

---

---

## VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

---

The CEQA Guidelines require that EIRs include the identification and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the project while still meeting the general project objectives. The CEQA Guidelines also set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR. Those considerations are discussed below.

### **Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparable merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the “rule of reason.”

### **Purpose**

Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly.”

### **Project Objectives**

The City of El Segundo has identified the following objectives for the proposed Circulation Element Update:

- To set forth a plan for modifying and upgrading the City’s roadway network to effectively accommodate projected traffic growth to the year 2025.
- To provide a circulation system that effectively serves the City’s residents and businesses.
- To promote the implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), transit use and other technological innovations that would enhance the City’s circulation system.

- To implement key policies of the El Segundo General Plan with respect to Land Use, Economic Development, Air Quality, Noise, and Public Safety.
- To maintain consistency with State and local congestion and transportation policies and practices.

### **Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives**

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.”

In selecting a reasonable range of alternatives, the City primarily considered the potential for the proposed Circulation Element roadway network to accommodate differing levels of traffic in the future. The City cannot control vehicular traffic that originates outside the City and transits through the City on the City’s roadway system. This traffic is reflected in the SCAG regional model based on land uses designated in the General Plans of the cities and unincorporated County areas located adjacent to or in the vicinity of El Segundo. Therefore, the principal mechanism available to the City to influence total future traffic levels that would utilize the City’s roadway network is the system of land use controls for future development in the City contained in the City’s General Plan and zoning code. In the process of developing the physical and policy changes that comprise the proposed Circulation Element Update, the City considered three alternative land use patterns that have been included in this EIR and are described below.

### **Overview of Selected Alternatives**

The alternatives to be analyzed in comparison to the proposed Circulation Element Update include:

Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Alternative B: FAR 0.8 Alternative

Alternative C: FAR 1.0 Alternative

Alternative D: FAR 1.3 Alternative

### **Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible**

As described above, Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Because the City's roadway system is highly developed and generalized land use patterns in the City have been basically established over the City's 90 year history, there is presently no land available for construction of major new roadways or realignment of the existing roadway system to provide substantial additional roadway capacity nor is any substantial land area within the City expected to become available to accommodate major new roadways in the future without major displacement of existing commercial or residential uses. In the absence of available land area for roadway development, the potential range of changes to Circulation Element roadways or policies was limited, as a practical matter, to relatively minor, incremental changes to the City's built roadway network. The proposed Circulation Element Update addresses all locations within the City's roadway network where such minor changes would be reasonably expected to change the performance of the Circulation Element roadway network. The only alternative roadway network that could reasonably be analyzed would be one which did not include the proposed changes in roadway designations and proposed deletion of currently designated roadway segments. However, this alternative is reflected in the No Project alternative, which analyzes the existing Circulation Element roadway network. Therefore, the City rejected the consideration of alternative Circulation Element roadway networks, which would include alternative locations where Circulation Element designations or policies could be applied, as infeasible.

In addition, the City considered the alternative of taking no action (i.e., modification of the Circulation Element to reflect the status quo, leaving the City's roadway network as it currently exists and not undertaking any further roadway or intersection improvements), as this alternative would avoid impacts related to construction activities. The City rejected this alternative because traffic growth both inside and outside of the City would continue to occur as a result of other factors (economic development, population growth), even if the Circulation Element were to be so modified and it would be an unreasonable policy for the City to take no action in the face of this continued growth in traffic.

### **Assumptions and Methodology**

The anticipated means for implementation of the alternatives can influence the assessment and/or probability of impacts for those alternatives. For example, a project may have the potential to generate impacts, but considerations in project design may also afford the opportunity to avoid or reduce such impacts. The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed project, and assumes that all applicable mitigation measures proposed for the project would apply to each alternative. Impacts associated with the alternatives are compared to project-related impacts and are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed project.

The following alternatives analysis compares the potential environmental impacts of four alternatives with those of the proposed project for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of the EIR.

## **A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

As required by CEQA, this subsection analyzes a “No Project” Alternative (Alternative A). Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Circulation Element Update would not be implemented and the policies set forth in the adopted Circulation Element would remain unchanged. The Circulation Element roadway network would remain as currently set forth in the adopted Circulation Element. Roadway and intersection improvements would be constructed to implement the adopted Circulation Element roadway network and the proposed Circulation Element Update policy that would limit identified intersection improvements to those that are feasible (i.e., would not affect building, freeway supports, or railroad rights-of-way) would not be included in the Circulation Element. Nash and Douglas Streets would not be converted from one-way to two-way operation. Traffic growth from land uses within the City of El Segundo would be governed by the adopted General Plan land use designations and increased regional traffic that would use the City’s roadway system would be as currently anticipated in adopted SCAG regional growth forecasts and associated regional transportation models.

To represent the No Project conditions, a year 2025 model was created, which is described in Section IV.B, Transportation and Traffic, of this EIR. The buildout assumptions are the same as for the Proposed Project.

The General Plan roadway network reflected in the adopted Circulation Element was depicted in the model with the appropriate characteristics such as facility type, number of travel lanes, freeflow speed, and capacity. Each roadway segment that was part of the adopted Circulation Element was included in the model, whether or not the roadway had been constructed and whether or not the roadway had the characteristics of its ultimate general plan classification.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

Application of the year 2025 model using the existing General Plan land use designations and Circulation Element roadway system indicates that 9 intersections would exceed the City’s level of service standard during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour or both under the No Project alternative (Table VI-1). Within the context of the No Project alternative, an “impact” represents a location where the future growth in traffic within and outside of the City would cause an intersection to exceed the level of service standard, even when all improvements identified in the adopted Circulation Element are implemented. This would be an increase of three locations compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, under which 6 intersections would exceed the City’s level of service standard under future traffic conditions.

The following additional locations would be impacted under the No Project Alternative:

- Sepulveda Boulevard/Imperial Highway
- Sepulveda Boulevard/Mariposa Avenue
- Sepulveda Boulevard/Grand Avenue
- Sepulveda Boulevard/Hughes Way
- Douglas Street/Mariposa Avenue

The following locations that would be impacted under the proposed Circulation Element Update would not be impacted under the No Project Alternative:

- Douglas Street/El Segundo Boulevard
- Sepulveda Boulevard/El Segundo Boulevard

Impacts of the No Project Alternative with respect to the CMP would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant since the No Project alternative would also not increase traffic levels beyond those already anticipated in the El Segundo General Plan and SCAG regional traffic model. Impacts of the No Project alternative would be greater than the proposed Circulation Element Update and would be significant and unavoidable.

