CHAPTER 5
Other CEQA Considerations

This section describes the evaluation of additional types of issues required by CEQA that are not analyzed within the previous chapters of this EIR. Other CEQA considerations include environmental effects that were found not to be significant, significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the project, significant and unavoidable adverse impacts, growth-inducing impacts, energy impacts (Public Resources Code 21100(b)(3), Appendix F [mitigation measures proposed to minimize significant effects on the environmental, including measures to reduce the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy]), potential urban decay effects caused by economic implications of project implementation on surrounding uses, and significant irreversible changes.

5.1 Effects That Were Found Not to Be Significant

The City of Redondo Beach, through the Initial Study process, determined the proposed project has the potential to cause or result in significant environmental impacts, and warranted further analysis, public review, and disclosure through the preparation of an EIR. The Initial Study and associated EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated October 2015, were forwarded to the California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse (SCH), and circulated for public review and comment. The assigned State Clearinghouse reference for the proposed project is SCH 2015101009. The Initial Study and NOP responses are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

As required by Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a brief discussion stating the reasons why various possible significant effects of a project were determined not significant and are therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, this section discusses the environmental issue areas where impacts were found to not be significant. These discussions address the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Checklist questions for each of the environmental topic areas.

5.1.1 Aesthetics

As discussed in the Initial Study, the impact of the proposed project on scenic vistas and state scenic highways was found to be less than significant and no impacts, respectively, as described below.
5. Other CEQA Considerations

5.1.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

As discussed in the Initial Study, the impact of the proposed project on agricultural and forestry resources has been found less than significant, and therefore, will not be discussed in greater detail in the EIR, as described below.

a) The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (Department of Conservation 2014). As there is no farmland on-site or in the proposed project’s immediate vicinity, the proposed project would not cause direct or indirect impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

A Williamson Act Contract requires private landowners to voluntarily restrict their land to agricultural land and compatible open-space uses. In return, private landowners’ land is taxed based on actual use, rather than potential market value. There is no Williamson Act contract in effect for the project site nor does the City have any agriculture-oriented zoning designations or Williamson Act Contract land. The project site is located in an entirely urbanized area and is...
zoned CR – Regional Commercial. Because the project site does not have a Williamson Contract, no impact would occur.

c) The proposed project would not 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)).

Forest land is defined as “land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits” (California Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]). Timberland is defined as “land…which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees” (California Public Resources Code Section 4526). The project site is located within a highly urbanized area and is comprised of an existing regional commercial shopping center and associated surfacing parking lots, and does not contain any land that would be considered forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned areas. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses.

As stated above, there is no forest land existing on the project site or in the surrounding area. Thus, the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, and no impact would occur.

e) The proposed project would not 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.

There are no agricultural uses or related operations on or in proximity to the project site, or anywhere within the city, therefore the proposed project would not involve the conversion of farmland to other uses, either directly or indirectly. No impacts involving the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses would occur, and this will not be discussed further in the EIR.

5.1.3 Air Quality – Odor

As discussed in the Initial Study, it was determined that the proposed project would not result potentially significant impacts with regard to odors for the reasons described below. The EIR evaluates the remaining air quality resources significance thresholds in Section 3.1, Air Quality Resources, of this Draft EIR.

e) The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

The SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook identifies the following uses as having potential odor issues: wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, agricultural uses, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass moldings. The proposed project would
implement commercial and residential development within the project area. These land uses do not involve the types of uses that would emit objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. In addition, odors generated by new and existing non-residential land uses are required to be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent odor nuisances on sensitive land uses. Under existing conditions, the project site requires the removal of solid waste. As such, the City would continue to require compliance with regulations related to maintenance of trash areas (including RBMC Section 10-2.1536) to ensure the project does not create any objectionable odors.

Although, demolition and construction activities, including construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coatings would temporarily generate odors, the proposed project is not identified as a land use typically associated with odor emissions impacts. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant odor impact.

5.1.4 Biological Resources

As discussed in the Initial Study, the following impacts were found to be less than significant and would not be evaluated in the EIR for the reasons described below. The EIR evaluates the remaining biological resources significance thresholds in Section 3.2, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR.

a) The proposed project would not 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.

The 29.85-acre project site is developed with commercial/retail and is located in an urbanized area. Due to the developed nature of the site, it does not provide any suitable habitat for any sensitive species. The nearest open space to the project site is El Nido Park, located at the southern end of Kingsdale Avenue, approximately 0.3 mile south of the project site. No endangered, rare, threatened, or special status plant species (or associated habitats) or wildlife species designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), or California Native Plant Society (CNPS) are known to occur on or adjacent to the site. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

b) The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Riparian habitats are those along banks of rivers or streams. Sensitive natural communities are considered rare in the region by the USFWS, CDFW, or local regulatory agencies and are known to provide habitat for sensitive animal or plant species. There are no streams or riparian habitat on the project site. In addition, there is no native habitats or sensitive natural communities on-site. The project area is not included in any local or regional plans, policies, and regulations that identify riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. No impact would occur.
c) The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Wetlands are defined under the federal Clean Water Act as “land that is flooded or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that normally does support, a prevalence of vegetation adapted to life in saturated soils” (40 CFR 232.2). Wetlands include areas such as swamps, marshes, and bogs. The area in the vicinity of the project site and the project site itself are located in an entirely urbanized area that does not contain natural wetlands. The nearest potential wetland may be the lake that is located in Alondra Park northeast of and over 1 mile from the project site. Due to the distance to the nearest potential wetland, the construction and operation activities of the proposed project would not result in impacts to wetlands.

d) The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance that applies to the project site. Additionally, no protected trees are located on-site, and although ornamental trees may be removed, the proposed project would include landscaping that would replace vegetation that would be removed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

The project site is developed and does not contain any natural lands that are subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of adopted plans, and would result in no impact.

