



City of Torrance, Community Development Dept.
3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503 (310) 618-5990

Jeffery W. Gibson, Director

Notice of Determination

Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

TO:

COUNTY CLERK
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL FILING DIVISION
12400 E. IMPERIAL HWY, RM 2001
NORWALK, CALIFORNIA 90650

FROM:

CITY OF TORRANCE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
3031 TORRANCE BOULEVARD
TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA 90503

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Project Title (Common Name Where Applicable) | State Clearing House Number (If Submitted To State Clearinghouse) |
| Rockefeller Group Professional Center Development | (SCH#2007121119) |
| Contact Person | Telephone Number |
| Gregg D. Lodan, AICP | 310-618-5990 |
| Project Address/Location | |
| 2740 Lomita Boulevard, between Garnier Street and Crenshaw Boulevard | |
| Project Description | |
| The development consists of approximately 351,200 square feet of medical/office, professional office and light industrial condominium buildings, to be developed in two phases on currently vacant property located in the M-2 Zone. The project also involves the subdivision of the existing 23.58-acre parcel into three parcels measuring 14.04 acres, 4.72 acres and 4.82 acres. | |

This is to advise that the City of Torrance (Lead Agency) has approved the above described project on June 21, 2005 and has made the following determination regarding this project:

1. The project Will have a significant effect on the environment.
2. Mitigation measures Were made a condition of approval of the project.

IF MITIGATION MEASURES WERE IMPOSED, THAN STATE: The mitigation measures are provided as Attachment #1.

- A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. A copy of the Negative Declaration and record of the project approval may be Examine at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503.
- An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, and was reviewed and considered by the decision-making body prior to its decision on the project. The Environmental Impact Report and record of project approval is available to the public on-line at <http://www.torrnet.com/8683.htm> and at:
 - Torrance City Clerk's Office/3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance CA 90503
 - Community Development Dept./3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance CA 90503
 - Katy Geissert Civic Center Library/3301 Torrance Blvd., Torrance CA 90503
 - Southeast Branch Library/23115 South Arlington Torrance, CA 90503.
- The City found that the environmental effects of the project could be mitigated by modification to the project which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency.
- Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

A Statement of Overriding Considerations Was adopted for this project.

This document is being filed in DUPLICATE. Please acknowledge the filing date and return acknowledged copy in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.



Signature

Planning Manager
Title

03/19/2010
Date

Gregg D. Lodan, AICP
Contact Number

Feasible Mitigation Measures: Rockefeller Group Professional Center
(FEIR SCH# 2007121119)

Land Use Mitigation Measures

3.1(1) That the applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with the Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace."

Transportation Mitigation Measures

3.2(2) Hawthorne Boulevard at Torrance Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Hawthorne Boulevard at Torrance Boulevard consists of the addition of an eastbound right-turn overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing these improvements would require Caltrans approval.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of an eastbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the traffic Mitigation Protocol (defined below). If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(4) Hawthorne Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure at the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a second northbound right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase. Construction of this traffic control improvement is feasible within the existing right-of-way. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing this improvement would require Caltrans approval.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a second northbound right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(5) Hawthorne Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Hawthorne Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard consist of the addition of the following traffic control improvements: (1) a second northbound left-turn lane, (2) a northbound right-turn lane, (3) a fourth southbound through lane, and (4) a westbound right-turn overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require Caltrans approval.

The City of Torrance is in the process of acquiring right-of-way on the southeast corner of this intersection. An entitled development has been conditioned to dedicate the necessary right-of-way to complete the referenced traffic improvements (1) and (2). Should the area not be dedicated, or if the entitled development completes the entirety

of the improvement, the subject project will not be responsible for their fair share to complete the identified improvement. Referenced traffic control improvements (3) and (4) could be constructed within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a second northbound left-turn lane, a northbound right-turn lane, a fourth southbound through lane, and a westbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows one or more of these improvements, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy the disallowed Mitigation Measures.

3.2(6) Hawthorne Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Hawthorne Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway consist of the addition of the following traffic control improvements: (1) a northbound right-turn lane with overlap phase, (2) a southbound right-turn overlap phase, and (3) a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require Caltrans approval.

An entitled development has been conditioned to dedicate the necessary right-of-way to complete the referenced traffic improvement (1). Should the area not be dedicated, or if the entitled development completes the entirety of the improvements, the project will not be responsible for their fair share to complete the identified improvement. Referenced traffic control improvements (2) and (3) could be constructed within the new right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn lane with overlap phase, a southbound right-turn overlap phase and a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows one or more of these improvements, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy the disallowed Mitigation Measures.

3.2(9) Crenshaw Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Crenshaw Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a northbound right-turn overlap phase.

Construction of referenced traffic control improvement can be incorporated into the signal phasing.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn overlap in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol.

3.2(11) Crenshaw Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Crenshaw Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway consist of the addition a northbound right-turn overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require Caltrans approval.

Construction of referenced traffic control improvement can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(12) Arlington Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Arlington Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of converting the southbound right-turn lane to a second southbound through/right-turn lane. This improvement is feasible within the existing right-of-way and will mitigate project impacts at this intersection.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of converting the southbound right-turn lane to a second southbound through/right-turn lane in accordance with the traffic Mitigation Protocol.

3.2(13) Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard consist of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol.

3.2(15) Pennsylvania Avenue at Lomita Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Pennsylvania Avenue at Lomita Boulevard consist of adding a northbound left-turn lane.

Construction of referenced traffic control improvement is feasible. However, the City of Lomita has not (a) promulgated a plan to construct these improvements, (b) identified these improvements in any current or future Capital Improvement Program (CIP), or (c) adopted any financing plan to obtain the funding necessary for construction of the improvement.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If the City of Lomita disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(19) Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane. This improvement is feasible within existing right-of-way. This intersection is under the City of Los Angeles' jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require the City of Los Angeles' approval.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of a second northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If the City of Los Angeles disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(20) Western Avenue at Pacific Coast Highway.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Western Avenue at Pacific Coast Highway consists of the addition of a second southbound left-turn lane. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the referenced traffic control improvements would require Caltrans approval.

Constructing referenced traffic control improvement can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of adding a second southbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(22) Vermont Avenue at Pacific Coast Highway.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for I-110 southbound at Pacific Coast Highway consists of converting the second southbound right-turn lane to a shared left-turn/right-turn lane. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvement would require Caltrans approval.

Construction of this traffic control improvement could be accommodated within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of converting the second southbound right-turn lane to a shared left-turn/right-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

3.2(23) Figueroa Street at I-110 Northbound.

The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Figueroa Street at I-110 northbound consists of signaling the intersection. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvement would require Caltrans approval.

Construction of this improvement is feasible within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of signaling the intersection in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

Air Quality Construction Phase Mitigation Measures

| | |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.3(1) | Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces in sufficient quantity to prevent generation of dust plumes. |
| 3.3(2) | Track-out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation, and track-out shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday. |
| 3.3(3) | A wheel washing system shall be installed and used to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site. |
| 3.3(4) | All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall maintain at least six inches of freeboard in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114. |
| 3.3(5) | All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions). |
| 3.3(6) | Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. |
| 3.3(7) | Operations on unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 miles per hour. |
| 3.3(8) | Heavy equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts. |
| 3.3(9) | On-site stockpiles of debris, dirt, or rusty materials shall be covered or watered at least twice per day. |
| 3.3(10) | Grading activity shall be limited to no more than 5 acres during any one day. |
| 3.3(11) | Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications. |
| 3.3(12) | Contractors shall utilize electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators, as feasible. |
| 3.3(13) | Spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as the electrostatic spray gun or manual coatings application (e.g., paint brush and hand roller), shall be used to reduce VOC emissions, to the maximum extent feasible. |
| 3.3(14) | Architectural coating shall have a VOC content of 75 grams per liter or less. The coatings shall be purchased from a super-compliant architectural coating manufacturer as identified by the SCAQMD (http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf). |

Noise Construction Phase Mitigation Measures

- 3.4(1) All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.
- 3.4(2) Grading and construction contractors shall use quieter equipment as opposed to noisier equipment (such as rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment).
- 3.4(3) Equipment staging areas shall be located on the eastern portion of the project site, as far away as possible from the Bread of Life Church.
- 3.4(4) During building construction, a temporary 6-foot sound wall constructed out of solid material (e.g., plywood) shall be located such that line of sight from construction activity and the Bread of Life Church is blocked. The wall shall extend for approximately 400 feet from the northwest corner of the project site toward the south and along the project Site boundary.

Hazards and Hazards Materials Mitigation Measures

- 3.5(1) The applicant shall comply with all mitigation requirements of the DTSC with regards to the response plan. These requirements include but are not limited to:
- Shallow polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)-impacted and diesel-impacted soil in the vicinity of previous sample point GS-18 shall be excavated and removed from the project site.
 - The existing vapor extraction system shall continue to be operated to remediate off-gassing from impacted groundwater at the project site and to reduce the possible threat of vapor intrusion into proposed buildings.
 - Groundwater shall be remediated using in-situ chemical oxidation in order to bring the groundwater into compliance with the RWQCB guidelines and reduce the long-term vapor threat. As an interim measure intended to minimize/eliminate any vapor inhalation risk during the groundwater remediation process, vapor barriers shall be installed under the future buildings.
- 3.5(2) Proper soil management procedures shall be prepared in cooperation with the DTSC and the applicable City of Torrance Department (e.g., Transportation Planning/Engineering Division and/or Building Division). The SMP will include specific protocols to address mitigation items 3.5(4) and 3.5(5).
- 3.5(3) Should field conditions encountered require training under 29 CFR 1910.120 (HAZWOPER) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA) 8CCR5192, the contractor shall implement necessary measures for compliance with the standard. If such conditions requiring the implementation of the HAZWOPER standards are identified, personnel not having the training shall cease work in the area. The contractor shall be responsible for proper identification and mitigation of identified potentially hazardous conditions.
- 3.5(4) Separate stockpiling and characterization of impacted soils with TPH concentrations above cleanup levels, and/or odorous soil encountered during excavation shall be performed. These soils shall be screened for chemicals of concern to evaluate proper management methods.

