

## **BLUE FOLDER ITEM**

*Blue folder items are additional back up material to administrative reports and/or public comments received after the printing and distribution of the agenda packet for receive and file.*

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING April 21, 2022**

- J.1.** A PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT - STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM), VARIANCE, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (DENSITY BONUS), PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW, AND VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 82561 TO PERMIT CONSTRUCTION OF A PROPOSED 30-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WITH ADAPTIVE REUSE OF EXISTING NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES ON PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3A) ZONE, IN THE COASTAL ZONE, AT 100-132 N. CATALINA AVENUE. (CASE NOS. IES-EIR-2021-01; CUP-2022-01; VAR-2022-02; CDP-2022-03; PCDR-2022-01; VTPM 82561)

**CONTACT: ANTONIO GARDEA, SENIOR PLANNER**

- Revised Resolution Attachment A Statement of Overriding Considerations

## **100 – 132 N. Catalina Avenue Project**

### **Exhibit A**

---

#### **CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations**

##### **I. CEQA Findings**

###### **A. Project Description Summary**

The project site is located at 100, 112, 116, 124, 126, and 132 North Catalina Avenue in the City of Redondo Beach (City). The project site is relatively flat with an area of 54,739 square feet (sf), or approximately 1.26 acres. The project would involve the demolition of approximately 8,929 sf of existing commercial development located between 112 and 132 North Catalina Avenue (includes full demolition of the building at 116 North Catalina Avenue); rehabilitation and reuse of three commercial buildings at 124, 126, and 132 North Catalina Avenue for further commercial use (i.e., coffee shop and tasting room); rehabilitation and reuse of the building at 112 North Catalina Avenue for residential use; and demolition of the shed located at the rear end of 116 North Catalina Avenue. The project also involves the construction of 22 three-story townhomes, four apartment units in the former Masonic Lodge building (i.e., 112 North Catalina Avenue), and four apartment units in a new three-story apartment building, for a combined total of 30 residential units on the project site. The proposed density bonus project uses State-mandated concessions and development standard waivers and thereby would not require amendments to the City's General Plan, Local Coastal Program, or the Redondo Beach Municipal Code (RBMC) – Coastal Land Use Plan Implementation Ordinance.

These findings have been prepared for the approval of project which involves the construction of the 30 residential units, four units of which would be affordable units and would consist of two townhome units and two apartment units. The 22 townhomes would be situated east of the commercial buildings fronting North Catalina Avenue, whereas the residential apartment building would be adjacent to (south of) the commercial buildings and would front both North Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street. A total of 72 on-site parking stalls, including 66 residential parking spaces (i.e., 44 private garage and 22 at-grade spaces) and six commercial parking spaces (i.e., all standard spaces) would be provided on-site. As a result of reconfiguration of the curb cuts, an additional seven on-street parking spaces would be retained. Parking garages would be equipped with electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. The proposed project would provide 22 bicycle parking spaces for residents and an additional 15 bicycle racks for guests. Pedestrians would be able to

---

access the commercial and residential buildings on the project site via sidewalks along Emerald Street and North Catalina Avenue and via the proposed internal pathways within the project site. In addition, rehabilitation and reusage of the existing commercial buildings would retain 3,063 sf of commercial/retail space in the form of a 1,279-sf tasting room and a 1,784-sf coffee shop.

The project was considered by both the Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission in materials submitted by the City of Redondo Beach's environmental consultants, which were described orally at the April 13, 2022 Preservation Commission hearing and the April 21, 2022 Planning Commission hearing, and in the written materials included in the respective Administrative Reports.

This project description summary is only intended to provide an overview of the project and should not be interpreted to set the scope of the project approvals, which are controlled by the project's entitlement resolution.

## **B. Project Objectives**

As set forth in Section 2.2 of the Draft EIR (p. 2-1 et seq.) the objectives and purpose of the Project are as follows:

1. To create a high-quality designed townhome and apartment complex that enhances the value of an existing underutilized site through the development of a project that is responsive to market demands that includes at least 26 market-rate units.
2. To realize the City of Redondo Beach's General Plan and Coastal Plan by recognizing the site's underlying R-3 zoning and incorporating multi-family housing into the Master Plan and near the harbor with access to outdoor recreational opportunities.
3. To further the City of Redondo Beach Housing Element policies to support the City's future housing needs by developing new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options at different income levels including affordable housing units per California State Density Bonus law.
4. To realize the utilitarian benefit of the existing non-conforming commercial buildings with respect to the overall site programming and to ensure economic vitality of the Project through offsetting the costs of construction for the affordable housing units through programming of the commercial spaces as revenue generating, high impact uses.
5. To preserve and reuse portions of three existing commercial buildings of local historic significance by designing the master plan, commercial open space, and vehicular and pedestrian circulation around the buildings' placement.
6. To provide neighborhood serving uses and amenities that cater to City of Redondo Beach residents and encourages pedestrian and bicycle activity through re-programming and reactivating the facades of the existing commercial buildings and providing access to a new shared courtyard and public bike racks.
7. To limit points of ingress/ egress to the site and remove surplus driveway curb cuts to create new on-street public parking spaces available for public access and within walking distance to the marina.
8. To remediate the existing site with little disturbance to historic buildings.

9. To design new residential structures that comply with City of Redondo Beach parking and open space requirements, and to contain parking and open space within each townhome envelope to limit opportunities for large gatherings.
10. To limit construction impact on surrounding uses and existing historic buildings and to control construction costs to maintain project viability through designing new structures with focused construction methods comprised of wood framed buildings at grade which eliminates costly and invasive shoring and structural concrete work.

## C. Procedural Compliance with CEQA

The City of Redondo Beach (City), acting as Lead Agency under CEQA, published a Draft EIR on December 2, 2021 and a Final EIR on April 7, 2022 in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, as amended. As allowed for in CEQA Guidelines §15084(d)(2), the City retained a consultant to assist with the preparation of the environmental documents. The City has directed, reviewed, and edited as necessary all material prepared by the consultant, and such material reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis. In addition, an extensive public involvement and agency notification effort was conducted to solicit input on the scope and content of the EIR and to solicit comments on the Draft EIR. Key milestones associated with the preparation of the EIR are summarized below:

- A Notice of Preparation/Initial Study (NOP/IS) for the Draft EIR was circulated from December 2, 2021 until January 18, 2022, during which time approximately 37 responses were received on the NOP/IS. (Draft EIR Appendix A1 and Final EIR Appendix A2-1)
- A scoping meeting held on April 8, 2021 and attended by approximately 20 people. (Draft EIR Appendix A2)
- The Draft EIR was published on December 2, 2021 and circulated for a 45-day comment period, which ended on January 18, 2022.
- The Draft EIR was made available for general public review at the following locations:
  - City of Redondo Beach, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street, Door "E," Redondo Beach, California 90277;
  - City of Redondo Beach, City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California 90277;
  - Redondo Beach Public Library, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California 90277;
  - Redondo Beach Public Library - North Branch, 2000 Artesia Boulevard, Redondo Beach, California 90277; and
  - On the City's website (<http://redondo.org>) by following the link to the 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project.
- The Draft EIR and Notice of Completion were transmitted the State Clearinghouse and the Notice of Availability was sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the project site and to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who previously had

requested such a notice in writing or had attended public meetings about the project and provided their contact information.

- The Final EIR was released on April 7, 2022 and includes:
  - Section 1, *Introduction*, consisting of a summary of the contents of the Final EIR and the environmental review process;
  - Section 2, *Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR*, providing copies of all correspondence and comments received on the Draft EIR, each identified with the agency's or author's name and an alphanumeric reference number to their comment correspondence, along with written responses to the comments;
  - Section 3, *Errata*, consisting of a summary of minor revisions to the information contained in the Draft EIR based on the comments received; and
  - Section 4, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, containing the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project which identifies mitigation measures on the project, the enforcing agency, the actions required by the responsible agency, the implementation period for each measure, and the monitoring period for each measure.
  - The Draft EIR in its entirety, including technical appendices.
- The Notice of Availability of the Final EIR/Public Hearing was published in the Easy Reader newspaper on April 7, 2022. This notice was also sent to all property owners within 1,000 feet of the project site and to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who previously had requested such a notice in writing or had attended public meetings about the project and provided their contact information. This notice and copies of the Final EIR were also sent to public agencies who commented on the Draft EIR.
- Notices for the Preservation Commission and Planning Commission public hearings were posted, published and sent in compliance with applicable laws, as outlined in the City Council's resolution recitals.

## D. Environmental Impacts and Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant impact:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

The City has made one or more of these specific written findings regarding each significant impact associated with the Project. Those findings are presented below, along with substantial evidence in support of the findings. Concurrent with the adoption of these findings, the City adopts the MMRP for the project, included as Exhibit B.

The EIR included a detailed analysis to determine whether the proposed project and alternatives would result in significant environmental impacts. The EIR discloses the environmental impacts expected to result from construction and operation of the Project and the alternatives, and where appropriate, identifies feasible mitigation measures that would, if implemented, avoid or minimize significant impacts. The mitigation measures identified in the EIR are measures proposed by the lead agencies, responsible or trustee agencies or other persons, that were not proposed as part of the project or alternatives, but that reasonably could be expected to avoid or minimize potential significant adverse impacts if required as conditions of approval (CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(1)(A)).

## 1. Findings of Environmental Impacts Not Requiring Mitigation

The City finds that the following environmental impacts will result in less than significant impacts without mitigation based on the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts for the environmental considerations included in Sections 4.1 through 4.8 of the Draft EIR, and further discussed in Section 2 of the Final EIR, *Response to Comments on the Draft EIR*. An explanation of the rationale for each finding is provided as follows.

### ***Aesthetics***

#### **Scenic Vistas**

Threshold: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 21 – 22)

Rationale: The City considers its coastal recreation areas (e.g., beaches, public piers, bikeways, and regional and local parks) as providing important scenic views in the city. The project site is not located on a scenic turnout or other visual access point and is not visible from the beach or harbor areas of Redondo Beach, which are located about 0.3-mile to the southwest and 0.2 mile to the west of the site, respectively, due to the existing multi-family and commercial development between three- and five-stories that block views from the coast to the project site. The closest parks within a 0.5-mile radius of the site include Czulagar Park, Vincent Park, and Veterans Park. While the project site is visible from Czulagar Park, the park's scenic views are facing west towards the Pacific Ocean; the project site is to the southeast of Czulagar Park and is already developed with existing commercial buildings that are surrounded by urbanized development and thus, does not constitute a scenic vista. The proposed townhomes and apartment building would be of similar height (30 feet) to other single- and multi-family residences surrounding the site, which range from one- to five-stories tall. Although there are ocean views along Catalina Avenue, there are no views of scenic resources inside the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would

not significantly obstruct any scenic vistas or views of or from scenic resources in the city. Impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Scenic Resources***

**Threshold:** Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 22)

**Rationale:** The project site is in an urban area consisting of residential and retail/commercial uses which does not contain any scenic resources such as natural habitats or rock outcroppings, nor is it in proximity to any such resources. The project site is not located on any National Register of Historic Places, California State Historical Landmarks, or California Historical Resources or Points of Interest. The project site is located approximately 300 feet south of the Diamond Apartments, which are listed properties on the National Register of Historic Places. The project abuts the Oklahoma Apartments (c. 1908), located at 305 Emerald Street that is a locally designated Historic Landmark property that may be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. However, the proposed project would not obstruct any scenic resources visible from or in proximity to a state scenic highway designated by the City of Redondo Beach. While Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) is designated as an eligible scenic highway in other areas, the portion of PCH nearest to the project site (0.1-mile east) is not an eligible or designated scenic highway. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade views of mature trees, rock outcroppings, or any other scenic resources along or visible from a scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Visual Character***

**Threshold:** Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 22 – 23)

**Rationale:** The project is in an urban area of the City that is primarily developed with one- to five-story residential and commercial/retail buildings. Implementation of the project would add residential uses and rehabilitate the site's existing commercial buildings for future commercial uses. While development of the project would change the appearance and use of the project site relative to existing conditions, it is not anticipated to degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings since it would be a compatible use with other existing residential uses in the project area and would upgrade the existing landscaping

and visual quality of the site and, therefore, contribute to an aesthetically enhanced project area. Furthermore, the City's regulatory review procedure provides the City with further assurances for aesthetic review and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Light and Glare**

**Threshold:** Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 23)

**Rationale:** Implementation of the project would replace existing lighting with new outdoor on-site lighting for the rehabilitated commercial buildings, proposed townhomes and apartment building, internal walking paths, driveway/garage lights, landscaping, and other safety-related lighting. New residential lighting that is proposed as part of the project would represent an increase in daytime and nighttime lighting at the project site relative to existing lighting associated with commercial uses. However, the light sources would not substantially increase the overall levels of day or nighttime lighting in the area because they would be comparable to existing light levels from the surrounding residences. Furthermore, Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street are already illuminated by street lighting. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a substantial new source of light such that day or nighttime views in the area would be adversely affected. Rather, the proposed exterior lighting and building materials would be consistent with those of surrounding uses and would be an important aide to public safety. Furthermore, the design of this project, including its finish, colors, and materials, would be reviewed for approval through the City's review process. Impacts would be less than significant

### ***Agriculture and Forestry Resources***

#### **Farmland Conversion**

**Threshold:** Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 25)

**Rationale:** The project site is in an urban area of the City and currently consists of commercial and parking uses. The project site is zoned and designated R-3A (Low-Density Multi-Family Residential). According to the California Department of Conservation's (DOC) California Important Farmland Finder, the project site is in an area that does not consist of Farmland. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on designated Farmland.



