

6. Future Traffic Volumes, Related Project, Page 86, modify the paragraph as follows:

Information about cumulative projects (approved and pending projects) in the Cities of El Segundo and Manhattan Beach was obtained from each City. Thirty-three approved and pending projects in the vicinity of the project site were identified. These related projects are included in Appendix ~~C~~ A to this Initial Study. The ambient growth rate and related project traffic volumes were added to existing traffic volumes to develop the Cumulative Conditions Without Project traffic volume forecasts for the year 2010.

7. General Plan Traffic Conditions, Table 25, Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary, Page 88, modify the table as follows:

Table 25
Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary

No.	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Without Project		With Project		Impact	Significant?
				Delay ICU	LOS	Delay ICU	LOS		
Imperial Highway at									
1	California Street	S	A.M.	~~0.554~~0.569 v/c	A	~~0.555~~0.570 v/c	A	0.001	No
			P.M.	~~0.570~~0.577 v/c	A	~~0.570~~0.577 v/c	A	0.000	No
2	Sepulveda Boulevard	S	A.M.	~~48.5~~28.3 sec/veh	~~D~~C	~~49.5~~28.6 sec/veh	~~D~~C	~~1.0~~0.3	No
				~~1.150~~0.879 v/c	~~F~~D	~~1.159~~0.888 v/c	~~F~~C	0.009	No
		S	P.M.	~~56.7~~33.7 sec/veh	~~E~~C	~~57.2~~34.1 sec/veh	~~E~~C	~~0.5~~0.4	No
				~~1.104~~1.037 v/c	F	~~1.108~~1.040 v/c	~~F~~E	~~0.004~~ 0.003	No
3	Selby Street	U	A.M.	~~53.1~~17.4 sec/veh	~~F~~C	~~95.1~~20.4 ~~v/c~~sec/veh	~~F~~C	~~42.0~~3.0	No
			P.M.	~~20.9~~17.8 sec/veh	C	~~28.0~~22.2 sec/veh	~~D~~C	~~7.1~~4.4	~~Yes~~No
4	Hughes Way	S	A.M.	~~0.724~~0.600 v/c	~~C~~A	~~0.726~~0.602 v/c	~~C~~B	0.002	No
			P.M.	~~0.778~~0.696 v/c	~~C~~B	~~0.780~~0.707 v/c	C	~~0.002~~ 0.011	No
Sepulveda Boulevard at:									
5	Walnut Avenue	S	A.M.	8.1 sec/veh	A	8.8 sec/veh	A	0.7	No
				0.650 v/c	B	0.652 v/c	B	0.002	No
		S	P.M.	13.6 sec/veh	B	14.3 sec/veh	B	0.7	No
				0.763 v/c	C	0.777 v/c	C	0.014	No
6	Mariposa Avenue	S	A.M.	~~20.2~~19.7 sec/veh	~~C~~B	~~20.2~~19.7 sec/veh	~~C~~B	0.0	No
				~~0.800~~0.780 v/c	C	~~0.803~~0.784 v/c	~~D~~C	~~0.003~~ 0.004	No
		S	P.M.	25.4 sec/veh	C	25.4 sec/veh	C	0.0	No
				~~0.958~~0.934 v/c	E	~~0.961~~0.934 v/c	E	~~0.003~~ 0.0	No
7	Grand Avenue	S	A.M.	25.3 sec/veh	C	25.3 sec/veh	C	0.0	No
				~~0.861~~0.851 v/c	D	~~0.864~~0.854 v/c	D	0.003	No
		S	P.M.	~~33.2~~32.9 sec/veh	C	~~33.3~~33.0 sec/veh	C	0.1	No
				~~0.949~~0.933 v/c	E	~~0.952~~0.942 v/c	E	~~0.003~~ 0.009	No
8	El Segundo Boulevard	S	A.M.	~~24.2~~23.9 sec/veh	C	~~24.2~~23.9 sec/veh	C	0.0	No
				~~0.799~~0.761 v/c	C	~~0.802~~0.764 v/c	~~D~~C	0.003	No
		S	P.M.	~~39.6~~35.4 sec/veh	D	~~39.7~~35.4 sec/veh	D	~~0.1~~0.0	No
				~~1.010~~0.961 v/c	~~F~~E	~~1.012~~0.962 v/c	~~F~~E	~~0.002~~ 0.001	No