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.5(5) Subdrains and waterproofing measures shall be provided during excavation, where appropriate. The design of subdrains shall be subject to review and approval by the Division of Building and Safety. Subdrain discharges shall be chemically analyzed to determine if the water meets the standards of the RWQCB. |
| 3.5(6) Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant shall submit a grading/drainage plan with a soil investigation report showing all existing and proposed grades, structures, required improvements and any proposed drainage structures. |
| 3.5(7) Hazardous materials use, storage and/or transport shall comply with all appropriate state and local regulations. |
| 3.5(8) If during construction, an abandoned oil well is found within the project boundaries, it would be uncovered, leak tested and if necessary, reabandoned in accordance with the Public Resources Code. All work related to well testing and reabandonment will be performed in compliance with DOGGR requirements. |
| 3.5(9) An emergency response plan for evacuation of commercial workers shall be developed by the Applicant and reviewed with the local emergency personnel. |
| 3.5(10) The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace." |

| |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Storm Water Mitigation Measures |
| 3.6(1) A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) shall be initiated prior to, during, and after construction in accordance with NPDES and State Water Quality Control Board Standards. |
| 3.6(2) The project shall include implementation of a comprehensive stormwater pollution prevention plan. |
| 3.6(3) An on-site water storage facility shall be designed to retain storm water runoff as directed by the City of Torrance Public Works Department. |

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 10-020

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER (SCH#2007121119); MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS RELATIVE THERETO; ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS; ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF A MEDICAL, PROFESSIONAL AND R&D/LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS PARK ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE M-2 ZONE AT 2740 LOMITA BOULEVARD.

FEIR (SCH#2007121119) - ROCK-LOMITA LLC

WHEREAS, the City of Torrance, acting by and through its Planning Commission has authority over Land Use entitlements within the City of Torrance; and

WHEREAS, on May 24th, 2007, Rock-Lomita LLC filed various applications with the City requesting approval of a proposed Business Park Development (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the City of Torrance is the lead agency for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*); and

WHEREAS, the City of Torrance determined to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to CEQA to determine the potential individual and cumulative environmental impacts associated with the Project; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the Draft EIR was mailed to public agencies, organizations, and persons likely to be interested in the potential impacts of the proposed Project on December 24th, 2007 and thereafter held a public scoping meeting on September 10th, 2008, to gather public and agency comments concerning the preparation of the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the City of Torrance thereafter caused the Draft EIR to be prepared by a consultant, Gruen Associates, under contract to the City and under the supervision of the City's Community Development Department;

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR took into account the comments the City received on the NOP, described the Project, and discussed the environmental impacts resulting therefrom, as well as proposed mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR was circulated for public review during a 47 day review period from May 7th, 2009 to June 22nd, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the comments received on the Draft EIR were reviewed, and full and complete responses thereto were prepared and distributed in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5; and

WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Project was presented to the Planning Commission, as the decision making body of the lead agency, for certification as having been completed in compliance with the provisions of CEQA and State and local CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the certification of the Final EIR, consisting of the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments, on March 17th, 2010 in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, California, during which it took and considered public testimony and exhibits regarding certification of the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has carefully reviewed and considered all environmental documentation comprising the Final EIR, including the Draft EIR and the comments and the responses thereto, and has found that the Final EIR considers all potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and is complete and adequate, and fully complies with all requirements of CEQA and of the State and local CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, prior to action on this Project, the Planning Commission considered all significant impacts, mitigation measures, and Project alternatives identified in the Final EIR and found that all potentially significant impacts of the Project have been lessened or avoided to the extent feasible; and

WHEREAS, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines provide that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes certain written findings for each of the significant effects, accompanied by a statement of facts supporting each finding; and

WHEREAS, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that where an agency approves a project that would allow the occurrence of significant environmental effects which are identified in an EIR, but are not mitigated to a level of insignificance, the agency must state in writing the specific reasons supporting its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has balanced the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental risks and has determined that such risks are outweighed by specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that the Project is necessary to serve the existing and future needs of the City of Torrance; and

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code Section 21091.6 requires that where an EIR has been prepared for a project for which mitigation measures are adopted, that a mitigation monitoring or reporting program be adopted for said project; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared and the Planning Commission has reviewed the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached hereto as Exhibit C.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission of the City of Torrance finds, determines, and resolves as follows:

Section 1. Certification. Based on its review and consideration of the Final EIR, and all written communications and oral testimony regarding the Project which have been submitted to, and received by, the City, the Planning Commission certifies that the Final EIR for the Project has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State and local CEQA Guidelines. The Planning Commission, having final approval authority over the Project, finds that the Final EIR reflects the Planning Commission's independent judgment and analysis as lead agency under CEQA, and hereby adopts and certifies the Final EIR as complete and adequate. The Planning Commission further certifies that the Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission and that the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in it prior to approving the Project.

Section 2. CEQA Findings and Statement of Facts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, the Planning Commission has reviewed, and hereby makes and adopts, the CEQA Findings and Statement of Facts for the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full.

Section 3. Statement of Overriding Considerations. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15093, the Planning Commission has reviewed and hereby makes and adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full.

Section 4. Mitigation Monitoring Program Adoption. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines section 15097, the Planning Commission hereby adopts and approves the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit "C" and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full. The Planning Commission further finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are feasible, and specifically makes each mitigation measure a condition of Project approval.

Section 5. No Significant New Information Added to Draft EIR. No significant new information has been added to the Final EIR that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and/or CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

Section 6. Location and Custodian of Record of Proceedings. The Planning and Environmental Manager of the Torrance Community Development Department, whose office is located at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, California 90503, is hereby designated as the custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission's decision is based, which documents and materials shall be available for public inspection and copying in accordance with the provisions of the California Public Records Act (Government Code §§ 6250 *et seq.*).

Section 7. Notice of Determination. The Planning and Environmental Manager shall file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles and with

the state Office of Planning and Research within five (5) working days after this approval becomes final.

Section 8. Certification, Posting and Filing. Unless appealed to the City Council, this resolution shall become final and take effect 15 days after its adoption by the Planning Commission. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify the passage of this Resolution by the Planning Commission, shall cause the Resolution to be posted in three (3) conspicuous places in the City of Torrance, and shall cause a certified copy of this Resolution to be filed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Torrance at its meeting of March 17th, 2010, by the following vote:

| | | |
|----------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| AYES: | COMMISSIONERS: | GIBSON, HORWICH, SKOLL, UCHIMA AND CHAIRMAN WEIDEMAN |
| NOES: | COMMISSIONERS: | BROWNING, BUSCH |
| ABSENT: | COMMISSIONERS: | NONE |
| ABSTAIN: | COMMISSIONERS: | NONE |

Introduced, approved and adopted this 17th day of March 2010.



Chairman, Torrance Planning Commission

ATTEST:



Secretary, Torrance Planning Commission

EXHIBIT A

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF FACTS

FOR

ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE # 2007121119)

CITY OF TORRANCE

ADOPTED MARCH 17TH, 2010

**CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING THE FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE # 2007121119) FOR THE
ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER**

I. Introduction

The City of Torrance, as Lead Agency, is required by Sections 15091 and 15093, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code (PRC), to make written findings as part of a certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), prior to approval of a project. This document provides the findings required by CEQA and sets forth the City's specific reasons for approving the project despite the existence of significant adverse impacts associated with the project for which there is no feasible mitigation.

A. Findings, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

As the Lead Agency, the City of Torrance is required under CEQA to make written findings concerning each significant adverse environmental impact created by the project and each project alternative identified in the FEIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

(1) Mitigation required by Lead Agency - Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

(2) Mitigation required by another Public Agency - Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Overriding Considerations - Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

B. Findings, General

(a) The EIR is hereby incorporated into these findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the Project in spite of the potential for associated significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

The Planning Commission hereby finds as follows:

- The Draft EIR and the Final EIR have been prepared in compliance with CEQA and the Guidelines;
- The City and the Planning Commission have independently reviewed and analyzed the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, and these documents reflect the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis;
- A Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) has been prepared requiring mitigation measures and/or changes to the proposed Project, which the Planning Commission has adopted and made a condition of approval of the proposed Project. The MMP is incorporated herein by reference and is considered part of the record of proceedings for the proposed project;
- In determining whether the proposed Project has a significant impact on the environment and in adopting these Findings pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, the City has complied with CEQA Sections 21081.5 and 21082.2;
- The impacts of the proposed project have been fully analyzed to the extent feasible at the time of certification of the Final EIR;
- The City reviewed the comments received on the Draft EIR, and the responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to those comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The City has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these Findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the Final EIR;
- The City of Torrance has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment where feasible as shown in the findings provided in this document. The City of Torrance has determined that remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable under Section 15091 are acceptable due to overriding concerns presented in the City's Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Rockefeller Group Professional Center EIR.

(b) Certification of FEIR/In adopting these findings, in accordance with CEQA, the City has considered the environmental effects as shown in the FEIR prior to approving the Project. These findings represent the independent judgment and analysis of the City and the Planning Commission.

(c) Changes to the DEIR/In the course of responding to comments received during the public review and comment period on the DEIR, certain portions of the DEIR have been modified and some new information has been added. The changes made to the DEIR do not result in the existence of:

- A significant new environmental impact that would result from the Project or an adopted Mitigation Measure;
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact that is not reduced to a level less than significant by adopted Mitigation Measures;
- A feasible project alternative or Mitigation Measure not adopted that is considerably different from others analyzed in the DEIR that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project; or
- Information that indicates that the public was deprived of a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on the DEIR.

The City finds that the amplifications and clarifications made in the DEIR do not collectively or individually constitute significant new information within the meaning of Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and therefore recirculation is not required. A summary of the changes is included in the Response to Comments and the Errata Sheet.

(d) Evidentiary Basis for Findings/These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the City as described in Section 4. The references to the DEIR and to the FEIR set forth in the findings are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

(e) Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures/Except as otherwise noted, the Mitigation Measures referenced herein are those identified in the FEIR. Except as otherwise stated in these findings, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines sections 15091, 15092 and 15093, the City finds that the environmental effects of the Project:

- Will not be significant; or
- Will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the Mitigation Measures adopted by the City; or
- Can and should be mitigated to a less than significant level by the Mitigation Measures within the jurisdiction of another public agency; or
- Will remain significant after mitigation, but specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

The City finds that the Mitigation Measures incorporated into and the imposed upon the project are feasible and fully capable of implementation.

(f) Findings regarding Monitoring/Reporting of CEQA Mitigation Measures/

As required in Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, the City adopts a monitoring and reporting program regarding changes in the Project or Mitigation Measures imposed to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The Mitigation Monitoring and reporting Plan, in the form presented to the City as Appendix A of the Final EIR, is adopted because it effectively fulfills the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirement.