5.1.5 Cultural Resources

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have no impact on human remains, for the reasons described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining cultural resources significance thresholds in Section 3.3, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR.

d) The proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

There are no known human remains in the project area. The project area is not part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of human remains. In addition, the ground has been previously disturbed by construction of existing land uses. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project.
California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation until the coroner has made recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. Implementation of the proposed project would comply with provisions of state law regarding discovery of human remains, and impacts relating to the disturbance of human remains would be less than significant.

5.1.6 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have no impact on the rupture of a known earthquake fault, landslides, or have soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks, as described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining geology and soils significance thresholds in Section 3.4, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, of this Draft EIR.

a) The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42).

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed to prevent construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface of active faults, in order to minimize the hazard of surface rupture of a fault to people and buildings. Before cities and counties can permit development within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, geologic investigations are required to show that the sites are not threatened by surface rupture from future earthquakes. An active fault is defined as a fault with surface displacement within the last 11,000 years. The nearest active faults to the project site are the Newport-Inglewood Fault located approximately 3.8 miles north of the project site and the Palos Verdes fault located approximately 5 miles to the south (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1986). Because there are no known active faults on or adjacent to the site, the proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zone, project development would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from rupture of a known earthquake fault.

b) The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

Landslides and other slope failures are secondary seismic effects that are common during or soon after earthquakes. Areas that are most susceptible to earthquake induced landslides are steep slopes underlain by loose, weak soils, and areas on or adjacent to existing landslide deposits. As described above, the project site is located within a seismically active region subject to strong ground shaking, and the proposed structures would conform with the standard engineering requirements of the California Building Code. The project site is not located within or adjacent to an earthquake-induced landslide area (CDMG 1999). The site is relatively flat and no slopes exist on or near the site that could pose a landslide hazard. As a result, implementation of the proposed
project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving landslides, and impacts related to landslides would not occur.

c) The proposed project would not 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.

The project area is served by a sewer system; septic tanks would not be installed for the project. All development associated with the proposed project would connect to and be served by the existing public sewer system for wastewater discharge and treatment. No impacts related to septic systems would occur as a result of the proposed project.

5.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impact areas described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining hazards and hazardous materials significance thresholds in Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR.

a) The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

A hazardous material is defined as any material that, due to its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the environment.

The proposed project’s construction activities would include demolition, grading/excavation, and site preparation. The demolition activities could include the removal of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) that would be required to comply with all applicable existing rules and regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities). SCAQMD Rule 1403 requires work practices that limit asbestos emissions from building demolition and renovation activities, including the removal and disturbance of ACM. This rule is designed to protect uses and persons adjacent to demolition or renovation activity from exposure to asbestos emissions. Rule 1403 requires surveys of any facility being demolished or renovated for the presence of all friable and Class I and Class II non-friable ACM. Rule 1403 also establishes notification procedures, removal procedures, handling operations, and warning label requirements, including High-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filtration, the glovebag method, wetting, and some methods of dry removal that must be implemented when disturbing appreciable amounts of ACM (more than 100 square feet of surface area).

In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) regulations regarding lead-based paints and materials. The California Code of Regulations, Section 1532.1, requires testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based paints and materials, such that exposure levels do not exceed Cal/OSHA standards. Compliance with applicable standards would ensure impacts related to hazardous materials are less than significant.
Project construction would include the use of construction machinery that would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, oils, grease, and caulking. Additionally, hazardous materials would be needed for fueling and servicing construction equipment on the site. While these types of hazardous materials are not acutely hazardous, all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials are regulated by county, state, and federal regulations and compliance with applicable standards would ensure impacts related to hazardous materials are less than significant.

Operation of the project would include limited storage and use of hazardous materials for residential and commercial uses, which include cleaning and degreasing solvents, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and degreasers, paints, cooking oils, chlorinated products, paints, and other materials used for property maintenance. These products would be used and stored in limited quantities and normal use of these products would not result in the production of large amounts of hazardous waste. Compliance with the existing safety standards related to handling, use, and storage of hazardous materials, and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations would be required. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

c) The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.

The nearest existing schools to the project site are Washington Elementary School and Adams Middle School located approximately 0.35 mile southwest of the project site. In addition, based on a review of the Redondo Beach Unified School District website (http://www.rbusd.org/), new schools are not proposed within the district; however, funding for improvements to existing schools has been provided through the implementation of Measure C in February 2008 and Measure Q in November 2012. Thus, the project site is not within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) The proposed project would not be located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

The nearest public-use airports to the project site are the Hawthorne Municipal Airport approximately 3.5 miles north of the site, and the Los Angeles International Airport approximately 5 miles northwest of the site. The project site is outside of the Airport Influence Area for both airports (LACDRP 2003), that is, the area in which land uses are regulated to minimize hazards from potential aircraft crashes. Project development would not subject workers, clients, or visitors of the proposed project to substantial hazards related to aircraft operating to or from the Hawthorne Municipal Airport or Los Angeles International Airport, and impacts would be less than significant.