### **Aesthetics**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Such improvements could include additional street lighting similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

### **Air Quality**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the adopted 1992 Circulation Element are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would be similar in scope to the prototypical construction project evaluated under the proposed Circulation Element Update. The prototypical project would generate daily construction emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for NOx. Impacts of the No Project alternative would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and significant and unavoidable with respect to NOx emissions during construction.

The No Project alternative, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update, would not increase overall future traffic levels already anticipated in the adopted El Segundo General Plan and SCAG

regional traffic model and therefore would not result in increased regional air emissions. The No Project alternative would result in significant impacts at a greater number of intersections than would the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would increase the potential for local CO concentrations to exceed the state CO standards. However, since projected concentrations under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the standards, it is unlikely that the No Project alternative would result in a violation of the CO standard. Although impact of the No Project alternative would be higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to local CO concentrations, those impacts would be less than significant.

### **Biological Resources**

The No Project alternative would not include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the biologically-sensitive Sepulveda/Rosecrans site. Impacts of the No Project alternative would be lower than the proposed Circulation Element with respect to biological resources and less than significant.

### **Cultural Resources**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Such improvements could include affected areas within the City that contain potential paleontological and archaeological resources, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures.

### **Geology and Soils**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Such improvements would include additional grading and could take place within areas of the City identified as having potential for expansive soils, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant with adherence to mitigation measures related to project design.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Such improvements could change drainage patterns and result in additional discharges to the storm drain systems within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures related to project design.

**Table VI-1**  
**Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Level of Service (LOS) –**  
**Future No Project with Adopted Circulation Element Roadway Network (2025)**

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Existing		No Project		Existing		No Project	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1	Vista Del Mar / Grand Ave.	0.47	A	0.56	A	0.59	A	0.63	B
2	Main St. / Imperial Hwy	0.84	D	0.78	C	0.66	B	0.73	C
3	Main St. / Imperial Ave.	0.53	A	0.56	A	0.42	A	0.44	A
4	Main St. / Palm Ave.	0.37	A	0.40	A	0.31	A	0.32	A
5	Main St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.34	A	0.34	A	0.33	A	0.28	A
6	Main St. / Grand Ave.	0.23	A	0.22	A	0.18	A	0.16	A
7	Main St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.23	A	0.12	A	0.30	A	0.16	A
8	Aviation Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	0.79	C	<b>1.35</b>	<b>F</b>	0.73	C	<b>1.06</b>	<b>F</b>
9	Aviation Blvd. / 118th St.	0.37	A	0.79	C	0.41	A	0.85	D
10	Aviation Blvd. / 120th St.	0.86	D	0.90	D	0.68	B	0.88	D
11	Aviation Blvd. / 124th St.	0.44	A	0.70	B	0.53	A	0.87	D
12	Aviation Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.95	E	0.92	E	0.96	E	<b>1.19</b>	<b>F</b>
13	Aviation Blvd. / Utah Ave.	0.61	B	0.84	D	0.61	B	0.73	C
14	Aviation Blvd. / Alaska Ave.	0.50	A	0.65	B	0.64	B	0.79	C
15	Aviation Blvd. / Hawaii St.	0.68	B	0.74	C	0.73	C	0.84	D
16	Aviation Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.95	E	<b>1.17</b>	<b>F</b>	1.26	F	<b>1.41</b>	<b>F</b>
17	Center St. / Grand Ave.	0.26	A	0.29	A	0.27	A	0.27	A
18	Center St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.27	A	0.17	A	0.28	A	0.19	A

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Existing		No Project		Existing		No Project	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
19	Sepulveda Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	0.97	E	<b>1.46</b>	<b>F</b>	0.84	D	<b>1.27</b>	<b>F</b>
20	Sepulveda Blvd. Blvd. / Maple Ave.	0.70	B	0.83	D	0.79	C	0.85	F
21	Sepulveda Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	0.98	E	<b>1.26</b>	<b>F</b>	0.90	D	<b>1.04</b>	<b>F</b>
22	Sepulveda Blvd. / Grand Ave.	0.92	E	<b>1.06</b>	<b>F</b>	0.94	E	<b>1.36</b>	<b>F</b>
23	Sepulveda Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.96	E	0.93	E	1.08	F	1.02	F
24	Sepulveda Blvd. / Hughes Way	0.65	B	<b>1.20</b>	<b>F</b>	0.71	C	<b>1.06</b>	<b>F</b>
25	Sepulveda Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.88	D	<b>0.96</b>	<b>E</b>	1.06	F	<b>1.15</b>	<b>F</b>
26	Hughes Way / Imperial Hwy.	0.49	A	0.57	A	0.60	A	0.67	B
27	Nash St. / Imperial Hwy	0.85	D	0.82	D	0.36	A	0.33	A
28	Nash St. / Atwood Way	0.43	A	0.78	C	0.28	A	0.62	B
29	Nash St. / Maple Ave.	0.39	A	0.62	B	0.29	A	0.49	A
30	Nash St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.52	A	0.50	A	0.41	A	0.48	A
31	Nash St. / Grand Ave.	0.52	A	0.85	D	0.42	A	0.71	C
32	Nash St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.44	A	0.78	C	0.64	B	0.86	D
33	Nash St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.37	A	0.33	A	0.60	A	0.57	A
34	Atwood Way / I-105 EB Ramp Entrance	0.16	A	0.35	A	0.52	A	0.85	D
35	Douglas St. / Imperial Hwy.	0.36	A	0.44	A	0.39	A	0.61	B
36	Douglas St. / (between Imperial & Mariposa)	0.14	A	0.28	A	0.20	A	0.340	A
37	Douglas St. / Atwood Way	0.23	A	0.35	A	0.38	A	0.58	A
38	Douglas St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.33	A	0.62	B	0.36	A	<b>0.96</b>	<b>E</b>
39	Douglas St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.56	A	0.75	C	0.54	A	0.78	C