S Signalized, U Unsignalized

Table 25
Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary

No.	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Without Project		With Project		Impact	Significant?
				Delay/ICU	LOS	Delay/ICU	LOS		

Intersection operation is expressed in average seconds of delay per vehicle during the peak hour for HCM 2000 Methodology and is expressed in volume-to-capacity (v/c) for ICU Methodology.
LOS shown in bold indicates unacceptable Level of Service.
Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., June 2009. Traffic report data are provided in Appendix C.

8. General Plan Traffic Conditions, Pages 89 and 90, modify the paragraph and mitigation measures as follows:

As indicated in Table 25, the Project would not result in significant impacts at any of the ~~signalized~~ study intersections. ~~Therefore, no mitigation measures would be required for any signalized study intersection. However, development of the Project would result in a significant impact at Imperial Highway and Selby Street, an intersection without signals. Therefore, Mitigation Measure TR-1 is required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally~~However, the Applicant is responsible for paying traffic mitigation fees as outlined in Mitigation Measure TR-~~2~~1. Additionally, the applicant would be responsible for contacting the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) prior to construction activities, as outlined in Mitigation Measure TR-2.

~~**MM TR-1.** *The Applicant must contribute on a fair share basis to the traffic signals for the intersection of Imperial Highway and Selby Street and coordination with adjacent signals along Imperial Highway.*~~

MM TR-~~2~~1. *The Applicant is responsible for paying a Traffic Mitigation Fee per Resolution No. 4443.*

MM TR-2. *The Applicant must contact the Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator and other Municipal Bus Service Operators prior to the start of construction.*

9. Response 15(f), Table 26, Proposed On-Site Parking, Page 91, modify the table as follows:

Table 26
Proposed On-Site Parking

Area	Existing Spaces	Proposed Spaces	Difference
Area North of S30 Building	98	62	8
Area west of S30	7	Removed	(7)
Area between S21 and S22	40	27	(14)
Area south and east of S22	38	36	(2)
Area south of S31	37	25	(35)
Total	**220**	**150**	**(~~71~~70)**
Loading Spaces	***6***	***3***	***(3)***

Question 16, Utilities and Service Systems

10. Response 16(f), Page 96, modify the paragraph as follows:

The Project would generate a net increase of approximately 989 pounds (or 0.5 tons) of solid waste per day. Thus the amount of solid waste generated by the Project would represent approximately 0.01 percent of the remaining capacity at the Puente Hills Landfill and

approximately 0.006 percent of the remaining capacity at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. Therefore, both the Puente Hills Landfill and the Sunshine Canyon Landfill would have sufficient remaining capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. Further, operations within the City and on the project site would continue to be subject to requirements set forth in AB 939 requiring each city and county to divert 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, as required by the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, the applicant would be required to provide adequate storage areas for the collection and storage of recyclable waste materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

VI. Summary of Mitigation Measures

11. Hydrology and Water Quality – Mitigation Measures, Page 99, delete Mitigation Measure HY-3 as follows:

~~**MM HY-3.** *The Applicant must submit a Water Quality Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Planning Division and the Public Works Department.*~~

12. Public Services – Mitigation Measures, Page 100, modify Mitigation Measure PS-1 as follows

MM PS-1. *The Applicant is responsible for paying a Fire Service Mitigation Fee to the ESFD for the provision of fire-protection services. Per the ESMC, the current fee is levied at ~~0.11~~ 0.14 cents per square foot of net new building area for commercial and industrial uses.*

13. Transportation/Traffic – Mitigation Measures, Pages 100 and 101, modify the mitigation measures as follows:

~~**MM TR-1.** *The Applicant must contribute on a fair share basis to the traffic signals for the intersection of Imperial Highway and Selby Street and coordination with adjacent signals along Imperial Highway.*~~

MM TR-~~2~~1. *The Applicant is responsible for paying a Traffic Mitigation Fee per Resolution No. 4443.*

MM TR-2. *The Applicant must contact the Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator and other Municipal Bus Service Operators prior to the start of construction.*

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT IS/MND

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Section 21091 of CEQA and Section 15105 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Boeing Selby Block Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment was noticed and circulated for a 30-day period ending on July 27, 2009. The public review period enables interested agencies, organization, and the public to submit written comments regarding the Project. Consequently, the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department received two letters.