f) The proposed project would not be located within vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
The nearest private airstrip to the project site is the Goodyear Blimp Base Airport approximately 5 miles southeast of the project site. Project development would not cause substantial hazards in a flight path to workers, clients, or visitors of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

g) The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The proposed project would not stage or store construction materials or construction equipment on public roadways. Construction activities would not interfere with emergency response to the project site. Because the proposed ingress and egress would remain essentially unchanged, the proposed project would not interfere with emergency access to surrounding properties. The proposed project would be required to meet fire access requirements in Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Part 9). As such, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the City of Redondo Beach has an adopted emergency evacuation routes for a tsunami. The goal of the routes is to get to higher ground away from the ocean. The nearest adopted route is 190th Street which is located approximately 0.75 mile south of the project site. The implementation of the proposed project would not affect an adopted emergency evacuation route.

h) The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

The project site is not located within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention and is not located within a wildland area or an urban-wildland interface zone. Impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.1.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impact areas described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining hydrology and water quality significance thresholds in Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR.

g) The proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

The site is in Flood Zone X designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2008), indicating that the site is outside of 100-year and 500-year flood zones. Thus, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact would occur.

h) The proposed project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.

According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the project site is outside of 100-year flood zones (FEMA 2008), and the project would not place structures that would impede or
redirect flood flows from a 100-year flood. No impact would occur to the proposed project from a 100-year flood.

i) The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Based on a review of dams located within Los Angeles County (US Gazetteer 2015), the Walteria 10-million-gallon reservoir and the Palos Verdes Reservoir are the nearest dams to the project site; however, these dams are located more than 5 miles from the project site and are not located in the same watershed as the project site (Beach Cities Watershed Management Group 2014). Therefore, project development would not expose people or buildings to flood hazards from failure of a levee or dam, and no impact would occur.

j) The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The proposed project would not be impacted by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The following discussion provides a brief discussion on each issue area:

**Seiche.** A seiche is a surface wave created when an inland water body is shaken, usually by an earthquake. There are no inland water bodies close enough to the site to pose a flood hazard to the site due to a seiche. No impact would occur.

**Tsunami.** A tsunami is a series of ocean waves caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. The project site is 3 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and is at an elevation of 97 feet above mean sea level. The project site is not mapped within a Tsunami Inundation Area (CEMA 2009). No impact would occur.

**Mudflow.** A mudflow is a landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. The site and surrounding land are flat, and there is no slope near the site that could generate a mudflow. No impact would occur.

5.1.9 Land Use and Planning

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impact areas described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining land use and land use planning significance thresholds in Section 3.8, *Land Use and Land Use Planning*, of this Draft EIR.

a) The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.

The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Redondo Beach General Plan and has a land use and zoning designation of regional commercial (CR). The CR zone and land use designation intends to establish regional-serving commercial and ancillary uses, department stores, retail, eating, and entertainment. The CR designation also encourages the possibility of residential units on the second floor and higher, which would be integrated with commercial (City of Redondo Beach 2008). The proposed project is surrounded by primarily commercial/retail uses
along Kingsdale Drive, including a large department store to the west of the site, as well as a furniture store and other commercial/retail uses to the south.

The proposed project consists of modifications and additions to the existing 29.85-acre commercial-retail property, and redeveloping the site into a mixed use site, including up to 650 new residential units, a hotel of up to 150 rooms, and additional office and retail uses. The project would not present a new barrier to the surrounding existing uses, rather it would provide for an integrated residential and commercial space that would serve local residents, as well as regional customers, thus obtaining some of the policy objectives of the General Plan (City of Redondo Beach 2008). The proposed project would not physically divide an existing community.

c) The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The project site is not within the boundaries of any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (USFWS 2011b; CDFG 2011), and no impact would occur.

5.1.10 Mineral Resources

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have no impact with regard to mineral resources, and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

a) The proposed project would not 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.

The project site does not lie on an area with active or known mining operations. The city of Redondo Beach does not have any active mine operations, nor land designated for PCC-Grade aggregate, according to the California Geological Survey (CGS 2010). The project site lies within the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region and has not been categorized as a Mineral Resource Zone, and thus not subject to mineral land classification studies by the State Geologist. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a loss of availability of known mineral resources valuable to the region or the state, and no impact would occur.

b) The proposed project would not 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.

The General Plan has no designated mining sites within the city. As described in the Update of Mineral Land Classification for the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, issued by the California Geological Survey in 2010, there are no mining sites within the city (CGS 2010). No impact would occur.

5.1.11 Noise

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impacts described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining noise significance thresholds in Section 3.9, Noise, of this Draft EIR.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. The nearest public-use airports to the project site are the Hawthorne Municipal Airport approximately 3.5 miles north of the site, and the Los Angeles International Airport approximately 5 miles northwest of the site. The project site is not located in the Airport Influence Area for either airport (LACDRP 2003). Project development would not subject workers, clients, residents, or visitors of the project to public-use airport-related noise.

f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. The nearest private airstrip to the project site is the Goodyear Blimp Base Airport approximately 5 miles southeast of the project site. Project development would not subject workers, clients, residents, or visitors of the project to private airport-related noise.

