The South Bay Galleria Improvement Project Final EIR noted that “The Final EIR becomes final upon certification by the City’s decision-making body, consequently, additional modifications to the Final EIR may be provided up until the time of certification.” (Final EIR, Section 1.1.) This Errata incorporates a Response to a Comment which was received after the close of the Draft EIR comment period into Chapter 2 of the Final EIR. This Errata also incorporates additional revisions to the Final EIR, Chapter 3, “Modifications to the Draft EIR,” Section 3.2.11. The City finds that the Final EIR Errata merely clarify and amplify the analysis presented in the document and do not trigger the need to recirculate per CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(b). Deletions are shown with strikethrough and additions are shown with underline. Where existing text has been omitted and is not shown in strikethrough, this omitted text shall be considered retained in its current state (such omitted text may be shown as “…”).

2.3.6 Public Comment – Late Submittal

The comment below was received after the close of the South Bay Galleria DEIR comment period, which ended on September 11, 2017, and therefore no response is legally required.

Responses have been provided in regards to substantive portions of the comment letter that address an environmental issue with the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Code</th>
<th>Date (date of issuance of receipt)</th>
<th>Individual/Organization</th>
<th>Responses in addition to FEIR Chapter 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC050</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td>Mary and Paul Miller</td>
<td>Late Submittal RTC Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment PC050-1

Thank you for accepting input on the Galleria Mall project.

We reviewed the various plans and elevations for each of the proposed project site developments and alternative layouts and we have some general and specific comments regarding the development drawings and proposals.

---

1 As part of the Project’s entitlement process, additional revisions have been made to the Conditions of Approval (COA) discussed in the EIR, which have not been shown in this Errata. The COAs adopted by the City in the approving resolution shall control and take precedence over any COA language in the EIR.
We live on Little Hawthorne and 176th St. so we are located directly East of the mall. I have grown up in this same house and seen Hawthorne and the mall develop for the last 40 years.

**General Comments:**

In general, we are excited to see development happening to the mall. As malls are currently changing due to the changing habits of shoppers, we do not want to see the Galleria continue to lose retail stores to Del Amo and deteriorate to a second-rate mall (or close like the Hawthorne Mall).

We attended community outreach meetings hosted by the developer for immediate neighbors multiple times so we are very vested in the planning and success of this mall property.

We are strong proponents of mixed use developments so we are happy to see the residential, retail, and hotel components on this property. And we are excited to have the Green Line extend to this site in order to connect public transportation to this area. Hopefully the buses and Green Line trains will encourage people to live in this area and travel more with public transportation. The housing components provide much-needed housing in Southern California. And specific to this property, the residents and hotel guests are built-in clientele for the restaurants and stores at the mall, which will help to ensure healthy, thriving businesses.

Currently the property has far too much surface parking and too many fully enclosed, large box retail buildings that do not connect with the context of the city surrounding the buildings. From an urban design point of view, the current mall is a wasteland of asphalt with a center island of blank exterior walled buildings cut off from the city. There is almost no accessible crosswalks, curb cuts, or sidewalks that surround and connect the public sidewalks with the mall property. Sidewalks terminate with no curb cuts and no crosswalks so it is very difficult for people in wheel chairs, parents with strollers, or pedestrians to safely move through the property. There are also no bike paths and very little landscaping to shade the dark asphalt and soften the look and experience of the property.

So seeing the development drawings brings us hope that there will be improvements to the neighborhood. But as a general comment, the elevation drawings are very inconsistent in detail, content, and development. The residential buildings, hotel building, and some retail spaces seem to have some design development but other retail buildings (including existing structures) are devoid of glazing and detail so they appear to be larger warehouse bunkers. Hopefully areas like the existing parking garage and Kohls get some kind of face lift to make the buildings look like they are part of the project improvements. The landscaping in the elevations is also sporadic, meager, and non-existent in areas of the elevations.