**Williamson Act**

Threshold: Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 26)

Rationale: The project site consists of commercial and parking uses and is not zoned or designated for agricultural use. In addition, the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. The project site would not convert farmland to non-agricultural uses; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact with respect to conflicting with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.

**Forestland Zoning**

Threshold: Would the project 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))?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 26)

Rationale: The project site consists of commercial and parking uses and is not zoned or designated for forest land or timberland. The project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning and no impact would occur.

**Loss of Forestland**

Threshold: Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 26)

Rationale: The project site consists of commercial and parking uses and is not zoned or designated for forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

**Conversion of Farmland or Forestland**

Threshold: Would the project 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?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 26)

Rationale: The proposed project does not include the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses, forest land to non-forest uses, nor any other change in the existing environment that could result in impacts to Farmland or forest land. No impact would occur.

---

## ***Air Quality***

### **Air Quality Management Plan**

Threshold: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 30 – 31)

Rationale: The growth projections used by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to develop the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) emissions budgets are based on the population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed in general plans and used by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in their 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The City has an estimated population of 66,994 with an average household size of 2.3 persons. SCAG estimates that the City's population will increase to 74,400 by 2040, an increase of approximately 11.1 percent or 7,406 persons. The project would generate 130 bedrooms and increase the existing population by approximately 299 residents (an approximately 0.5 percent increase from the existing population) to 67,293, which would be within SCAG's 2040 population forecast. Furthermore, the City has an existing housing stock of 30,892 units, which SCAG forecasts will increase by 2,108 units (an approximately seven percent increase) to 33,000 units by 2040. Construction of the proposed 22 new townhomes and eight apartment units would represent approximately 1.4 percent of this projected increase in housing units, which would not exceed SCAG's 2040 housing units forecast. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the SCAQMD's AQMP and the potential population and housing increase generated by the proposed project would not substantially alter air quality conditions in the Basin and would not generate emissions that would adversely affect regional air quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Pollutant Emissions**

Threshold: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.1-14 – 4.1-16)

Rationale: Air pollutant emissions from project construction would result from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, fugitive dust mobilized by export of demolition debris and soil import, and the evaporation of volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings (e.g., paint), among other sources. Based on modeled project emissions, total maximum daily emissions generated by project construction activities would not exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for criteria pollutants. In addition, maximum daily on-site emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD Localized Significant Thresholds (LST). Therefore, project

construction would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase of any criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment.

Air pollutant emissions from project operation include area sources (such as consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment), energy sources, and mobile sources (i.e., vehicles accessing the site). The proposed project would replace existing uses on the project site and therefore would eliminate operational emissions on the site generated under current conditions. As such, existing operational emissions were subtracted from the project's operational emissions to estimate net new operational emissions. Based on modeled project emissions, neither total project operational emissions nor net new operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Sensitive Receptors**

**Threshold:** Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.1-16 – 4.1-21)

**Rationale:** Sensitive receptors are those individuals more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. People most likely to be affected by air pollution include children, the elderly, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases.

Based on modeled project emissions, maximum daily construction emissions of carbon monoxide would be approximately 25 pounds and maximum on-site emissions would be approximately 23 pounds, which would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional threshold (550 lbs/day) or LST (664 lbs/day) for carbon monoxide. Furthermore, operational emissions from area, energy, and mobile sources combined would generate a net increase of approximately 21 pounds of carbon monoxide emissions compared to existing operational emissions, which is below the SCAQMD regional threshold of 550 pounds. Both the SCAQMD's regional thresholds and LSTs are designed to be protective of public health. Based on the low background level of carbon monoxide in the project area, ever-improving vehicle emissions standards for new cars in accordance with State and federal regulations, and the project's low level of operational carbon monoxide emissions, the project would not create new hotspots or contribute substantially to existing hotspots. Localized air quality impacts related to carbon monoxide hot spots would be less than significant.

The project's construction activities would result in short-term diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions associated with exhaust emissions from off-road, heavy-

duty diesel equipment for site preparation grading, building construction, and other construction activities. Maximum daily on-site PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions during grading would be approximately two pounds per day, which would not exceed the SCAQMD LST of three pounds per day that is designed to be protective of human health. PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions would decrease for the remaining phases of the construction period because construction activities such as building construction and paving would require less construction equipment. There would be no residual emissions or corresponding individual cancer risk after project construction is complete and on-site construction activities cease. Therefore, DPM generated by project construction is not expected to create conditions where the probability that the Maximally Exposed Individual would contract cancer is greater than ten in one million or to generate ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants (TAC) that exceed a Hazard Index greater than one for the Maximally Exposed Individual. As such, project construction would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions, and impacts would be less than significant. Upon completion of construction, the project does not propose routine operational activities that would generate substantial TAC emissions.

Operation of the proposed project would not result in any nonpermitted direct emissions (e.g., those from a point source such as diesel generators) or result in a substantial increase in diesel vehicles (i.e., delivery trucks) over existing baseline conditions because the proposed project does not include the types of uses that generate substantial TAC emissions (e.g., distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, etc.). As such, project operation would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions, and impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would add residential land uses to the project site that would result in new sensitive receptors on the site. A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was prepared to assess the potential health effects associated with TAC emissions from Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1), located approximately 540 feet east of the project site. The results of the HRA indicate that the proposed residential use of the site would not expose future on-site residents to significant excess cancer risks associated with vehicle emissions based on SCAQMD health risk guidelines and existing vehicle travel on SR-1. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Other Adverse Emissions**

<u>Threshold:</u>	Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?
<u>Finding:</u>	Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 32)
<u>Rationale:</u>	Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project, which would be attributable to

concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site, generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people and would be limited to the construction period. Impacts associated with odors during construction would be temporary and less than significant. With respect to operation, the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies land uses associated with odor complaints as agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, chemical and food processing plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Residential and commercial uses are not identified on this list and no odor-producing uses are in the project vicinity. In addition, solid waste generated by the proposed on-site uses would be collected by a contracted waste hauler, ensuring that odors resulting from on-site waste would be managed and collected in a manner to prevent the proliferation of odors. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** \_\_\_\_\_ Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.1-21)

**Rationale:** The SCAQMD's approach to determining cumulative air quality impacts for criteria air pollutants is to first determine whether the proposed project would result in a significant project-level impact to regional air quality based on the SCAQMD significance thresholds. There is one project currently under development within the vicinity of the project site, the Foundry Project. The Foundry Project is located at the intersection of 190th Street and Fisk Lane in Redondo Beach, approximately 2.2 miles northeast of the project site, and involves the demolition of existing industrial and retail/commercial buildings and construction of 36 two-story condominium homes. The Foundry Project would generate air pollutant emissions during construction and operation; however, the Foundry Project's IS-MND determined that no significant air quality impacts would occur. The proposed project would be consistent with the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP and would not result in significant impacts to air quality during construction and operation. Although multiple construction projects, including the Foundry Project, could be occurring simultaneously in the project site vicinity, the proposed project would not combine with other projects to result in a significant cumulative air quality impact because maximum daily emissions generated by construction of the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, per SCAQMD guidance, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts.

### **Biological Resources**

#### **Riparian Habitat**

**Threshold:** Would the project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 35)

Rationale: The project is in a developed urban area and is not located within a vegetated or open space area. The only vegetation present on site is landscaping, consisting of sparse, ornamental shrubs and planted trees. These existing trees and shrubs do not constitute a sensitive natural community. Additionally, there is no riparian habitat on or near the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as none exist on the site or in nearby areas. No impact would occur.

### **Wetlands**

Threshold: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 35)

Rationale: No riparian habitats, wetlands, or other water features have been identified on or adjacent to the project site. Furthermore, the project site does not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils. As a result, no state or federally protected wetlands or other waters that may be considered jurisdictional by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) occur on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands or other jurisdictional waters. No impact would occur.

### **Wildlife Movement**

Threshold: Would the project 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?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 35 – 36)

Rationale: The site is separated from any open space areas by existing development and roadways. The project site does not contain any natural communities or habitat areas that would be expected to support populations of native wildlife nurseries or movement. While the project site contains trees, these trees are ornamental and are not a part of larger habitat area; they are surrounded by development and do not form a natural community or constitute a habitat area. Due to their fully developed nature, the project site and surrounding area do not contain any natural or physical features that connect habitat areas, and impacts to the

movement of native or resident species or on the use of native wildlife nursery sites resulting from the proposed project are not expected. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### **Local Policies and Ordinances**

Threshold: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 36)

Rationale: Street tree species, size, spacing, and planting standards will be subject to approval of the Superintendent of Parks. The Superintendent of Parks shall select street trees taking into consideration the following criteria: that the selected tree as proposed to be located will not harm public sidewalks, streets, and infrastructure; that the tree is consistent with water conservation objectives; that the tree requires low maintenance and no pesticides; that the tree will enhance the visual character and identity of City streets; and that the tree complements appropriate existing street trees. The City does not have any additional ordinances or policies protecting biological resources. Removal of street trees due to project implementation would be completed in accordance with Section 10-2.1900 of the City's Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and the impact would be less than significant.

### **Habitat Conservation Plans**

Threshold: Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 36)

Rationale: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in the City of Redondo Beach. Further, there are also no approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans in the City. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

### **Cultural Resources**

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.3-25 – 4.3-26)

Rationale: The only planned or pending project is the Foundry Project, approximately 2.2 miles northeast of the project site. The area to analyze cumulative impacts to cultural resource includes the project site and immediately adjacent areas that could be indirectly affected. The potential for uncovering significant archaeological (prehistoric and historic) and/or tribal cultural resources within

the project area during earthmoving construction activities is unknown. However, the proposed project would involve redevelopment of already graded and developed sites in an urban area. The project would result in a less than significant impact to historic resources, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources, as well as human remains with mitigation identified above. As such, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources in the project vicinity. In addition, individual development proposals are reviewed separately by the appropriate jurisdiction and undergo environmental review when it is determined that the potential for significant impacts exist. In the event that future cumulative projects would result in impacts to known or unknown cultural resources, impacts to such resources would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Future cumulative projects would also be required to comply with existing regulatory requirements related to the unanticipated discovery of cultural resources and human remains. Therefore, impacts related to cultural resources would not be significant and the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts.

## ***Energy***

### **Energy Consumption**

Threshold: Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 39 – 42)

Rationale: Energy use during construction would be temporary in nature, and construction equipment used would be typical of similar-sized construction projects in the region. In addition, construction contractors would be required to comply with the provisions of California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes and would minimize unnecessary fuel consumption. Construction equipment would be subject to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Construction Equipment Fuel Efficiency Standard, which would also minimize inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary fuel consumption. Furthermore, per applicable regulatory requirements such as California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), the project would comply with construction waste management practices to divert a minimum of 65 percent of construction and demolition debris. These practices would result in efficient use of energy necessary to construct the project. In the interest of cost-efficiency, construction contractors also would not utilize fuel in a manner that is wasteful or unnecessary. Therefore, the project would not involve the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary use of energy during construction, and the construction-phase impact related to energy consumption would be less than significant.