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Existing		No Project		Existing		No Project	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
40	Douglas St. / Utah Ave.	0.38	A	0.63	B	0.31	A	0.76	C
41	Douglas St. / Alaska Ave.	0.28	A	0.20	A	0.26	A	0.19	A
42	Douglas St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.63	B	0.74	C	0.65	B	0.75	C
43	Continental Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	0.61	B	0.84	D	0.45	A	0.76	C
44	Continental Blvd. / Grand Ave.	0.34	A	0.72	C	0.24	A	0.56	A
45	Continental Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.47	A	0.50	A	0.47	A	0.41	A
46	Continental Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.43	A	0.32	A	0.75	C	0.60	A
47	California St. / Imperial Hwy (N/S)	0.47	A	0.57	A	0.61	B	0.70	B
48	California St. / Imperial Hwy (S/S)	0.24	A	0.47	A	0.26	A	0.46	A
49	El Segundo Blvd. / Illinois St.	0.35	A	0.32	A	0.42	A	0.40	A
50	El Segundo Blvd. / Isis Ave.	0.68	B	0.88	D	0.79	C	0.88	D
51	Rosecrans Ave. / Apollo St.	0.43	A	0.33	A	0.84	D	0.68	B
52	Rosecrans Ave. / Village Dr.	0.43	A	0.37	A	0.74	C	0.64	B
53	Rosecrans Ave. / Pacific Ave.	0.40	A	0.50	A	0.56	A	0.64	B
54	Rosecrans Ave. / Blanche Rd.	0.47	A	0.47	A	0.49	A	0.56	A
55	45 <sup>TH</sup> Street / Vista Del Mar	0.65	B	0.76	C	0.52	A	0.61	B

Note: **Bold** denotes significant impact.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Such improvements could occur on sites that reflect conditions related to the presences of hazardous materials, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The No Project alternative would not include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the Sepulveda/Rosecrans site, which is heavily impacted by conditions related to hazardous materials. Overall, impacts of the No Project alternative with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be lower than the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

**Land Use**

Under the No Project alternative, the City's roadway system would be built to meet the requirements set forth in the adopted Circulation Element, which is consistent with and works to implement numerous policies set forth in the General Plan and Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

**Noise**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the adopted Circulation Element are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would employ similar construction equipment and similar construction phasing as would occur under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts of the No Project alternative with respect to construction noise would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and would be significant and unavoidable.

The No Project alternative would result in significant impacts at a greater number of intersections than would the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would increase the potential for noise impacts on roadway segments located adjacent to residential neighborhoods. However, since projected noise levels under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the threshold for a significant traffic noise impact (i.e., an increase of 5 dBA; the largest increase under the proposed Circulation Element would be 3.5 dBA), it is not likely that traffic levels under the No Project alternative would result in noise levels that would exceed the threshold. Although impacts of the No Project Alternative would be slightly higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to traffic noise, those impacts would be less than significant.

**Population, Housing, and Employment**

The No Project alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at identified intersections. Such improvements would provide additional

construction employment opportunities, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The No Project alternative would not include any housing or permanent population increase within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

## **B. FAR 0.8 ALTERNATIVE**

Under the FAR 0.8 alternative, the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan and associated zoning classifications would be amended to provide for a maximum FAR of 0.8 in the areas of the City that are currently zoned Urban Mixed-Use North (MU-N) and Corporate Office (CO). Under the existing General Plan designations and zoning classifications, development in the MU-N zone is presently permitted to a maximum FAR of 1.3, while development in the CO zone is limited to a maximum FAR of 0.8. Thus, under the FAR 0.8 alternative, maximum development density in the MU-N zone would be reduced to 0.8 FAR, while the maximum development density in the CO zone would remain the same. This would result in lower traffic levels than would be experienced under the proposed Circulation Element Update, where no land use designations would be changed. All other land use designations set forth in the General Plan and zoning code would remain the same. Future levels of regional traffic that would utilize the City's roadway system would remain as currently anticipated in adopted SCAG regional growth forecasts and associated regional transportation models. The proposed changes to Circulation Element policies and roadway configurations would be the same as under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Nash and Douglas Streets would be converted from one-way to two-way operations.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

Application of the year 2025 model using the same roadway assumptions utilized for the proposed Circulation Element Update and reduced traffic levels that would result from the reductions in FAR that would occur under the FAR 0.8 alternative indicates that 7 intersections would exceed the City's level of service standard during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour or both (Table VI-2). This would be an increase of one impacted location (Sepulveda Blvd/Maple Ave.) compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, under which 6 intersections would exceed the City's level of service standard under future traffic conditions. However, under the FAR 0.8 alternative, a larger number of intersections would be beneficially impacted. Under the FAR 0.8 alternative, 31 intersections would experience improved ICU values during the a.m. peak hour and 29 intersections would experience improved ICU values in the p.m. peak hour, compared to 21 each during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts of the FAR 0.8 Alternative with respect to the CMP would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant since the FAR 0.8 alternative would not increase traffic levels beyond those already anticipated in the El Segundo General Plan and SCAG regional traffic model. Impacts of the FAR 0.8 alternative would be greater than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to the number of impacted intersections, but

more beneficial than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to improved operating values at a greater number of intersections.

**Table VI-2  
Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Level of Service (LOS) –  
Future under FAR 0.8 Alternative (2025)**

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 0.80 Alternative		No Project		FAR 0.8 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1	Vista Del Mar / Grand Ave.	0.56	A	0.42	A	0.63	B	0.47	A
2	Main St. / Imperial Hwy	0.78	C	0.65	B	0.73	C	0.54	A
3	Main St. / Imperial Ave	0.56	A	0.53	A	0.44	A	0.41	A
4	Main St. / Palm Ave.	0.40	A	0.40	A	0.32	A	0.32	A
5	Main St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.34	A	0.32	A	0.28	A	0.27	A
6	Main St. / Grand Ave.	0.22	A	0.24	A	0.16	A	0.16	A
7	Main St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.12	A	0.14	A	0.16	A	0.20	A
8	Aviation Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	1.35	F	0.91	E	1.06	F	1.01	F
9	Aviation Blvd. / 118th St.	0.79	C	0.46	A	0.85	D	0.46	A
10	Aviation Blvd. / 120th St.	0.90	D	0.81	D	0.88	D	0.78	C
11	Aviation Blvd. / 124th St.	0.70	B	0.43	A	0.87	D	0.54	A
12	Aviation Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.92	E	<b>1.04</b>	<b>F</b>	1.19	F	1.13	F
13	Aviation Blvd. / Utah Ave.	0.84	D	0.87	D	0.73	C	0.74	C
14	Aviation Blvd. / Alaska Ave.	0.65	B	0.35	A	0.79	C	0.43	A
15	Aviation Blvd. / Hawaii St.	0.74	C	0.35	A	0.84	D	0.45	A
16	Aviation Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	1.17	F	<b>1.20</b>	<b>F</b>	1.41	F	<b>1.46</b>	<b>F</b>
17	Center St. / Grand Ave.	0.29	A	0.20	A	0.27	A	0.22	A
18	Center St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.17	A	0.15	A	0.19	A	0.15	A