5.1.12 Population and Housing

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impacts described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining population and housing significance thresholds in Section 3.10, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR.

b) The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The project site is currently developed with commercial/retail land uses and does not contain existing residential development. The proposed project, which includes the development of 650 residential units, would not displace any existing housing and would not result in the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

c) The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The project site is currently developed for commercial/retail uses and does not include any residential uses. The project would not displace substantial numbers of people and would not result in the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

5.1.13 Transportation and Traffic

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impacts described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining transportation and traffic significance thresholds in Section 3.13, Transportation and Traffic, of this Draft EIR.

c) The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks.
The nearest public-use airports to the project site are the Hawthorne Municipal Airport approximately 3.5 miles north of the site, and the Los Angeles International Airport approximately 5 miles northwest of the site. Given the residential and commercial nature of the proposed project, and its distance from the airport, construction and operation of the project would not result in a change to air traffic or alter air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

5.1.14 Utilities and Service Systems

As discussed in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the impacts described below and will not be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR evaluates the remaining utilities and service systems significance thresholds in Section 3.14, Utilities, of this Draft EIR.

g) The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, County, and City statutes and regulations pertaining to solid waste disposal. This includes compliance with AB 939, the California Solid Waste Management Act, which requires each city in the state to divert at least 50 percent of their solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. AB 341 builds upon AB 939 and requires jurisdictions to implement mandatory commercial recycling with a statewide 75 percent diversion rate (from landfill disposal) by 2020. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

5.2 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

An EIR must identify any significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed project (Public Resources Code, §21100(b)(2)(B)). As evaluated in Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR and summarized below, implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to traffic. The following is a summary of the significant and unavoidable traffic impact.

The proposed project would result in the following project and cumulative significant impacts which cannot be reduced to less than significant, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Intersection impacts at the following two intersections during both the AM and PM peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation:

- #16 – Hawthorne Boulevard & Artesia Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
- #17 – Prairie Avenue & Artesia Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
- #19 – I-405 Northbound Ramps & Artesia Boulevard (PM peak hour)

An additional summary of these impacts is included in the Executive Summary for this Draft EIR.
5.3 Growth Inducement

Section 15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR include a discussion of whether the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Projects that remove obstacles to population growth (for example, a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant may allow for more construction in its service area, or a new freeway may allow growth at freeway exits) and/or cause an influx of workers from outside the region are also considered growth inducing. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2 (d) also requires a discussion of the characteristics of projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Finally, the State CEQA Guidelines also state that it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment (Section 15126 (d)).

The proposed project would develop a mixed-use residential complex by combining expanded retail and dining venues with open-air promenades, hotel and residential development. Specifically, at maximum build-out, the proposed project would consist of 1,300,565 sf of total commercial uses. Additionally, the proposed project would include the development of 650 residential units (650,000 sf) on-site (apartment homes) within two separate development pads.

The residential units and the commercial development provided by the proposed project would be expected to result in direct population growth and employment growth. However this growth is within the regional growth projections. The City’s 2013–2021 General Plan Housing Element identifies the project site (including the approximately 16-acre Market Place/Living Spaces site to the south) as “the site with the greatest potential for future residential development.” As the project site has a zoning designation of CR, it can be converted into a mixed-use development. According to the General Plan, the project site could house approximately 812 dwelling units by 2035. Thus, with the development of 650 units at the site, the proposed project is developing less residential units than anticipated by the General Plan.

Because the proposed project would include the construction of both residential and commercial uses, some of the additional demand for commercial uses that would be generated by the proposed residential uses on the project site. While the proposed project would involve an increase in employment, given the proposed project’s location within a well-established urban community with a large population base an existing housing stock, a large existing labor pool in the local area and the region as a whole, and established infrastructure, it would not induce substantial unanticipated population growth/employment growth. Given the highly integrated nature of the Southern California economy and the prevalence of cross-county and intercommunity commuting by workers between their places of work and places of residence, it is unlikely that this increase in the number of workers would change their place of residence in response to the proposed project, consequently, there would not be an increased need for new housing associated with employment at the project site.

---

1 As of June 2016, the unemployment rate in Los Angeles County was 5.2 percent with a labor force of 5,041,800 (262,174 workers) in Los Angeles County (California Employment Development Department 2016).
While the existing on-site infrastructure would be improved and upgraded as part of the proposed project, such as new on-site wastewater lines to support the new residential and hotel developments, substantial off-site infrastructure improvements would not be required to serve/accommodate the proposed project. These improvements would not result in indirect growth inducement as they would be required to ensure adequate utility service for the proposed demand and would be constructed in an area already developed with urban uses.

While the project would induce population and employment growth on the project site, this growth is within the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation issued by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and would be used to fulfill existing local housing demand, and the implementation of the project would not result in a substantial inducement of unanticipated growth outside the project site.

## 5.4 Energy

### 5.4.1 Introduction

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) states that an EIR shall include “mitigation measures proposed to minimize significant effects on the environment, including, but not limited to, measures to reduce the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy.” Similarly, the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.4(a)(1)(C) states that “Energy conservation measures, as well as other appropriate mitigation measures, shall be discussed when relevant.”

Appendix F of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states that a project EIR should consider to the extent relevant and applicable the potentially significant energy implications of a project, including, “Energy consuming equipment and processes which will be used during construction, operation and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project” (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix F (II)(A)(1)).

The physical environmental impacts associated with the generation of electricity and burning of fuels for heating and transportation have been accounted for in Draft EIR Sections 3.2 *Air Quality*, 3.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and 3.14, *Utilities*. Additional regulatory efficiency requirements are discussed in the individual resource sections in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR. Discussion of not constructing the project and the size of the project is included in the alternatives analysis in Chapter 4.0, *Analysis of Alternatives*.

The project would receive its electricity from Southern California Edison SCE. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) are constantly assessing population growth, electricity demand, and reliability. As discussed on the CEC’s website, the CEC is tasked with conducting assessments and forecasts of all aspects of energy industry supply, production, transportation, delivery and distribution, demand and prices. The CEC uses these assessments and forecasts to develop energy policies, that conserve

---

resources, protect the environment, ensure energy reliability, enhance the state’s economy, and protect public health and safety (Public Resources Code Section 25301(a)).