Though the project would result in increased energy consumption compared to existing uses, the project would comply with all standards established in California Building Code (CBC) Title 24, which would minimize the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during operation. California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11) requires implementation of energy efficient light fixtures and building materials into the design of new construction projects. Furthermore, the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (CBC Title 24, Part 6) requires newly constructed buildings to meet energy performance standards set by the Energy Commission. These standards are specifically crafted for new buildings to result in energy efficient performance so that the buildings do not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. The standards are updated every three years and each iteration is more energy efficient than the previous standards. To help achieve Title 24 reduction targets, the project applicant proposes to incorporate several energy efficient features into overall project design. Energy efficient design features include use of passive solar by including large windows, energy-efficient appliances and lighting, high-efficiency irrigation systems, water-efficient indoor fixtures throughout the project site, rooftop solar panels, and water-efficient landscaping irrigation. Approximately ten percent of the project's total parking would be equipped with EV charging outlets. In addition, the project would include 15 common and 22 private on-site bicycle parking spaces. Operation of the project would consume fuel, natural gas, and electricity; however, the project would conform to the latest version of California's Green Building Standards Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards and would therefore not lead to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Energy Efficiency Plans**

Threshold: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 42)

Rationale: The City of Redondo Beach has not adopted a renewable energy or energy efficiency plan; however, the City has adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) which contains policies for the conservation of energy resources. The project would be designed to comply with the performance levels of the latest version of the California Green Building Standards Code, which would reduce energy consumption compared to standard building practices. The proposed project would be required to comply with the residential and nonresidential mandatory measures in the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code, Title 24, Part 11. The proposed project would also be required to comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these energy standards may include

rooftop solar panels, low-flow plumbing fixtures, water-efficient irrigation systems, high-efficiency HVAC and hot water storage tank equipment, and lighting conservation features. The project would not conflict with the policies and goals, including energy efficiency-related measures, of the CAP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant.

## ***Geology and Soils***

### **Fault Rupture**

Threshold: Would the project directly or indirectly cause 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?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 44)

Rationale: The project site is located in a seismically active area of southern California; however, according to the California Geological Survey (CGS), the project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. There are no faults present on the project site, and the nearest fault to the project site is the Palos Verdes Fault Zone, located less than two miles southwest of the site.

To reduce geologic and seismic impacts, the City's General Plan Environmental Hazards/Natural Hazards Element includes goals, objectives, and policies intended to reduce death, injuries, damage to property, and economic and social dislocation due to earthquakes and related geologic hazards. In addition, the project would comply with the CBC (Title 24), which establishes minimum standards to safeguard the public health, safety, and general welfare through structural strength, means of egress, and general stability by regulating and controlling the design, construction, quality of materials, use and occupancy, location, and maintenance of all building and structures within its jurisdiction. The impact to people, buildings, or structures from fault rupture would be reduced by the required conformance with applicable building codes and accepted engineering practices. Nonetheless, due to the project's location from an Alquist-Priolo mapped zone, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects related to rupture of a known earthquake fault. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

### **Seismic Ground Shaking**

Threshold: Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 44 – 45)

**Rationale:** The project site is situated in the seismically active Southern California Region and is therefore susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. Although the nearest mapped fault (i.e., the Palos Verdes Fault Zone) is located less than two miles southwest of the site, strong ground shaking at the site may occur in the event of a sufficiently large earthquake on this or other nearby faults, such as the Newport-Inglewood Fault located approximately eight miles northeast of the site.

The City's General Plan Environmental Hazards/Natural Hazards Element includes goals, objectives, and policies intended to reduce death, injuries, damage to property, and economic and social dislocation due to earthquakes and related geologic hazards. The City also regulates development through the requirements of the CBC. The earthquake design requirements of the CBC consider the occupancy category of the structure, site class, soil classifications, and various seismic coefficients. The CBC provides standards for various aspects of construction, including but not limited to excavation, grading, earthwork, construction, preparation of the site prior to fill placement, specification of fill materials, fill compaction and field testing, retaining wall design and construction, foundation design and construction, and seismic requirements. It includes provisions to address issues such as (but not limited to) construction on expansive soils and soil strength loss. In accordance with California law, project design and construction would be required to comply with provisions of the CBC. Because the project would comply with the CBC and because the project would not exacerbate existing ground shaking hazards, impacts related to seismically induced ground shaking would be less than significant.

### **Liquefaction**

**Threshold:** Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 45)

**Rationale:** Liquefaction is a process whereby soil is temporarily transformed to fluid form during intense and prolonged ground shaking or because of a sudden shock or strain. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where the groundwater is less than 30 feet from the surface and where the soils are composed of poorly consolidated fine to medium sand. According to the CGS, the project site is not located in a liquefaction zone. Based on the findings in the geotechnical study, groundwater was not encountered during boring activities within the project site, which reached depths of up to 50 feet below ground surface. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to the current seismic design provisions of the CBC. The 2019 CBC incorporates the latest seismic design standards for structural loads and materials, as well as provisions from the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, to mitigate losses from an earthquake and provide for the latest in earthquake safety. While the project would be susceptible to

seismic activity given its location within a seismically active area, the project would be required to minimize this risk, to the extent feasible, through the incorporation of applicable CBC standards. Therefore, the potential effects of differential settlement as a result of liquefaction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### **Landslides**

**Threshold:** Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 45)

**Rationale:** According to the CGS, the project site is not located in an area subject to landslides caused by earthquakes, nor is it downslope from an area subject to seismically induced landslides. The project site and surrounding area are relatively flat. Implementation of the project would not exacerbate the existing risk of earthquake-induced landslides in the immediate vicinity because the project would not directly result in a seismic event or destabilize soils prone to landslide. Therefore, the risk of earthquake-induced landslides at the project site is low and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Soil Erosion**

**Threshold:** Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 45 – 46)

**Rationale:** Construction activities involving soil disturbance, such as excavation, stockpiling, and grading could result in increased erosion and sediment transport by stormwater to surface waters. Fugitive dust caused by strong wind and/or earth-moving operations during construction would be minimized through compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, which prohibits visual particulate matter from crossing property lines. Standard practices to control fugitive dust emissions include watering of active grading sites, covering soil stockpiles with plastic sheeting, and covering soils in haul trucks with secured tarps. Furthermore, construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with a Construction General Permit, which is issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The Construction General Permit requires the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which outlines best management practices (BMP) to reduce erosion and topsoil loss from stormwater runoff. Compliance with the Construction General Permit would ensure that BMPs are implemented during construction and minimize substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Unstable Soils**

**Threshold:** Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 46)

**Rationale:** Although the proposed project is in a seismically active area, the project site is not located on unstable soils or a geologic unit at risk for liquefaction or landslides. The project site consists of compact, relatively flat land that is surrounded by developed land. According to the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, artificial fill underlying the project site consists of moist, medium dense, dark brown fine-grained silty sands to approximately three feet below ground surface. Artificial fill is underlain by native alluvial soils; consisting of moist to very moist, medium dense to very dense, yellowish-brown to dark brown, fine to medium-grained silty sands. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve activities known to cause or trigger subsidence and is not anticipated to adversely affect soil stability or increase the potential for local or regional landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Lastly, the project would comply with CBC requirements. Because the project would not create or exacerbate conditions related to unstable soils, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Septic Tanks**

**Threshold:** Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 47)

**Rationale:** The proposed project would be served by the City's existing sewer system and no septic tanks are proposed for the project. Therefore, there is no potential for adverse effects due to soil incompatibility with septic tanks. No impact would occur.

## ***Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

### **Emission Generation**

**Threshold:** Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 54 – 59)

**Rationale:** Project construction is assumed to occur over a period of approximately two years and would become operational in 2024. Based on the California Emissions Estimator Model modeling results, construction activities for the project would

generate an estimated 826 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). Amortized over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project per SCAQMD guidance), project construction would generate about 28 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase of 336 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year on the project site compared to existing uses. Because the proposed project would not conflict with plans and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions (refer to following discussion), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, impacts would be less significant.

### **Emission Reduction Plans**

**Threshold:** Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 54 – 59)

**Rationale:** The project would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan's emission reduction goals through project design, which includes complying with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Efficiency Energy Standards and installing energy-efficient LED lighting, water-efficient faucets and toilets, and water efficient landscaping and irrigation. The proposed project would also be consistent with the GHG emission reduction strategies contained in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

Most of the goals, measures, and sub strategies in the City's CAP are directed towards City initiated projects and not specific individual development projects. However, the project would result in a net decrease of GHG emissions compared to the existing developments on-site. As such, the project would not conflict with the City's CAP, which is intended to reduce citywide emissions. Furthermore, the project would be consistent with applicable goals and measures to reduce GHG emissions contained within the City's CAP. Because the proposed project would not conflict with plans and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions, impacts would be less significant.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

#### **Hazardous Materials**

**Threshold:** Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 62)

**Rationale:** Project construction would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials such as construction equipment and vehicles which use fuels and fluids that could be released should an accidental leak or spill occur. However, standard construction BMPs for the use and handling of such materials would be

implemented to avoid or reduce the potential for such conditions to occur. Any use of potentially hazardous materials utilized during construction of the proposed project would be subject to all local, State, and federal regulations regarding the handling of potentially hazardous materials. In addition, arsenic was historically used on the project site to prevent pest infestation and control weeds along railroad tracks. Consequently, soil treatment or removal during construction of the project are proposed to eliminate the potential risk of arsenic leaching to groundwater beneath the site; and the project would include barriers to avoid dermal contact during construction and dust generation would be implemented to minimize potential exposure to construction workers. The applicant would also be required to obtain a waste discharge requirement permit from the California Environmental Protection Agency Los Angeles RWQCB for the proposed treatment and reuse of onsite arsenic-affected soil. Therefore, the primary method of remediation of the arsenic would be on-site treatment, so any transport during construction of the project would be minimal and would not create a significant hazard to the public.

Operation and maintenance of the proposed project would likely involve the use of common household materials such as cleaning and degreasing solvents, fertilizers, and pesticides. Use of these materials would be subject to compliance with existing regulations, standards, and guidelines established by the federal, State, and local agencies related to storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during construction of the project would be subject to all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. Upon compliance with all applicable regulations and standards, potential impacts would be less than significant.

### **Hazard Near Schools**

Threshold: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 63)

Rationale: The nearest school is Redondo Union High School, located approximately 0.4-mile southwest of the project site. As discussed under impact discussion *a.* of this section, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. The construction of the project, and associated air pollutant emissions, would be temporary and less than significant. Furthermore, operation and maintenance of

the proposed project would likely involve the use of common household materials comparable to those materials already in use in the project site vicinity. Therefore, emissions or hazardous materials releases near Redondo Union High School would be less than significant.

### **Public Airports**

**Threshold:** 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 63)

**Rationale:** The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. The airports nearest to the project site are Zamperini Field located 3.9 miles southeast of the site and Los Angeles International Airport located approximately 6.5 miles north-northwest of the site. According to the Los Angeles Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Airport Land Use Plan, the site is not located in either of the airports' hazard areas. Furthermore, there are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in safety hazards related to airports for people residing or working at the project site and its vicinity. No impact would occur.

### **Emergency Plans**

**Threshold:** Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 63 – 64)

**Rationale:** During construction, temporary and occasional lane closures may be required, however two-way traffic would still be maintained at construction entry points. Although the project would result in an increase in density of land use at the project site, it would not modify existing roadways in the vicinity. Vehicles would be able to access the project site via Emerald Street for the southernmost residential building and North Catalina Avenue for the remaining residential and commercial buildings. Implementation of the proposed project would not create new obstructions to an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. In addition, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access because it would be subject to Fire Department review of site plans, site construction, and the actual structures prior to occupancy to ensure that required fire protection safety features, including building sprinklers and emergency access, are implemented. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. No impact would occur.



**Wildland Fires**

Threshold: Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 64)

Rationale: The project site is in an urban area of the City of Redondo Beach. Undeveloped wildland areas are not located in proximity to the project site. The project site is not located in a "Fire Hazard Severity Zone" or "Very High Hazard Severity Zone" for wildland fires. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.5-9)

Rationale: Cumulative development in Redondo Beach could have the potential to place people in areas with risk of accidents involving hazardous materials and health hazards associated with hazardous materials by developing and/or redeveloping areas that may have previously been contaminated. However, as analyzed in this section of the EIR, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to human exposure to hazardous materials. Demolition activities involving structures that may contain lead or asbestos would be required to comply with mitigation measures that would ensure the proposed project would not accidentally release these hazardous materials to the environment. Likewise, the proposed project would comply with mitigation that requires proper remediation of contaminated soils on the project site and the construction of a soil vapor barrier in accordance with the recommendations of the Soil Vapor Extraction and Soil Treatment Workplan for the proposed project. In addition, operation of the proposed project would not involve the use, storage, emissions, or generation of significant quantities of hazardous materials and hazardous waste, and would not subject nearby residents, workers, and students to risk from accidents involving hazardous materials.

In addition, there are no nearby projects that would have the potential to produce significant hazards or hazardous materials impacts that would directly interact with those of the proposed project in a way that would produce a cumulatively significant impact. Planned and pending projects in the vicinity of the project site consist of The Foundry project located approximately 2.2 miles northeast of the project site. Therefore, operation of the proposed project and other planned and pending projects in the vicinity is not anticipated to involve the use, storage, generation, and or emissions of significant quantities of hazardous materials that could impact the environment and pose a safety risk to people.