C. Statement of Overriding Considerations, CEQA Guidelines Section 15093

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

(b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

D. Process of Environmental Review

The final EIR ("FEIR"), completed in February 2010, incorporated the extensive environmental review of the proposed project required by CEQA. This environmental review process included:

-In December of 2007, an Initial Study (EAS07-00003) was completed and determined that proposed project may have a potentially significant impact on the environment, requiring additional study of several key areas. Following the preparation of the Initial Study, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated between December 24th, 2007 and January 22nd, 2008, advising responsible agencies and the community that an EIR would be prepared to address the potential impacts from the proposed project. The NOP was posted at the Los Angeles County Clerk/Recorder's Office on December 21, 2007. Public notices were mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the project boundaries, a Coalition of Homeowners Associations, responsible Agencies and to the members of the public that requested to be a part of the notification list. A Legal Ad also ran in the Daily Breeze, a newspaper of general circulation. Copies of the Initial Study were made available for the public at the City of Torrance Community Development Department and it was available for download via the City of Torrance Community Development web site.

-On September 10th, 2008, the City held a Scoping Meeting in which the public was invited to participate at the Wood Elementary School Cafeteria (2250 W. 235th

Street, Torrance, CA 90501). Public Notices were again mailed for this meeting and an additional legal ad was placed in the Daily Breeze.

-After completing additional investigation in several areas identified as in EAS07-00003, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was prepared and circulated for public review between May 7th, 2009 and June 22nd, 2009. Copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and all Technical Appendices, were made available for review in the office of the Torrance City Clerk (3031 Torrance Blvd. Torrance, CA 90503), the Community Development Department (3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503), the Katy Geissert Civic Center Library (3301 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503) and Southeast Branch Library (23115 South Arlington, Torrance, CA 90501) as well as on the Community Development web site. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was sent to the public notification lists, a legal ad was displayed in the Daily Breeze and a Public Notice sign was posted at the project site.

-A total of ten comment letters were received from various public agencies and surrounding local jurisdictions. The Final EIR includes the corrections and changes based on the comment letters. The FEIR also includes the entirety of the corrected DEIR, the comment letters received, and an addendum to the Traffic Analysis elaborating on feasibility determinations made in the DEIR. The FEIR was released for a 10-day public review period between February 19th, 2010 and March 1st, 2010, prior to certification of the FEIR.

A. Project Location and Description

The Project area encompasses a currently vacant 23.58-acre site located on the south side of Lomita Boulevard between Garnier Street and Crenshaw Boulevard in the southerly extent of the City of Torrance, Los Angeles County, California. The site is bounded by Lomita Boulevard on the north, an access road to Sam's Club on the east, a Costco store and parking lot to the south, and retail, office and a church/private school to the west. The site is located just west of Torrance Crossroads shopping center, southeast of the Torrance Memorial Hospital and Medical Center, and approximately one-quarter mile north of the Torrance Municipal Airport.

The Applicant, Rock-Lomita LLC, is requesting approval to develop *Rockefeller Group Professional Center* on the currently vacant property located in the M-2 Zone at 2740 Lomita Boulevard. The proposed development would consist of approximately 351,200 square feet of medical office, professional office and light industrial condominium buildings, to be developed in two phases. The project includes subdivision of the existing 23.58-acre parcel into three parcels measuring 14.04 acres, 4.72 acres and 4.82 acres. The 14.04-acre lot located on the western portion of the site would comprise Phase I, totaling approximately 210,200 building square feet. The 4.72-acre and 4.82-acre lots would comprise Phase II, totaling approximately 141,000 building square feet. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP 07-00016) has been proposed to allow a series of structures exceeding 15,000 square feet and to allow the proposed uses of professional office and medical in-out patient care services in the M-2: Heavy Manufacturing District. The applicant has also submitted a Tentative Parcel Map (DIV07-00020) proposing the subdivision of the site into three new lots and for condominium purposes.

B. Project Objectives

- Achieve productive reuse of a former aerospace manufacturing site, including the necessary remedial measures to allow that reuse.
- Develop a first class professional center on one of the largest under-utilized parcels in Torrance, providing an economically productive use of the property that benefits the Torrance community and local businesses.
- Provide both short and long term employment opportunities for residents in the City of Torrance by approving a project that will generate substantial construction work opportunities and long term local light industrial, professional and medical jobs. Project will employ over 100 workers in construction of shell buildings and tenant improvements. Purchase of construction materials will stimulate both local and regional jobs and economies. The completed Project will employ over 1,300 workers. Project businesses will stimulate both local and regional jobs and economies.
- Provide additional medical office or related facilities consistent with the existing medical uses to the west of the project site.
- The Proposed Project would be consistent with the following existing local plans for the site as administered by the City of Torrance: Land Use Element and Noise Element of the City of Torrance General Plan; General Plan Objectives 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 6.0, and 12.0 (*Proposed Project density is less than one-half the allowable FAR set by the General Plan*); City of Torrance Zoning Code; and the Extended Airport Boundary Plan. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the following existing regional plans: 2002 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County; SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide; Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan; and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Regulations.
- Construct a high-quality development responsive to market conditions.
- Establish a new improved image that enhances the area through new development and landscaping.
- Create an environment suitable for small and medium sized businesses offering professional and technical jobs and services.
- Regional Plan Conformity – Implementation of.
- Provide a secondary economic benefit to local and regional economy derived from spending of project employees and visitors.
- Generate increased sales and business license taxes to the City of Torrance. Project visitors and employees will generate increased sales taxes.
- Provide increased property taxes from the proposed improvements.

- Help Community job/housing balance
- Develop a sustainable “green” commercial complex through the incorporation of “green” construction methods including: high solar reflectance roofing and paving; minimal artificial light trespass; high-efficiency insulated windows; non-VOC interior finishes; use of recycled construction materials; maximum use of natural lighting; drought tolerant landscaping; “smart” irrigation; high percent shading of parking lots, sidewalks, drive aisles and courtyards; underground retention and filtration of stormwater.

II. Findings on Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts

CEQA Section 15382 states: *“Significant effect on the environment” means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within an area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.* In the subject EIR, potential “significant effects” were analyzed within six (6) separate categories: Land Use; Transportation & Parking; Air Quality; Noise; Hazardous Materials; and Utilities (Storm Water).

The Findings of Fact are based on information contained in the Final EIR for the proposed Project, as well as information contained in the Administrative Record. The Administrative Record, or Record of Proceedings, for the proposed Project, for purposes of CEQA and these findings, consists of the following documents:

- The Project Application
- The FEIR and all Technical Appendices
- The Planning Commission Hearing Staff Report and all attachments
- Written Comments on the Project
- The Public Hearing Records
- All Public Notices, including but not limited to, public notification mailers, legal display ads, project site postings, Notice(s) of Preparation, Notice(s) of Completion and Notice(s) of Availability
- Any documents cited in any of the above referenced items
- Proposed decisions and findings on the Project
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by the Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e)

When making CEQA findings required by Public Resources Code Section 21081(a), a public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material, which constitute the Record of Proceedings upon which its decision is based. The Development Review and Environmental Manager of the Torrance Community Development Department, whose office is located at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance CA 90503, is designated as the custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the Record of

Proceedings upon which the Planning Commission's decision is based. Such documents and materials shall be available for public inspection and copying in accordance with the provisions of the California Public Records Act (Government Code §§ 6250 et seq.).

The Draft EIR addressed the project's potential effects on the environment, and was circulated for public review and comment pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines. Comments were received from a variety of public agencies and organizations. The Final EIR contains copies of all comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR, a list of those that commented on the Draft EIR, and responses to comments received during the public review period. The Final EIR also identifies changes to the Draft EIR. This section provides a summary of the environmental effects of the project that are discussed in the Final EIR, and provides written findings for each of the significant effects, which are accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding.

While findings set forth below identify certain specific facts supporting the various determinations and conclusions, additional facts supporting the conclusions are set forth in the corresponding sections of the Final EIR, and these findings specifically incorporate those facts. In addition, the Planning Commission incorporates the facts set forth in the Record of Proceedings on the Rockefeller Group Professional Center to the extent they relate to and support the findings set forth herein.

A. No Impacts

The Final EIR determined that there would be no impacts on the environment in the following areas if the Proposed Project were implemented:

- i. Aesthetics
- ii. Agriculture Resources
- iii. Biological Resources
- iv. Cultural Resources
- v. Geology/Soils
- vi. Mineral Resources
- vii. Parking
- viii. Population/Housing
- ix. Public Services
- x. Recreation

Land Use:

Impact(s): The FEIR determined that no significant land use compatibility impacts or conflicts are anticipated, therefore, no mitigation measures are required. However, the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure consistency of the project with FAA regulations. The site is located within a distance from Torrance Airport requiring FAA notification. The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace."

Finding: A requirement for FAA notification has been incorporated into the project as identified in the Final EIR. No other land use mitigation measures are required.

Rationale for Finding: As stated in Section 3.1 of the FEIR, the proposed 23.58-acre project site is vacant and contains sparse vegetation. The site is adjacent to industrial land uses to the north; a church, large parking lot and two retail/office facilities to the west; warehouse commercial to the south; and industrial and warehouse commercial to the east. Phases I and II of the proposed project would consist of a mixture of medical, professional office and light industrial buildings totaling 210,183 square feet and 141,026 square feet, respectively. The existing small two-lane roadway that runs along the western edge of the project site (the Costco access road) would be preserved within the existing easement. The proposed project would not affect or require the removal, relocation or separation of an existing community. No significant land use impacts are anticipated.

Parking:

Impact(s): The FEIR determined that Proposed Project will provide onsite parking exceeding the City of Torrance Zoning Code for the proposed uses. The Proposed Project would have no offsite parking impact.

Finding: The Proposed Project would have no environmental impact on Parking.

Rationale for Finding: The Proposed Project will have 1,488 onsite spaces. The City of Torrance Zoning Code requires 1,387 spaces. The Proposed Project will have a potential surplus of 61 spaces.

B. Less than Significant without Mitigation

The Planning Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, including as discussed in the FEIR, the following environmental impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required:

Noise (Operational):

Impact(s): The FEIR determined that operational phase noise impacts from the Proposed Project would be less than significant without mitigation.

Finding: Operational phase noise impacts would be less than significant, with no mitigation measures required.