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 0.80 Alternative		No Project		FAR 0.8 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
19	Sepulveda Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	1.46	F	1.34	F	1.27	F	1.10	F
20	Sepulveda Blvd. / Maple Ave.	0.83	D	<b>0.92</b>	<b>E</b>	0.85	D	<b>0.95</b>	<b>E</b>
21	Sepulveda Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	1.26	F	1.13	F	1.04	F	0.94	E
22	Sepulveda Blvd. / Grand Ave.	1.06	F	<b>1.11</b>	<b>F</b>	1.36	F	0.90	D
23	Sepulveda Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.93	E	0.85	D	1.02	F	<b>1.12</b>	<b>F</b>
24	Sepulveda Blvd. / Hughes Way	1.20	F	0.69	B	1.06	F	0.80	C
25	Sepulveda Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.96	E	0.93	E	1.15	F	<b>1.24</b>	<b>F</b>
26	Hughes Way / Imperial Hwy.	0.57	A	0.48	A	0.67	B	0.54	A
27	Nash St. / Imperial Hwy	0.82	D	0.88	D	0.33	A	0.35	A
28	Nash St. / Atwood Way	0.78	C	0.63	B	0.62	B	0.88	D
29	Nash St. / Maple Ave.	0.62	B	0.85	D	0.49	A	0.83	C
30	Nash St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.50	A	0.64	B	0.48	A	0.57	A
31	Nash St. / Grand Ave.	0.85	D	0.75	C	0.71	C	0.86	D
32	Nash St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.78	C	0.83	D	0.86	D	0.87	D
33	Nash St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.33	A	0.35	A	0.57	A	0.69	B
34	Atwood Way / I-105 EB Ramp Entrance	0.35	A	0.29	A	0.85	D	0.74	C
35	Douglas St. / Imperial Hwy.	0.44	A	0.53	A	0.61	B	0.89	D
36	Douglas St. / (between Imperial & Mariposa)	0.28	A	0.23	A	0.34	A	0.34	A
37	Douglas St. / Atwood Way	0.35	A	0.35	A	0.58	A	0.36	A
38	Douglas St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.62	B	0.45	A	0.96	E	0.50	A
39	Douglas St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.75	C	<b>0.94</b>	<b>E</b>	0.78	C	<b>0.93</b>	<b>E</b>

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 0.80 Alternative		No Project		FAR 0.8 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
40	Douglas St. / Utah Ave.	0.63	B	0.63	B	0.76	C	0.53	A
41	Douglas St. / Alaska Ave.	0.20	A	0.32	A	.0.19	A	0.28	A
42	Douglas St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.74	C	0.67	B	0.75	C	0.69	B
43	Continental Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	0.84	D	0.47	A	0.76	C	0.36	B
44	Continental Blvd. / Grand Ave.	0.72	C	0.84	D	0.56	A	0.60	A
45	Continental Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.50	A	0.43	A	0.41	A	0.40	A
46	Continental Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.32	A	0.32	A	0.60	A	0.61	B
47	California St. / Imperial Hwy (N/S)	0.57	A	0.56	A	0.70	B	0.70	B
48	California St. / Imperial Hwy (S/S)	0.47	A	0.45	A	0.46	A	0.43	A
49	El Segundo Blvd. / Illinois St.	0.32	A	0.27	A	0.40	A	0.36	A
50	El Segundo Blvd. / Isis Ave.	0.88	D	0.89	D	0.88	D	0.70	B
51	Rosecrans Ave. / Apollo St.	0.33	A	0.35	A	0.68	B	0.72	C
52	Rosecrans Ave. / Village Dr.	0.37	A	0.43	A	0.64	B	0.73	C
53	Rosecrans Ave. / Pacific Ave.	0.50	A	0.41	A	0.64	B	0.54	A
54	Rosecrans Ave. / Blanche Rd.	0.47	A	0.34	A	0.56	A	0.39	A
55	45 <sup>TH</sup> Street / Vista Del Mar	0.76	C	0.76	C	0.61	B	0.61	B

Note: **Bold** denotes significant impact.

**Aesthetics**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could include additional street lighting similar to, although at fewer locations than, the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

**Air Quality**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and intersection improvements at identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the FAR 0.8 alternative are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would be similar in scope to the prototypical construction project evaluated under the proposed Circulation Element Update. The prototypical project would generate daily construction emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for NOx. More intersections would be impacted under the FAR 0.8 alternative and therefore total construction emissions would be greater than the proposed Circulation Element Update. However, with respect to individual construction projects required to implement the FAR 0.8 alternative, impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and significant and unavoidable with respect to NOx emissions.

The FAR 0.8 alternative would reduce overall future traffic levels compared to those anticipated in the adopted El Segundo General Plan and therefore would result in lower regional air emissions than the proposed Circulation Element Update, although impacts of both the FAR 0.8 alternative and proposed Circulation Element Update would be less than significant with respect to regional emissions. The FAR 0.8 alternative would result in significant impacts at a greater number of intersections than would the proposed Circulation Element Update. Since projected concentrations under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the standards, it is unlikely that the FAR 0.8 alternative would result in a violation of the CO standard. Impacts of the FAR 0.8 alternative would be greater than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to local CO concentrations and both would be less than significant.

**Biological Resources**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the biologically-sensitive Sepulveda/Rosecrans site. Impacts of the FAR 0.8 alternative would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element with respect to biological resources. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration.

**Cultural Resources**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could include affected areas within the City that contain potential paleontological and archaeological resources similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

**Geology and Soils**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements would include additional grading and could take place within areas of the City identified as having the potential for expansive soils similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could change drainage patterns and result in additional discharges to the storm drain systems within the City, similar to, although at fewer locations than, the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted, shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could occur on sites that reflect conditions related to the presences of hazardous materials, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the

Sepulveda/Rosecrans site, which is heavily impacted by conditions related to hazardous materials. Overall, impacts of the FAR 0.8 alternative with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration.

### **Land Use**

Under the FAR 0.8 alternative, the City's roadway system would be built to meet the same requirements set forth in the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would be consistent with and work to implement numerous policies set forth in the General Plan. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

### **Noise**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the adopted Circulation Element are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would employ similar construction equipment and similar construction phasing as would occur under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts of the FAR 0.8 alternative with respect to construction noise would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and would be significant and unavoidable.