As with the proposed project, hazard evaluations for construction of other projects in the vicinity of the project site would need to be completed on a case-by-case basis. Similar to the proposed project, if soil and groundwater contamination or lead or asbestos are found to be present on sites of planned and future development, these conditions would require appropriate mitigation and compliance with existing applicable local, State, and federal regulations. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of appropriate project-level remedial action on contaminated sites would reduce potential cumulative impacts associated with project construction to a less than significant level.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

#### **Water Quality Standards**

Threshold: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 66)

Rationale: The existing site is almost entirely developed with commercial uses and is surrounded by residential and commercial uses in an urban area. Drainage is collected in existing paved parking lots and at downspouts on existing structures. Stormwater is then directed to the City's existing stormwater system via curb gutters near the intersection of North Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street. Construction of the proposed project would involve removal of a few ornamental trees. However, the project would incorporate landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site, which increase permeable surface area on-site. Therefore, upon completion, the proposed project would not increase existing stormwater flows off the site and would not affect water quality. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with all established regulations under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program to control both construction and operation stormwater discharges. Under the permit, the project applicant would be required to eliminate or reduce non-stormwater discharges to waters of the nation, develop and implement a SWPPP for project construction activities, and perform inspections of the stormwater pollution prevention measures and control practices to ensure conformance with the SWPPP. Further, the applicant would be required to implement all applicable source control BMPs to reduce water-quality impacts as listed under the NPDES permit. The project would also be required to comply with various sections of the RBMC that regulate water quality, including Title 5, Chapter 7, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control.

As required by the City's Municipal Code and NPDES permit, construction activities on the project site would use a series of BMPs to reduce erosion and sedimentation and the construction contractor would be required to operate and

maintain these controls throughout the duration of construction. Because the proposed project includes additional permeable surface area that would improve infiltration and stormwater quality and would comply with all applicable local and federal stormwater drainage requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Groundwater Supplies**

**Threshold:** Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 67)

**Rationale:** The City receives its water service from the California Water Service Company (Cal Water), which has provided water service to the community since 1927. Part of Cal Water's water supply comes from groundwater, which comes from two adjudicated basins, the West Coast Basin and the Central Basin, which limit groundwater pumping to safe yield amounts. Safe yield is based upon a calculation of the rate of groundwater replenishment, as explained in Cal Water's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for the Rancho Dominguez District. As shown in the Low-Impact Development (LID) Plan, the project would increase permeable surfaces on-site and include landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site. Compared to existing conditions, the increase of landscaped area under the proposed project would increase infiltration and groundwater recharge and reduce the amount of surface runoff. In addition, according to the 2015 UWMP, the Cal Water would be able to provide reliable water supplies for an average year, single dry year, and multiple dry years for its existing and planned supplies. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by existing water supplies and would not result in an exceedance of safe yield or a significant depletion of groundwater supplies. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Erosion or Siltation**

**Threshold:** Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 67)

**Rationale:** The project site is generally flat, with minimal elevation change across the site. The project site does not contain any streams, rivers, or other drainage features. The project site is developed with commercial buildings and surface parking lots and is almost entirely paved with impermeable surfaces. According to the LID Plan, the project would increase permeable surfaces on-site and include

landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site. Therefore, runoff leaving the project site would be reduced when compared to existing conditions. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the City's urban runoff requirements as stated in the City's Municipal Code, the applicant would be required to comply with the site-specific LID Plan, which would reduce the quantity and level of pollutants from runoff leaving the project site. Therefore, impacts related to erosion and siltation would be less than significant.

## **Flooding**

**Threshold:** Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 68)

**Rationale:** The project site is developed with commercial buildings and surface parking lots and is almost entirely paved with impermeable surfaces. According to the LID Plan, the project would include landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site and would, therefore increase pervious surfaces, reducing the volume of runoff from the site when compared to existing conditions. In addition, any runoff from the site would be conveyed into the existing drainage system and the project would not substantially change the site's drainage patterns and would not alter a stream, river or other drainage course in a manner that would result in flooding or redirect flood flows. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the City's urban runoff and drainage requirements as stated in the RBMC and would be required to comply with the site-specific LID, which would reduce the amount of runoff leaving the site. The proposed project would not increase runoff such that flooding would occur, and impacts would be less than significant.

## **Stormwater Drainage Systems**

**Threshold:** Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 68)

**Rationale:** The project site is generally flat, with minimal elevation changes across the site. The project site does not contain any streams, rivers, or other drainage features. The project site is developed with commercial buildings and is almost entirely paved with impermeable surfaces. The project would increase permeable

surfaces on-site and include landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site. Therefore, as the proposed project would be required to comply with the site-specific LID and the City's urban runoff requirements as stated in the RBMC, runoff leaving the project site would be reduced when compared to existing conditions.

The proposed project would comply with the City's urban runoff requirements as stated in the City's Municipal Code, which would reduce the quantity and level of pollutants in runoff leaving the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Flood Flows**

Threshold: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 68)

Rationale: The project site is developed with commercial buildings and surface parking lots and is almost entirely paved with impermeable surfaces. Under the proposed project, the project site would be redeveloped from its current condition by rehabilitating and repurposing four of the five existing commercial buildings and constructing 22 new townhomes and eight apartments. According to the LID Plan, the project would include landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site and would, therefore increase pervious surfaces, reducing the volume of runoff from the site when compared to existing conditions. In addition, any runoff from the site would be conveyed into the existing drainage system and the project would not substantially change the site's drainage patterns and would not alter a stream, river or other drainage course in a manner that would result in flooding or redirect flood flows. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the City's urban runoff and drainage requirements as stated in the RBMC and would be required to comply with the site-specific LID, which would reduce the amount of runoff leaving the site. The proposed project would not increase runoff such that flooding would occur, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Flood Hazard**

Threshold: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 69)

**Rationale:** The project site is not located near any dams, levees, or other major bodies of water that could produce seiche impacts at the project site. The project site is located approximately 900 feet from the Pacific Ocean and, according to the California DOC is not inside the boundaries of any regional tsunami impact areas. No impact would occur.

### **Water Quality and Groundwater Plans**

**Threshold:** Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 69)

**Rationale:** The project would be served by Cal Water, which maintains a UWMP. Cal Water utilizes water treatment facilities to ensure water quality standards and goals are met. Both the proposed residential and commercial uses on the project site are not considered point source generators of water pollutants and would not interfere with the ability of Cal Water to maintain water quality standards per the UWMP. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Land Use and Planning***

#### **Established Communities**

**Threshold:** Would the project physically divide an established community?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 71)

**Rationale:** Vehicular access to the proposed townhome buildings and associated at-grade parking would be provided via North Catalina Avenue and the proposed interior alleyway. Vehicular access to the at-grade parking associated with the proposed residential apartment building would be provided via Emerald Street and North Catalina Avenue. The project does not include any new roads, development or infrastructure that has the potential to divide any established communities. No impact would occur.

#### **Conflicts With Plans**

**Threshold:** Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 71)

**Rationale:** The proposed site is zoned and designated R-3A (Low-Density Multi-Family Residential). The R-3A zone and land use designation permit low-density multi-family residential land uses, including townhomes and apartment buildings. In addition, the proposed project has applied for a Density Bonus

concession/incentive to adaptively reuse the existing commercial buildings currently on-site. Furthermore, the proposed project only involves residential and commercial uses. Therefore, the project is consistent with the existing land use designation and impacts would be less than significant.

## ***Mineral Resources***

### **Regional and Statewide Mineral Resources**

Threshold: Would the project 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?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 73)

Rationale: The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) was enacted to promote conservation and protection of significant mineral deposits. According to the California Department of Conservation Mineral Land Classification Maps, the project site is in an area with MRZ-3 designation, indicating that the area may contain mineral deposits; however, the significance cannot be evaluated using available data. Given the existing conditions of the site and the nature of the project, extensive excavations, which may impact mineral resources at moderate depths, are not proposed and is thus unlikely to result in an impact related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

### **Locally-Important Mineral Resource**

Threshold: Would the project 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?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 73)

Rationale: The California SMARA of 1975 was enacted to promote conservation and protection of significant mineral deposits. According to the California Department of Conservation Mineral Land Classification Maps, the project site is in an area with MRZ-3 designation, indicating that the area may contain mineral deposits; however, the significance cannot be evaluated using available data. Given the existing conditions of the site and the nature of the project, extensive excavations, which may impact mineral resources at moderate depths, are not proposed and is thus unlikely to result in an impact related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

## ***Noise***

### **On-Site Operation (Permanent) Noise**

Threshold: Would the project result in generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.6-15)

**Rationale:** The primary on-site noise sources associated with operation of the proposed project would include noise from delivery trucks, trash hauling trucks, HVAC units, and persons associated with outdoor areas such as conversation on residential balconies/patios or at street-facing seating areas along North Catalina Avenue. Delivery and trash-hauling services are already typical occurrences associated with existing uses in the developed project area. Therefore, delivery and trash-hauling trucks would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of the when compared to ambient noise levels without the project. Based on project plans, the nearest HVAC units to off-site receivers would be located at the townhome rooftops, typical of multi-family residential construction. With attenuation over a 34-foot distance to the nearest off-site sensitive receiver, a rooftop HVAC unit would result in a noise level of approximately 43 dBA at these property lines. These noise levels would be below the City's daytime (i.e., 55 dBA) and nighttime (i.e., 50 dBA) exterior noise limits for multi-family residences, as established by Section 4-24.301 of the City's Municipal Code. Furthermore, on-site conversational noise would be similar to those of existing residences in the vicinity and would result in a negligible change to existing noise levels. Moreover, traffic noise from North Catalina Avenue would dominate conversational noise from outdoor seating areas associated with project commercial uses. Noise from outdoor conversations would be an intermittent and temporary noise source, which would typically be concentrated around less-sensitive daytime hours.

On-site operational noise generated by the project would not exceed the City's exterior noise limits and interior noise standards identified by Sections 4-24.301 and 4-24.401, respectively, of the City's Municipal Code. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Off-Site Operation (Permanent) Noise**

**Threshold:** Would the project result in generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.6-16)

**Rationale:** The project would generate new vehicle trips and incrementally increase traffic on area roadways, particularly on North Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street. According to the traffic volumes for area roadways included in the Transportation Impact Study, the segment of North Catalina Avenue between Diamond Street and Emerald Street carries 1,315 vehicles during the a.m. peak hour while the segment of Emerald Street east of North Catalina Avenue carries 107 vehicles during the a.m. peak hour. Based on the project's trip distribution, operation of



the project would add 66 a.m. peak hour trips to North Catalina Avenue (increasing the existing volume by approximately five percent) and 44 a.m. peak hour trips to Emerald Street (increasing the existing volume by approximately 41 percent). These respective trip additions would increase traffic noise by less than 0.5 dBA along North Catalina Avenue and by 1.5 dBA along Emerald Street. A doubling of traffic is required for a barely perceptible 3 dBA increase in traffic noise levels. Therefore, the project would not create a perceptible increase in traffic noise. Noise impacts associated with off-site traffic generated by the project would be less than significant.

### **Land Use Compatibility**

**Threshold:** Would the project result in generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Finding:** Operation of the project would expose on-site development to ambient noise levels, which are predominately characterized by vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways. The project would be exposed to noise levels within the City's "Normally Acceptable" range for multi-family residences. In addition, on-site development would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of the noise standards specified by the California Code of Regulations. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.6-16 – 4.6-17)

**Rationale:** Analysis of impacts of the environment on a project is not required for CEQA compliance (*Ballona Wetlands Land Trust et al. v. City of Los Angeles*). Therefore, noise exposure to new noise-sensitive land uses has been analyzed for informational purposes only.

According to the noise contour maps included in the City's General Plan Environmental Hazards/Natural Hazards Element, land uses along Catalina Avenue are exposed to noise levels up to 65 CNEL. Based on the City's noise and land use compatibility matrix, on-site project development would be exposed to noise levels within the "normally acceptable" range for multi-family residences and commercial uses. The City also has an interior noise standard of 45 CNEL for habitable room in multi-family residences, which is consistent with the State's interior noise standard. Modern residential buildings in California are typically constructed with storm windows, single- or double-glazed, that achieve the required energy saving on heating and cooling, which also provide an exterior-to-interior noise level reduction of at least 20 dBA. Based on a noise exposure level of up to 65 CNEL and a noise attenuation of at least 20 dBA, the interior noise level within proposed multi-family residences would be up to 45 CNEL and in compliance with the City and State interior noise standard.