II. COMMENTS RECEIVED

Each comment letter has been assigned a corresponding number; comments within each comment letter are also numbered. For example, comment letter "1" is from the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. The comment in this letter is numbered "1-1". Written comments made during the public review period for the Draft IS/MND intermixed points and opinions relevant to the Project's merits with points and opinions relevant to the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project. The responses to comments provided in this section of the Final IS/MND provide detailed responses to all comments relevant to the Project's merits and discuss as necessary the points relevant to the environmental review required by CEQA.

The following organizations/persons provided written comments on the Draft IS/MND to the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department during the designated review period.

Los Angeles County Agencies

1.	County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Dennis Hunter, Assistant Deputy Director, Land Development Division (page VI-2)	July 28, 2009
2.	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Susan F. Chapman, Program Manager, Long Range Planning (page VI-5)	July 22, 2009

III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

The City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department received an additional comment letter relevant to the Draft IS/MND after the close of the public review period (between June 26 and July 27, 2009). The additional comment letter is from the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). CEQA does not require the Lead Agency to respond to comments received after the review period closes. Section 15207 of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

> "*If any public agency or person who is consulted with regard to an EIR or negative declaration fails to comment within a reasonable time as specified by the lead agency, it shall be assumed, absent a request for a specific extension of time, that such agency or person has no comment to make. Although the lead agency need not respond to late comments, the lead agency may choose to respond to them.*"

Notwithstanding the above, the Caltrans letter has been included as Comment Letter No. 3 and the responses are included below.

The following organizations/persons provided written comments on the Draft IS/MND to the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department after the close of the designated review period.

State Agencies

3. State of California Department of Transportation August 4, 2009
Elmer Alvarez, IGR/CEQA Program Manager,
Office of Regional Planning (page VI-8)

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

GAIL FARBER, Director

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
http://dpw.lacounty.gov

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO FILE: LD-1

July 28, 2009

Ms. Masa Alkire, Principal Planner
Planning and Building Safety Department
350 Main Street
City of El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Ms. Alkire:

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
BOEING SELBY BLOCK ZONE CHANGE AND GENERAL PLAN
LAND USE MAP DESIGNATION AMENDMENT

We reviewed the Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the proposed project. The proposed project site is currently a 256,606-square-feet project site with four buildings totaling 159,743-square-feet that contain a mix of warehouse, storage, and office uses. The project includes a building addition of up to 46,920-square-feet for office use for a total of 205,284-square-feet of total development on the project site.

The following comments are for your consideration and relate to the environmental document only.

Hazards–Environmental Safety

FOR LAND USE PERMIT

Storage Space for Recyclables

The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires each development project to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. The environmental document should include/discuss standards to provide adequate recyclable storage areas for collection/storage of recyclable and green waste materials for this project. 1

If you have any questions regarding the environmental comment, please contact Mr. Corey Mayne (626) 458-3524.

If you have any other questions or require additional information, please contact Mr. Toan Duong at (626) 458-4921.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

for DENNIS HUNTER, PLS PE
Assistant Deputy Director
Land Development Division

MA:ca
P:\ldpub\CEQA\CDM\ CITY OF EL SEGUNDO. - BOEING SELBY BLOCK ZONE CHANGE AND GENERAL PLAN-DIS/MND.doc

Comment Letter No. 1

Dennis Hunter, PLS PE, Assistant Deputy Director
Land Development Division
County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
P.O. Box 1460
Alhambra, CA 91802-1460
July 28, 2009

Response 1-1

The commentor, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, states that the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires each development project to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. The commentor further states that the IS/MND should include/discuss standards to provide adequate recyclable storage areas for collection/storage of recyclable and green waste materials for the Project.