The FAR 0.8 alternative would result in lower overall traffic generation, which would reduce the potential for noise impacts on roadway segments located adjacent to residential neighborhoods and other potential sensitive receptors. Since projected noise levels under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the threshold for a significant traffic noise impact (i.e., an increase of 5 dBA; the largest increase under the proposed Circulation Element would be 3.5 dBA), traffic levels under the FAR 0.8 alternative would not result in noise levels that would exceed the threshold. Impacts of the FAR 0.8 Alternative would be lower than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to traffic noise and both would be less than significant.

Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration. This analysis shall address construction noise impacts related to specific proposed projects and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

### **Population, Housing, and Employment**

The FAR 0.8 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements would provide additional construction employment opportunities, similar

to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The FAR 0.8 alternative would not include any housing or permanent population increase within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

### **C. FAR 1.0 ALTERNATIVE**

Under the FAR 1.0 Alternative, the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan and associated zoning classifications would be amended to provide for a maximum FAR of 1.0 in the areas of the City that are currently zoned Urban Mixed-Use North (MU-N) and Corporate Office (CO). Under the existing General Plan designations and zoning classifications, development in the MU-N zone is presently permitted to a maximum FAR of 1.3, while development in the CO zone is limited to a maximum FAR of 0.8. Thus, under the FAR 1.0 alternative, maximum development density in the MU-N zone would be reduced to 1.0 FAR, while the maximum development density in the CO zone would increase to 1.0 FAR. This would result in roughly similar traffic levels as would be experienced under the proposed Circulation Element Update, where no land use designations would be changed. Future levels of regional traffic that would utilize the City's roadway system would be as currently anticipated in adopted SCAG regional growth forecasts and associated regional transportation models. The proposed changes to Circulation Element policies and roadway configurations would be the same as under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Nash and Douglas Streets would be converted from one-way to two-way operations.

#### **Transportation and Traffic**

Application of the year 2025 model using the same roadway assumptions utilized for the proposed Circulation Element Update and projected traffic levels that would result from the changes in FAR that would occur under the alternative indicates that 10 intersections would exceed the City's level of service standard during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour or both (Table VI-3). This would be an increase of four intersections compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, under which 6 intersections would exceed the City's level of service standard under future traffic conditions.

The following additional locations would be impacted under the FAR 1.0 alternative:

- Sepulveda Boulevard/Grand Avenue
- Nash Street/Atwood Way
- Nash Street/Maple Avenue
- Nash Street/ El Segundo Boulevard
- Douglas Street/Imperial Highway

The following intersection that would be impacted under the proposed Circulation Element Update would not be impacted under the FAR 1.0 alternative:

- Aviation Boulevard/Rosecrans Avenue

Impacts of the FAR 1.0 Alternative with respect to the CMP would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant since traffic levels under the FAR 1.0 alternative would be similar to those already anticipated in the El Segundo General Plan and SCAG regional traffic model. Overall traffic impacts of the FAR 1.0 alternative would be greater than the proposed Circulation Element Update.

### **Aesthetics**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could include additional street lighting similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

### **Air Quality**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the FAR 1.0 alternative are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would be similar in scope to the prototypical construction project evaluated under the proposed Circulation Element Update. The prototypical project would generate daily construction emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub>. Impacts of the FAR 1.0 alternative would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and significant and unavoidable with respect to emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> during construction.

The FAR 1.0 alternative, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update, would not result in a substantial increase in overall future traffic levels already anticipated in the El Segundo General Plan and SCAG regional traffic model and therefore would not result in increased regional air emissions. The FAR 1.0 alternative would result in significant impacts at five additional intersections compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would increase the potential for local CO concentrations to exceed the state CO standards. However, since projected concentrations under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the standards, it is unlikely that the FAR 1.0 alternative would result in a violation of the CO standard. Although impact of the FAR 1.0 alternative would be slightly higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to local CO concentrations, both would result in less than significant impacts.

**Table VI-3**  
**Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Level of Service (LOS) –**  
**Future under FAR 1.0 Alternative (2025)**

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 1.0 Alternative		No Project		FAR 1.0 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1	Vista Del Mar / Grand Ave.	0.56	A	0.42	A	0.63	B	0.49	A
2	Main St. / Imperial Hwy.	0.78	C	0.97	0.64	0.73	C	0.51	A
3	Main St. / Imperial Ave.	0.56	A	0.57	A	0.44	A	0.44	A
4	Main St. / Palm Ave.	0.40	A	0.40	A	0.32	A	0.32	A
5	Main St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.34	A	0.33	A	0.28	A	0.28	A
6	Main St. / Grand Ave.	0.22	A	0.25	A	0.16	A	0.16	A
7	Main St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.12	A	0.14	A	0.16	A	0.19	A
8	Aviation Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	1.35	F	0.93	E	1.06	F	<b>1.08</b>	<b>F</b>
9	Aviation Blvd. / 118th St.	0.79	C	0.48	A	0.85	D	0.47	A
10	Aviation Blvd. / 120th St.	0.90	D	0.84	F	0.88	D	0.81	D
11	Aviation Blvd. / 124th St.	0.70	B	0.45	A	0.87	D	0.58	A
12	Aviation Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.92	E	<b>1.05</b>	<b>F</b>	1.19	F	1.12	F
13	Aviation Blvd. / Utah Ave.	0.84	D	0.87	D	0.73	C	0.76	C
14	Aviation Blvd. / Alaska Ave.	0.65	B	0.36	A	0.79	C	0.46	A
15	Aviation Blvd. / Hawaii St.	0.74	C	0.36	A	0.84	D	0.48	A
16	Aviation Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	1.17	F	1.18	F	1.41	F	1.42	F
17	Center St. / Grand Ave.	0.29	A	0.20	A	0.27	A	0.22	A
18	Center St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.17	A	0.15	A	0.19	A	0.16	A