---

## **Airport Noise**

**Threshold:** For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 76)

**Rationale:** The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. The airports nearest to the project site are Zamperini Field located 3.3 miles southeast of the site and Hawthorne Municipal Airport located approximately six miles northeast of the site. According to the Los Angeles ALUC Airport Land Use Plan, the site is not located in either of the airports' noise contours. Furthermore, there are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports or airstrips and the project would not exacerbate existing noise conditions related to airports or airstrips. No impact would occur.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.6-19)

**Rationale:** Currently planned and pending projects in the vicinity of the project includes The Foundry project located approximately 2.2 miles northeast of the site. Cumulative construction impacts would consist of combined noise and vibration impacts from the construction under the proposed project and The Foundry project. Construction noise and vibration associated with the project would be less than significant with mitigation. Furthermore, all development in the City would be required to comply with the construction hours permitted by the City's Municipal Code. Construction noise and vibration would not disturb receivers during sensitive nighttime hours of sleep. In addition, construction noise attenuates greatly with distance, and is considered a localized impact. Unless construction of cumulative projects occurs in close proximity to each other (i.e., less than a couple hundred feet), and simultaneously, noise and vibration from individual construction projects have a small chance of combining to create significant cumulative impacts. Therefore, with the distance of The Foundry project, the proposed project would not contribute to temporary cumulative construction noise and vibration impacts.

Cumulative operational noise impacts would consist of combined operational noise of the proposed project in conjunction with planned projects in the vicinity. Operation of the proposed project would not generate on-site noise that exceeds ambient noise in the existing urban area. On-site operational noise generated by the project would not exceed the City's exterior noise limits and interior noise standards identified by Sections 4-24.301 and 4-24.401, respectively, of the City's Municipal Code, and impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, the

project would not double existing traffic volumes on area roadways and traffic noise impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, with the distance to The Foundry project, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative noise increases in the project vicinity above ambient noise levels.

## ***Population and Housing***

### **Population Growth**

Threshold: Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 77)

Rationale: According to the California Department of Finance (DOF), the City of Redondo Beach has an estimated population of 66,994 with an average household size of 2.3 persons. As part of their 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, SCAG estimates that the City's population will increase to 72,900 by 2045, an increase of approximately 8.8 percent or 5,906 persons. The project would increase the existing population by up to approximately 299 residents (an approximately 0.5 percent increase from the existing population) to 67,293, which would be within SCAG's 2045 population forecast. In addition, according to California DOF estimates, the City has an existing housing stock of 30,892 units, which SCAG forecasts will increase by 208 units (an approximately one percent increase) to 31,100 units by 2045. The project would generate 30 housing units, which would represent approximately 14 percent of the projected increase in housing units. The proposed commercial use would not generate an increase in project residents. Given that the proposed project would not exceed SCAG's 2045 population or housing forecast, the project would not cause a substantial increase in population or induce unplanned population growth. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Displacement of Housing**

Threshold: Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 78)

Rationale: Because no existing housing is located on the project site, the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

## ***Public Services***

### **Fire Protection**

Threshold: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could

cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 79 – 80)

**Rationale:** The City of Redondo Beach Fire Department provides fire protection services in the City and maintains a Mutual Aid Agreement with other fire departments in the region. The site would be served by Fire Station #1, located at 401 South Broadway, approximately 0.4-mile south of the site. Other stations would respond to emergencies at the project site as needed. The target response time for the Fire Department is five minutes or less for approximately 90 percent of calls.

With implementation of the proposed project, demand for fire protection would remain similar to existing conditions since the site has been operating with commercial uses that have relied on the availability of fire protection services. Furthermore, the Fire Department would review site plans, site construction, and the actual structures prior to occupancy to ensure that required fire protection safety features, including building sprinklers and emergency access, are implemented. In addition, the proposed project would comply with applicable policies and ordinances for fire prevention, protection, and safety as required by the City's Municipal Code, which include development with modern materials and in accordance with current standards, inclusive of fire-resistant materials, and provision of fire alarms and detection systems, and automatic fire sprinklers. With these provisions and because the project site is in an area already served by the Fire Department, the proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded firefighting facilities. Therefore, the project's potential impacts to fire services and facilities would be less than significant.

### **Police Protection**

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

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 80)

**Rationale:** The City of Redondo Beach Police Department provides police protection services in the City and maintains mutual assistance programs with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The Police Department is located at 401 Diamond Street, approximately 900 feet north of the project site. The Police Department already serves the existing commercial development on the site. Therefore, current estimated response time for priority police emergency calls for service is approximately four minutes from the time that the call is made.

During operation of the proposed project, potential impacts could be generated from an increased need for police protection services associated with routine patrols and responding to calls possibly related to graffiti, vandalism, and robbery. However, the project would also be designed, constructed, and operated per all applicable standards required by the City for new development with respect to public safety. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities that could have an environmental impact. Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Schools**

**Threshold:** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 80 – 81)

**Rationale:** The Redondo Beach Unified School District (RBUSD) provides primary and secondary public education services to students living in the local area. According to the RBUSD, there were approximately 9,500 students enrolled in district schools for the 2018-2019 school year.

The need for new school facilities is typically associated with a population increase that generates an increase in enrollment large enough to cause new schools to be constructed. Using a Student Yield Factor of 0.7 students per dwelling unit for Unified School Districts and conservatively applying this factor to the project's bedroom count, the proposed project would generate approximately 91 new students in the RBUSD. Compared to the 9,500 students enrolled in RBUSD schools for the 2018-2019 school year, the project would incrementally increase existing student enrollment by approximately one percent. Furthermore, the project applicant would be required to pay the state-mandated school impact fees that would contribute to the funds available for development of new school facilities. Pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees "...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization." Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the number of students at local public school or lead to the need for new or physically altered school facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

---

## **Parks**

**Threshold:** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks, or the need for new or physically altered parks, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 81)

**Rationale:** The City currently owns and operates a total of 35 public parks, open space areas, and recreation sites, occupying approximately 155 acres of land. These areas are all part of the city recreation and parks system.

The City's current estimated population is 66,994. Using the standard of three acres per 1,000 residents, as given in the Recreation and Parks Element of the General Plan, the City's parkland goal is approximately 201 acres. Consequently, the existing 155 acres of parkland in the City, which equates to 2.3 acres per 1,000 residents, do not achieve the Recreation and Parks Element goal. The addition of 299 residents associated with the project would increase the City's population to 67,293. Therefore, the project would not change the City's ratio of parkland to residents, which would remain at approximately 2.3 acres per 1,000 residents. The proposed project would therefore not create the need for new or expanded park facilities and Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Other Public Facilities**

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

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Page 82)

**Rationale:** Development of the proposed project would result in incremental impacts to the City's public services and facilities such as storm drain usage, solid-waste disposal, water usage, and wastewater disposal.

The proposed project would introduce new residential uses to the project site, but these uses would be similar to existing residential uses surrounding the project site and use similar levels of public services. In addition, the proposed commercial uses would use similar levels of public services to the existing commercial developments on the project site. The project site is in an urban area already served by other commonly used public facilities such as public libraries and medical facilities. The proposed project would not induce substantial growth and would therefore not adversely affect existing governmental facilities or require the need for new or altered governmental facilities and would generally

follow the same use patterns of similar existing residential uses in terms of demand for public services. Impacts would be less than significant.

## ***Recreation***

### **Increased Use**

**Threshold:** 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?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 83 – 84)

**Rationale:** The City currently owns and operates a total of 35 public parks, open space areas, and recreation sites, occupying approximately 155 acres of land. Using the standard of three acres per 1,000 residents, as given in the Recreation and Parks Element of the General Plan, the City's parkland goal is approximately 205 acres. Therefore, the existing 155 acres of parkland in the City, which equates to 2.3 acres per 1,000 residents, do not achieve the Recreation and Parks Element goal.

The addition of 299 residents associated with the project would increase the City's population to 67,293. Therefore, implementation of the project would not change the City's ratio of parkland to residents, which would remain at approximately 2.3 acres per 1,000 residents. Further, the project applicant would be required to dedicate land, pay a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for neighborhood and community park or recreational purposes according to the standards and formula contained in Section 10-1.1408 of the City's Municipal Code. As such, the proposed project would not increase the demand for parks nor cause substantial deterioration of existing parks such that new park facilities would be needed. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Construction and Expansion**

**Threshold:** Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Appendix B, Pages 83 – 84)

**Rationale:** The City currently owns and operates a total of 35 public parks, open space areas, and recreation sites, occupying approximately 155 acres of land<sup>9</sup>Using the standard of three acres per 1,000 residents, as given in the Recreation and Parks Element of the General Plan, the City's parkland goal is approximately 205 acres. Therefore, the existing 155 acres of parkland in the City, which equates to 2.3 acres per 1,000 residents, do not achieve the Recreation and Parks Element goal.

*The addition of 299 residents associated with the project would increase the City's population to 67,293. Therefore, implementation of the project would not change the City's ratio of parkland to residents, which would remain at approximately 2.3 acres per 1,000 residents. Further, the project applicant would be required to dedicate land, pay a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for neighborhood and community park or recreational purposes according to the standards and formula contained in Section 10-1.1408 of the City's Municipal Code. As such, the proposed project would not increase the demand for parks nor cause substantial deterioration of existing parks such that new park facilities would be needed. Impacts would be less than significant. Transportation*

#### **Programs, Plans, Ordinances, or Policies**

Threshold: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.7-11 – 4.7-16)

Rationale: The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies of the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, South Bay Bicycle Master Plan, the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan, and the City's Harbor/Civic Center Specific Plan. In addition, the Local Transportation Assessment prepared by Fehr & Peers for the project concludes that the project is not expected to significantly degrade transit operations and facilities or pedestrian and bicycle modes. Furthermore, based on the Level of Service (LOS) analyses, the project is not expected to have any operational effects under the cumulative plus project scenario. Under the existing and plus project scenarios, all intersections operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of Intersection 6 (Pacific Coast Highway and Herondo Street/Anita Street), which operates at LOS E under all scenarios. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Hazardous Design/Incompatible Uses**

Threshold: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.7-19 – 4.7-20)

Rationale: The project is not adding any additional driveways or curb cuts, and the driveways are perpendicular to the public right-of-way and adequately spaced from existing signalized intersections. In addition, the project does not introduce incompatible uses with the surrounding community. Furthermore, using data collected from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System, a collision analysis was conducted for the intersections Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street and Catalina Avenue and Diamond Street, which are the primary intersections used for site access. Over the five-year period of collision data evaluated, four collisions occurred in the immediate vicinity of the project site on streets used to access



the project site, including people driving and walking. Of the total number of collisions, none resulted in serious injury or fatality. All four collisions occurred at an intersection, with no reported collisions occurring outside of an intersection. The primary collision factors associated with collisions near the project site were vehicle right of way violation (50 percent), improper turning (25 percent), and pedestrian violation (25 percent). Based on the collision history detailed above, collisions are relatively infrequent adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use.

### **Emergency Access**

Threshold: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.7-20)

Rationale: The project's effect on response times would largely depend on the congestion level where the project would be adding the most trips. The project would add the most trips to the intersections along Catalina Avenue, which generally operate with less congestion, and thus, the project is expected to have a negligible effect on response times. The project would retain the existing driveways on Catalina Avenue and would widen the southernmost driveway, which would effectively provide two points of ingress and egress for emergency vehicles should they need to access the site. In addition, the project is located approximately 0.25 mile from Redondo Beach Fire Station 2. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact related to emergency access.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.7-21)

Rationale: Currently planned and pending projects in the vicinity of the project includes The Foundry project located approximately 2.2 miles northeast of the site. Cumulative transportation impacts would consist of increased vehicle trips on the analyzed study intersections from the proposed project and The Foundry project. The project would not create hazardous traffic conditions or result in inadequate emergency access due to project design and existing traffic conditions. Therefore, with the distance of The Foundry project, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative hazardous traffic conditions or inadequate emergency access impacts. However, despite implementation of applicable TDM measures, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impacts would remain significant and unavoidable as the project would exceed the City's Home-Based VMT per Capita even with mitigation. Nonetheless, while the project would have a project-specific impact related to VMT, the project would not contribute to a cumulative VMT impact.

## **Utilities and Service Systems**

### **New or Expanded Facilities**

**Threshold:** Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 90 – 91)

**Rationale:** Water Facilities. According to the 2015 UWMP, Cal Water would be able to provide reliable water supplies for an average year, single dry year, and multiple dry years for its existing and planned supplies. Therefore, the project would not result in the need for new or expanded water facilities and impacts would be less than significant.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities. The local wastewater collection system is owned by the City of Redondo Beach and is managed, operated, and maintained by the City's Public Works Department. Wastewater in the City is conveyed to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) located in the City of Carson. This wastewater treatment plant provides both primary and secondary treatment for approximately 3.5 million people throughout Los Angeles County. The JWPCP has a capacity of 400 million gallons per day and currently average daily flows are approximately 260 million gallons per day. Therefore, the plant has a remaining daily capacity of approximately 140 million gallons per day. The project would result in a net increase of approximately 5,493 gallons of wastewater per day. The project's estimated daily wastewater generation accounts for less than 0.01 percent of the JWPCP's remaining daily capacity of approximately 140 million gallons. Therefore, the JWPCP has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional wastewater flows generated by the proposed project, the proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded treatment facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Storm Water Drainage Facilities. Project implementation would result in similar drainage patterns as existing conditions. Furthermore, the project would increase permeable surfaces on-site compared to existing conditions because the site is currently almost entirely composed of impermeable surfaces, but the proposed project would include landscaping at the eastern and southwestern areas of the project site. Therefore, runoff leaving the project site would be reduced compared to existing conditions and the project would not necessitate the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Electric Power/Natural Gas Facilities. The project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. The project's electricity demand would represent less than 0.01 percent of electricity provided by

Southern California Edison (SCE). Therefore, SCE would have sufficient supplies for the project. The project's natural gas consumption would represent less than 0.01 percent of natural gas provided by the Southern California Gas Company, which would therefore have adequate supply to serve the project. Therefore, the project would not require the construction of new electric power or natural gas facilities and impacts would be less than significant.

