

## **8.0 Effects Found Not To Be Significant**

---





## 8.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The City of El Segundo (City) conducted an *Initial Study* in October 2012 to determine significant effects of the proposed project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the project were found to be less than significant due to the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the Draft EIR. In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128, the following section provides a brief description of potential impacts found to be less than significant. A copy of the *Initial Study* is located in Appendix 10.1, *Initial Study/Environmental Checklist*.

**AESTHETICS.** *Would the project:*

**4.1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is located in the southeast quadrant of the City, which consists of, and is surrounded by, urban/developed land. There are no scenic vistas present from within or involving this relatively flat portion of the City. Therefore, Project implementation would have no effect on a scenic vista.

**4.1.b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**No Impact.** No designated State scenic highways are located adjacent to the Project site.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, there are no scenic resources present on the site. Therefore, Project implementation would not damage any scenic resource (i.e., trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings) within the viewshed of a State scenic highway. No impact would occur in this regard.

**4.1.c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

### Existing Visual Character

Exhibit 2-4 depicts the Project site in the context of its environmental setting. As depicted in Exhibit 2-4, the visual character of the Project site is dominated by the existing Raytheon SAS facility that is housed in 11 buildings, located primarily in the central portion of the property. These buildings, which are at a maximum height of approximately 37 feet, are constructed in a modern architectural style and exhibit no distinctive architectural feature. Vast surface parking lots, with ornamental landscaping interspersed throughout, surround the buildings. Other uses that contribute to the site's visual character are the El Segundo Metro Rail Station and elevated Metro Green Line railway located adjacent to the northeast corner of the Project site, and the recreational area (tennis and basketball courts and baseball fields) located at the northwest corner. With an onsite FAR of approximately 0.29, the Project site is developed at significantly less intensity than the surrounding CO and MU-N Zones, with 0.8 and 1.3 FARs, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> State of California, Department of Transportation Website, California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Officially Designated State and County Scenic Highways, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm>, Accessed August 2, 2012.



The Project site is surrounded by urban/developed land. The land uses located east of Sepulveda Boulevard consist of a mix of research and development, manufacturing, and office developments that largely support aerospace and defense related industries. However, land uses also include information technology and industrial design, among other enterprises. Low and high-rise office buildings with multi-story parking structures and a hotel are located immediately north of the Project site. Extensive landscaped areas surround the newer developments located in this area. A Union Pacific Railroad spur is located immediately to the south, with the City of El Segundo sump and various light industrial uses located further south. The elevated Metro Green Line railway and an industrial subdivision are located to the east, and a Southern California Edison high voltage transmission easement, the Lakes at El Segundo municipal golf course, and the West Basin Municipal Water District water recycling facility are located to the west. The Chevron Oil Refinery is located further west, beyond Sepulveda Boulevard. The buildings that surround the Project site are generally constructed in a modern, utilitarian architectural style. There is no defining or cohesive architectural theme. Additionally, these buildings range in height from single-story to approximately ten stories.

### Significance Criteria

A project is generally considered to have a significant visual/aesthetic impact if it substantially changes the character of the project site such that it becomes visually incompatible when viewed in the context of its surroundings. Based on the CEQA Guidelines, a project would have a significant visual impact if it would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, where the project involves:

- Structures that would exceed the allowed height or bulk regulations, or prevailing height and bulk of existing structures;
- An architectural style or building materials that would diverge significantly from an adjacent development where that development had been constructed adhering to a common architectural style or theme;
- A visually prominent site and, due to its height, bulk, architecture, or signage, would diverge significantly from the surrounding development or environment degrading the visual unity of the area;
- Unscreened outdoor uses or materials; and
- An architectural feature or building mass that conflicts with the character of the surrounding development.

### Visual Character With Project

This visual impact analysis is based on field observations and the El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan (ESSCSP) and Vesting Tentative Map. Table 2-4 presents a potential implementation scenario of the ESSCSP uses based upon the plotting of the proposed Vesting Tentative Map and the conceptual site plan illustrated on Exhibit 2-6. As previously noted, the ultimate land use would be determined at the time of Site Plan submittal for a specific parcel, subject to the Specific Plan's permitted uses, development standards, and the specified FAR and vehicle trip ceiling limitations.