As Redondo Beach, Torrance, Hawthorne, and the mall have grown and developed, traffic has increased, buildings have become larger, and the area is no longer appropriate for single family residences along Kingsdale and Hawthorne. On the west side, single family residences are no longer appropriate to be directly across the street from an 8 story parking garage or an 8 story residential building. And on the east side, single family residences in a small pocket from 177th street to Sizzlers face 11 lanes of traffic and pollution from Hawthorne and an uninviting parking lot with black facade buildings. The prevailing winds blow east with pollution and garbage from the mall and Hawthorne with little to no landscaping, walls, or buffers to reduce noise, pollution, and vehicular or mall light pollution.
So hopefully Redondo Beach, Torrance, and Cal Trans can work together with the developer to look not just at the micro-level of the immediate property, but the macro-level of surrounding area. We hope everyone can review the zoning, landscaping, and other ways to transition this site more cohesively to the surrounding neighborhoods. There needs to be better ways to mitigate the noise, pollution, and traffic and help to make the adjacent properties more appropriate to this current scale of development and use. There definitely should be more trees, landscaping, and possibly low walls to higher walls to provide buffers to neighboring residences and reduce pollution (from vehicle lights, noise, and exhaust) in the area. The landscaping on the property, along the public right-of-ways, in the center medians, and along the opposite side public right-of-ways should be improved as part of, or in conjunction with this development. One potential solution for the west side of the property would be to rezone the Kingsdale single family properties from R1 to a more appropriate multifamily zoning designation that would encourage multifamily housing. Multifamily properties would have more appropriate building scale and the driveways could lead to subterranean parking that allows turnaround space on the property so residents can come out onto Kingsdale driving forward instead of reverse. Currently the single family residences have short driveways that force the residents to back out into oncoming traffic from the buses and mall traffic. Along Hawthorne, and specifically Little Hawthorne, a vine-covered wall with layers of additional trees and bushes on the medians and sidewalks, would be great to buffer the mall and street traffic from the east side single family residences.

**Response to Comment PC050-1**

Thank you for your comment. The commenter generally provides statements of opinion regarding the existing setting of the project and suggested design features for the project.

The commenter also asserts “the elevation drawings are very inconsistent in detail, content, and development. The residential buildings, hotel building, and some retail spaces seem to have some design development but other retail buildings (including existing structures) are devoid of glazing and detail so they appear to be larger warehouse bunkers…” The commenter’s opinions are noted, however the level of detail requested is not required by CEQA. As discussed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 “[i]the description of the project…should not supply extensive detail beyond that needed for evaluation and review of the environmental impact.” (See also *Dry Creek Citizens Coalition v. County of Tulare* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 20 [“Appellants have not established that the general description of the diversion structures in the EIR coupled with approval of final designs after the project is approved violated any CEQA mandate.”].) Furthermore, Draft EIR Figures 2-8 through 2-11 provided detailed elevations of the proposed project. Similarly, Draft EIR Figure 4-15 through 4-18 provided detailed elevations of Alternative 4/4-1.

The commenter further states “As Redondo Beach, Torrance, Hawthorne, and the mall have grown and developed, traffic has increased, buildings have become larger, and the area is no longer appropriate for single family residences along Kingsdale and Hawthorne. On the west side, single family residences are no longer appropriate to be directly across the street from an 8 story parking garage or an 8 story residential building… And on the east side, single family residences in a small pocket from 177th street to Sizzlers face 11 lanes of traffic and pollution from Hawthorne and an uninviting parking lot with black facade buildings.”
The commenter’s opinions are noted, however the EIR did not identify any significant intersection impacts or air quality impacts to homes on the west side of the project site. While the commenter equates increased vehicles to increased air pollution, this is an incorrect assumption. As discussed in Draft EIR page 3.1-11:

Air quality within the Basin has generally improved since the inception of air pollutant monitoring in 1976. This improvement is mainly due to lower-polluting on-road motor vehicles, more stringent regulation of industrial sources, and the implementation of emission reduction strategies by the SCAQMD. This trend toward cleaner air has occurred in spite of continued population growth. As discussed in the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB as a whole:

Despite this growth, air quality has improved significantly over the years, primarily due to the impacts of the region’s air quality control program … PM10 levels have declined almost 50% since 1990, and PM2.5 levels have also declined 50% since measurements began in 1999… the only air monitoring station that is currently exceeding or projected to exceed the 24-hour PM2.5 standard from 2011 forward is the Mira Loma station in Western Riverside County. Similar improvements are observed with ozone, although the rate of ozone decline has slowed in recent years… Since the end of World War II, the Basin has experienced faster population growth than the rest of the nation. The annual average percent growth has slowed but the overall population of the region is expected to continue to increase through 2023 and beyond… Despite this population growth, air quality has improved significantly over the years, primarily due to the impacts of air quality control programs at the local, state and federal levels…PM2.5 levels in the Basin have improved significantly in recent years. By 2013 and again in 2014 and 2015, there were no stations measuring PM2.5 in the Basin violating the former 1997 annual PM2.5 NAAQS (15.0 μg/m3) for the 3-year design value period with the filter-based federal reference method (FRM).5 On July 25, 2016 U.S. EPA finalized a determination that the Basin attained the 1997 annual (15.0 μg/m3) and 24-hour PM2.5 (65 μg/m3) NAAQS, effective August 24, 2016.

Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.13, and Final EIR, Chapter 3 Modifications, for additional details regarding the project’s vehicular intersection analysis. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.0.3 for discussion of aesthetics (i.e. “mall light pollution.”). Please see Draft EIR Section 3.9 for discussion of noise. The City further finds that the commenter’s suggestion to “rezone the Kingsdale single family properties from R1 to a more appropriate multifamily zoning designation” would not reduce or avoid a significant environmental impact. Nevertheless, the commenter’s suggestion will be forwarded to the decision makers.
Comment PC050-2
Main Proposal:

Pros

This site plan appears to have the least amount of surface parking, which is promising, and begins to surround the buildings with more landscaping. The underground parking reduces vehicular light pollution, noise pollution (from car alarms, cars honking, and general car noises) and the heat island effect. The Open Air Retail space is the central heart of the project and is the best part of the development. This central space has great potential if it develops into something similar to some of the perspective renderings. Also the developer said they will try to surround the open air retail center core with non-chain, higher quality restaurants similar to The Point in El Segundo. This would be a fantastic improvement. The residential building to the west is extremely tall, which will dwarf the single family residences across the street.

Response to Comment PC050-2

Thank you for your comment. The commenter provides statements of opinion regarding Alternative 1 of the project and preferred design features for the project. While the comment does not directly address an environmental issue with the project the comment is acknowledged and will be presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

With regards to building heights, please refer to Draft EIR Section 2.0, Project Description, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, for additional information on project features. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.0.3, which explains that Aesthetics are not considered environmental impacts for this project by statute. Nevertheless, the commenter's suggestions have been included in the Final EIR for consideration by the decision-makers.

Comment PC050-3
Main Proposal:

Cons

The elevations of the retail buildings facing Hawthorne to the east and Artesia to the north are still extremely blank and devoid of glazing and storefront windows. There is no sense of scale on the ground floor of almost any of the buildings and very little development to show any connection still to the surrounding city. There are just a few sporadic Palm trees and almost no trees shown in the elevations in some areas. The stark windowless buildings look similar to prisons. The west side residential building is a 8 story block. Although it has some central courtyards and setbacks in plan to give some relief to the continuous 8 story building, it still dwarfs the single story, single family residences across the street on Kingsdale. It's too bad the residential building couldn't have varying heights in the towers and spread units throughout more of the site including incorporating residential units and outdoor roof terraces over the existing Kohls to incorporate the existing structure into some of the residential components.
Also the plans still don't show any bikeable paths coming from the Hawthorne Blvd side, especially not from 177th/Hawthorne Blvd corners into the mall. It seems there are slivers of paths, but not really a designated bike route from the public entry of 177th/Hawthorne Blvd.

**Response to Comment PC050-3**

Thank you for your comment. The commenter provides statements of opinion regarding the proposed project and both preferred and undesired design features, including landscaping for the project. While the comment does not directly address an environmental issue with the project the comment is acknowledged and will be presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

With regards to building heights, please refer to Draft EIR Section 2.0, Project Description, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, for additional information on project features. For information related to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, please refer to Draft EIR Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation, in 3.13.2 Environmental Setting. The commenter asserts that the “west side residential building is a 8 story block.” Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.0.3, which explains that Aesthetics are not considered environmental impacts for this project by statute. As also discussed in detail on Draft EIR page 3.8-15, the proposed project is providing a 30-foot setback along Kingsdale Avenue. Additionally, the project is providing massing relief along Kingsdale Avenue through the articulation of the structure within 50 feet of Kingsdale Avenue. In lieu of a flat façade, the building will have a modulated west elevation providing both massing relief and architectural interest at all levels. As can be seen in Draft EIR, Chapter 2.0, Project Description, Figure 2-7, the only new structure located along Kingsdale would be the Residential Building located on the southwest corner of the project site. This new structure is shaped like a horseshoe with the open end facing Kingsdale providing height and massing consistent with Policy 1.41.7. Nevertheless, the commenter’s suggestions have been included in the Final EIR for consideration by the decision-makers.