Power Plants that provide electricity for SCE are required to go through individual environmental review processes, which may be through the California Energy Commission’s (CEC) certified regulatory program under CEQA, or may go through the California Public Utility Commission’s CEQA processes. As discussed by the CEC, from 1978 to 1998 before California’s electricity generation industry was restructured, the Energy Commission analyzed and approved 47 projects totaling 5,589 megawatts (MW). More recently, in the early 1990s the Energy Commission certified 14 power plants. Of the 14 plants, 10 were approved and eight were constructed totaling 995 MW. From 1998 through today, electric generation projects, totaling 34,692.90 MW, have been reviewed and licensed by the Energy Commission. 64 of these licensed facilities have been built and are on-line producing 22,055 MW. The Energy Commission is continuously tracking potential projects 50 MW and larger. Similarly, the CPUC conducts and manages environmental review of infrastructure projects, including electric, gas, water and telecommunications.

For the reasons set forth below, this EIR concludes that the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, would not cause the need for additional natural gas or energy-producing facilities, and, therefore, would not create a significant impact on energy resources.

5.4.2 Energy Requirements of the Project

On May 11, 2004, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) announced a comprehensive rule to reduce emissions from non-road diesel engines by integrating engine and fuel controls as a system to gain the greatest emission reductions. Engine manufacturers would produce engines with advanced emission-control technologies. Exhaust emissions from these engines will decrease by more than 90 percent in comparison to those at the time of the 2004 regulations. These construction equipment efficiency requirements are contained in 40 CFR Parts 1039, 1065, and 1068 (originally adopted in 69 Fed. Reg. 38958 [June 29, 2004], and were most recently updated in 2014 [79 Fed. Reg. 46356]). The new emission standards apply to diesel engines used in most construction, agricultural, industrial, and airport equipment. This rule sets emission standards for different sizes of nonroad engines. Additionally, idling for diesel trucks is limited to five minutes (13 Cal. Code Regs. § 2485).

Construction Activities

During project construction, approximately 558,341 gallons of diesel and 558,313 gallons of gasoline would be used. Worker, vendor, and haul trips have been estimated based on the construction schedule assumptions used in the preparation of the project air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analyses. Construction activities are estimated to consume approximately 30,000 kWh over the four year construction period. In 2012, over 2.6 billion gallons of diesel and 14.6 billion gallons of gasoline were consumed in California (BOE 2013a, 2013b). There are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction
equipment that would be less energy-efficient than at comparable construction sites in other parts of the State. Calculations for total construction fuel consumption are provided in Table 5-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Diesel (gallons)</th>
<th>Gas (gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>83,374</td>
<td>19,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving – On-site</td>
<td>6,621</td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage – On-site</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>2,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading – On-site</td>
<td>336,438</td>
<td>5,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building -On-site</td>
<td>97,721</td>
<td>515,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>33,952</td>
<td>11,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>558,341</td>
<td>558,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational Activities**

*Transportation Energy Demand*

Employees, vendors, and occupants of the proposed project would result in the generation of vehicle trips to and from the project site, resulting in the use of gasoline and diesel fuels over the life of the proposed project. Vehicle trips from the proposed project were estimated in the traffic study prepared for the proposed project (refer to Appendix L of this Draft EIR). The proposed project is estimated to generate a net increase of approximately 8,020 daily vehicular trips, 366 AM peak-hour, and 449 PM peak-hour net new trips (on top of the existing trip generation of the project site).

Calculations for annual mobile source fuel consumption are provided in Table 5-2, below. The table shows the existing, proposed, and net increase in gasoline and diesel demand based on the implementation of the proposed project. Mobile sources from the proposed project would result in a net increase of approximately 40,929 gallons of diesel and 898,568 gallons of gasoline per year for total annual consumption of 196,992 gallons of diesel and 4,324,842 gallons of gasoline. Calculation of fuel demand is included in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile Source Fuel Demand</th>
<th>Diesel (gallons)</th>
<th>Gas (gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>156,063.1</td>
<td>3,426,274.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed (2020)</td>
<td>192,706.29</td>
<td>4,230,753.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed (2035)</td>
<td>196,991.91</td>
<td>4,324,842.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase (2035)</td>
<td>40,928.81</td>
<td>898,568.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While residential vehicles trips would be new for the project site, it is reasonable to assume that these trips are already occurring within the region. As discussed by the State Legislative Analyst’s Office, California, and in particular Los Angeles County has built fewer housing units in comparison to existing demand, particularly in the coastal communities thereby requiring individuals to commute greater distances. By providing additional housing in areas with housing shortages and in proximity to transit and other retail/commercial/entertainment options, the City is able to reduce regional residential commuting and regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT). This is consistent with the statewide goals in Senate Bill 375 and the adopted Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. More specifically these Planning efforts have focused upon infill development, development in transit priority areas, and reducing per capita VMT with the goal of reducing fuel consumption and the associated greenhouse gas emissions.