The Project site's character would be altered through the introduction of a new-mixed use development, with new structures, architecture, landscaping, and streetscape improvements. The majority of the vast surface parking lots that surround the Campus core would be replaced by new structures and smaller site specific surface parking lots and parking structures. A loop circulation system would create a Campus core "island" that would be occupied by the remaining uses (office, laboratory, manufacturing, and warehousing) and proposed warehouse and light industrial uses. This core area would be fenced and gated for security purposes. With the greatest visibility, the parcels fronting onto El Segundo Boulevard (east of Continental Boulevard) would be developed with commercial uses, such as retail, restaurants, and a fitness center. In the northwest corner, single-tenant office uses would replace the existing recreational uses, which would be relocated to a location at the southeast portion of the Project site. Single-tenant office uses are also proposed at the northeast and southeast corners.

Overall, Project implementation would significantly alter the visual character of the Project site. Despite this visual alteration, Project implementation would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The Project would develop an in-fill property that is surrounded by other commercial and industrial developments, and would require consistency with the General Plan. The proposed development would be consistent with the historic development that has occurred in the surrounding area and represents a reasonable or natural progression of development. This is demonstrated through the adjoining commercial and industrial developments, as described in [Section 2.2](#). Additionally, all future development proposals within the ESSCSP area would be subject to compliance with the provisions of the ESSCSP relative to permitted uses, development standards, and FAR limitations, which would ensure they would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Namely, ESSCSP Section VI specifies the standards by which ESSCSP development would proceed. These standards address various aspects of development, including permitted uses, development standards (i.e., lot area, height, setbacks, lot frontage, floor area, walls/fences, and accessory structures), circulation, and parking/loading, that influence the visual character of development and ensure its compatibility with the scale and character of existing developments. Development within the Campus would be restricted to a maximum of 200 feet in height and a FAR of 0.60, thus, would not exceed the prevailing height and intensity of the surrounding developments. Moreover, ESSCSP Section V includes design guidelines that address criteria relative to buildings, landscaping, and signage, among others, and which are intended to promote the quality of design planned for the ESSCSP area. Namely, the guidelines include the following provisions, among others, that address architecture, orientation, and massing:

- The massing, scale, and architectural style should consider compatibility with the surrounding character and existing buildings to reflect a cohesive campus character.
- The mass and scale of new buildings should be compatible with the existing and adjacent structures and with each other.
- Buildings should be divided into distinct massing elements and should be articulated with architectural elements and details. Changes in height, horizontal plane, materials, patterns and colors should be used to reduce building scale and mass.

Overall, adherence to the specified El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan regulations and consideration to the specified guidelines would ensure that future development would both achieve visual unity within the Campus and avoid conflicts with the character of the surrounding developments. The future development's adherence to ESSCSP regulations would be verified by the City through the Site Plan review process. Therefore, although future development



would substantially alter the visual character of the Project site, it would not degrade the visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Light Impacts**

Lighting effects are associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and nighttime hours. There are two primary sources of light: light emanating from building interiors passing through windows and light from exterior sources (i.e., street lighting, building illumination, security lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscape lighting). Light introduction can be a nuisance to adjacent residential areas, diminish the view of the clear night sky and, if uncontrolled, can cause disturbances. Uses such as residences are considered light sensitive, because occupants have expectations of privacy during evening hours and may be subject to disturbance by bright light sources. Light spill is typically defined as the presence of unwanted light on properties adjacent to the property being illuminated. With respect to lighting, the degree of illumination may vary widely depending on the amount of light generated, height of the light source, presence of barriers or obstructions, type of light source, and weather conditions.