The commentor is referred to this Final IS/MND, Section III. Corrections and Additions to the Draft IS/MND, response to Question 16(f), which includes a revision to the Draft IS/MND to include the discussion suggested by the commentor regarding the provision of recyclable storage areas.

Comment Letter No. 2

Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952
213.922.2000 Tel
metro.net

Metro

RECEIVED
JUL 24 2009
Planning and Building Safety

July 22, 2009

Masa Alkire, AICP
Principal Planner
City of El Segundo
Planning and Building Safety Department
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mr. Alkire:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is in receipt of the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Boeing Selby Block Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment Project. This letter conveys recommendations concerning issues that are germane to Metro's statutory responsibilities in relation to the proposed project.

Several transit corridors with Metro bus service could be impacted by the project. Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator should be contacted at 213-922-4632 regarding construction activities that may impact Metro bus lines. Other Municipal Bus Service Operators may also be impacted and therefore should be included in construction outreach efforts. 2-1

If you have any questions regarding this response, please call me at 213-922-6908 or by email at chapmans@metro.net.

Sincerely,

Susan F. Chapman
Program Manager, Long Range Planning

Comment Letter No. 2

Susan F. Chapman, Program Manager, Long Range Planning
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012-2952
July 22, 2009

Response 2-1

The commentor, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), states that they are in receipt of the Draft IS/MND. The commentor provides recommendations concerning issues that are germane to Metro's statutory responsibilities in relation to the Project. The commentor also states that several transit corridors with Metro bus service could be impacted by the Project and that Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator should be contacted regarding construction activities that may impact Metro bus lines. Further, the commentor states that other Municipal Bus Service Operators may also be impacted and therefore should be included in construction outreach efforts. The commentor is referred to this Final IS/MND Section III. Corrections and Additions to the Draft IS/MND, Table 25, Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary, which includes revisions to Table 25 that were made as a result of additional information attained regarding the cumulative projects list. Table 25 indicates that none of the study intersections would be impacted by the Project. The commentor is also referred to the Draft IS/MND, response to Question 15(g), page 91, which states that "development of the Project would not alter any existing bus routes."

The commentor's statement concerning the contacting of the Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator and other Municipal Bus Service Operators would not create new significant environmental effects and is not necessary to mitigate an avoidable significant effect. Notwithstanding the above, the commentor's suggestion to contact the Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator and other Municipal Bus Service Operators has been included in this Final IS/MND. The commentor is referred to this Final IS/MND, Section III. Corrections and Additions to the Draft IS/MND, Mitigation Measure TR-2 and Summary of Mitigation Measures, Transportation/Traffic Mitigation Measures, Mitigation Measure TR-2; and Section V. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Transportation/Traffic, Mitigation Measure TR-2, which include the addition of the commentor's suggestion as Mitigation Measure TR-2.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, OFFICE OF PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION AND REGIONAL PLANNING
IGR/CEQA BRANCH
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 897-6696
FAX (213) 897-1337

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

August 4, 2009

IGR/CEQA MND CS/090702
City of El Segundo
Boeing Selby Block Zone Change
900, 950 and 960 Sepulveda Boulevard
Vic. LA-1-25.92

Mr. Masa Alkire
City of El Segundo
Planning Division
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mr. Alkire:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Boeing Selby Block Zone Change Project. The proposed project is a request by the Boeing Company to change the zoning and General Plan designation of the property located at 950, and 960 Sepulveda Boulevard and 901 and 915 Selby Street. The General Plan Amendment request is a re-designation of the project site from general commercial to corporate office. Based on the information received, we have the following comments: 3-1

We note MM TR-2: *The Applicant is responsible for paying a Traffic Mitigation Fee per resolution No. 4443.* Please indicate if any of the above-mention Traffic Mitigation Fee will be used for improvements on Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1) or for any other State Highway facility.