**Building Energy Demand**

Southern California Edison (SCE) and SoCal Gas would provide service to the project site to meet project electrical needs. Electrical service in the project area is provided by SCE. SCE provides electricity to approximately 15 million people, 5,000 large businesses, and 280,000 small businesses throughout its 50,000-square-mile service area, which includes 180 cities across 15 counties in central coastal and southern California (SCE,2015). SCE produces and purchases its energy from a mix of conventional and renewable generating sources. Table 5-3 shows the electric power mix that was delivered to SCE’s retail customers in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Source</th>
<th>Percent (%) of Total Power Mix Delivered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Hydroelectric</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fossil Fuels</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Sources</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewables (24.3%):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass and Waste</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Hydroelectric</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5-3**

Electric Power Mix Delivered to SCE Retail Customers in 2015

The California Renewable Portfolio requirement was established in 2002 under SB 1078, and accelerated by SB 107 [2006] and SB 2 [2011], California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard obligates investor-owned utilities, energy service providers, and community choice aggregators to procure 33 percent of their electricity from renewable energy sources by 2020. The state legislature recently updated this requirement to 50% renewables by the year 2030. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission are jointly responsible for implementing the program. In 2013, Southern California Edison (SCE), electricity provider for Redondo Beach, produced 21.6 percent of its electricity from renewable sources (CPUC 2016). In 2015, SCE produced approximately 24.3 percent of its electricity from renewable sources (SCE 2016). Southern California Edison is on track to meeting these obligations, and currently has contracts to generate 41.4 percent of its electricity from renewable resources by the year 2020 (CPUC 2016).

Electricity and natural gas would be required to provide energy to the proposed project for indoor and outdoor lighting, building cooling and heating, building appliances, and water heating. As presented in Section 3.14. Utilities, the estimated annual electricity use associated with the existing on-site uses is 19,593,150 kilowatt hours (KWhr). Baseline energy consumption for the 1,008 residents currently living off-site is 2,937,320 kWh/year (Appendix G). The estimated annual natural gas use associated with existing on-site uses is 3,366,630 British thermal units (kBTU/year). Baseline energy consumption for the 1,008 residents currently living off-site is 8,890,930 kBTU/year (Appendix G).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increased electricity demand at the project site. According to the CalEEMod generation factors (Appendix G), annual electricity demand for the proposed project is estimated at 28,454,074 kWh/year. The demand factors reflect 2016 energy standards for the proposed project and 2001 energy standards for the existing conditions, and would increase the electricity demand at the project site by 5,923,604 kWh/year above baseline conditions. Given that the proposed buildings would not be constructed at the time of release of the Draft EIR, the project may be subject to more stringent requirements at the time permits are issued, therefore actual electricity demand may be further reduced.  

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increased natural gas demand on the project site. According to the CalEEMod generation factors (Appendix G), annual natural gas demand at the proposed project site is estimated at 31,192,960 kBTU/year, an increase of 18,935,400 kBTU/year over the existing conditions. The demand factors reflect 2016 energy standards and all of the proposed buildings would be subject to the CalGreen and State Energy Conservation Standards contained in Title 24 for the proposed project and 2001 Title 24 standards for the existing conditions. According to the Impact Analysis on California’s 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards report prepared by the California Energy Commission, the 2016 Title 24 standards would reduce natural gas use in non-residential newly construction buildings by 17 percent compared to 2008 standards (CEC 2013).

---

Natural gas services to the project area would be provided by SoCal Gas. SoCalGas has sufficient capacity to meet the demand of its customers (CPUC 2001). SoCalGas can receive and deliver 3,500 million cubic feet per day (MMcfd), which is 111 percent of its average 2000 demand with additional available capacity of about 230 MMcfd (CPUC 2001).

The proposed project would also promote building energy efficiency through compliance with energy efficiency standards and the building design features listed below and in Chapter 2, Project Description:

- Bicycle accommodations such as bicycle racks and a bicycle fix-it station (s) if space permits.
- Electric vehicle charging stations equivalent to three percent of parking capacity or preferred LEV parking for five period of parking capacity.
- No wood stoves or fireplaces based on SCAQMD requirements.
- Consistent with 2016 Title 24 energy efficiencies as the project will be built after 2017 and the 2016 efficiencies will go into effect January 1, 2017.
- Consistent with 2016 Title 24 water reductions (35 percent reduction in indoor water usage and 25 percent reduction in outdoor water usage for residential. A 20 percent reduction in indoor for non-residential uses).
- Solid waste reduction rate of 64.39 percent based on the current California reduction.

The proposed project would not result in the inefficient, unnecessary, or wasteful consumption of energy.

**Water and Wastewater**

Electricity would indirectly be required to supply, treat, and convey water to the project site and treat wastewater generated at the project site. The estimated daily water demand for the proposed project, as determined by the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared for the proposed project by Todd Groundwater is 530 acre-feet/year (AFY). Factoring in the existing water use at the project site (221 AFY), the net increase in average daily water use under the proposed project would be approximately 309 AFY.

Wastewater discharges were estimated within the Torrance Municipal Water (TMW) service area that customers generate wastewater based on 80 percent of potable water demand (City of Torrance, 2011). The proposed project is estimated to generate a new water use increase of 309 AFY. Thus, it is anticipated the proposed project would generate approximately 248 AFY of wastewater. Table 5-4 below shows an increase of 154,791 kilowatts per year (kWh/yr) in indirect electricity demand that is expected to occur from wastewater generation.

Electricity demand for water-related energy is estimated using the energy intensity provided in the 2006 report prepared for the CEC, *Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in*
California (CEC, 2006). As show in Table 5-4, and increase of 1,133,220 kWh/year in indirect electricity demand is expected to occur for water supply. Combined, indirect electricity demand for water and wastewater treatment and conveyance would require approximately 1,288,011 kWh/year of electricity.