There are no light-sensitive land uses located on or adjacent to the Project site. The light sources that exist within the Project boundaries are associated with the light emanating from the building interiors and light from exterior sources (building illumination, security lighting, and parking lot lighting). The sources of lighting that surround the Project site are associated with the light industrial, commercial, manufacturing uses located to the north, south, and east, the Metro Rail uses to the east, and the Chevron Oil Refinery to the west. Lighting, including from building interiors and exterior sources (i.e., building illumination, security lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscape lighting), is generated by these urban uses. The roadways located in the Project vicinity, namely El Segundo Boulevard, South Hughes Way, Douglas Street, Sepulveda Boulevard, Continental Boulevard, Nash Street, and Coral Circle, contain car headlights, street lighting, and traffic signals that contribute to the existing light effects on the Project site and its surroundings.

The Project proposes a mixed-use development that would create new sources of light, including light emanating from building interiors passing through windows and light from exterior sources (i.e., building illumination, security lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscape lighting). These light sources would be similar to those that exist within the Project boundaries and surrounding developments. As previously noted, there are no light-sensitive land uses located on or adjacent to the Project site. Additionally, the El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan includes standards that are intended to ensure that the exterior lighting is designed and located to avoid intrusive effects on adjacent properties. Namely, the lighting design standards require that the type and location of parking area and building lighting prevent direct glare on to adjacent properties. Additionally, the parking structure standards require that light sources be shielded so that the source of the illumination is not seen from outside the structure. All new development would undergo review through the City's Site Plan review process, in order to verify compliance. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving the creation of a new source of substantial light.



## Glare Impacts

Glare is primarily a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light by highly polished surfaces such as window glass or reflective materials and, to a lesser degree, from broad expanses of light-colored surfaces. Perceived glare is the unwanted and potentially objectionable sensation as observed by a person looking directly into the light source of a luminaire. Daytime glare generation is common in urban areas and is typically associated with buildings with exterior facades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass. Glare can also be produced during evening and nighttime hours by the reflection of artificial light sources such as automobile headlights. Glare generation is typically related to either moving vehicles or sun angles, although glare resulting from reflected sunlight can occur regularly at certain times of the year. Glare-sensitive uses include residences, hotels, transportation corridors, and aircraft landing corridors.

The El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan design guidelines specify that acceptable building materials include concrete, stone masonry, metal, stucco, glass and/or other contemporary composites. Future development proposals would be reviewed by the City through the Site Plan review process to verify the use of non-reflective façade treatments and minimal use of unrelieved glass surfaces. Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving the creation of a new source of substantial glare.

**AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.** *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:*

**4.2.a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is not designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, Project implementation would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use.

**4.2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** As depicted on the official Zoning Map, the Project site is zoned Light Industrial (M-1) Zone, Open Space (OS) Zone, and Public Facilities (P-F) Zone. According to ESMC Chapter 15-3, *Zones and Uses*, agricultural uses are not among the zones' permitted uses. Additionally, the site is not a part of a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

**4.2.c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public**



***Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?***

***No Impact.*** As discussed in Response 4.2.b, the Project site is not zoned as forest land. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

***4.2.d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

***No Impact.*** The Project site was previously developed and does not contain forestland. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

***4.2.e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

***No Impact.*** There is no Farmland or forestland located on the Project site or in its immediate vicinity. The Project site is located within an urbanized area. The proposed Project would not involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

***AIR QUALITY.*** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

***4.3.e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

***Less Than Significant Impact.*** According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project does not propose development of any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Construction activities associated with the Project could generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, construction-related odors would be intermittent, short-term in nature, and cease upon Project completion. Therefore, Project implementation would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.*** Would the project:

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

***No Impact.*** The Project site consists of, and is surrounded by, urban/developed land that has been permanently altered due to the construction of aboveground improvements (e.g., buildings, parking lots, roads, and hardscapes). Therefore, Project implementation would not impact:



- Either directly or through habitat modifications, any plant or wildlife species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status;
- Any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community;
- Federally protected wetlands or other jurisdictional waters; or
- The movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.4.a.

**4.4.c. *Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.4.a.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.4.a.