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 1.0 Alternative		No Project		FAR 1.0 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
19	Sepulveda Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	1.46	F	1.30	F	1.27	F	1.07	F
20	Sepulveda Blvd. Blvd. / Maple Ave.	0.83	D	0.82	D	0.85	D	0.85	D
21	Sepulveda Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	1.26	F	1.12	F	1.04	F	0.94	E
22	Sepulveda Blvd. / Grand Ave.	1.06	F	<b>1.09</b>	<b>F</b>	1.36	F	0.89	D
23	Sepulveda Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.93	E	0.85	D	1.02	F	<b>1.11</b>	<b>F</b>
24	Sepulveda Blvd. / Hughes Way	1.20	F	0.69	B	1.06	F	0.80	C
25	Sepulveda Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.96	E	0.91	E	1.15	F	<b>1.23</b>	<b>F</b>
26	Hughes Way / Imperial Hwy.	0.57	A	0.56	A	0.67	B	0.64	B
27	Nash St. / Imperial Hwy	0.82	D	0.90	D	0.33	A	0.37	A
28	Nash St. / Atwood Way	0.78	C	0.88	D	0.62	B	<b>1.61</b>	<b>F</b>
29	Nash St. / Maple Ave.	0.62	B	<b>1.08</b>	<b>F</b>	0.49	A	0.87	D
30	Nash St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.50	A	0.63	B	0.48	A	0.63	B
31	Nash St. / Grand Ave.	0.85	D	0.77	C	0.71	C	0.89	D
32	Nash St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.78	C	0.86	D	0.86	D	<b>0.91</b>	<b>E</b>
33	Nash St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.33	A	0.34	A	0.57	A	0.70	B
34	Atwood Way / I-105 EB Ramp Entrance	0.35	A	0.33	A	0.85	D	0.83	D
35	Douglas St. / Imperial Hwy.	0.44	A	0.54	A	0.61	B	<b>0.96</b>	<b>E</b>
36	Douglas St. / (between Imperial & Mariposa)	0.28	A	0.25	A	0.34	A	0.37	A
37	Douglas St. / Atwood Way	0.35	A	0.38	A	0.58	A	0.40	A
38	Douglas St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.62	B	0.50	A	0.96	E	0.56	A
39	Douglas St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.75	C	<b>1.14</b>	<b>F</b>	0.78	C	<b>0.98</b>	<b>E</b>

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 1.0 Alternative		No Project		FAR 1.0 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
40	Douglas St. / Utah Ave.	0.63	B	0.62	B	0.76	C	0.52	A
41	Douglas St. / Alaska Ave.	0.20	A	0.31	A	0.19	A	0.27	A
42	Douglas St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.74	C	0.69	B	0.75	C	0.69	B
43	Continental Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	0.84	D	0.53	A	0.76	C	0.40	A
44	Continental Blvd. / Grand Ave.	0.72	C	0.83	D	0.56	A	0.61	B
45	Continental Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.50	A	0.44	A	0.41	A	0.40	A
46	Continental Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.32	A	0.32	A	0.60	A	0.61	B
47	California St. / Imperial Hwy (N/S)	0.57	A	0.56	A	0.70	B	0.70	B
48	California St. / Imperial Hwy (S/S)	0.47	A	0.51	A	0.46	A	0.48	A
49	El Segundo Blvd. / Illinois St.	0.32	A	0.27	A	0.40	A	0.36	A
50	El Segundo Blvd. / Isis Ave.	0.88	D	0.88	D	0.88	D	0.71	C
51	Rosecrans Ave. / Apollo St.	0.33	A	0.35	A	0.68	B	0.72	C
52	Rosecrans Ave. / Village Dr.	0.37	A	0.43	A	0.64	B	0.72	C
53	Rosecrans Ave. / Pacific Ave.	0.50	A	0.41	A	0.64	B	0.55	A
54	Rosecrans Ave. / Blanche Rd.	0.47	A	0.34	A	0.56	A	0.40	A
55	45 <sup>TH</sup> Street / Vista Del Mar	0.76	C	0.77	C	0.61	B	0.62	B

Note: **Bold** denotes significant impact.

**Biological Resources**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the biologically-sensitive Sepulveda/Rosecrans site. Impacts of the FAR 1.0 alternative would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element with respect to biological resources. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration.

**Cultural Resources**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could include affected areas within the City that contain potential paleontological and archaeological resources, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

**Geology and Soils**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements would include additional grading and could take place within areas of the City identified as having potential for expansive soils, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant with adherence to mitigation measures related to project design. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could change drainage patterns and result in additional discharges to the storm drain systems within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted, shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

---

---

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could occur on sites that reflect conditions related to the presence of hazardous materials, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the Sepulveda/Rosecrans site, which is heavily impacted by conditions related to hazardous materials. Overall, impacts of the FAR 1.0 alternative with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration.

## **Land Use**

Under the FAR 1.0 alternative, the City's roadway system would be built to meet the same requirements set forth in the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would be consistent with and work to implement numerous policies set forth in the General Plan. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

## **Noise**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the FAR 1.0 alternative are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would employ similar construction equipment and similar construction phasing as would occur under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts of the FAR 1.0 alternative with respect to construction noise would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and would be significant and unavoidable.

The FAR 1.0 alternative would result in higher traffic generation compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would increase the potential for noise impacts on roadway segments located adjacent to residential neighborhoods. However, since projected noise levels under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the threshold for a significant traffic noise impact (i.e., an increase of 5 dBA; the largest increase under the proposed Circulation Element would be 3.5 dBA), it is not likely that traffic levels under the FAR 1.0 alternative would result in noise levels that would exceed the threshold. Although impacts of the FAR 1.0 Alternative would be slightly higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to traffic noise, both would result in less than significant impacts.

Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or

Negative Declaration. This analysis shall address construction noise impacts related to specific proposed projects and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

### **Population, Housing, and Employment**

The FAR 1.0 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements would provide additional construction employment opportunities, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The FAR 1.0 alternative would not include any housing or permanent population increase within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

## **D. FAR 1.3 ALTERNATIVE**

Under the FAR 1.3 Alternative, the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan and associated zoning classifications would be amended to provide for a maximum FAR of 1.3 in the areas of the City that are currently zoned Urban Mixed-Use North (MU-N) and Corporate Office (CO). Under the existing General Plan designations and zoning classifications, development in the MU-N zone is presently permitted to a maximum FAR of 1.3, while development in the CO zone is limited to a maximum FAR of 0.8. Thus, under the FAR 1.3 alternative, maximum development density in the MU-N zone would remain the same, while the maximum development density in the CO zone would increase to 1.3 FAR. This would result in higher traffic levels as would be experienced under the proposed Circulation Element Update, where no land use designations would be changed. All other land use designations set forth in the General Plan and zoning code would remain the same. Future levels of regional traffic that would utilize the City's roadway system would be as currently anticipated in adopted SCAG regional growth forecasts and associated regional transportation models. The proposed changes to Circulation Element policies and roadway configurations would be the same as under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Nash and Douglas Streets would be converted from one-way to two-way operations.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

Application of the year 2025 model using the same roadway assumptions utilized for the proposed Circulation Element Update and traffic levels that would result from the changes in FAR that would occur under the alternative indicates that 15 intersections would exceed the City's level of service standard during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour or both (Table VI-4). This would be an increase in impacted locations compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, under which 6 intersections would exceed the City's level of service standard under future traffic conditions.