Rationale for Finding: Pursuant to the City's Municipal Code, a project would have a significant operational noise impact if it would expose existing sensitive receptors to noise levels that exceed the Municipal Code standards. If existing noise levels exceed the noise standards, a significant impact would occur if the project-related vehicular noise results in a 5-dBA increase; and Mobile noise levels would increase by 3 dBA CNEL to or within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category (Table 3.4.3) or any 5-dBA or more increase in noise level.

The FEIR concluded that the greatest project-related vehicular noise increase would be 1.3 dBA CNEL , that stationary noise will not increase ambient noise levels by 5 dBA or more, and that parking would increase ambient noise at the nearest receptor by only 1.9 dBA. Thus, noise attributable to the operational phase of the Proposed Project would be less than significant without mitigation.

Vibrations (Construction):

Impact(s): The FEIR determined that construction phase vibration impacts from the Proposed Project would be less than significant without mitigation.

Finding: Construction phase vibration impacts would be less than significant, with no mitigation measures required.

Rationale for Finding: The FEIR concluded that construction vibration levels at the nearest sensitive receptor would not exceed the potential building damage threshold of 0.5 inches per second PPV. The environmental impact attributable to construction vibration would be less than significant without mitigation.

Vibrations (Operational):

Impact(s): The FEIR determined that operational phase vibration impacts from the Proposed Project would be less than significant without mitigation.

Finding: Operational phase vibration impacts would be less than significant, with no mitigation measures required.

Rationale for Finding: The FEIR concluded that operational vibration levels from the Proposed Project would not be perceptible at the nearest sensitive receptor. The environmental impact attributable to operational vibration would be less than significant without mitigation.

Utilities (Water & Wastewater):

Impact(s): The FEIR determined that the environmental impact from Water and Wastewater from the Proposed Project would be less than significant without mitigation.

Finding: Water and Wastewater impacts would be less than significant, with no mitigation measures required.

Rationale for Finding: The Proposed Project would include construction of a water piping system consisting primarily of 8-inch pipes. The Project would connect to the existing 8-inch water supply line along Lomita Boulevard. Additional water infrastructure would not need to be built to accommodate the Project and impacts on water services would be less than significant without mitigation.

The FEIR concluded that as part of the Proposed Project, plans would be submitted to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts Public County for approval by the Districts. Also, a Trunk Sewer Connection Permit would be obtained prior to construction. The environmental impact attributable to water and wastewater would be less than significant without mitigation.

C. Less than Significant with Mitigation

The Planning Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, including as discussed in the FEIR, the following environmental impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below and in the FEIR:

Noise (Construction)

Impact(s): The Proposed Project would significantly impact noise levels during construction.

Finding: As identified in the FEIR, mitigation measures requiring changes or alteration would be required or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact due to noise during construction to a level of insignificance.

Rationale for Finding: Based on information and analysis set forth in the FEIR and the Record of Proceedings, construction of the Proposed Project would result in a significant increase in ambient Noise during construction. The Proposed Project would be required to implement four (4) mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impact due to noise during construction. Specifically, the following measures will be required to mitigate the Project's noise impacts during construction:

3.4(1) All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.

3.4(2) Grading and construction contractors shall use quieter equipment as opposed to noisier equipment (such as rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment).

3.4(3) Equipment staging areas shall be located on the eastern portion of the project site, as far away as possible from the Bread of Life Church.

3.4(4) During building construction, a temporary 6-foot sound wall constructed out of solid material (e.g., plywood) shall be located such that line of sight from construction activity and the Bread of Life Church is blocked. The wall shall extend for approximately 400 feet from the northwest corner of the project site toward the south and along the project site boundary.

Successful deployment of these mitigation measures would result in less than significant environmental impact from Noise.

Hazardous Materials

Impact(s): The subject site is currently being remediated. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (“DTSC”) is the lead agency in the site remediation. The Proposed Project would have a significant environmental impact if the on-going remediation plan were compromised during pre-construction and construction.

Finding: As identified in the FEIR, changes or alteration would be required, or incorporated into the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact from Hazardous Materials during preconstruction and construction. The implementation of such mitigation measures would reduce the impacts from hazardous materials to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding: Based on information and analysis set forth in the FEIR and the Record of Proceedings, the Proposed Project would possibly have a significant environmental impact from Hazardous Materials if the on-going remediation plan were disrupted during preconstruction and construction. The project would be required to implement ten (10) mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the impact from Hazardous Materials during preconstruction and construction. Specifically, the following measures will be required to mitigate the Project’s noise impacts during construction:

3.5(1) The applicant shall comply with all mitigation requirements of the DTSC with regards to the response plan. These requirements include but are not limited to:

- Shallow polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)-impacted and diesel-impacted soil in the vicinity of previous sample point GS-18 shall be excavated and removed from the project site.
- The existing vapor extraction system shall continue to be operated to remediate off-gassing from impacted groundwater at

the project site and to reduce the possible threat of vapor intrusion into proposed buildings.

□ Groundwater shall be remediated using in-situ chemical oxidation in order to bring the groundwater into compliance with the RWQCB guidelines and reduce the long-term vapor threat. As an interim measure intended to minimize/eliminate any vapor inhalation risk during the groundwater remediation process, vapor barriers shall be installed under the future buildings.

3.5(2) Proper soil management procedures shall be prepared in cooperation with the DTSC and City of Torrance Fire Department. The SMP will include specific protocols to address mitigation items 3.5(4) and 3.5(5).

3.5(3) Should field conditions encountered require training under 29 CFR 1910.120 HAZWOPER) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA) 8CCR5192, the contractor shall implement necessary measures for compliance with the standard. If such conditions requiring the implementation of the HAZWOPER standards are identified, personnel not having the training shall cease work in the area. The contractor shall be responsible for proper identification and mitigation of identified potentially hazardous conditions.

3.5(4) Separate stockpiling and characterization of impacted soils with TPH concentrations above cleanup levels, and/or odorous soil encountered during excavation shall be performed. These soils shall be screened for chemicals of concern to evaluate proper management methods.

3.5(5) Subdrains and waterproofing measures shall be provided during excavation, where appropriate. The design of subdrains shall be subject to review and approval by the Division of Building and Safety. Subdrain discharges shall be chemically analyzed to determine if the water meets the standards of the RWQCB.

3.5(6) Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant shall submit a grading/drainage plan with a soil investigation report showing all existing and proposed grades, structures, required improvements and any proposed drainage structures.

3.5(7) Hazardous materials use, storage and/or transport shall comply with all appropriate state and local regulations.

3.5(8) If during construction, an abandoned oil well is found within the project boundaries, it would be uncovered, leak tested and if necessary, reabandoned in accordance with the Public Resources Code. All work related to well testing and reabandonment will be performed in compliance with DOGGR requirements.

3.5(9) An emergency response plan for evacuation of commercial workers shall be developed by the Applicant and reviewed with the local emergency personnel.

3.5(10) The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace."

Successful deployment of these mitigation measures will result in less than significant impact from Hazardous Materials.

Utilities (Storm Water)

Impact(s): The Proposed Project would significantly impact Storm Water quality during pre-construction, construction and operation phases.

Finding: As identified in the FEIR, changes or alteration would be required, or incorporated into the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact to Storm Water quality and quantity during preconstruction, construction and operation. The implementation of such mitigation measures would reduce the impact to Storm Water to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding: Based on information and analysis set forth in the FEIR and the Record of Proceedings, the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact to Storm Water quality during preconstruction, construction, and operation. The project would be required to implement three (3) mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impact to Storm Water quality and quantity. Successful deployment of these mitigation measures will eliminate the environmental impact to Storm Water quality. Specifically, the following measures will be required to mitigate the Project's impacts to Storm Water quality:

3.6(1) A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) shall be initiated prior to, during, and after construction in accordance with NPDES and State Water Quality Control Board Standards.

3.6(2) The project shall include implementation of a comprehensive stormwater pollution prevention plan.

3.6(3) An on-site water storage facility shall be designed to retain storm water runoff as directed by the City of Torrance Community Development and Public Works Departments.

To treat initial runoff prior to discharging to the storm drain system, and to limit runoff from the Project site, an underground storage system would be provided for approximately 35,900 cubic feet in Phase 1 and 23,000 cubic feet in Phase II. The required storage for Phase 1 and 2 is 0.16 acre-feet and 0.19 acre-feet respectively. The underground storage will be sized to store and treat the first

three-quarter inch of runoff. The runoff will be stored and slowly released to allow pollutants to settle in the separation chambers.

D. Significant and Unavoidable

The Planning Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level:

Air Quality

Impact(s): The Proposed Project would significantly impact Air Quality levels as a result of dust, fumes, and equipment exhaust during construction and from auto emissions during operation.

Finding: As identified in the FEIR, changes or alteration would be required, or incorporated into the project to substantially lessen the significant environmental impact upon Air Quality during construction, however NOx emissions from construction cannot be mitigated to an insignificant level. Mobile source emissions during operation cannot be substantially reduced through mitigation because the Applicant cannot reasonably impose mitigation measures on private vehicles.

Rationale for Finding: Air Quality Construction Phase Emissions - A significant regional impact and local impact is anticipated from construction-related emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, through construction vehicle trips, and through fugitive dust from grading. Regional construction emissions would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) threshold for reactive organic gases (ROG) and Nitrogen oxides (NOx). The project would be required to implement fourteen (14) measures to avoid or substantially lessen the impact upon Air Quality during construction. Specifically, the following measures will be required to mitigate the Project's air quality impacts during construction:

3.3(1) Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces in sufficient quantity to prevent generation of dust plumes.

3.3(2) Track-out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation, and track-out shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday.

3.3(3) A wheel washing system shall be installed and used to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site.

3.3(4) All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall maintain at least six inches of freeboard in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.

3.3(5) All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).

3.3(6) Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.

3.3(7) Operations on unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

3.3(8) Heavy equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

3.3(9) On-site stockpiles of debris, dirt, or rusty materials shall be covered or watered at least twice per day.

3.3(10) Grading activity shall be limited to no more than 5 acres during any one day.

3.3(11) Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications.

3.3(12) Contractors shall utilize electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators, as feasible.

3.3(13) Spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as the electrostatic spray gun or manual coatings application (e.g., paint brush and hand roller), shall be used to reduce VOC emissions, to the maximum extent feasible.

3.3(14) Architectural coating shall have a VOC content of 75 grams per liter or less. The coatings shall be purchased from a super-compliant architectural coating manufacturer as identified by the SCAQMD (http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf).