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

**No Impact.** There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance that are relevant to the Project site. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

**4.4.f. *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is not within the jurisdiction of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with the provisions of any such plan.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:*

**4.5.a. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?***



**No Impact.** The Project site is currently developed with the Raytheon Company's SAS facility. The existing facility is comprised of 11 buildings, none of which qualify as a historical resource as defined in *CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5*. Moreover, ESMC Chapter 15-14, *Historic Preservation*, provides for the identification, protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of historic buildings and structures within the City that reflect special elements of the City's historical heritage. According to ESMC § 15-1-6, Definitions, a historic site is defined as "any parcel or portion of real property, which has special character or special historical, cultural, architectural, archaeological, community, or aesthetic value." In compliance with ESMC § 15-14-5, *List of Designated Cultural Resources*, the El Segundo Department of Planning and Building Safety maintains a designated cultural resources list. None of the existing building or structures are listed as a designated cultural resource. Therefore, Project implementation would not cause a change in the significance of a historical resource.

**4.5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no known designated cultural (i.e., archaeological) resources present on the Project site, as concluded in Response 4.5.a above. Additionally, the Project site consists of, and is surrounded by, urban/developed land that has been permanently altered due to the construction of below and aboveground improvements (i.e., buildings, parking lots, roads, hardscapes, and utilities). The Project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and may contain artificial fill materials. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for ground-disturbing activities to impact an as yet unidentified archeological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

**4.6.c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As noted above, the Project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and may contain artificial fill materials. Additionally, there are no unique geologic features present on the Project site. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for Project implementation to impact an as yet unidentified paleontological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving the potential destruction of a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

**4.5.d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for Project implementation to disturb any human remains is remote. Additionally, no conditions exist that suggest human remains are likely to be found during Project construction activities. Also, in compliance with the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Consultation with California Native American Tribes), City Staff contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to identify the appropriate tribal groups for consultation. The NAHC identified 4 groups (Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians) for consultation. The City sent consultation requests to the four groups by mail. The City also initiated phone and email contact with the identified groups. An email from the representative of the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians requested a cultural monitor be present during ground



disturbance. In a telephone call the Chairman of the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe requested that a certified Tongva soil monitor be required during any earthmoving activities. The representative of the Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians also requested by phone that cultural monitoring occur during site work.

If human remains were found, those remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws. Public Resources Code §§ 5097, *et seq.*, and Health and Safety Code §§ 7050.5-7055 describe the general provisions regarding human remains, including the requirements if any human remains are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. The requirements and procedures set forth in Public Resources Code § 5097.98 would be implemented if human remains are discovered, including notification of the County Coroner, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission and consultation with the individual identified by the Native American Heritage Commission to be the “most likely descendant.” If human remains are found during excavation, excavation must stop in the vicinity of the find and any area that is reasonably suspected to overly adjacent remains until the County coroner investigates and the remains have been investigated and appropriate recommendations have been made for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Compliance with applicable law regarding human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would result in less than significant environmental impacts.

## **GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** *Would the project:*

**4.6.a.1. *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?***

**No Impact.** Seismically induced ground rupture is defined as the physical displacement of surface deposits in response to an earthquake’s seismic waves. Ground rupture is most likely along active faults, and typically occurs during earthquakes of magnitude five or higher. Ground rupture only affects the area immediately adjacent to a fault.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Act’s main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory zones, known as “Alquist-Priolo (AP) Earthquake Fault Zones,” around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back from the fault (typically 50 feet). The Project site is not affected by a State-designated AP Earthquake Fault Zone.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.

**4.6.a.4. *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic Landslides?***

---

<sup>2</sup> State of California, Department of Conservation California Geological Survey Website, *Alquist-Priolo Home Page*, [http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap\\_maps.htm](http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap_maps.htm), Accessed February 22, 2012.



**No Impact.** The Project site and its surroundings are relatively level. Onsite elevations range from approximately 100 feet above mean sea level on the eastern portion of the site, to approximately 120 feet above mean sea level at the northwest corner. Given the site's topography, there is no potential for seismically-induced landslides. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic landslides.

**4.6.e. *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?***

**No Impact.** Sewers are available for disposal of wastewater generated by the proposed development. Accordingly, septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be permitted.

#### **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:***

**4.8.e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In compliance with the legislative requirements, the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUC) prepared the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) (Revised December 1, 2004). The ALUP provides for the orderly expansion of Los Angeles County's public use airports and the areas surrounding them. It is also intended to provide for the adoption of land use measures that will minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards. In formulating the ALUP, the Los Angeles County ALUC established provisions for safety, noise insulation, and the regulation of building height within areas adjacent to each of the County's public airports.