Telecommunications Facilities. The project site is an infill project served by existing telecommunications facilities within the City and would not require the expansion or construction of new telecommunications infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Water Supplies**

Threshold: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 91)

Rationale: Cal Water's recent 2015 UWMP identifies anticipated water supplies and demands for the years 2020 through 2040. The UWMP states that, with its existing and planned supplies, Cal Water can provide reliable water supplies for an average year, single dry year, and multiple dry years. The population in the UWMP service area is expected to increase from 142,227 in 2015 to 152,372 in 2040, based on Cal Water estimates. The project would generate a population increase of approximately 299 residents, which would account for approximately three percent of the service area population increase between the years 2015 and 2040. In addition, the project would demand a net increase of an estimated 5,493 gallons of water per day, or approximately 6.2 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water, which is within the forecasted increase in water demand for Cal Water. Impacts related to water supply would therefore be less than significant.

### **Wastewater Treatment Capacity**

Threshold: Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Finding: Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 90 – 91)

Rationale: The local wastewater collection system is owned by the City of Redondo Beach and is managed, operated, and maintained by the City's Public Works Department. Wastewater in the City is conveyed to the JWPCP located in the City of Carson. This wastewater treatment plant provides both primary and secondary treatment for approximately 3.5 million people throughout Los Angeles County. The JWPCP has a capacity of 400 million gallons per day and currently average

daily flows are approximately 260 million gallons per day. Therefore, the plant has a remaining daily capacity of approximately 140 million gallons per day. The project would result in a net increase of approximately 5,493 gallons of wastewater per day. The project's estimated daily wastewater generation accounts for less than 0.01 percent of the JWPCP's remaining daily capacity of approximately 140 million gallons. Therefore, the JWPCP has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional wastewater flows generated by the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Solid Waste Generation**

**Threshold:** Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 92 – 93)

**Rationale:** Construction debris would be removed and disposed of at California Waste Services in a timely manner and in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including the diversion of a minimum of 65 percent of construction and demolition debris pursuant to CALGreen. California Waste Services is a local recycling facility equipped to handle construction debris located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of the project site in the City of Gardena. The removal of demolition materials would only occur during the construction period. In addition, the project would be required to submit a Waste Management Plan for demolition activities in accordance with Section 5-2.704 of the City's Municipal Code. However, because demolition activities would be temporary, construction of the proposed project would not exceed the permitted capacity of any local landfill.

Athens Services is the City's exclusive franchise waste hauler that services all residential and commercial waste and recycling programs. Unrecyclable solid waste collected by Athens Service is delivered to the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, or the El Sobrante Landfill, or various San Bernardino County landfills that accept waste from Los Angeles County, including Mid-Valley Landfill and San Timoteo Landfill. The project would generate a net increase of an estimated 36.2 tons of solid waste per year, which would not exceed the current estimated remaining daily capacity of the landfills. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Solid Waste Management and Regulations**

**Threshold:** Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 92 – 93)

**Rationale:** Construction debris would be removed and disposed of at California Waste Services in a timely manner and in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including the diversion of a minimum of 65 percent of construction and demolition debris pursuant to CALGreen. California Waste Services is a local recycling facility equipped to handle construction debris located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of the project site in the City of Gardena. The removal of demolition materials would only occur during the construction period. In addition, the project would be required to submit a Waste Management Plan for demolition activities in accordance with Section 5-2.704 of the City's Municipal Code. However, because demolition activities would be temporary, construction of the proposed project would not exceed the permitted capacity of any local landfill.

Athens Services is the City's exclusive franchise waste hauler that services all residential and commercial waste and recycling programs. Unrecyclable solid waste collected by Athens Service is delivered to the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, or the El Sobrante Landfill, or various San Bernardino County landfills that accept waste from Los Angeles County, including Mid-Valley Landfill and San Timoteo Landfill. The project would generate a net increase of an estimated 36.2 tons of solid waste per year, which would not exceed the current estimated remaining daily capacity of the landfills. The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, such as AB 939 and the City's recycling programs for residences. Impacts would be less than significant.

## ***Wildfire***

### **Emergency Response/Evacuation Plans**

**Threshold:** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Pages 95 – 96)

**Rationale:** Undeveloped wildland areas are not located near the project site. According to CalFire, the project site is not located in a "Fire Hazard Severity Zone" or "Very High Hazard Severity Zone" for wildland fires. Therefore, the project site is not located near a state responsibility area or classified as having a high fire hazard. Furthermore, the RBFD would provide fire prevention, fire protection, and emergency response for the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project would comply with applicable policies and ordinances for fire prevention, protection, and safety as required by the City's Municipal Code, which include development with modern materials and in accordance with current standards, inclusive of fire-resistant materials, and provision of fire alarms and detection systems, and automatic fire sprinklers. Construction of the proposed project would be required to maintain emergency access to the site and on area

roadways and would not interfere with an emergency response plan or evacuation route. Impacts would be less than significant.

### **Pollutant Concentrations**

**Threshold:** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Page 96)

**Rationale:** The project site is in an urban area and is not located in or near a high fire hazard severity zone. In addition, the proposed project would comply with applicable policies and ordinances for fire prevention, protection, and safety as required by the City's Municipal Code, which include development with modern materials and in accordance with current standards, inclusive of fire-resistant materials, and provision of fire alarms and detection systems, and automatic fire sprinklers. No impact would occur.

### **Infrastructure Risks**

**Threshold:** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Page 96)

**Rationale:** The project site is in an urban area and is not located in or near a state responsibility area or land classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone. The project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. The project site would be adequately served by existing facilities and utilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not require additional roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities that would exacerbate fire risk and no temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment would occur.

### **Runoff Risks**

**Threshold:** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

**Finding:** No Impact. (Draft EIR, Pages 96)

**Rationale:** The project site is in an urban area and is not located in or near a high fire hazard severity zone. There are no streams or rivers located on or adjacent to the project site, and the project site and surrounding areas are not at high risk of downslope or downstream flooding or landslides. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks, and risks to people or structures due to runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes would not occur. No impact would occur.

### ***Tribal Cultural Resources***

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Less Than Significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4.8-5)

**Rationale:** The only planned or pending project is the Foundry Project, approximately 2.2 miles northeast of the project site. The area to analyze cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources includes the project site and immediately adjacent areas that could be indirectly affected. The potential for uncovering significant archaeological (prehistoric and historic) and/or tribal cultural resources within the project area during earthmoving construction activities is unknown. However, the proposed project would involve redevelopment of already graded and developed sites in an urban area. The project would result in a less than significant impact to tribal cultural resources, as well as human remains with mitigation identified above. As such, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources in the project vicinity. In addition, individual development proposals are reviewed separately by the appropriate jurisdiction and undergo environmental review when it is determined that the potential for significant impacts exist. In the event that future cumulative projects would result in impacts to known or unknown tribal cultural resources, impacts to such resources would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Future cumulative projects would also be required to comply with existing regulatory requirements related to the unanticipated discovery of tribal cultural resources and human remains. Therefore, impacts related to tribal cultural resources would not be significant and the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative tribal cultural resource impacts.

## **2. Findings on Potential Significant Environmental Impacts That Can Be Reduced to a Less-than-Significant Level with Mitigation**

The City has analyzed each of the following potential impacts and, after due consideration of substantial evidence contained in the EIR and the administrative record and based upon its independent judgment, finds that each potential significant impact has been reduced to a level of less than significant through project design or mitigation measures adopted as part of the project and implemented through the MMRP. These findings are based on the analysis of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts for the environmental considerations included in Sections 4.1 through 4.8 of the Draft EIR, and further discussed in Section 2 of the Final EIR, *Response to Comments on the Draft EIR*. An explanation of the rationale for each finding is presented in the following discussion.

Additional details on the timing and implementation of the mitigation measures are included in the MMRP, which is included as Exhibit B.

## ***Biological Resources***

### **Sensitive Species**

Threshold: Would the project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.2-6 – 4.2-7) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: The vegetation present on the project site could provide nesting habitat for common resident birds, whose eggs, nests, and nestlings are protected by federal and State law, and several large ornamental trees on-site could provide low-quality potential habitat for nesting raptors. The project could directly (e.g., vegetation removal) and indirectly (e.g., construction noise and motion) affect nesting of these species.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level by conducting construction, demolition, and other project-related activities, including vegetation removal and ground disturbance, outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31); conducting a nesting bird pre-construction survey if construction, demolition, or project-related activities occur during bird breeding season; creating an avoidance buffer if nests are found on the project site; and submitting a survey report to the City prior to the issuance of grading permits.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 4.2-7) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: The area to analyze cumulative biological resource impacts includes the project site and immediately adjacent areas that could be indirectly affected. Vegetation, including trees, located on the project site could potentially support nesting migratory birds. As discussed previously, the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) and Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protect migratory avian species when they are nesting. Compliance with the CFGC and MBTA throughout the project would ensure that cumulative impacts to migratory birds would not be significant. Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** would ensure that the implementation of



the project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts related to nesting bird disturbance.

## ***Cultural Resources***

### **Historical Resources**

Threshold: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.3-19 – 4.3-22) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: As discussed in Section 4-3, *Cultural Resources*, of the DEIR, four out of the five buildings (112, 124, 126, and 132 North Catalina Avenue), located on the project site were found to qualify as historical resources pursuant to CEQA. These four buildings are contributors to a locally eligible historic district in Redondo Beach's early commercial core, eligible under Criterion A. In addition, 126 North Catalina Avenue appears individually eligible at the local level under Criterion C as a City landmark based on its Mid-century Modern style as applied to a commercial property, and 112 North Catalina Avenue appears individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A based on the significant role the building played in support of the early civic engagement and volunteerism in the early years of the development of the City. In addition to the properties identified above, there are three additional historical resources which are adjacent to the project site (321 Diamond Street, 305 Emerald Street, and 133 North Broadway). At present, plans for the proposed project are designed to avoid significant adverse impacts and material impairment to historical resources through compliance with the Secretary's Standards. However, given that the project remains largely conceptual in nature, project elements developed or changed through the schematic and design development phases could result in potentially significant adverse impacts to historical resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-1** would require ongoing project compliance with the Secretary's Standards and avoidance, lessening, and mitigation of significant adverse impacts as well as work to ensure any potential indirect impacts to the three adjacent historical resources (321 Diamond Street, 305 Emerald Street, and 133 North Broadway) remain less than significant. Therefore, potential impacts related to historical resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### **Archaeological Resources**

Threshold: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.3-23 – 4.3-24) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: While the project site has been heavily disturbed by previous development, the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search results and Native American outreach indicate that the project site is sensitive for archaeological cultural resources. The CHRIS records search results indicate that four archaeological resources, including one containing human remains, exist within one mile of the project site. In addition, during informal tribal outreach, Chairperson Andrew Salas of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation, Chairperson Robert Dorame of the Gabrieliño Tongva Indians of California, and Chairperson Anthony Morales of the Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians all indicated that the area of the project site is highly sensitive.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **CUL-2a**, **CUL-2b**, and **CUL-2c** would avoid significant direct impacts to archaeological resources to the maximum extent feasible through the preparation of a project-specific Cultural Resources Management Plan, archaeological monitoring, and evaluation of unanticipated archaeological resources and would provide for recovery of any significant resources that cannot be preserved in place. Therefore, potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### Human Remains

Threshold: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.3-24 – 4.3-25) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: No cemeteries or burials are known to exist within the project site; however, the CHRIS records search results indicate that one prehistoric burial is known to exist within one mile of the project site, and the area is highly sensitive for Native American remains, as discussed in Section 4.8, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of the DEIR. In addition, the discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-3** would require contacting the County Coroner and halting further disturbance if human remains are found on the project site. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site and provide recommendations for treatment to the

landowner within 48 hours of being granted access. Mitigation Measure **CUL-3** would avoid potential impacts to previously undiscovered human remains to the maximum extent feasible and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant level.