**Comment PC050-4**

Alternative 2 - eliminates some retail areas and leaves more existing surface asphalt parking. This is disappointing to leave those areas open as surface parking (especially at the northwest corner) however it still has a lot of improvements compared to the current mall and the other Alternative proposals.

**Response to Comment PC050-4**

Thank you for your comment. The commenter provides statements of opinion regarding Alternative 2 of the project and specific design features for parking. While the comment does not directly address an environmental issue with the project the comment is acknowledged and will be presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

With regards to parking, please refer to Draft EIR Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.0.3, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, for additional information on project features related to parking. For information related to parking facilities, please refer to Draft EIR Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation. Nevertheless, the commenter’s suggestions have been included in the Final EIR for consideration by the decision-makers.
Comment PC050-5

Alternative 3 - This might be the worst proposal especially in plan. This places the hotel in a sea of surface parking similar to a motel or cheap roadside hotel. It does not engage the hotel within the central retail courtyard nor does it incorporate the building into the landscaped park area like the first two proposals. The east side also erects an above ground parking structure along Hawthorne which further separates the retail areas from engaging with the surrounding city. This proposal seems like a bandaid, half-hearted, bare bones development of the existing building infrastructure with virtually no cohesion of the various components. This proposal surprisingly appears to have the most amount of glazing and landscaping trees compared to the stark elevations and lack of trees in the other proposals’ elevations.

Response to Comment PC050-5

Thank you for your comment. The commenter provides statements of opinion regarding Alternative 3 of the project and specific design features for parking and a hotel. While the comment does not directly address an environmental issue with the project the comment is acknowledged and will be presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

With regards to parking or hotel use, please refer to Draft EIR Section 2.0, Project Description, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, for additional information on project features related to parking and hotel uses. For information related to parking facilities, please refer to Draft EIR Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.0.3, which explains that Aesthetics are not considered environmental impacts for this project by statute. Nevertheless, the commenter’s suggestions have been included in the Final EIR for consideration by the decision-makers.

Comment PC050-6

Alternative 4 - Strangely enough, this proposal seems the favorite of the developers and/or architects. It seems the most developed especially in elevations. There are more trees of various sizes, colors, and species, the buildings integrate retail on the bottom floors of lower residential buildings, the buildings seem more developed and do not look as much like place holders (except for the “Cement Plaster prison box on the east/north/northeast corner). The northeast corner with the most prominent, visible location on the site, has the shortest building, the least amount of glass, and is all one continuous, dull building with no articulation, glazing, or sense of human scale. Also continuing the above ground parking garage structures on the west side along Kingsdale seems like it just turns it’s rear end at this street and the residences across from the garages. It does seem to provide a multiple layer tree buffer though between the existing/new parking garages and the residents. Large linear planters should also be introduced along the west edge of the garages (existing and new) to cascade planting down the elevation of the parking garage to soften up the elevation in addition to the trees.

Response to Comment PC050-6

Thank you for your comment. The commenter provides statements of opinion regarding Alternative 4 of the project and specific design features for aesthetics, landscaping, building heights, and parking. While the comment does not directly address an environmental issue with the project the comment is acknowledged and will be presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.
With regards to design features such as landscaping and building heights, please refer to Draft EIR Section 2.0, Project Description, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, for additional information on project features specific to this alternative. For information related to parking facilities, please refer to Draft EIR Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.0.3, which explains that Aesthetics are not considered environmental impacts for this project by statute. Additionally, as shown in Draft EIR Figures 4-13 and 4-14, Alternative 4 does include a landscaped buffer space on the western side of the project site. Nevertheless, the commenter’s suggestions have been included in the Final EIR for consideration by the decision-makers.