The ALUC adopted planning boundaries for each of the public use airports in Los Angeles County. The planning boundaries delineate areas subject to noise impacts and safety hazards (height restriction areas and approach surface and runway protection zones [RPZ]). Within these boundaries, certain proposed local actions must be submitted to the ALUC for review. The airport influence area maps illustrate the planning boundaries, RPZs, and 65 and 70 CNEL noise contours.

The Project site is located approximately 0.76 mile south of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). According to the LAX Airport Influence Area Map,<sup>3</sup> the Project site is not located within the LAX Planning Area Boundary/Airport Influence Area. Additionally, the Project site is located approximately 1.9 miles west of Hawthorne Municipal Airport (HMA), also known as Jack Northrop Field. According to the HMA Airport Influence Area Map,<sup>4</sup> the Project site is not located within the HMA Planning Area Boundary/Airport Influence Area. Therefore, the

---

<sup>3</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning Website, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Los Angeles International Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc\\_airport-lax.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-lax.pdf), Accessed August 2, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning Website, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Hawthorne Municipal Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc\\_airport-hawthorne.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-hawthorne.pdf), Accessed August 2, 2012.



proposed Project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people working at or visiting the ESSCSP area.

**4.8.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the Project area associated with a private airstrip.

**4.8.h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**No Impact.** The Project site consists of, and is surrounded by, urban/developed land. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires.

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** *Would the project:*

**4.9.g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

**No Impact.** Flood hazard areas identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) are identified as a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). A Special Flood Hazard Area is defined as the area that will be inundated by the flood event having a one (1) percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The one-percent annual chance flood is also referred to as the base flood or 100-year flood. The entire City of El Segundo has been placed in Zone X (unshaded), pursuant to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel 1770F, Map No. 06037C1T10F (September 28, 2008).<sup>5</sup> Zone X (unshaded) is an area of minimal flood hazard. It includes the areas located outside the Special Flood Hazard Area and higher than the elevation of the 0.2-percent-annual-chance (or 500-year) flood. The proposed El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area and does not involve housing development. Therefore, Project implementation would not place housing within a Special Flood Hazard Area.

**4.9.h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** As concluded in Response 4.9.g above, the proposed ESSCSP is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, Project implementation would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.

**4.9.i. Increase expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

---

<sup>5</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency Website, Map Service Center, <https://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/FemaWelcomeView?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1>, Accessed October 5, 2012.



**No Impact.** No portion of the Project site is located within a levee or dam inundation area. Therefore, Project implementation would not increase the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

**4.9.j. *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

**No Impact.** A seiche is an earthquake or slide-induced wave that can be generated in an enclosed body of water of any size from swimming pool, to a harbor, or lake. There is no enclosed body of water that is located in the vicinity of the Project site.

A tsunami is a sea wave generated by an earthquake, landslide, volcanic eruption, or even by a large meteor hitting the ocean. An event such as an earthquake creates a large displacement of water resulting in a rise or mounding at the ocean surface that moves away from this center as a sea wave. Tsunamis generally affect coastal communities and low-lying (low-elevation) river valleys in the vicinity of the coast. Buildings closest to the ocean and near sea level are most at jeopardy. According to the California Geological Survey Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps,<sup>6</sup> the Project site is not located within a tsunami inundation area.

Potential risk from mudflow (i.e., mudslide, debris flow) does not exist within the Project area, as steep slopes are not located on or in proximity to the Project site.

Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential hazards from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**LAND USE AND PLANNING.** *Would the project:*

**4.10.a. *Physically divide an established community?***

**No Impact.** The City can be generally described according to quadrants, with the intersection of El Segundo Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard at the center. The City's residential uses are located in the northwest quadrant and the non-residential land uses (i.e., office, commercial, and industrial, among others) are located in the remaining three quadrants. The Project site encompasses approximately 142-acres in the City's southeast quadrant. The Project site is currently developed with the Raytheon Company's SAS facility. The El Segundo South Campus ESSCSP proposes a commercial and industrial mixed-use development, all within the boundaries of the existing property. Given the City's existing land use pattern, and since the proposed development would occur entirely within Project site boundaries, Project implementation would not physically divide an established community.