## ***Geology and Soils***

### **Expansive Soils**

Threshold: Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.4-9 – 4.4-10) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: As discussed in Section 4-4, *Geology and Soils*, of the DEIR, the project site includes moderately compressible soils. Artificial fill underlying the project site consists of moist, medium dense, dark brown fine-grained silty sands to approximately three feet below ground surface. The artificial fill is underlain by native alluvial soils; consisting of moist to very moist, medium dense to very dense, yellowish-brown to dark brown, fine to medium-grained silty sands.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **GEO-1** would reduce the direct or indirect risk of life or property by implementing foundation and floor slab design recommendations, which would limit the shrinking and swelling behavior caused by clay soil and would prevent damage to foundations. Therefore, potential impacts related to expansive soils would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### **Paleontological Resources**

Threshold: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.4-11 – 4.4-12) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: The older Quaternary dune sands (Qoe) geologic units underlying the project site have a low potential to contain paleontological resources, but may be underlain at shallow to moderate depths by older, fossiliferous geologic units assigned a high paleontological sensitivity. As such, ground disturbing activities on the project site (including grading, excavation, drilling, or any other activity that disturbs intact (native) geologic units with high paleontological sensitivity) could potentially result in destruction, damage, or loss of scientifically important paleontological resources and associated stratigraphic and paleontological data.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **GEO-2a** and **GEO-2b** would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level by including preparation of a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Plan and full-time paleontological monitoring when excavation exceeds depths of ten feet to determine if older paleontologically sensitive sediments are present would be required.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.4-12 – 4.4-13) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

**Rationale:** Cumulative development in the project vicinity would gradually increase population and therefore gradually increase the number of people exposed to potential geological hazards, including effects associated with seismic events such as ground rupture, seismic shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and expansive soils. The magnitude of geologic hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. Any specific geologic hazards associated with each individual site would be limited to that site without affecting other areas. Seismic and geologic hazards would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts. Additionally, cumulative development projects would be required to conform with the current CBC, Division of the State Architect (DSA), CGS, and the City's General Plan, as well as other laws and regulations mentioned above, ensuring that future cumulative impacts associated with ground rupture, seismic shaking, liquefaction, and landslides would be less than significant. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and the project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to seismic hazards.

Cumulative development would also increase ground disturbance in the vicinity of the project site, which would contribute to erosion and loss of topsoil in the area. However, cumulative development projects would be required to obtain coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit and conform with the City's Municipal Code. In compliance with these regulations, each construction project would be required to prepare a SWPPP and implement site-specific BMPs designed to reduce erosion. These standard requirements would ensure that future cumulative impacts associated with erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and the project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to erosion and loss of topsoil.

The proposed project would be served by the City's existing wastewater and sewer system and would not involve the construction of septic tanks of

alternative wastewater disposal systems. Cumulative development projects in the City are required to analyze and submit percolation tests that ensure soils are adequate for on-site wastewater disposal. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be less than significant, and the project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Cumulative projects would also increase the potential for impacts to paleontological resources through construction activities in the area. The project site has potential for buried paleontological resources, and the project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure **GEO-2a** to reduce impacts of the project on paleontological resources to less than significant. It can be reasonably assumed similar measures would be taken for cumulative development projects. Therefore, although cumulative projects may result in significant cumulative impacts to paleontological resources, project-specific mitigation for cumulative development would limit this impact to less than significant, and implementation of Mitigation Measure **GEO-2a** would ensure the project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

#### **Accident or Upset**

Threshold: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.5-6 – 4.5-8) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: The project site contains contaminated soil and soil vapor. A Soil Vapor Extraction and Soil Treatment Workplan and Addendum to the Soil Vapor Extraction and Soil Treatment Workplan have been developed and approved by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) on October 2, 2020 to address contamination in shallow soil and soil vapor at the project site. Hazards project design features (PDF) 1 (Shallow Soil Remediation), Hazards PDF 2 (Soil Vapor), and Hazards PDF 3 (Vapor Intrusion) would be included as part of the project under the oversight of the LACoFD. Hazards PDF 1 would address impacts associated with shallow contaminated soil and associated air quality or fugitive dust emissions during excavation, grading, stockpiling, transport, or disposal of soils provided that such activities are conducted under the oversight of LACoFD and in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations, and Hazards PDF 2 and 3 would address potential vapor migration to indoor air by residual volatile organic compounds in soil and soil vapor. Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measures **HAZ-1a**, **HAZ-1b**, **HAZ-1c**,

and **HAZ-1d** would reduce potential soil contamination impacts to a less than significant level through the implementation of shallow soil remediation measures, incorporation of all soil and soil vapor requirements in the design of the project as set forth by the LACoFD for issuance of building permits, operation maintenance and monitoring of the vapor barrier and sub-slab ventilation system, and the completion of an asbestos survey prior to the demolition of any on-site structure.

## **Noise**

### **Construction (Temporary) Noise**

Threshold: Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.6-13 – 4.6-14) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

Rationale: As discussed in Section 4-6, *Noise*, of the DEIR, maximum hourly noise levels during project construction, which would occur during the demolition, grading, and building phases of construction, were calculated at between 69 dBA Leq (8-hour) and 90 dBA Leq (8-hour) at the nearest receivers, consisting of surrounding retail/commercial uses, multi-family residences, and a church. Based on these calculations, construction noise levels would exceed the Federal Transit Administration daytime noise criterion of 80 dBA Leq (8-hour) for residential uses and 85 dBA Leq (8-hour) for commercial uses at the adjacent uses.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **N-1** would reduce potential construction noise impacts to a less than significant level through the implementation of required measures, including installation of temporary sound barriers/blankets, providing signage at the project site that includes a 24-hour telephone number for project information and a procedure where a field engineer/construction manager shall respond to and investigate noise complaints and take corrective action if necessary, and retaining a City-approved noise consultant if noise complaint(s) are registered.

### **Construction Vibration**

Threshold: Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.6-17 – 4.6-19) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

**Rationale:** Construction of the project would potentially utilize loaded trucks, jackhammers, and/or bulldozers during most construction phases, which would generate groundborne vibration that could potentially cause physical damage to nearby structures, including the historic buildings on-site. As discussed in Section 4-6, *Noise*, of the DEIR, according to the California Department of Transportation vibration criteria, groundborne vibration from typical construction equipment would exceed the applicable threshold of 0.12 in./sec. PPV for building damage at fragile historic buildings.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **N-5** would reduce potential construction vibration impacts to a less than significant level by requiring large dozers, loaded trucks, and other construction equipment with similar vibration levels to avoid operation within 20 feet of on-site historic buildings.

### ***Tribal Cultural Resources***

#### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

**Threshold:** Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074 that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k)?

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074 that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1?

**Finding:** Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.8-4 – 4.8-5) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(1).)

**Rationale:** As discussed in Section 4-8, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of the DEIR, during informal tribal outreach, Chairperson Andrew Salas of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation, Chairperson Robert Dorame of the Gabrieliño Tongva Indians of California, and Chairperson Anthony Morales of the Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians all indicated that the area of the project site is highly sensitive. In addition, during consultation, the Kizh Nation stated that the project has a high potential to impact undiscovered tribal cultural resources as the project site is located within a known prehistoric sacred village site affiliated with the Kizh Nation, exists within the Kizh Nation traditional ancestral territory, and is adjacent to important areas to the Kizh Nation, including a sacred water course, salt ponds, and major traditional trade routes.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **TCR-1a** and **TCR-1b** would ensure potential impacts to previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources are

reduced to a less than significant level through Native American monitoring, the halting of construction activities within a 100-foot radius of discovered tribal cultural resources, and evaluation of potential tribal cultural resources by a qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor/consultant. As appropriate and based on consultation with the tribal monitor/consultant, treatment of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources shall occur consistent with the Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan required under Mitigation Measure **CUL-1**. The tribal monitor/consultant may request preservation in place or recovery for educational purposes. The disposition of any artifacts of Native American origin shall be determined in consultation with the tribal monitor/consultant.

### **3. Findings on Significant Environmental Impacts That Cannot Be Avoided or Reduced to a Less than Significant Level with Mitigation**

Based on the environmental analysis in the EIR, the City has determined that the project will have significant transportation impacts with respect to VMT and that these impacts cannot be avoided or reduced despite the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These findings are based on the evaluation of impacts in the detailed issue area analyses and associated cumulative impacts evaluations in the EIR. For the significant and unavoidable impact identified in the following discussion, the City has made a finding(s) pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081. As discussed under CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(1) and (a)(5) “If the Lead Agency determines that a mitigation measure cannot be legally imposed, the measure need not be proposed or analyzed.” All three project alternatives would have lower transportation impacts with respect to VMT. Specifically as to Alternative 3 (Increased Affordable Housing), one commenter stated that the City should consider this alternative, in part because it is environmentally superior. Alternative 3 would reduce VMT impacts to a less than significant level. But by increasing the number of affordable units from four units to 17 units of the total 30 units, Alternative 3 would not satisfy Objective 1. Objective 1 seeks the construction of at least 26 market-rate units.

#### ***Transportation***

##### **Vehicle Miles Traveled**

Threshold: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable. (Draft EIR, Pages 4.7-16 – 4.7-19) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(3).)

Rationale: On July 13, 2021, the Redondo Beach City Council adopted the use of VMT methodology as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Neither the commercial or residential components of the project meet the screening criteria, and thereby, the entire project must undergo a VMT analysis.



Two metrics were used to analyze each component of the project consistent with the City's adopted transportation analysis guidelines.

The CEQA Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared by Fehr & Peers for the project determined that the proposed project would generate VMT exceeding the City's VMT per Capita and VMT per Employee thresholds of 11.1 and 15.3, respectively. Implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that result in shorter average trip lengths and/or a reduction in the demand for vehicle trips altogether would reduce VMT for both the residential and commercial components of the project. Specific TDM measures considered for the project included, but were not limited to, transit subsidies for project residents, commuter incentives, pedestrian-oriented project design, commute marketing program, bikeshare system, and local hiring. However, no combination of TDM measures would be sufficient in mitigating the project's Home-Based VMT per Capita impact.

Alternative 3 (Increased Affordable Housing) would reduce a significant and unavoidable VMT impact to a less than significant level. Alternative 3 would maintain the same uses and total number of units as the proposed project, but would not fulfill the same objectives. Objective 1 seeks the construction of at least 26 market-rate units. Alternative 3 would not meet this objective due to the increase in affordable housing units from four units to 17 units of the total 30 units.

Alternative 1 (No Project) would maintain existing conditions and would not result in any significant impacts. But this alternative would not fulfill Objectives 1 through 4 and 9, in that it would not result in the construction of multi-family residential units, including affordable housing units. Nor would Alternative 1 fulfill Objectives 5, 6, and 8, which aim to provide neighborhood serving commercial uses.

Alternative 2 (By Right Residential) would have lower VMT impacts than the proposed project, but the Alternative 2 VMT impacts would still be significant. Alternative 2 would generally fulfill the same objectives as the proposed project, but not to the same extent. Due to the reduction in eight residential units, this alternative would not include at least 26 market rate units or assist the City's housing needs with units for different income levels, including affordable housing, to the same extent as the proposed project, falling short of meeting Objectives 1 and 3.

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations make it infeasible to reduce the VMT impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

## E. Findings on Growth-Inducing Impacts

The City finds that the growth-inducing potential of the project would be less than significant since it would not result in growth that exceeds those assumptions included in projections made by regional planning authorities, it would not induce economic expansion to the extent that physical environment effects would result, and it would not remove an obstacle to growth.

**Population Growth:** The city has an estimated population of 66,994 with an average household size of 2.3 persons, whereas the project would be anticipated to result in up to 299 new residents in the city. As part of their 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, SCAG estimates that the city's population will increase to 72,900 by 2045, an increase of approximately 5,906 persons. The project would directly increase the city's population to 67,293, which would be within the anticipated population growth even with the conservative assumption of 299 residents under the proposed project. In addition, the city has an existing housing stock of 30,892 units, which SCAG forecasts will increase by 208 units (an approximately one percent increase) to 31,100 units by 2045. The project would generate 30 housing units, which would be within the projected increase in housing units in Redondo Beach. Moreover, development and operation of the project would not generate air quality or GHG emissions that would result in a significant impact provided the applicable mitigation measures are implemented during project construction. Additionally, the project involves redevelopment within a fully urbanized area that lacks significant scenic resources, native biological habitats, known cultural resource remains, surface water, or other environmental resources. Therefore, any population growth associated with the project would not result in significant long-term physical environmental effects.

**Economic Growth:** The project would generate temporary employment opportunities during construction. Because construction workers would be expected to be drawn from the existing regional work force, construction of the project would not be growth-inducing from a temporary employment standpoint. The project would both eliminate existing employment on the project site associated with the current land uses and would create new long-term employment opportunities associated with operation of the coffee shop and tasting room. The proposed project would reduce commercial/retail uses on the project site by 12,619 square feet compared to existing uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not be anticipated to generate a net increase in jobs or induce substantial economic expansion to the extent that direct physical environmental effects would result.