Mitigation measures would reduce ROG emissions below SCAQMD threshold. However, NOx emissions from construction would still exceed the SCAQMD threshold, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Localized construction emissions would exceed SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for dust particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) during construction. However, with the implementation of the above mitigation measures, localized fugitive dust would be reduced by 61 percent to a level below SCAQMD thresholds.

Air Quality Operational Phase Emissions - A significant regional impact is anticipated from operations-related emissions attributable to CO and NOx from motor vehicles accessing the project. Mobile source emissions cannot be substantially reduced through mitigation as the Applicant cannot reasonably

impose mitigation measures on private vehicles. As such, regional operation emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact.

Localized operational CO concentrations would not exceed the State one-and eight-hour standards at worst case sidewalk locations at the ten study intersections modeled in the analysis, and would result in a less than significant impact.

The proposed project would comply with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Consistency Criterion No. 1 and No. 2. Thus, the proposed project is considered consistent with the AQMP.

The proposed project would result in carbon dioxide equivalent emissions of 15,389 tons per year, which represents 0.0000291 percent of Statewide emissions. Cumulative impacts related to global warming would be considered less than significant.

Transportation

Impact(s): The Proposed Project would significantly impact Traffic during operation.

Finding: As identified in the FEIR and Project Conditions of Approval, changes or alteration would be required, or incorporated into the project to substantially lessen the significant environmental impact from Traffic, however, traffic impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant.

Rationale for Finding: Based on information and analysis set forth in the FEIR and the Record of Proceedings, construction of the Proposed Project will result in increased traffic. Phase I of the project would generate 387 AM peak hour trips, 461 PM peak hour trips, and 3,976 daily trips. Buildout of the project would generate 664 AM peak hour trips, 812 PM peak hour trips, and 7,107 daily trips. Based on the criteria of six different jurisdictions, the project would have a significant impact on 22 study intersections. As mitigation, the Proposed Project would be required to contribute its fair share traffic mitigation fees toward construction of feasible traffic improvements within the City of Torrance, and to post improvement bonds for its fair share contribution toward possible future construction of feasible traffic improvements in the neighboring cities of Los Angeles and Lomita. Identified mitigation measures consist of feasible and non-feasible components. As set forth in the Final EIR, feasible mitigation measure components were identified at 13 study intersections (eight in the City of Torrance, one in the City of Lomita, three in the City of Los Angeles, and one shared between the City of Torrance and the City of Los Angeles). These feasible mitigation measure components would fully mitigate the project increase at seven of the 22 significantly impacted study intersections. Nevertheless, because operational traffic levels are projected to potentially

exceed current levels, operational traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Significant impacts would remain at 15 intersections.

Findings on Project Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines require that Environmental Impact Reports include a discussion of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project." In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the alternatives should focus on avoiding or substantially avoiding the significant adverse impacts of a proposed project, even if the alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly. CEQA requires analysis of a "No Project" Alternative and consideration of an alternative site for the project. Where it is determined that no feasible alternative locations exist, the EIR must disclose the reasons for this conclusion.

The Environmental analysis should identify the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project and disclose why it was or was not rejected in light of the proposed project. In the event the environmentally superior alternative is the "No Project" Alternative, then an additional alternative is to be designated as environmentally superior.

This section presents project alternatives and summarizes their potential impacts that may foreseeably occur based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

A. No Project Alternative

-Description - The "No Project" Alternative assumes no new development on the proposed project site. The environmental setting would continue unchanged from current conditions. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that a No Project Alternative should discuss what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. The Proposed Project site is underutilized; a vacant, underutilized site invites proposals for development. There is no assurance that the No Project Alternative would permanently avoid development on the site.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use - Selection of the No Project Alternative would result in no development on the project site. Land uses surrounding the site include industrial and commercial to the east, industrial to the north and west, and commercial to the south. The project site would remain vacant and available for future development consistent with current M-2 land use and zoning designations. No land use impacts would result.
- Transportation and Parking - Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not generate additional traffic, and the study intersections would maintain at the levels of service estimated in the pre-project conditions. A total of 22 fewer intersections would be significantly impacted under the No Project

Alternative. Related projects would contribute to cumulative increases in traffic in the area.

- Air Quality - The No Project Alternative would not change the current level of short- or long-term air emissions currently produced at the site. There would be no short-term air quality impacts from construction dust and exhaust emissions from construction equipment. There would be no long-term air quality impacts from auto emissions attributable to the completed project.
- Noise - The No Project Alternative would not raise ambient noise level of neighborhoods proximate to the site. The absence of construction activities would eliminate short-term construction noise impacts.
- Hazardous Materials - The selection of the No Project Alternative would leave the site undisturbed. Existing soil and groundwater contamination of the project site would not be remediated. The potential for persons to be exposed to hazardous materials on the project site would remain the same as existing conditions.
- Utilities (Water / Wastewater / Stormwater) - The No Project Alternative would leave the site undisturbed. Existing water, wastewater, and stormwater conditions would remain unchanged. Current generation rates for water, wastewater, and stormwater would remain unchanged.

-Finding - The No Project Alternative would lessen the Proposed Project's environmental impact(s), but would fail to achieve any of the Proposed Project benefits. Furthermore, remediation of soil and groundwater contamination could be postponed or halted.

-Facts Supporting Finding - The Project site may not be remediated; contamination from the former aerospace operations would remain. Other Project benefits addressed above would not occur. Since the Project site is large, vacant, and underutilized, it is likely that the Project site would be subject to development proposals, with environmental impacts, in the near future. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

B. Reduced Intensity Alternative

-Description - Similar to the Proposed Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative assumes development of the project site as a professional business park. This alternative would reduce the project size by 10 percent. It is assumed that the project would occupy the same site area, but with reduced intensity of development. The total square footage on the site would be reduced from approximately 351,200 square feet to approximately 316,090 square feet, or an FAR of .31. Under such an alternative, the square footage of the medical office, professional office, and light industrial buildings would be reduced by 10 percent.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use-As with the Proposed Project, the uses proposed in the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be compatible with surrounding uses and consistent with the following local plans for the site as administered by the City of Torrance;

the Land Use Element and Noise Element of the City of Torrance General Plan; General Plan objectives 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 6.0, and 12.0 (Project density would be less than one-half the allowable FAR set by the General Plan); City of Torrance Zoning Code; and the Extended Airport Boundary Plan. The M2: Heavy Manufacturing zone conditionally allows professional and medical office uses. Also, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be consistent with the following regional plans: 2002 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County; SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide; Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan; and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Regulations. The Reduced Intensity Alternative has no impact on Land Use, similar to the Proposed Project.

- **Transportation and Parking** - The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less additional traffic. The site would be parked at the general office rate allowing general office uses to occupy the industrial space; therefore, the office trip rates were applied to the entire site similar to the proposed project. Trip generation for the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be approximately 6,400 daily trips compared with 7,107 daily trips generated by the Proposed Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in approximately 66 fewer AM peak hour trips and 81 fewer PM peak hour trips. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in one less significantly impacted intersection than the Proposed Project due to the decrease in peak hour trips. Parking related impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Proposed Project.
- **Air Quality** - The Reduced Intensity Alternative would require less construction activity than assumed for the Proposed Project because building square footage would be reduced from 351,200 to 316,090. Pollutant emissions during the entire Reduced Intensity Alternative construction period would be less than the amount of pollutants emitted during the entire Proposed Project construction period. However, the daily construction intensity (e.g., construction equipment hours) for the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to the daily construction intensity assumed for the proposed project. Accordingly, the Reduced Intensity Alternative daily regional construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact.

Localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ construction emissions were calculated based on the amount of acres to be disturbed per day. The size of the project site would not change under the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the acres of land graded per day would be similar to that analyzed for the proposed project. This would result in fugitive dust emissions similar to the proposed project, which exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a significant localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ impact.

Trip generation for this alternative would be approximately 6,396 daily trip ends over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday compared to 7,107 daily trip ends for the proposed project. Table 4.2-1 shows the daily operational emissions for the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Regional operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for NO_x. Regional operational emissions for the

Reduced Intensity Alternative would still result in a significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact, but would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project.

| Emission Sources | Pounds per Day | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | CO | ROG | NO_x | SO_x | PM_{2.5} | PM₁₀ |
| Area Sources /a/ | 5 | <1 | 2 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile Sources | 527 | 45 | 71 | <1 | 20 | 105 |
| Total Emissions | 532 | 45 | 73 | <1 | 20 | 105 |
| SCAQMD Threshold | 550 | 55 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 150 |
| Exceed SCAQMD Threshold? | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Reduced Intensity Alternative | 532 | 45 | 73 | <1 | 20 | 105 |
| Proposed Project | 634 | 50 | 81 | <1 | 23 | 117 |
| Difference | (102) | (5) | (8) | (<1) | (3) | (12) |
| /a/ Area sources include natural gas, wood-burning fireplaces, and consumer products. SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, 2008 | | | | | | |

Mobile source emissions associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would potentially reduce localized CO emissions. Maximum project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations are estimated to be 4 and 3.2 ppm, respectively. As with the proposed project, these concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Reduced traffic associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the proposed project. As with the Proposed Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable operational CO and NO_x air quality impact.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would generate less GHG emissions than estimated for the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would comply with all State, regional, and local greenhouse gas regulations and policies. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a less-than-significant global warming impact.

- Noise - Construction activity associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would generally result in similar construction noise levels as discussed for the Proposed Project. Construction-related noise exposure would be expected to be shorter in duration due to decreased development. However, daily noise levels would be similar to noise levels presented for the Proposed Project. Noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to the Bread of Life Church and mitigation measures would be recommended to reduce noise levels. It is anticipated that construction activity associated with the project would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Construction noise impacts associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to those

presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project and, as such, would result in lower mobile noise levels. Mobile noise associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not result in noise level increases greater than 3 dBA within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category resulting in a less-than-significant impact, similar to the Proposed Project. In addition, stationary noise sources associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to those sources identified for the proposed project. Stationary noise under the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

- **Hazardous Materials** - Since the Reduced Intensity Alternative utilizes the same site area as the proposed project, the risk of exposure to hazardous materials for the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would experience the same likelihood of exposure to hazardous materials, although fewer people would be exposed. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would require similar mitigation measures to address impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials.
- **Utilities (Water / Wastewater / Stormwater)** - The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in reduced consumption of water and reduced production of wastewater and stormwater in comparison to the proposed project. A reduction in the square footage in this infill urban location would not necessarily result in less demand for utility service on a regional basis. The stormwater systems identified for the Proposed Project would be downsized commensurate with the Reduced Intensity Alternative. The impact would be less than significant after mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project.