**Table VI-4**  
**Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Level of Service (LOS) –**  
**Future under FAR 1.3 Alternative (2025)**

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 1.3 Alternative		No Project		FAR 1.3 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1	Vista Del Mar / Grand Ave.	0.56	A	0.44	A	0.63	B	0.49	A
2	Main St. / Imperial Hwy	0.78	C	0.70	B	0.73	C	0.56	A
3	Main St. / Imperial Ave.	0.56	A	0.58	A	0.44	A	0.45	A
4	Main St. / Palm Ave.	0.40	A	0.41	A	0.32	A	0.33	A
5	Main St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.34	A	0.33	A	0.28	A	0.30	A
6	Main St. / Grand Ave.	0.22	A	0.25	A	0.16	A	0.16	A
7	Main St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.12	A	0.14	A	0.16	A	0.21	A
8	Aviation Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	1.35	F	0.99	E	1.06	F	<b>1.14</b>	<b>F</b>
9	Aviation Blvd. / 118th St.	0.79	C	0.51	A	0.85	D	0.51	A
10	Aviation Blvd. / 120th St.	0.90	D	0.86	D	0.88	D	0.82	D
11	Aviation Blvd. / 124th St.	0.70	B	0.50	A	0.87	D	0.71	C
12	Aviation Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.92	E	<b>1.09</b>	<b>F</b>	1.19	F	1.15	F
13	Aviation Blvd. / Utah Ave.	0.84	D	<b>0.93</b>	<b>E</b>	0.73	C	0.78	C
14	Aviation Blvd. / Alaska Ave.	0.65	B	0.35	A	0.79	C	0.46	A
15	Aviation Blvd. / Hawaii St.	0.74	C	0.35	A	0.84	D	0.48	A
16	Aviation Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	1.17	F	<b>1.19</b>	<b>F</b>	1.41	F	<b>1.44</b>	<b>F</b>
17	Center St. / Grand Ave.	0.29	A	0.20	A	0.27	A	0.21	A
18	Center St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.17	A	0.15	A	0.19	A	0.16	A

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 1.3 Alternative		No Project		FAR 1.3 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
19	Sepulveda Blvd. / Imperial Hwy.	1.46	F	1.32	F	1.27	F	1.08	F
20	Sepulveda Blvd. Blvd. / Maple Ave.	0.83	D	0.83	D	0.85	D	0.85	D
21	Sepulveda Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	1.26	F	1.17	F	1.04	F	0.99	E
22	Sepulveda Blvd. / Grand Ave.	1.06	F	1.04	F	1.36	F	0.88	D
23	Sepulveda Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.93	E	0.87	D	1.02	F	<b>1.14</b>	<b>F</b>
24	Sepulveda Blvd. / Hughes Way	1.20	F	0.71	C	1.06	F	0.82	D
25	Sepulveda Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.96	E	0.93	E	1.15	F	<b>1.23</b>	<b>F</b>
26	Hughes Way / Imperial Hwy.	0.57	A	0.56	A	0.67	B	0.64	B
27	Nash St. / Imperial Hwy	0.82	D	<b>0.95</b>	<b>E</b>	0.33	A	0.38	A
28	Nash St. / Atwood Way	0.78	C	<b>0.92</b>	<b>E</b>	0.62	B	<b>1.74</b>	<b>F</b>
29	Nash St. / Maple Ave.	0.62	B	<b>1.16</b>	<b>F</b>	0.49	A	<b>0.90</b>	<b>E</b>
30	Nash St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.50	A	0.82	D	0.48	A	0.71	C
31	Nash St. / Grand Ave.	0.85	D	0.78	C	0.71	C	<b>0.91</b>	<b>E</b>
32	Nash St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.78	C	0.90	D	0.86	D	<b>0.93</b>	<b>E</b>
33	Nash St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.33	A	0.35	A	0.57	A	0.71	C
34	Atwood Way / I-105 EB Ramp Entrance	0.35	A	0.37	A	0.85	D	<b>0.93</b>	<b>E</b>
35	Douglas St. / Imperial Hwy.	0.44	A	0.56	B	0.61	B	<b>0.99</b>	<b>E</b>
36	Douglas St. / (between Imperial & Mariposa)	0.28	A	0.37	A	0.34	A	0.57	A
37	Douglas St. / Atwood Way	0.35	A	0.57	A	0.58	A	0.58	A
38	Douglas St. / Mariposa Ave.	0.62	B	0.69	B	0.96	E	0.79	C
39	Douglas St. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.75	C	<b>1.27</b>	<b>F</b>	0.78	C	<b>1.12</b>	<b>F</b>

Intersection		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		No Project		FAR 1.3 Alternative		No Project		FAR 1.3 Alternative	
		ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
40	Douglas St. / Utah Ave.	0.63	B	0.75	C	0.76	C	0.64	B
41	Douglas St. / Alaska Ave.	0.20	A	0.34	A	0.19	A	0.29	A
42	Douglas St. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.74		0.68	B	0.75	C	0.69	B
43	Continental Blvd. / Mariposa Ave.	0.84	D	0.64	B	0.76	C	0.49	A
44	Continental Blvd. / Grand Ave.	0.72	C	0.85	D	0.56	A	0.63	B
45	Continental Blvd. / El Segundo Blvd.	0.50	A	0.51	A	0.41	A	0.43	A
46	Continental Blvd. / Rosecrans Ave.	0.32	A	0.32	A	0.60	A	0.62	B
47	California St. / Imperial Hwy (N/S)	0.57	A	0.56	A	0.70	B	0.70	B
48	California St. / Imperial Hwy (S/S)	0.47	A	0.52	A	0.46	A	0.49	A
49	El Segundo Blvd. / Illinois St.	0.32	A	0.28	A	0.40	A	0.37	A
50	El Segundo Blvd. / Isis Ave.	0.88	D	<b>1.04</b>	<b>F</b>	0.88	D	0.74	C
51	Rosecrans Ave. / Apollo St.	0.33	A	0.36	A	0.68	B	0.73	C
52	Rosecrans Ave. / Village Dr.	0.37	A	0.43	A	0.64	B	0.73	C
53	Rosecrans Ave. / Pacific Ave.	0.50	A	0.42	A	0.64	B	0.56	C
54	Rosecrans Ave. / Blanche Rd.	0.47	A	0.34	A	0.56	A	0.40	A
55	45 <sup>TH</sup> Street/ Vista Del Mar	0.76	C	0.78	C	0.61	B	0.63	8

Note: **Bold** denotes significant impact.