In accordance with the El Segundo General Plan, the minimum acceptable level of service for signalized intersections in the City is LOS D. As shown in Table 22, the following intersections currently operate at unacceptable level of service during one or both peak hours:

- Imperial Highway at Sepulveda Boulevard-PM Peak Hour
- Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard-PM Peak Hour

Table 25 shows Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary. The intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard with PM project trips would operate at LOS-F and the intersections of Sepulveda Boulevard at Mariposa Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard at Grand Avenue with PM project traffic would operate at LOS-E. 3-2

Caltrans is concerned about the poor level of service conditions on State Highways including, but not limited to State Route 1, Sepulveda Boulevard. The report should address the unacceptable level of service conditions at Sepulveda Boulevard at Imperial Highway, Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard at Grand Avenue, and Sepulveda Boulevard at Mariposa Avenue.

If you have any questions, you may reach me at (213) 897-6696 and please refer to our record number 090702/CS.

Sincerely,

ELMER ALVAREZ
IGR/CEQA Program Manager
Office of Regional Planning

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

Comment Letter No. 3

Elmer Alvarez, IGR/CEA Program Manager
Office of Regional Planning
State of California
Department of Transportation
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
August 4, 2009

Response 3-1

The commentor, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), requests indication as to whether the Traffic Mitigation Fee outlined in Mitigation Measure TR-2 will be used for improvements on Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1) or for any other State Highway facility.

The commentor is referred to this Final IS/MND Section III. Corrections and Additions to the Draft IS/MND, which indicates that Mitigation Measure TR-2 has been renumbered as Mitigation Measure TR-1. The traffic mitigation fees collected per resolution No. 4443 are pooled together in a Traffic Mitigation Fee Fund. The funds are allocated for planned traffic improvements which have been identified in the Circulation Element of the El Segundo General Plan within the Master Plan of Streets. The City Council reviews traffic improvement projects based on the priority of needs which are determined by the level of service at which key roadways in the City are currently operating, as well as the anticipated future traffic demand of these roadways. At this time it has not been determined for which improvement projects the funding for Mitigation Measure TR-1 will be used.

Response 3-2

The commentor accurately states that pursuant to the El Segundo General Plan, the minimum acceptable level of service for signalized intersections in the City is LOS D. The commentor states that as shown in Table 22 of the Draft IS/MND, the following study intersections currently operate at unacceptable levels of service during one or both peak hours:

- Imperial Highway at Sepulveda Boulevard PM Peak Hour; and
- Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard PM Peak Hour.

The commentor also states that Table 25, Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary, of the Draft IS/MND shows that the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard would operate at LOS F during the PM Peak Hour, and that the intersections of Sepulveda Boulevard at Mariposa Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard at Grand Avenue would operate at LOS E during the PM Peak Hour with project traffic. The commentor further states that Caltrans is concerned about the poor level of service conditions on State Highways including, but not limited to, State Route 1, Sepulveda Boulevard and that the IS/MND should address the unacceptable level of service conditions at Sepulveda Boulevard at Imperial Highway, Sepulveda Boulevard at El Segundo Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard at Grand Avenue, and Sepulveda Boulevard at Mariposa Avenue.

Policy C3-1.2 of the Circulation Element of the El Segundo General Plan states: The minimum acceptable level of service (LOS) at an intersection is LOS D. Intersections operating at LOS E or F shall be considered deficient. If traffic caused by a development project is forecast to result in an intersection level of service change from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, then the development impact shall be considered significant. If a development project is forecast to result in an increase of intersection volume/capacity ratio (V/C) of 0.02 or greater at any intersection that is forecast to operate at LOS E or F, the impact shall be considered significant. This threshold was used by the traffic consultant in preparation of the traffic analysis.

The commentor is referred to this Final IS/MND Section III. Corrections and Additions to the Draft IS/MND, Table 25, Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary, which includes revisions to Table 25 that were made as a result of additional information attained regarding the cumulative

projects list. As indicated in Table 25, project-generated traffic would not result in any level of service changes from LOS D or better to LOS E or F. Furthermore, project-generated traffic would not result in an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.02 or greater at any study intersection forecasted to operate at LOS E or F. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur as a result of development of the Project and no mitigation measures are required.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires a Lead Agency to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Mitigation Monitoring Program, Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines provides additional direction on mitigation monitoring or reporting). The City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department is the Lead Agency for the Proposed Boeing Selby Block Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment.