**Table 5-4**  
**INDIRECT DEMAND ASSOCIATED WITH THE WATER CYCLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Estimated Project Demand/Generation Increase over Existing Conditions (mgy)</th>
<th>Supply (kWh/mg)</th>
<th>Treatment (kWh/mg)</th>
<th>Distribution (kWh/mg)</th>
<th>Total (kWh/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,133,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Electricity Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,288,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.4.3 Energy Conservation

**Energy Efficiency**

The California Energy Code is codified in Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 6 and was adopted by the City of Redondo Beach (RBMC Section 9-1.00). Part 6 provides energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential development with the express goal of “reducing of wasteful, uneconomic, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy” (Public Resources Code Section 25402). The California Building Standards Commission reviews and updates the Code every 3 years (Health & Safety Code Section 18949.6).

The CEC forecasts that consumption will reach approximately 114, 503 million kWh in the year 2024 (CEC, 2014). The proposed project is estimated to require approximately 18 million kWh of electricity per year. In response to a request for service, SCE provided a letter stating that SCE would serve the above subject property’s electrical requirements per the California Public Utilities Commission and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission tariffs (SCE 2016). As the state’s primary energy policy and planning agency, the CEC conducts assessments and forecasts of all aspects of energy industry supply, production, transportation, delivery and distribution, demand and prices. The CEC uses these assessments and forecasts to develop energy policies, that conserve resources, protect the environment, ensure reliability, enhance the state’s economy, and protect public health and safety.

**Renewable Energy Sources**

Energy Policy Act of 2005 seeks to reduce reliance on non-renewable energy resources and provide incentives to reduce current demand on these resources. For example, under the Act, consumers and businesses can attain federal tax credits for purchasing fuel-efficient appliances and products, buying hybrid vehicles, building energy efficient buildings, and improving the energy efficiency of residential and commercial buildings. Additionally, tax credits are available
for the installation of qualified fuel cells, stationary microturbine power plants, and solar power equipment.

The California Renewable Portfolio requirement was established in 2002 under SB 1078, and accelerated by SB 107 [2006] and SB 2 [2011]. California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard obligates investor-owned utilities, energy service providers, and community choice aggregators to procure 33 percent of their electricity from renewable energy sources by 2020. The state legislature recently updated this requirement to 50% renewables by the year 2030. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission are jointly responsible for implementing the program. In 2013, Southern California Edison (SCE), electricity provider for Redondo Beach, produced 21.6 percent of its electricity from renewable sources (CPUC, 2016). In 2015, SCE produced approximately 24.3 percent of its electricity from renewable sources (SCE, 2016). Southern California Edison is on track to meeting these obligations, and currently has contracts to generate 41.4 percent of its electricity from renewable resources by the year 2020 (CPUC, 2016).

Additionally, Draft EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, includes Mitigation Measure GHG-1, which provides for renewable energy generation, installation of parking garage motion detectors, TDM measures, and water efficient fixtures.

**Transportation Fuel Efficiency**

The Federal Government sets fuel efficiency standards for construction equipment. Tier 4 efficiency requirements are contained in 40 CFR Parts 1039, 1065, and 1068 (originally adopted in 69 Fed. Reg. 38958 [June 29, 2004], and were most recently updated in 2014 [79 Fed. Reg. 46356]). Similarly, the Federal Government sets national fuel efficiency standards for light duty vehicles, pursuant to the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, which were recently updated in 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 25324 et seq. (May, 7, 2010); see also Health & Safety Code, Sections 39002, 43000 et seq). Similarly, federal fuel efficiency standards are anticipated to continue to increase between now and 2020 and beyond. Additionally, drivers are beginning to convert to electric or alternative fuel vehicles.

It is however legally infeasible for individual municipalities to adopt more stringent fuel efficiency standards. The Clean Air Act (42 US C Section 7543(a) states that “No state or any political subdivision therefore shall adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines subject to this part.”

The City of Redondo Beach is also a member of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which is charged with preparing a Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) pursuant to SB 375 (2008). SB 375 required the preparation of a SCS, as part of its regional transportation plan, designed to achieve certain goals for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks in a region.

**Water Efficiency**

The California Plumbing Code is codified in Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 5 and has been adopted by the City (Redondo Beach Municipal Code Section 9-5.01). Part 5, Chapter 4
contains provisions requiring the installation of low flow fixtures and toilets. Existing development would also be required to reduce its wastewater generation and water use by retrofitting existing structures with water efficient fixtures (Senate Bill 407 [2009], Civil Code Section 1101.1 et seq.). Additionally, Part 5 Section 5.303.2 & 5.303.4 provide for a minimum of 20 percent reduction in water demand and wastewater discharges. This would result in a concurrent reduction in energy demand to supply, treat, and convey water and wastewater. Water demand calculations included to assume a 20 percent reduction to account for efficiency and conservation required.

The potable water supply for the proposed project would be delivered by the Torrance Municipal Water (TMW) district. The TMW uses groundwater, imported surface water, and recycled supplies. According to the TMW 2051 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), water demand in the TMW service area is anticipated to increase from 23,672 AFY in 2015 to 27,063 in 2040 AFY in 2040. The water supply available was 29,007 AFY in 2015 and is projected to be 31,607 AFY in 2040.

The WSA prepared for the proposed project, TMW determined that for the next 20 years (2015-2035), TMW would have adequate water supplies to meet projected demands associated with the proposed project and those of all existing customers and other anticipated future customers and additional supply will not be required (Appendix J). Additionally, Mitigation Measure GHG-1 in Section 3.5 includes installation of water efficient fixtures.