3.2.9 Section 3.11 Public Services

Section 3.11.4, Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Impacts and Mitigation, Page 3.11-10

The following change was made to the Condition of Approval:

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required. While impacts are considered less than significant, the City is proposing Condition of Approval PS-1.

**Condition of Approval:** The applicant shall fund and implement a Fire, Life-Safety, Crime Prevention, and Security Plan, which may include fair-share staffing funding for supplemental staffing to achieve an enhanced level of service established by the parties based on data from comparable regional shopping centers. The plan will provide for the supplemental staffing levels to be reviewed and adjusted annually within a pre-negotiated range based on calls for service and incident data from the previous year. The Draft Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Redondo Beach Police and Fire Departments RBPD Chief and RBFD Chief prior to the issuance of Building Permits, and a Final Plan final plan shall be approved, funded, and implemented prior to the issuance of Building Permits, and a final plan shall be approved and implemented prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. Inspections by the appropriate Staff members shall be made to ensure compliance with the approved plan prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and the plan shall be implemented throughout operation of the project. The Final Plan final plan may be phased as required and shall incorporate the following:

(a) Provide Security Plans and design specifications that show the location of visual camera systems for key areas to which access is granted to the public.

(b) Provide specifications and/or security plans that provide the police with visual access to the interior of all commercial tenant spaces.

(c) Provide details on emergency access to the property by police and fire responders in the event of an emergency including a numerical address system and an “on-site” map.

(d) Provide a garage lighting plan along with design specifications that include lighting of the garage stair wells, ramps and all access roads. The plan shall ensure that the lighting does not encroach on the adjacent residential properties to the east.

(e) Provide a painting scheme for the garage areas that employs the use of light and highly reflective color to enhance visibility and improve lighting effectiveness.

(f) Provide plans for the installation of a “repeater” system, if necessary, allowing the use of personal cell phones on all levels of the parking garage.
(g) The applicant/property owner shall ensure that the visual security equipment be monitored as necessary during business hours and that regular daily patrols of the subject property be made by security personnel. License plate readers shall be installed.

Section 4.6.4 Alternative 4: Reduced Density, Alternative Residential Location, Air Quality, Violation of Air Quality Standards – Operational Page 4-146 and 4-147

Operational emissions associated with Alternative 4 were modeled using CalEEMod. Model defaults and adjusted to reflect data specific to Alternative 4, where available, including the size and type of the proposed land use and project specific trip rates. Detailed modeling assumptions are included in Appendix D. Modeled operations emissions are presented in Table 4-32, and include two conservatively assumed fire pits in the outdoor recreation area for residences which were assumed to run for 6 hours per day consistent with the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, operational emissions are less than significant and no mitigation is required. Alternative 4 would result in a less than significant impact, similar to the proposed project, and would ultimately result in fewer local and regional daily operational emissions than the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-32</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Unmitigated Operational Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emissions Source</td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>76.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Emissions</td>
<td>102.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>38.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>50.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Pits</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Emissions</td>
<td>90.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Project Emissions</td>
<td>(12.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Project Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>(26.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Pits</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Project Emissions</td>
<td>(12.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Significance Threshold</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-35

**ALTERNATIVE 4 LOCALIZED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Phases</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Pits</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localized Significance Threshold</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>61.95</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** ESA CalEEMod Modeling, 2017 (based on Appendix D of this Draft EIR).

**Section 4.6.4 Alternative 4: Reduced Density, Alternative Residential Location, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Page 4-157 and 4-158**

The total net operational emissions for 2023, including amortized construction, would result in net emissions increase of approximately 4,596-4,600 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e per year (compared to 10,614 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e for the proposed project). Alternative 4 would have a net increase of 996 employees and 465 new residents resulting in a service population of 1,461 (compared to 925 and 1,008 for the proposed project, respectively for new employees and residents, resulting in a service population of 1,933). Therefore, the per service population emissions for 2023 would equal 3.2 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e annually (compared to the 5.5 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e annual emissions of the proposed project). This would not exceed the project level efficiency.