**4.10.c. *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.4.f.

**MINERAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:*

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

---

<sup>6</sup> State of California, Department of Conservation Website, *Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps*, [http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/tsunami/tsunami\\_maps.htm](http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/tsunami/tsunami_maps.htm), Accessed August 2, 2012.



**No Impact.** No state-designated mines or mineral producers currently exist on the Project site or in its vicinity. Additionally, the Project site does not maintain any natural mineral resources. Therefore, Project implementation would result in no impact involving the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

**4.11.b. *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.11.a.

**NOISE.** *Would the project:*

**4.12.e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located approximately 0.76 mile south of LAX. According to the LAX Airport Influence Area Map,<sup>7</sup> the Project site is not located within the LAX planning boundaries, which include the 65 and 70 CNEL noise contours. Additionally, the Project site is located approximately 1.9 miles west of HMA. According to the HMA Airport Influence Area Map,<sup>8</sup> the Project site is not located within the HMA planning boundaries. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people working in or visiting the El Segundo South Campus to excessive noise levels associated with LAX or HMA.

**4.12.f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people working in the Project area to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING.** *Would the project:*

**4.13.b. *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No Impact.** No housing units currently exist on the Project site. Therefore, Project implementation would not displace housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. It is also noted that numerous housing opportunities would be available for the Project's future employees within El Segundo and surrounding cities, based on existing vacancy rates and housing stocks:<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning Website, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Los Angeles International Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc\\_airport-lax.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-lax.pdf), Accessed August 2, 2012.

<sup>8</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning Website, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Hawthorne Municipal Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc\\_airport-hawthorne.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-hawthorne.pdf), Accessed August 2, 2012.



- El Segundo: 326 units;
- Culver City: 715 units;
- Gardena: 920 units;
- Hawthorne: 1,402 units;
- Hermosa Beach: 611 units;
- Inglewood: 2,051 units;
- Lawndale: 470 units;
- Manhattan Beach: 890 units; and
- Redondo Beach: 1,599 units.

Collectively, these vacancy rates amount to approximately 8.984 dwelling units. This topic will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

**4.13.c. *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.13.b.

**PUBLIC SERVICES.** *Would the project:*

**4.14.a.5. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Project implementation would not involve residential development or induce substantial population growth through new residential development. Therefore, the Project would not generate a significant demand for new or physically altered library facilities or result in adverse physical impacts associated with library facilities. Therefore, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered library facilities.

**RECREATION.** *Would the project:*

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Project implementation would not involve residential development or induce substantial population growth through new residential development. Therefore, the Project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities as a result of new residential development. Further, Project implementation would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur as a result of the new employees, since by nature, the work place would offer the new employees minimal opportunity for use of existing recreational facilities. Additionally, as concluded in Response 4.14.a.4 above, the Project proposes new recreational facilities at the southeast corner of the

---

<sup>9</sup> State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2011-2014*. Sacramento, California, May 2014.



Campus. The proposed recreational facilities would replace the existing recreational facilities that would be removed by the proposed development, as well as satisfy any demand generated by the increased employment. Therefore, the Project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Compliance with ESMC Chapter 15-27A, which requires payment of a development impact fee, would further minimize any potential impacts in this regard.

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** *Would the project:*

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located approximately 0.76 mile south of LAX and approximately 1.9 miles west of HMA. The Project would allow for up to an additional 2.1 million square feet of development, which could increase travel through LAX and/or HMA. However, given the nature, scope, and location of the proposed development, any increased travel would not be such that a change in air traffic patterns would occur. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in a substantial safety risk associated with increased travel.

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** *Would the project:*

**4.18.a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As concluded in Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*, the proposed Project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

As concluded in Response 4.5.a, the Project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history, since none are present on the Project site. Additionally, as concluded in Response 4.5, the Project would result in less than significant impacts involving major periods of California prehistory.



This page intentionally left blank.