**Solid Waste**

As discussed in Section 3.14, Utilities, the City has enacted a number of programs to meet and exceed the mandated waste diversion and recycling requirements in compliance with AB 939, including curbside recycling, multi-family centralized recycling and commercial recycling as well as school recycling programs, backyard and worm composting. The operation of the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 2,200 tons of solid waste per year based on CalEEMod solid water generation factors prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix G). It is important to note the generation factor accounts for the project meeting the statewide recycling/reduction achievements of 65% for non-residential and 63% for residential land uses. These do not take into account other waste diversion programs, including the City’s 70 percent diversion rate. Solid waste would be taken to various landfills throughout Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, which have a collective remaining capacity of 477,819,076 cubic yards.

**Summary**

As described above, the proposed project would be infill/redevelopment located in a transit priority area that has existing energy, water, and transportation infrastructure available to serve the proposed project. It would comply with regulations that address energy and water conservation. Energy demand for the proposed project would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.
5.5 Urban Decay

Urban decay is generally defined as substantial physical deterioration, due to store closures and long-term vacancies in existing shopping centers, that impairs the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community. Physical deterioration includes, but is not limited to, abandoned buildings and commercial sites in disrepair, boarded doors and windows, long-term unauthorized use of properties and parking lots, extensive graffiti on structures, dumping of refuse, or overturned dumpsters on properties, dead trees and landscaping, extensive litter, uncontrolled plant overgrowth, and homeless encampments. CEQA does not trigger an automatic presumption that urban decay would occur as a result of other business closures. However, store closures can lead to conditions of urban decay.

The proposed project is projecting to maintain existing commercial retail uses at the site, and expand upon the existing uses by providing a walkable mixed-use community that contains not only the commercial retail uses, but on-site residential uses, public open space and hotel uses. The new development under the proposed project would rehabilitate or replace existing structures. The project site currently includes 971,101 square feet (sf) of commercial retail and entertainment land uses. There are 563,474 sf of existing department stores, 343,617 sf of retail stores including mall stores, and a 64,010 sf theater. When the NOP was issued, the Nordstrom department store was occupied and had a total of 258 employees, however, this space was vacated after the NOP was published.

At maximum build-out, the proposed project would consist of 1,300,565 sf of total commercial uses. The commercial uses would consist of department stores, shops, dining, independent retail stores, hotel, and the existing enclosed mall and theater uses. The nearest regional project mall is the Del Amo Fashion Center located approximately 2 miles south of the project site. The project would meet the General Plan’s Objectives and Policies of serving as a regional commercial mixed-use transit oriented development, and the project is not expected to be in direct competition with nearby retail centers, and would not detract away from existing development such that urban decay would occur.
5.6 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

The proposed project would require the consumption of non-renewable resources during the temporary construction phase of the proposed project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. Project development would include the following commitment of resources: building materials, fuel and operational materials/resources, and transportation of goods and people to the project site. Several non-renewable resources, or renewable resources may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable, would be required during project construction, such as certain types of lumber and other forest supplies; aggregate materials contained in concrete and asphalt including sand, gravel and stone; metals such as steel, cooper, and lead; petrochemical construction materials such as plastics; and water. Additionally, non-renewable fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment, as well as the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site.

Project operation would increase the amount of nonrenewable resources that are currently consumed within the city. These resources would include energy resources and natural gas, petroleum-based fuels required for vehicle-trips, fossil fuels and water. Fossil fuels would be considered the primary energy source associated with both construction and ongoing operation of the proposed project, and the existing, finite supplies of these natural resources would be incrementally reduced.

The proposed project would contribute to a land use pattern that would reduce reliance on private automobiles and the consumption of nonrenewable resources when considered in a larger context. The project would provide 650 residential units adjacent to regional commercial uses and is located adjacent to a bus turnout and 0.25 mile from a proposed Green Line Station. Given its location, the project site would support pedestrian access to a considerable range of employment, retail, and entertainment activities. The proposed project is located within a developed area that provides existing public transit and non-motorized infrastructure (e.g., established bus routes and pedestrian access) in and around the project site. The proposed project would be located in proximity to a number of public transit opportunities, including Metro Local and Rapid bus lines, Torrance Transit Rapid bus lines, and the proposed South Bay Regional Transit Center. These factors would contribute to a land use pattern that is considered to reduce the consumption of non-renewable resources.

The project applicant would also provide effective alternate transportation opportunities for its occupants and customers. The proposed project would include bicycle accommodations such as bicycle racks and a bicycle fix-it station(s) if space permits. Preferred spaces are those located nearest to the building entry, exclusive of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking. Transportation boards are made available to residents. The proposed project would also include HVAC features that improve indoor environmental quality.

Continued use of non-renewable resources during construction and operation on a relatively small scale would be consistent with regional and local growth forecasts in the area, as well as state and local goals for reductions in the consumption of such resources. Also, the proposed project would not affect access to existing resources, nor interfere with the production or delivery of such
resources. The project site contains no energy resources that would be precluded from future use through project implementation.

By providing additional housing in areas with housing shortages and in proximity to transit and other retail/commercial/entertainment options, the City is able to reduce regional residential commuting and regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT). This is consistent with the statewide goals in Senate Bill 375 and the adopted Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. More specifically these Planning efforts have focused upon infill development, development in transit priority areas, and reducing per capita VMT with the goal of reducing fuel consumption and the associated greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently consumption of non-renewable resources is justified if the project is approved.
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