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts of the Project. Where appropriate, this environmental document identified project design features or recommended mitigation measures to avoid or to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is designed to monitor implementation of mitigation measures identified for the Project. The required mitigation measures are listed separately and categorized by impact area, with an accompanying identification of the following:

- Monitoring Phase, the phase of the Project during which the mitigation measure must be monitored;
  - Pre-Construction, including the design phase
  - Construction
  - Post-Construction
- The Implementing Party, the agency with the power to implement the mitigation measure;
- The Enforcement Agency, the agency with the power to enforce the mitigation measure, and
- The Monitoring Agency, the agency to which reports involving feasibility, compliance, implementation and development are made.

The MMRP for the Proposed Boeing Selby Block Zone Change and General Plan Land Use Map Designation Amendment will be in place throughout all phases of the Project. The Applicant shall be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures unless otherwise noted. The applicant shall also be obligated to provide certification, as identified below, to the appropriate monitoring agency and the appropriate enforcement agency that compliance with the required mitigation measure has been implemented. The City s existing planning, engineering, review, and inspection processes will be used as the basic foundation for the MMRP procedures and will also serve to provide the documentation for the reporting program.

The substance and timing of each certification report that is submitted to Planning and Building Safety Department shall be at the discretion of the Planning and Building Safety Department. Generally, each report will be submitted to the Planning and Building Safety Department in a timely manner following completion/implementation of the applicable mitigation measure and shall include sufficient information to reasonably determine whether the intent of the measure has been satisfied. The Planning and Building Safety Department in conjunction with the Applicant shall assure that project construction occurs in accordance with the MMRP. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) shall be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions relative to violations of SCAQMD rules associated with mitigation. Departments listed below are all departments of the City of El Segundo unless otherwise noted.

I. AESTHETICS

MM AE-1. Construction equipment staging areas must use appropriate screening (e.g., temporary fencing with opaque material) to buffer views of construction equipment and material, when feasible. Staging locations must be identified on Final Development Plans and Grading Plans.

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

MM AE-2. Expansive areas of highly reflective materials, such as mirrored glass, are prohibited. Non-reflective building materials must be used to the maximum extent possible to reduce potential glare impacts. Building materials must be identified on the Architectural Plans submitted for plan check for the Planning Division's review and approval.

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

MM AE-3. All exterior lighting must be shielded downward and away from adjoining properties and the public right-of-way. A lighting plan must be submitted for Planning Division approval. This lighting plan must specify lighting type and placement to ensure lighting does not spill over onto adjoining properties.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction, Construction, Post-Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department
Monitoring Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

MM AE-4. A construction lighting plan must be submitted before the City issues building permits. Construction lighting must be shielded downward and not shine onto adjoining properties and the public right-of-way.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department
Monitoring Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

No mitigation measures are required.

III. AIR QUALITY

No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist (as appropriate) must prepare a research design for recovery of the resources in consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of CEQA 21083.2. The archaeologist must complete a report of excavations and findings, and must submit the report for peer review by three certified archaeologists or paleontologists, as appropriate. Upon approval of the report, the report must be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center and keep the report on file at the South Central Coastal Information Center. After the find is appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

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

MM CR-2. In the event that subsurface paleontological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has been provided the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel must be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.

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

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

MM CR-3. If human remains are unearthed, Health and Safety Code 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance can occur until the County coroner makes the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains.

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

MM GS-1. A geotechnical report must be prepared and submitted to the City that addresses soil conditions in the project vicinity with respect to liquefaction potential. The Project must be designed and constructed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the geotechnical report.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction, Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department
Monitoring Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

MM GS-2. All soil disturbance and travel on unpaved surfaces must be suspended if winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

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

MM GS-3. A geotechnical report must be prepared and submitted to the City that addresses soil conditions in the project vicinity with respect to unstable soils. The Project must be designed and constructed in accordance with recommendations provided in the geotechnical report.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction, Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department
Monitoring Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

MM GS-4. A geotechnical report must be prepared and submitted to the City that addresses soil conditions in the project vicinity with respect to expansive soils. The Project must be designed and constructed in accordance with recommendations provided in the geotechnical report.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction, Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department
Monitoring Agency:	Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

MM HM-1. Before the City issues grading or building permits, the Applicant must submit to the City written acknowledgment from DTSC that proceeding with Project construction will not be detrimental to the required remediation of on-site hazardous materials as required by the Corrective Action Consent Agreement (CACA); written acknowledgement that the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) approves of any well monitoring relocation; approval by the El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) of a Health and Safety Plan regarding the excavation of potentially hazardous materials; and any necessary permitting for Los Angeles County regarding well installations.