-Finding - The Reduced Intensity Alternative would achieve most of the Proposed Project benefits, including the increase to employment opportunities in the City Torrance. However, though reduced square footage would somewhat reduce the intensity of impacts at the subject site, it would also provide reduced project benefits.

-Facts Supporting Finding - The Reduced Intensity Alternative would meet the objective of environmental remediation of a former aerospace facility and developing an underutilized parcel. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in one less significantly impacted intersection than the proposed project due to the decrease in peak hour trips. Air quality impacts and noise impacts would not be reduced to a level of non-significance. Water and Wastewater impact would be reduced and remain less than significant, without mitigation. Stormwater quantity and quality would remain significant, but mitigated, similar to the Proposed Project. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected

C. Industrial Alternative

-Description - The Industrial Alternative assumes no office uses on the site. The entire site would be utilized for light industrial uses. This alternative would be developed at an assumed floor area ratio of 0.45ⁱ as permitted in the City's General Plan or

approximately 462,600 square feet of light industrial uses. The development would likely include one- to two-story industrial office buildings with open, surface parking at a ratio of 2 spaces per 1,000 building square feet.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use - The Industrial Alternative would have light industrial uses compatible with existing industrial uses east and north of the site. This alternative would have no land use impacts, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Transportation and Parking - The Industrial Alternative is estimated to generate approximately 3,220 daily trips, or 3,887 fewer daily trips than the Proposed Project. During the AM peak hour, the Industrial Alternative would generate 238 fewer trips than the proposed project. During the PM peak hour, this alternative would generate 358 fewer trips. The Industrial Alternative would result in six fewer significantly impacted study intersections than the Proposed Project. There would be no Parking related impacts, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Air Quality - The Industrial Alternative would require more construction activity than assumed for the proposed project, as building square footage would be increased from 351,200 to 462,600. Pollutant emissions during the entire Industrial Alternative construction period would be more than the amount of pollutants emitted during the entire proposed project construction period. However, the daily construction intensity (e.g., construction equipment hours) for the Industrial Alternative would be similar to the daily construction intensity assumed for the proposed project. Accordingly, the Industrial Alternative daily regional construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the proposed project, resulting in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact.

Localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ construction emissions were calculated based on the amount of acres to be disturbed per day. The size of the project site would not change under the Industrial Alternative and the acres of land graded per day would be similar to that analyzed for the proposed project. This would result in fugitive dust emissions similar to the proposed project, which exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, the Industrial Alternative would result in a significant localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

Trip generation for this alternative would be approximately 3,220 daily trip ends over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday compared to 7,107 daily trip ends for the Proposed Project. Table 4.2-2 shows the daily operational emissions for the Industrial Alternative. Industrial Alternative emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀. The Industrial Alternative would generate less operational emissions compared to the proposed project and would eliminate the project-related operational CO and NO_x impacts. The significant air quality impacts to operational regional emissions from the Proposed Project could be avoided under this alternative.

| Emission Sources | Pounds per Day | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | CO | ROG | NO_x | SO_x | PM_{2.5} | PM₁₀ |
| Area Sources /a/ | 2 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile Sources | 305 | 27 | 41 | <1 | 12 | 60 |
| Total Emissions | 307 | 27 | 41 | <1 | 12 | 60 |
| SCAQMD Threshold | 550 | 55 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 150 |
| Exceed SCAQMD Threshold? | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Industrial Alternative | 307 | 27 | 41 | <1 | 12 | 60 |
| Proposed Project | 634 | 50 | 81 | <1 | 23 | 117 |
| Difference | (327) | (23) | (40) | (<1) | (11) | (57) |

/a/ Area sources include natural gas, wood-burning fireplaces, and consumer products.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, 2008

Mobile source emissions associated with the Industrial Alternative would potentially reduce localized CO emissions. Maximum project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations are estimated to be 4 and 3.2 ppm, respectively. As with the Proposed Project, these concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Reduced traffic associated with the Industrial Alternative would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, the Industrial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant localized CO impact.

The Industrial Alternative would generate less green house gas (GHG) emissions than estimated for the proposed project. The Industrial Alternative would comply with all State, regional, and local GHG and policies. Therefore, the Industrial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant global warming impact.

- Noise - Construction activity associated with the Industrial Alternative would generally result in similar noise levels than as discussed for the proposed project. Construction-related noise exposure would be expected to be longer in duration due to increased development. However, daily noise levels would be similar to noise levels presented for the proposed project. Noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to the Bread of Life Church and mitigation measures would be recommended to reduce noise levels. It is anticipated that construction activity associated with the project would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Construction noise impacts associated with the Industrial Alternative would be similar to those presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a less-than-significant impact, with mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project.

The Industrial Alternative would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project and, as such, would result in lower mobile noise levels. Mobile noise associated with the Industrial Alternative would not result in noise level increases greater than 3 dBA within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category resulting in a less-than-significant impact, without mitigation, similar to the

Proposed Project. In addition, stationary noise sources associated with the Industrial Alternative would be similar to those sources identified for the Proposed Project. Stationary noise under the Industrial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact, without mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project.

- Hazardous Materials - Development resulting from implementation of the Industrial Alternative would be subject to the same potential for exposure to hazardous materials contamination at the Proposed Project site; however, fewer people would be exposed. An industrial facility on the site would likely require similar mitigation measures as the Proposed Project.
- Utilities - The Industrial Alternative would have a lower consumption of water and lower production of wastewater than the proposed project. Impacts related to the demand of water and the generation of wastewater would be less than significant, without mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative may result in a higher release of storm water because most of the site would be covered by impenetrable surfaces. To limit runoff, this alternative may require on-site retention of storm water in higher capacity underground storage tanks as compared to the Proposed Project. Generation of storm water would increase as compared to the Proposed Project, but, with a larger detention system, the impact to storm water would be mitigated, similar to the Proposed Project

-Finding

The Industrial Alternative would generally result in less environmental impacts as compared to the Proposed Project. However, the Industrial Alternative would fail to meet many of the Project Objectives.

-Facts Supporting Finding

This alternative would provide a lower number of jobs as compared to the Proposed Project. The Industrial Alternative would not provide medical office uses. This alternative would not provide perimeter and internal site landscaping as generously as the proposed project. The Industrial Alternative is less likely to meet the objectives of replacing an underutilized area with an economically viable alternative. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

D. Commercial Alternative

-Description - The Commercial Alternative assumes no office and light industrial development of the site. The entire site would be utilized for commercial uses compatible with areas to the east and south. Although the General Plan allows a floor area ratio of 0.6 for General Commercial, this alternative proposes a ratio of 0.3 FAR, which is more consistent with the intensity of the adjacent commercial development with surface parking. This alternative would incorporate approximately 308,400 square feet of commercial uses or planned development. The development would likely include at least one large retail store, and several smaller stores or restaurants. Approximately 1,540 parking spaces would be provided to serve the commercial facility and would be located in an interconnected parking area distributed through the site.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use - The Commercial Alternative would introduce commercial uses that would be compatible with existing commercial uses to the east and south of the site, and generally compatible with the industrial uses across Lomita Boulevard. The commercial uses of this alternative would not be compatible with the existing General Plan designation. The General Plan would need to be amended to allow for commercial uses. The M2: Heavy Manufacturing zone conditionally allows for commercial retail uses.
- Transportation and Parking - The Commercial Alternative would generate approximately 13,240 daily trips, approximately 6,130 more than the Proposed Project. This alternative would generate approximately 320 AM peak hour trips, 347 fewer trips than the proposed project, and 1,156 PM peak hour trips, 344 more than the Proposed Project. Even with reductions for pass-by trips (25 percent during the PM peak hour and 10 percent daily), the Commercial Alternative would result in one more significantly impacted study intersection than the Proposed Project.

Trip generation for commercial uses is generally higher on weekends than on weekdays; therefore, the trip generation for Saturdays was determined for the Commercial Alternative. This alternative would generate approximately 15,411 Saturday daily trips, and 1,533 Saturday peak hour trips. The Saturday trip generation for the Commercial Alternative is higher than the weekday trips generated; however, the background traffic on the streets is typically lower on Saturdays than on weekdays, and the weekday analysis represents the worst-case condition. Parking-related impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Proposed Project.

- Air Quality - The Commercial Alternative would require less construction activity than assumed for the Proposed Project as building square footage would be reduced from 351,200 to 308,400. Pollutant emissions during the entire Commercial Alternative construction period would be less than the amount of pollutants emitted during the entire proposed project construction period. However, the daily construction intensity (e.g., construction equipment hours) for the Commercial Alternative would be similar to the daily construction intensity assumed for the proposed project. Accordingly, the Commercial Alternative daily regional construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact.

Localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ construction emissions were calculated based on the amount of acres to be disturbed per day. The size of the project site would not change under the Commercial Alternative and the acres of land graded per day would be similar to that analyzed for the Proposed Project. This would result in fugitive dust emissions similar to the Proposed Project, which exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, the Commercial Alternative would result in a significant localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ impact.

Trip generation for this alternative would be approximately 13,240 daily trip ends over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday compared to 7,107 daily trip ends for the proposed project. Table 4.2-3 shows the daily operational emissions for the Commercial Alternative. Similar to the Proposed Project, regional operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for CO and NO_x. The SCAQMD significance thresholds would also be exceeded for ROG and PM₁₀. Regional operational emissions for the Commercial Alternative would still result in a significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact, and would be greater compared to the Proposed Project.

Mobile source emissions associated with the Commercial Alternative would potentially increase localized CO emissions. Maximum project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations are estimated to be 4 and 3.2 ppm, respectively. As with the Proposed Project, these concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Increased traffic associated with the Commercial Alternative would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, the Commercial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant localized CO impact.