---

\[2\] All of the revisions in this subsection account for the minor addition of GHG emissions associated with the fire pits discussed in Final EIR, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.6.
threshold of 4.4 MT CO\textsubscript{2}e per service population. Additionally, Alternative 4 does not exceed the interim 2023 efficiency threshold of 4.0 MT CO\textsubscript{2}e per service population.

The total net operational emissions for 2035, including amortized construction, would result in net emissions increase of approximately 4,737 4,741 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e per year (compared to 10,600 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e for the proposed project). For 2035 the per service population emissions would equal 3.2 3.3 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e annually (compared to the 5.5 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e per service population for the proposed project), which exceeds the 2035 threshold of 2.5 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e annually. Using the 2035 efficiency threshold, the net increase in GHG emissions resulting from implementation of Alternative 4 is considered to be significant without the implementation of mitigation.

Section 4.6.4 Alternative 4: Reduced Density, Alternative Residential Location, Page 4-176\textsuperscript{3}

Traffic generated by the proposed project would result in a significant traffic impact at the following five six locations during one or both of the analyzed peak hours for Existing plus Project and Cumulative plus Project conditions:

- #13 – Inglewood Avenue & Artesia Boulevard (both peak hours)
- #15 – Redondo Beach Boulevard & Artesia Boulevard (PM peak hour)
- #16 – Hawthorne Boulevard & Artesia Boulevard (both peak hours)
- #17 – Prairie Avenue & Artesia Boulevard (both peak hours)
- #18 – I-405 Southbound Ramps & Artesia Boulevard (PM peak hour)
- #19 – I-405 Northbound Ramps & Artesia Boulevard (PM peak hour)

Alternative 4 would result in one less significantly impacted intersection (# 15 Redondo Beach Boulevard & Artesia Boulevard) as compared with the proposed project intersection before mitigation for Existing plus Project and Cumulative plus Project conditions. After implementation of Mitigation…

Section 4.6.5., Alternative 4-1: Reduced Density, Office Location, Transportation and Traffic, Page 4-198

Under Alternative 4-1, 50,000 sf of commercial retail uses located in the southwest corner under Alternative 4 would be developed and substituted with an office building. Office uses would generate similar generation rates as commercial uses. As with Alternative 4, this Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at five six locations during one or both of the analyzed peak hours for Existing plus Project and Cumulative plus Project conditions. Similar to the Alternative 4 analysis under TRA-1, there would be no significant impact at Intersection #15 (Redondo Beach Boulevard & Artesia Boulevard). Further, under Alternative 4-1, as fewer residents would live at the project site, and would continue to reside elsewhere in the SCAG region with greater VMT and associated regional vehicle trips

\textsuperscript{3} While the Alternative 4 analysis stated on page 4-176 that there would be significant impacts at six locations, the subsequent analysis on page 4-176 correctly stated that “Alternative 4 would result in one less significantly impacted intersection (#15 Redondo beach Boulevard & Artesia Boulevard) as compared with the proposed project…” These revisions in this subsection modify the EIR text for the Alternative 4 and 4-1 analysis.
under existing and cumulative conditions. Impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable. Additional Level of Service of Service calculations are provided in Appendix L.

Section 4.6.5 Alternative 4-1: Reduced Density, Office Location, Air Quality, Page 4-191

From an operational standpoint the reduction in daily vehicle trips (1,979 less daily trips under Alternative 4-1 compared to Alternative 4) and the change in land use would reduce operational emissions with respect to Alternative 4 as well as the proposed project. With respect to Alternative 4, Alternative 4-1 reduces emissions of all criteria pollutants by approximately 1 percent, as seen in Table 4-41a. Note that the Alternative 4-1 emissions include emissions from two outside fire pits consistent with both the proposed project and Alternative 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-41A</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 4-1 UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Emissions</td>
<td>102.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alternative 4-1 Emissions</td>
<td>89.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Emissions</td>
<td>(12.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Significance Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4-1</td>
<td>(12.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>(12.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: Area sources include emissions from consumer product use, architectural coating, and landscape equipment. Energy source include natural gas use for heating/cooling as well as electrical consumption. Values presented within parenthesis represents a negative value.

SOURCE: ESA CalEEMod Modeling 2017 (based on Appendix D of this Draft EIR).