The following additional locations would be impacted under the FAR 1.3 alternative:

- Aviation Boulevard/Utah Avenue
- Nash Street/Imperial Highway
- Nash Street/Atwood Way
- Nash Street Maple Avenue
- Nash Street/Grand Avenue
- Nash Street/El Segundo Boulevard
- Atwood Way/I-105 EB Ramp Entrance
- Douglas Street/Imperial Highway
- El Segundo Boulevard/Isis Avenue

Impacts of the FAR 1.3 Alternative with respect to the CMP would be higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update since the FAR 1.3 alternative would increase traffic levels beyond those already anticipated in the El Segundo General Plan and SCAG regional traffic model. Impacts of the FAR 1.3 alternative would be higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update and significant and unavoidable impacts would occur at 15 intersections.

### **Aesthetics**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could include additional street lighting similar to, although at more locations than, the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

### **Air Quality**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the FAR 1.3 alternative are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would be similar in scope to the prototypical construction project evaluated under the proposed Circulation Element Update. The prototypical project would generate daily construction emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub>. Impacts of the FAR 1.3 alternative would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and significant and unavoidable with respect to emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> during construction.

The FAR 1.3 alternative would increase overall future traffic levels beyond those already anticipated in the El Segundo General Plan and SCAG regional traffic model and therefore would result in increased

regional air emissions that could exceed SCAQMD thresholds. The FAR 1.3 alternative would result in significant impacts at a greater number of intersections than would the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would increase the potential for local CO concentrations to exceed the state CO standards. However, since projected concentrations under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the standards, it is unlikely that the FAR 1.3 alternative would result in a violation of the CO standard. Although impact of the FAR 1.3 Alternative would be higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to local CO concentrations, those impacts would be less than significant.

### **Biological Resources**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the biologically-sensitive Sepulveda/Rosecrans site. Impacts of the FAR 1.3 alternative would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element with respect to biological resources. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration.

### **Cultural Resources**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could include affected areas within the City that contain potential paleontological and archaeological resources, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

### **Geology and Soils**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements would include additional grading and could take place within areas of the City identified as having potential for expansive soils, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

---

---

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could change drainage patterns and result in additional discharges to the storm drain systems within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration and as warranted, shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element.

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements could occur on sites that reflect conditions related to the presence of hazardous materials, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways or intersection improvements within the Sepulveda/Rosecrans site, which is heavily impacted by conditions related to hazardous materials. Overall, impacts of the FAR 1.3 alternative with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration.

## **Land Use**

Under the FAR 1.3 alternative, the City's roadway system would be built to meet the same requirements set forth in the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would be consistent with and work to implement numerous policies set forth in the General Plan. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

## **Noise**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Although specific projects that would be required to implement the FAR 1.3 alternative are not known at this time, it is likely that such projects would employ similar construction equipment and similar construction phasing as would occur under the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts of the FAR 1.3 alternative with respect to construction noise would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and would be significant and unavoidable.

The FAR 1.3 alternative would result in higher traffic generation than would occur under the proposed Circulation Element Update, which would increase the potential for noise impacts on roadway segments

located adjacent to residential neighborhoods. However, since projected noise levels under the proposed Circulation Element Update are well below the threshold for a significant traffic noise impact (i.e., an increase of 5 dBA; the largest increase under the proposed Circulation Element would be 3.5 dBA), it is not likely that traffic levels under the FAR 1.3 alternative would result in noise levels that would exceed the threshold. Although impacts of the FAR 1.3 alternative would be slightly higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update with respect to traffic noise, those impacts would be less than significant.

Subsequent environmental documentation shall be prepared, similar to the proposed project, to determine whether a new Initial Study would be required to be prepared leading to either an EIR or Negative Declaration. This analysis shall address construction noise impacts related to specific proposed projects and as warranted shall include the mitigation measures identified for the proposed Circulation Element Update.

### **Population, Housing, and Employment**

The FAR 1.3 alternative would include construction of new roadways and implementation of intersection improvements at 14 identified intersections, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Such improvements would provide additional construction employment opportunities similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. The FAR 1.3 alternative would not include any housing or permanent population increase within the City, similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Circulation Element Update and less than significant.

## **E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

None of the alternatives examined in this EIR would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Circulation Element with respect to construction air quality and construction noise. The only option available to avoid these impacts would be to conduct no construction activity in conjunction with the proposed Circulation Element Update. The option of taking no action with respect to the Circulation Element roadway network in the City (i.e., modifying the Circulation Element to leave the City's roadway network as it currently exists) was considered and rejected by the City because traffic growth both inside and outside of the City would continue as a result of other factors (economic development, population growth) and it would not be a reasonable policy for the City to take no action in the face of this continued growth in traffic. Similarly, all of the alternatives examined in this EIR would have less than significant impacts with respect to aesthetics, operational air quality, land use, operational noise and population, housing and employment as a result of implementing roadway or intersection improvements in the City. Taking no action would also be the only way to eliminate these impacts and was similarly considered and rejected by the City.

The only substantial difference between the alternatives examined in this EIR is related to the ability of the alternatives to accommodate projected growth in traffic in the City to the year 2025. In this regard, the FAR 0.8 alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed Circulation Element. Even

though one additional intersection would exceed the City's level of service threshold under the FAR 0.8 alternative compared to the proposed Circulation Element Update, the FAR 0.8 alternative would have beneficial impacts (i.e., reducing ICU value) at 10 more intersections during the a.m. peak hour and 8 more intersections during the p.m. peak hour than would the proposed Circulation Element Update. However, the FAR 0.8 alternative would not meet the objectives of the project as it would reduce allowable development density in the MU-N zone from 1.3 to 0.8, which would potentially affect the City's economic and employment base, and would therefore be inconsistent with the policies of the General Plan Economic Development Element. Overall, the No Project, the FAR 1.0 and the 1.3 alternatives would have traffic impacts that are similar to or higher than the proposed Circulation Element Update and would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Circulation Element Update.