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

MM HM-2. The Applicant will provide the Building and Safety Division with asbestos containing materials (ACM), lead based paint (LBP), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) surveys on all buildings and associated infrastructure scheduled for demolition. If ACMs LBP, and/or PCBs are detected, they must be abated in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations before renovation or demolition.

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

MM HM-3. Before the City issues a building permit, the Applicant must submit one of the following: Acknowledgement from Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) that construction of the project will not conflict with the airport operations.

-OR-

Proof of completion of an FAA type 77 review.

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

VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

MM HY-1. The Applicant must maintain all structural or treatment control best management practices (BMPs) for the life of the project.

Monitoring Phase: Construction, Post-Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department
Monitoring Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

MM HY-2. Materials with the potential to contaminate stormwater must be: (1) placed in an enclosure such as, without limitation, a cabinet, shed, or similar sheltered enclosure; or (2) protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs.

Monitoring Phase: Construction, Post-Construction
Implementation Party: Applicant
Enforcement Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
Monitoring Agency: Planning and Building Safety Department, Public Works Department

VIII. LAND USE AND PLANNING

No mitigation measures are required.

IX. MINERAL RESOURCES

No mitigation measures are required.

X. NOISE

MM NS-1. As stated in the El Segundo Municipal Code, construction activities are restricted to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Monday through Saturday, and are prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays.

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

MM NS-2. Construction activities must be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels, to the maximum extent feasible.

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

MM NS-3. Construction contracts must specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, must be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other noise attenuating devices.

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

MM NS-4. All construction truck traffic must be restricted to truck routes approved by the City of El Segundo Department of Planning and Building Safety, and must generally avoid residential areas and other sensitive receptors to the extent feasible.

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

MM NS-5. All construction entrances must post construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the construction superintendent.

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

MM NS-6. All new rooftop equipment associated with the Project must be either screened from view by parapets or fully enclosed.

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

MM NS-7. The operation of construction equipment that generates high levels of vibration in excess of 80 VdB, including, without limitation large bulldozers, loaded trucks, caisson drills, and jackhammers, must be prohibited within 52 feet of the existing off-site industrial building that abuts the northeast corner of the project site. Instead, small rubber-tired bulldozers must be used within this area during demolition, grading, and site preparation operations.

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

XI. POPULATION AND HOUSING

No mitigation measures are required.

XII. PUBLIC SERVICES

MM PS-1. The Applicant is responsible for paying a Fire Service Mitigation Fee to the ESFD for the provision of fire-protection services. Per the ESMC, the current fee is levied at 0.14 cents per square foot of net new building area for commercial and industrial uses.

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

MM PS-2. The Applicant is responsible for paying a Police Service Mitigation Fee of 0.11 per gross square foot of net new building area to the ESPD for the provision of police-protection services.

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

MM PS-3. The Applicant is responsible for paying a School District Developer Fee of 0.47 per square foot of net new commercial, industrial, or warehouse development to the WSD for the provision of school services.

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

MM PS-4. The Applicant is responsible for paying a Library Fee of 0.03 per square foot of net new development to the City of El Segundo Public Library for the provision of library services.

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

XIII. RECREATION

No mitigation measures are required.

XIV. TRANSPORTATION TRAFFIC

MM TR-1. The Applicant is responsible for paying a Traffic Mitigation Fee per Resolution No. 4443.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Public Works Department, Planning and Building Safety Department
Monitoring Agency:	Public Works Department, Planning and Building Safety Department

MM TR-2. The Applicant shall contact the Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator and other Municipal Bus Service Operators prior to the start of construction.

Monitoring Phase:	Pre-Construction
Implementation Party:	Applicant
Enforcement Agency:	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Monitoring Agency:	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

XV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

No mitigation measures are required.