Section 4.6.5 Alternative 4-1: Reduced Density, Office Location, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Page 4-192

Under Alternative 4-1, 50,000 sf of commercial retail uses included in Alternative 4 would be replaced with office uses. It is assumed that the timing and length of the construction phases would be similar, if not identical, to Alternative 4 and therefore would result in the same overall annual construction emissions. Overall the emissions from construction activities would be similar to that of Alternative 4 and the proposed project.

The total net operational emissions for 2023, including amortized construction, would result in net emissions increase of approximately 4,453 MTCO2e per year (compared to 10,614 MTCO2e for the proposed project; and 4,600 MTCO2e per year for Alternative 4). Alternative 4-1 would have a net...
increase of 1032 employees and 465 new residents resulting in a service population of 1,497 (compared to 925 and 1,008 for the proposed project, respectively for new employees and residents, resulting in a service population of 1,933; and of 996 employees and 465 new residents resulting in a service population of 1,461 for Alternative 4). Therefore, the per service population emissions for 2023 would equal 2.97 MTCO\(_2\)e annually (compared to the 5.5 MTCO\(_2\)e annual emissions of the proposed project and 3.2 for Alternative 4). This would not exceed the project level efficiency threshold of 4.4 MT CO\(_2\)e per service population. Additionally, Alternative 4-1 does not exceed the interim 2023 efficiency threshold of 4.0 MT CO\(_2\)e per service population.

The total net operational emissions for 2035, including amortized construction, would result in net emissions increase of approximately 4,474 MTCO\(_2\)e per year (compared to 10,600 MTCO\(_2\)e for the proposed project; and 4,741 MTCO\(_2\)e per year for Alternative 4). For 2035 the per service population emissions would equal 3.0 MTCO\(_2\)e annually (compared to the 5.5 MTCO\(_2\)e per service population for the proposed project; and 3.3 MTCO\(_2\)e for Alternative 4), which exceeds the 2035 threshold of 2.5 MTCO\(_2\)e annually. Using the 2035 efficiency threshold, the net increase in GHG emissions resulting from implementation of Alternative 4 is considered to be significant without the implementation of mitigation.

Implementation of mitigation measures GHG-1 would reduce the per service population emissions to -0.64 MT CO\(_2\)e per year for 2023 and 1.28 MT CO\(_2\)e per year for 2035, (compared to the mitigated proposed project emissions of 1.3 MTCO\(_2\)e and 2.4 MTCO\(_2\)e respectively for 2023 and 2035; and to 1.4 MT CO\(_2\)e per year for 2023 and 2035 for Alternative 4.) therefore reducing GHG emissions to a less than significant level. Alternative 4-1 would reduce impacts with respect to those of the proposed project. Because Alternative 4-1 has lower per service population emissions, Alternative 4-1 is more efficient than the proposed project under the efficiency threshold.

3.2.10 Section 3.14 Utilities


The following change was made to the Condition of Approval:

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required. While impacts are considered less than significant, the City is proposing additional language to Condition of Approval UTL-1 through UTL-4.

**Conditions of Approval**

**UTL-1:** Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the City’s Public Works Department will confirm the proposed project applicant’s on-site water system has been developed to accommodate the land uses proposed at the project site. If the Department determines the system upgrades referenced in the FEIR will be required to serve the project improvements to be permitted, such upgrades shall be installed and operational prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

**UTL-2:** Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the City’s Public Works Department, in concurrence with the LACSD, will confirm the proposed project applicant’s on-site and off-site wastewater conveyance system has been developed to accommodate the land uses proposed at the
project site. If the Department determines the system upgrades referenced in the FEIR will be required to serve the project improvements to be permitted, such upgrades shall be installed and operational prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

**UTL-3:** Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the City’s Public Works Department will confirm the proposed project applicant’s on-site stormwater conveyance system has been designed to accommodate the land uses proposed at the project site and development of the proposed project would not increase existing flows from the project site into the stormwater system. If the Department determines the system upgrades referenced in the FEIR will be required to serve the project improvements to be permitted, such upgrades shall be installed and operational prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

**UTL-4:** Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the City’s Public Works Department will confirm the proposed project applicant’s water conveyance system has been designed to accommodate the land uses proposed at the project site. If the Department determines the system upgrades referenced in the FEIR will be required to serve the project improvements to be permitted, such upgrades shall be installed and operational prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.