**Removal of Obstacles to Growth:** The project is in a fully urbanized area that is well served by existing infrastructure. Existing utilities and roadway infrastructure in Redondo Beach would be adequate to serve the project. Minor improvements to water, sewer, and drainage connection infrastructure may be needed, but would be sized to specifically serve the proposed project. The project would include new internal driveways to connect the proposed townhomes and apartment building with North Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street and to provide for safe circulation of vehicles on the site. However, no new or expanded roads would be required. Because the project constitutes redevelopment within an urbanized area and does not require the extension of new infrastructure through undeveloped areas, project implementation would not remove an obstacle to growth.

## F. Findings on Irreversible Environmental Effects

The City finds that construction and operation of the project would involve an irreversible commitment of construction materials and non-renewable energy resources. The project would involve the use of building materials and energy, some of which are non-renewable resources, to construct the proposed townhomes and apartments. However, the project includes rehabilitation and reuse of four of the five buildings on the project site, which would reduce the amount of materials and energy use required during project construction. Furthermore, project construction would utilize environmentally preferable materials such as concrete containing fly ash and sustainably sourced wood. Though project construction would require construction materials and fuels for power construction equipment, consumption of these resources would occur with any development in the region and are not unique to the proposed project.

Project operation would also irreversibly increase local demand for non-renewable energy resources such as petroleum products and natural gas. However, increasingly efficient building design would offset this demand to some degree by reducing energy demands of the project. The project's design features would include sustainability features such as EnergyStar appliances in the residential units, dedicated EV charging spaces equipped with chargers (10 percent of all parking spaces), cool roofs, passive solar, and high-efficiency lighting. In addition, the project would be subject to the energy conservation requirements of the California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings) and the California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations). Consequently, the project would not use unusual amounts of energy or construction materials and impacts related to consumption of non-renewable and slowly renewable resources would be less than significant. Again, consumption of these resources would occur with any development in the region and is not unique to the proposed project.

## G. Findings on Project Alternatives

### 1. Alternatives Screened Out from Detailed Consideration in the EIR

The City finds that the alternatives considered but rejected from further evaluation in Draft EIR Section 6.4 are infeasible, would not meet most of the basic project objectives, and/or would not reduce or avoid any of the significant effects of the project, for the reasons described in Draft Section 6.4.

An alternative in which the total number of residential units included is increased was considered since it would result in a decreased traffic impact due to lower residential VMT. However, this alternative would either reduce the amount of commercial space proposed under the project or remove commercial space altogether, which would not achieve Objectives 4, 5, and 6. Furthermore, this alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources as there is a possibility that the existing commercial buildings qualified as historical resources could be removed for the construction of the residential units. Therefore, this scenario was rejected from further consideration.

Decreasing the number of residential units constructed under the proposed project to 15 total units was also considered as an alternative since it would result in a decreased traffic impact due to lower residential VMT. However, buildout under this alternative would be below the 22 units that could be constructed at the project site by-right and would not achieve project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project or satisfy the City's intent of constructing the full number of units allowed by-right. Therefore, this scenario was rejected from further consideration.

## **2. Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR**

As required by CEQA, this EIR examines alternatives to the proposed project. Based on the alternatives analysis, Alternative 3 was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

**Alternative 1 (No Project)** assumes that the existing commercial buildings (i.e., total of 15,682 square feet) and associated surface parking lots would remain under this alternative, and construction of the proposed project would not occur. Two of the existing buildings are vacant and the other buildings currently serve commercial uses. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing commercial uses in two buildings would be maintained, and no building modifications would occur at the project site.

**Finding/Rationale:** The No Project Alternative would not fulfill Objectives 1 through 4 and 9 since it would not result in the construction of multi-family residential units, including affordable housing units, near the harbor and with access to commercial and recreational opportunities. Furthermore, because the proposed project would rehabilitate existing commercial buildings (including those with historic significance) and introduce new commercial uses, the No Project Alternative would not fulfill Objectives 5, 6, and 8, which aim to provide neighborhood-serving commercial uses while simultaneously encouraging pedestrian and bicycle activity at the project's facade and preserving existing historic buildings.

**Alternative 2 (By-Right Residential)** would involve the same rehabilitation work of the existing commercial buildings and retention of 3,063 sf of commercial/retail space for a tasting room and coffee shop as the proposed project. However, this alternative would involve the buildout of the number of residential units allowed at the project site by-right, which would be 22 units consisting of townhome and apartment units. This alternative would not include any affordable units.

**Finding/Rationale:** Alternative 2 would fulfill the same objectives as the proposed project, but not to the same extent. Due to the reduction in eight residential units, this alternative would not include at least 26 market-rate units or assist the City's housing needs with units for different income levels to the same extent as the proposed project per Objectives 1 and 3.

**Alternative 3 (Increased Affordable Housing)** would involve the same rehabilitation work of the existing commercial buildings, retention of 3,063 sf of commercial/retail space for a tasting room and coffee shop, and development of 30 residential units. However, this alternative would increase the percentage of affordable housing units from 13 percent to 57 percent of the total number of units. As such, Alternative 3 would include 17 below-market rate units, which would be 13 more units compared to the proposed project.

**Finding/Rationale:** Alternative 3 would maintain the same uses and total number of units as the proposed project, but would not fulfill the same objectives. Alternative 3 would not include at least 26 market-rate units and would not meet Objective 1 due to the increase in affordable housing units.

Refer to Section 6, *Alternatives*, for the complete analysis.

## H. Finding on the Final EIR & Materials Submitted up to the Close of the Hearing

The Response to Comments section of the Final EIR includes the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of environmental issues as raised in the comments, as specified by CEQA Guidelines §15088(b). The City finds that the Final EIR merely clarifies and amplifies the analysis presented in the document and does not trigger the need to recirculate per CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(b).

## I. Custodian of Records

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the project findings are based are located at the City of Redondo Beach Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, CA. The custodian for these documents is the Community Development Department of the City of Redondo Beach. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(e). However, this section should not be interpreted to mean that the City has prepared and organized the Record of Proceedings, as contemplated under Pub. Res. Code § 21167.6.

## II. Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC)

The Final EIR determines that the project would have a significant and unavoidable Vehicle Miles Traveled impact (“VMT”) (Impact T-2).

The Final EIR concludes that vehicle miles traveled impacts would be significant and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is provided here. The City finds that the project, furthers City policies and objectives. The City of Redondo Beach finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, region-wide and state-wide environmental benefits, and other benefits of the project as approved outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that these adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable for the reasons outlined below. Each benefit (and subsection thereof) set forth below independently constitute an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project.

### Alternative 3

Alternative 3 (increased affordable housing) would reduce a significant and unavoidable VMT impact to a less than significant level. Alternative 3 would maintain the same uses and total number of units as the proposed project, but would not fulfill the same objectives. Objective 1 seeks a project that is “responsive to market demands” and includes the construction of “at least 26 market-rate units.” Alternative 3 would not meet this objective due to the increase in affordable housing units from four units to 17 units of the total 30 units. The total number of new housing units would be the same, but rather than 26 units being market-rate, only 13 units would be market-rate. The City’s approval criteria for density bonus projects requires a dispersal of affordable units throughout the development. In addition, the project site would be unduly burdened in terms of proportional dispersal of affordable units under this alternative. The distribution of high-density and affordable housing throughout the community is a strategy of the City’s Housing Element. The City’s goals and policies are intended to balance the location of affordable units, noting that previous decades of rezoning added significant density to south Redondo Beach.

### Alternative 1

Alternative 1 (no project) would maintain existing conditions and would not result in any significant impacts. But this alternative would not satisfy most or all of the project objectives. One of the project objectives is to ‘realize the utilitarian benefit of the existing non-conforming commercial buildings and ensure economic vitality through programming of the commercial spaces as revenue generating, high impact uses.’ Another project objective includes “creat[ing] a high-quality designed townhome and apartment complex that enhances the value of an existing underutilized site through the development of a project that is responsive to market demands.” Furthermore, a project objective strives to “...preserve and reuse portions of three existing commercial buildings of local historic significance.” The project provides new commercial space and would provide new on-site residences, which would help ensure the long-term economic vitality of the site and the City, through increased sales tax. City policies state that the land use designations shall accommodate housing, commercial, and employment needs of the residents

and that properties be developed to maintain and enhance the quality and character of the City. The approval of a mixed-use/residential project on the subject property is in keeping with these policies as well as housing goals and targets.

The State legislature emphasizes that “the lack of housing is a critical problem that threatens the economic, environmental, and social quality of life in California... Among the consequences of those actions are.... reduced mobility, urban sprawl, excessive commuting, and air quality deterioration...” (Government Code 65589.5(a).) The Legislature explains, in part, that “California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions.” The Redondo Beach Housing Element contains State mandated policies and analysis to ensure that the City “facilitate[s] the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community” More specifically, the Legislature’s stated intent is “to assure that counties and cities recognize their responsibilities in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal...to assure that counties and cities will prepare and implement housing elements which...will move toward attainment of the state housing goal”. State law requires that jurisdictions provide their fair share of regional housing needs. The current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) identifies housing needs in each SCAG jurisdiction and allocates a fair share of that need to every community. Redondo Beach’s RHNA for the 2021–2029 planning period has been determined by SCAG at 2,490 housing units, of which 936 for very low-income households. The project as approved would help meet these legislative goals by providing 30 new residential units, four of which would be designated for very low-income households.

Additionally, if the project were denied, then the City would potentially have to comply with Gov. Code § 65863(c)(2) which would potentially require the City to amend its zoning to provide new residential density at other locations within the City. As noted in Draft EIR Section 4.3, the project site is considered a potential historic district with individual buildings eligible for local landmark designation. Retaining the existing structures prevents an environmental impact as noted above and benefits the community by preserving the City’s cultural history and its architectural legacy. Consequently, if this development were relocated to another site within the City, it would likely result in similar environmental impacts in comparison to the project site and not further the City’s historic preservation and housing goals, as discussed under the No Project Alternative in Draft EIR Section 6.1.

The Legislature adopted Senate Bill 743 (2013) with the goal of “encouraging land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce VMT and contribute to the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.” The Legislature explained in SB 743 that “there is a need to balance the need for level of service standards for traffic with the need to build infill housing and mixed use commercial developments within walking distance to mass transit facilities, downtowns, and town centers and to provide greater flexibility to local governments to balance these sometimes competing interests.”

In April 2016, the SCAG adopted the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS has the primary goal of reducing long-term emissions from transportation sources to comply with Senate Bill (SB) 375, improving public health and meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as set forth by the federal Clean Air Act. The project would be located within walking distance to

public transportation as well as the commercial and recreational opportunities of the Pier and Harbor area. The key goal of the SCS is to achieve long-term GHG emission reduction targets through integrated land use and transportation strategies. The focus of these reductions is on transportation and land use strategies that influence vehicle travel.

Other project goals are, 'to provide neighborhood serving uses and amenities that cater to City of Redondo Beach residents and encourages pedestrian and bicycle activity through re-programming and reactivating the facades of the existing commercial buildings and providing access to a new shared courtyard and public bike racks; and ...to develop[e] new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options ... near the harbor with access to outdoor recreational opportunities.' The project would further the City's goals to provide a diversity of housing options within the coastal area where housing costs and affordability are acute. The project also furthers a specific goal of the Coastal Land Use Plan to incentivize the use of the State Density Bonus Law as well as provides housing in proximity to areas of public recreation. The project uses demand management measures to reduce the amount of home-based vehicle miles traveled per capita and work vehicle miles traveled per employee. The project furthers the goals of enhancing bicycle infrastructure by providing on-site bike racks and creating opportunities for physical activity. The project provides amenities that make walking safe and enjoyable as well as promote the use of alternative transportation for short trips in accordance with the City's Circulation Element goals and policies.

#### Alternative 2

Compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 (by-right residential) would have lower transportation impacts by way of VMT. But Alternative 2's VMT impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. This alternative would involve the same rehabilitation work of the existing commercial buildings and retention of 3,063 square feet of commercial/retail space as the proposed project. Alternative 2, however, would have fewer residential units, just 22 in total. By way of comparison, the proposed project would have 30 residential units. Further, Alternative 2 would have zero affordable units, while the proposed project would have 4 affordable units.

As a general matter, Alternative 2 would fulfill the same objectives as the proposed project, but not to the same extent. Alternative 2 would not fully satisfy Objective 1, which seeks not only a project that is "responsive to market demands," but also one that will result in the construction of "at least 26 market-rate units." In addition, Alternative 2 would not fully satisfy Objective 3, which seeks to support the City's future housing needs by developing new housing options at different income levels, "including affordable housing units per California Senate Bill (SB) 1818."