The Commercial Alternative would generate less GHG emissions than estimated for the Proposed Project. The Commercial Alternative would comply with all State, regional, and local greenhouse gas regulations and policies. Therefore, the Commercial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant global warming impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

| Emission Sources | Pounds per Day | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | CO | ROG | NO_x | SO_x | PM_{2.5} | PM₁₀ |
| Area Sources /a/ | 3 | <1 | 2 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile Sources | 1,180 | 99 | 157 | 1 | 45 | 233 |
| Total Emissions | 1,183 | 99 | 159 | 1 | 45 | 233 |
| SCAQMD Threshold | 550 | 55 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 150 |
| Exceed SCAQMD Threshold? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Commercial Alternative | 1,183 | 99 | 159 | 1 | 45 | 233 |
| Proposed Project | 634 | 50 | 81 | <1 | 23 | 117 |
| Difference | 549 | 49 | 78 | 1 | 22 | 116 |
| <i>/a/</i> Area sources include natural gas, wood-burning fireplaces, and consumer products. | | | | | | |
| SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, 2008 | | | | | | |

- Noise- Construction activity associated with the Commercial Alternative would generally result in similar noise levels than as discussed for the Proposed Project. Construction-related noise exposure would be expected to be shorter in duration due to decreased development. However, daily noise levels would be similar to

noise levels presented for the Proposed Project. Noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to the Bread of Life Church and mitigation measures would be recommended to reduce noise levels. It is anticipated that construction activity associated with the project would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Construction noise impacts associated with the Commercial Alternative would be similar to those presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a less-than-significant impact, with mitigation.

The Commercial Alternative would result in more daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and, as such, would result in higher mobile noise levels. Mobile noise associated with the Commercial Alternative would likely result in noise level increases greater than 3 dBA within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category resulting in a significant impact, which is greater than the impact identified for the Proposed Project. Stationary noise sources associated with the Commercial Alternative would be similar to those sources identified for the Proposed Project. Stationary noise under the Commercial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact without mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project.

- Hazardous Materials - Development resulting from implementation of the Commercial Alternative would be subject to the same potential for exposure to hazardous materials as the Proposed Project. However, most of the site would be occupied by the commercial structure or a surface parking lot. Such coverage would reduce the potential for hazardous materials contamination. Nevertheless, construction of a commercial facility on the site would require the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project.
- Utilities - The Commercial Alternative would have a lower consumption of water and lower production of wastewater than the Proposed Project. Impacts related to the demand of water and on the generation of wastewater would be less than significant without mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative may result in a higher release of storm water because most of the site would be covered by impenetrable surfaces due to the increase in the number of parking spaces. To limit runoff, this alternative may require on-site retention of storm water in higher capacity underground storage tanks as compared to the Proposed Project. Generation of storm water would increase as compared to the Proposed Project, but, with a larger detention system, the impact to storm water would be mitigated, similar to the Proposed Project.

-Finding

The Commercial Alternative would generally result in greater environmental impacts as compared to the Proposed Project. Also, the Commercial Alternative would fail to meet many of the Project Objectives.

-Facts Supporting Finding

This alternative would provide a lower number of jobs as compared to the Proposed Project and greater impacts related to traffic and air quality. The Commercial Alternative would not provide medical office uses and employment. This alternative would not provide perimeter and internal site landscaping as generously as the proposed project. The Commercial Alternative would meet the objectives of replacing

an underutilized area with an economically viable alternative, and environmentally remediating the site. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

E. Office/Industrial Alternative (without medical offices)

-Description - The Office/Industrial Alternative assumes no medical offices on the site. The entire site would be utilized for flexible office and light industrial uses compatible with areas to the north, east and west. This alternative proposes 0.34 FAR, which is same as the Proposed Project. This alternative would incorporate approximately 351,200 square feet of office and light industrial uses. Parking spaces would be located in an interconnected parking area distributed through the site.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use - As with the proposed project, the uses proposed in the Office/Industrial Alternative would be compatible with the surrounding uses. The M2: Heavy Manufacturing zone conditionally allows for professional office uses. Compatibility of the alternative with adjacent uses and consistency with regional plans would be maintained. There would be no environmental impact with regard to Land Use, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Transportation and Parking - Since the Proposed Project would be parked at the office rate (allowing office uses to occupy the industrial space), the office trip rates were applied to the entire site. Because there would be no medical office use, the Office/Industrial Alternative would generate approximately 3,870 daily trips, 3,240 less than the Proposed Project. During the AM peak hour, the Office/Industrial Alternative would generate 545 trips, 119 less than the proposed project, and during the PM peak hour, this alternative would generate 523 trips, 289 less than the proposed project. The Office/Industrial Alternative would result in three fewer significantly impacted study intersections than the proposed project. Parking related impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Air Quality- The Office/Industrial Alternative would require similar construction activity as assumed for the proposed project as building square footage would remain at 351,200. Pollutant emissions during the entire Office/Industrial Alternative construction period would be similar to the amount of pollutants emitted during the entire Proposed Project construction period. Accordingly, the Office/Industrial Alternative daily regional construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

Localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ construction emissions were calculated based on the amount of acres to be disturbed per day. The size of the project site would not change under the Office/Industrial Alternative and the acres of land graded per day would be similar to that analyzed for the Proposed Project. This would result in fugitive dust emissions similar to the Proposed Project, which exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, the Office/Industrial Alternative would result in a significant localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ impact.

Due to the absence of medical use, trip generation for this alternative would be approximately 3,870 daily trip ends over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday compared to 7,107 daily trip ends for the Proposed Project. Table 4.2-4 shows the daily operational emissions for the Office/Industrial Alternative. Office/Industrial Alternative emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀. The Office/Industrial Alternative would generate less operational emissions compared to the Proposed Project and would eliminate the project-related operational CO and NO_x impacts. The significant air quality impacts to operational regional emissions from the Proposed Project could be avoided under this alternative.

| Emission Sources | Pounds per Day | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | CO | ROG | NO_x | SO_x | PM_{2.5} | PM₁₀ |
| Area Sources /a/ | 2 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile Sources | 366 | 31 | 48 | <1 | 14 | 72 |
| Total Emissions | 368 | 31 | 48 | <1 | 14 | 72 |
| SCAQMD Threshold | 550 | 55 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 150 |
| Exceed SCAQMD Threshold? | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Office/Industrial Alternative | 368 | 31 | 48 | <1 | 14 | 72 |
| Proposed Project | 634 | 50 | 81 | <1 | 23 | 117 |
| Difference | (266) | (19) | (33) | (<1) | (9) | (45) |

/a/ Area sources include natural gas, wood-burning fireplaces, and consumer products.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, 2008

Mobile source emissions associated with the Office/Industrial Alternative would potentially reduce localized CO emissions. Maximum project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations are estimated to be 4 and 3.2 ppm, respectively. As with the Proposed Project, these concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Reduced traffic associated with the Office/Industrial Alternative would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, the Office/Industrial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant localized CO impact.

The Office/Industrial Alternative would generate less GHG emissions than estimated for the Proposed Project. The Office/Industrial Alternative would comply with all State, regional, and local greenhouse gas regulations and policies. Therefore, the Office/Industrial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant global warming impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

- Noise - Construction activity associated with the Office/Industrial Alternative would generally result in similar noise levels than as discussed for the Proposed Project. Daily noise levels would be similar to noise levels presented for the Proposed Project. Noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to the Bread of Life Church and mitigation measures would be recommended to reduce

noise levels. It is anticipated that construction activity associated with the project would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Construction noise impacts associated with the Office/Industrial Alternative would be similar to those presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a less-than-significant impact, with mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project.

The Office/Industrial Alternative would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and, as such, would result in lower mobile noise levels. Mobile noise associated with the Office/Industrial Alternative would not result in noise level increases greater than 3 dBA within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category resulting in a less-than-significant impact without mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project. In addition, stationary noise sources associated with the Office/Industrial Alternative would be similar to those sources identified for the Proposed Project. Stationary noise under the Office/Industrial Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact without mitigation, similar to the Proposed Project.

- **Hazardous Materials** - Since the Office/Industrial Alternative utilizes the same site area as the Proposed Project, the risk of exposure to hazardous materials for the Office/Industrial Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project. The Office/Industrial Alternative would experience the same likelihood of hazardous materials contamination, although fewer people would be exposed. The Office/Industrial Alternative would require similar mitigation measures to prevent impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials.
- **Utilities** - The Office/Industrial Alternative would result in reduced consumption of water and a reduced production of wastewater in comparison to the Proposed Project. The stormwater generation would be similar. Impact related to the quantity and quality of storm water runoff as a result of this alternative would also be less than significant with mitigating onsite retention, similar to the Proposed Project.

-Finding

The Office/Industrial would reduce certain environmental impacts, but would not meet many of the Project Objectives and may not be economically viable given the costs of acquiring and developing the site, the projected sale price of the office condominiums, and market conditions in the area.

-Facts Supporting Finding

The Commercial Alternative would provide fewer jobs as compared to the Proposed Project. The Commercial Alternative would not provide medical office uses and employment. This alternative would not provide perimeter and internal site landscaping as generously as the proposed project. The Commercial Alternative would meet the objectives of replacing an underutilized area with an economically viable alternative, and environmentally remediating the site. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

F. Medical Office Alternative

-Description - The Medical Office Alternative assumes no professional office and light

industrial uses on the site. The entire site would be utilized for medical offices at 0.34 FAR. Therefore, this alternative would incorporate approximately 351,200 square feet of medical office uses. In addition, parking spaces would be provided to serve the facility and would be located in an interconnected parking area distributed through the site.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use - As with the Proposed Project, the uses proposed in the Medical Office Alternative would be compatible with the surrounding uses. A conditional use permit would be required for allowing medical office uses in the M2: Heavy Manufacturing zone. Compatibility with adjacent uses and consistency with local and regional plans would be maintained, similar to the Proposed Project. There would be no environmental impacts related to Land Use, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Transportation and Parking - The Medical Office Alternative would generate approximately 12,690 daily trips, 5,583 more trips than the Proposed Project. This alternative would generate approximately 871 trips during the AM peak hour, 207 more trips than the Proposed Project, and 1,306 trips during the PM peak hour, 494 more trips than the Proposed Project. The Medical Office Alternative would result in three more significantly impacted study intersections than the Proposed Project. There would be no environmental impacts from Parking, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Air Quality - The Medical Office Alternative would require similar construction activity as assumed for the Proposed Project as building square feet would remain at 351,200. Pollutant emissions during the entire Medical Office Alternative construction period would be similar to the amount of pollutants emitted during the entire Proposed Project construction period. Accordingly, the Medical Office Alternative daily regional construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact.

Localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ construction emissions were calculated based on the amount of acres to be disturbed per day. The size of the project site would not change under the Medical Office Alternative and the acres of land graded per day would be similar to that analyzed for the Proposed Project. This would result in fugitive dust emissions similar to the Proposed Project, which exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, the Medical Office Alternative would result in a significant localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ impact.

Trip generation for this alternative would be approximately 12,690 daily trip ends over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday compared to 7,107 daily trip ends for the Proposed Project. Table 4.2-5 shows the daily operational emissions for the Medical Office Alternative. Similar to the Proposed Project, regional operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for CO and NO_x. The SCAQMD significance thresholds would also be exceeded for ROG and PM₁₀.

Regional operational emissions for the Medical Office Alternative would still result in a significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact, similar to but greater than the Proposed Project.

| Emission Sources | Pounds per Day | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | CO | ROG | NO_x | SO_x | PM_{2.5} | PM₁₀ |
| Area Sources /a/ | 4 | <1 | 2 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile Sources | 1,001 | 85 | 136 | 1 | 39 | 201 |
| Total Emissions | 1,005 | 85 | 138 | 1 | 39 | 201 |
| SCAQMD Threshold | 550 | 55 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 150 |
| Exceed SCAQMD Threshold? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Medical Office Alternative | 1,005 | 85 | 138 | 1 | 39 | 201 |
| Proposed Project | 634 | 50 | 81 | <1 | 23 | 117 |
| Difference | 371 | 35 | 57 | 1 | 16 | 184 |

/a/ Area sources include natural gas, wood-burning fireplaces, and consumer products.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, 2008

Mobile source emissions associated with the Medical Office Alternative would potentially increase localized CO emissions. Maximum project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations are estimated to be 4 and 3.2 ppm, respectively. As with the Proposed Project, these concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Increased traffic associated with the Medical Office Alternative would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, the Medical Office Alternative would result in a less-than-significant localized CO impact.

The Medical Office Alternative would generate less GHG emissions than estimated for the Proposed Project. The Medical Office Alternative would comply with all State, regional and local greenhouse gas regulations and policies. Therefore, the Medical Office Alternative would result in a less-than-significant global warming impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

- Noise- Construction activity associated with the Medical Office Alternative would generally result in similar noise levels than as discussed for the Proposed Project. Daily noise levels would be similar to noise levels presented for the Proposed Project. Noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to the Bread of Life Church and mitigation measures would be recommended to reduce noise levels. It is anticipated that construction activity associated with the project would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Construction noise impacts associated with the Medical Office Alternative would be similar to those presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a less-than-significant

impact, with mitigation.

The Medical Office Alternative would result in more daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and, as such, would result in higher mobile noise levels. Mobile noise associated with the Medical Office Alternative would likely result in noise level increases greater than 3 dBA within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category resulting in a significant impact, which is greater than the impact identified for the Proposed Project. Stationary noise sources associated with the Medical Office Alternative would be similar to those sources identified for the Proposed Project. Stationary noise under the Medical Office Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact, without mitigation.

- Hazardous Materials - Since the Medical Office Alternative utilizes the same site area as the Proposed Project, the risk of exposure to hazardous materials for the Medical Office Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project. The Medical Office Alternative would experience the same likelihood of hazardous materials contamination. The Medical Office Alternative would require similar mitigation measures to address impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials.
- Utilities - The Medical Office Alternative would result in a higher water demand and a greater production of wastewater in comparison to the Proposed Project. The stormwater generation would be similar. Impact related to the quantity and quality of storm water runoff as a result of this alternative would also be less than significant, mitigated by underground retention systems, similar to the Proposed Project.

-Finding

The Medical Office Alternative would result in greater environmental impacts than the Proposed Project, particularly increased traffic. The Medical Office Alternative meets most of the project objectives.

-Facts Supporting Finding

The Medical Office Alternative would result in greater traffic impacts. The Medical Office Alternative would meet most of the project objectives, including the provision of medical offices and medical employment opportunities in the City of Torrance, construction of a high-quality development with an extensive landscape environment, developing an underutilized parcel of property, and environmentally remediating a former aerospace site. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

G. Project on Phase I site / Industrial uses on Phase II site Alternative

-Description- This Alternative consists of a mix of medical offices, professional offices and light industrial uses on the western portion of the site, as proposed (Phase I) of the project site, plus industrial uses only on the eastern portion of the project site (Phase II). The entire site would be developed at 0.34 FAR, similar to the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative would include the same approximately 351,200 square feet of medical offices, professional offices, and light industrial uses. In addition, parking spaces would be provided to serve the facility and would be located in an interconnected parking area distributed through the site.

-Potential Impacts

- Land Use - As with the Proposed Project, the uses proposed in the this alternative would be compatible with the surrounding uses. The M-2: Heavy Manufacturing zone allows industrial uses and conditionally allows professional and medical office uses. Compatibility with adjacent uses and consistency with regional plans result in no environmental impacts, similar to the Proposed Project.
- Transportation and Parking - This alternative would generate approximately 4,960 daily trips, approximately 2,147 fewer trips than the Proposed Project. This alternative would generate approximately 517 AM peak hour trips, approximately 147 fewer trips than the proposed project, and 599 PM peak hour trips, approximately 213 fewer than the proposed project. This alternative would result in two fewer significantly impacted study intersections than the Proposed Project.
- Air Quality - This Alternative would require similar construction activity as assumed for the Proposed Project as building square footage would remain at approximately 351,200. Pollutant emissions during the entire construction period would be similar to the amount of pollutants emitted during the entire Proposed Project construction period. Accordingly, daily regional construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the proposed project and would result in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

Localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ construction emissions were calculated based on the amount of acres to be disturbed per day. The size of the project site would not change under this Alternative and the acres of land graded per day would be similar to that analyzed for the Proposed Project. This would result in fugitive dust emissions similar to the Proposed Project, which exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a significant localized PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ impact.

Trip generation for this Alternative would be approximately 4,960 daily trip ends over a 24-hour period on a typical weekday compared to 7,107 daily trip ends for the Proposed Project. Table 4.2-6 shows daily operational emissions. Emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for ROG, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀. This Alternative would generate less operational emissions compared to the Proposed Project and would eliminate the project-related operational CO impact but not the NO_x impact. This Alternative would result in a significant operational air quality impact similar to, but less than the Proposed Project.

The reduced trip generation would result in less localized CO emissions than identified for the Proposed Project. Maximum project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations are estimated to be 4 and 3.2 ppm, respectively. As with the Proposed Project, these concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. As with the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a less-than-significant localized CO impact.

**TABLE 4.2-6
DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS – PROJECT ON PHASE I AND INDUSTRIAL USES
ON PHASE II ALTERNATIVE**

| Emission Sources | Pounds per Day | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | CO | ROG | NO _x | SO _x | PM _{2.5} | PM ₁₀ |
| Area Sources /a/ | 6 | 1 | 2 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile Sources | 457 | 36 | 57 | <1 | 16 | 84 |
| Total Emissions | 463 | 37 | 59 | <1 | 16 | 84 |
| SCAQMD Threshold | 550 | 55 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 150 |
| Exceed SCAQMD Threshold? | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Phase I Project plus Industrial Alternative | 463 | 37 | 59 | <1 | 16 | 84 |
| Proposed Project | 634 | 50 | 81 | <1 | 23 | 117 |
| Difference | (171) | (13) | (22) | (<1) | (7) | (33) |

/a/ Area sources include natural gas, wood-burning fireplaces, and consumer products.
SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, 2008

This Alternative would generate less GHG emissions than estimated for the Proposed Project. The Alternative would comply with all State, regional, and local greenhouse gas regulations and policies. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a less-than-significant global warming impact, similar to the Proposed Project.

- Noise - Construction activity associated with this Alternative would generally result in similar noise levels discussed for the Proposed Project. Daily noise levels would be similar to noise levels presented for the Proposed Project. Noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to the Bread of Life Church and mitigation measures would be recommended to reduce noise levels. It is anticipated that construction activity associated with the project would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Construction noise impacts associated with this Alternative would be similar to those presented for the Proposed Project and would result in a less-than-significant impact, with mitigation.

This Alternative would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project, and would result in lower mobile noise levels. Mobile noise would not result in noise level increases greater than 3 dBA within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category resulting in a less-than-significant impact, which is similar than the impact identified for the Proposed Project. In addition, stationary noise sources would similar to those sources identified for the Proposed Project. Similar to the proposed project, stationary noise would result in a less-than-significant impact.

- Hazardous Materials - Since this Alternative utilizes the same site area as the Proposed Project, the risk of exposure to hazardous materials for this Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project. This Alternative would experience the same likelihood of hazardous materials contamination, although fewer people

would be exposed. This Alternative would require similar mitigation measures to avoid impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials.

- Utilities - This alternative would result in a lower water demand and a reduced production of wastewater in comparison to the Proposed Project. The stormwater generation would be similar. Impact related to the quantity and quality of storm water runoff as a result of this alternative would also be less than significant, mitigated by underground retention systems, similar to the Proposed Project.

-Finding

The Alternative would result in two fewer significantly impacted study intersections than the proposed project. This alternative meets most of the Project Objectives.

-Facts Supporting Finding

This alternative would provide a high-quality development that responds to market conditions utilizing a landscaped environment, including a landscaped perimeter with a monument entrance. This alternative would meet the objectives of developing an underutilized parcel of property and environmentally remediating a former aerospace site. However, it will do less to provide new medical office use and employment opportunities in the City of Torrance. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

H. Alternative Location in Torrance

-Description - This alternative would involve developing the proposed business park development in alternate locations in Torrance. To explore if an environmentally superior alternative site within the City of Torrance was available for the Proposed Project, the following criteria were used in identifying potential sites:

- Vacant, or underutilized site of 23.6 acres or more
- Access of the development to the regional transit system
- Compatibility of adjoining uses and zoning or adequate area for appropriate buffers
- Ability of the applicant to acquire the site
- Several access roads, including at least one access from a main road
- Ability to maintain efficient traffic circulation in the vicinity

-Finding

As the City is considered to be built-out, no alternative sites large enough for the Proposed Project currently exist within the City of Torrance that meet the criteria.

-Facts Supporting Finding

There exists one vacant 14.51-acre parcel, located at the southwest corner of Crenshaw Boulevard and 208th Street, designated Heavy Industrial and zoned M2: Heavy Manufacturing, available for development within the City of Torrance. However,

this site does not meet the project criteria for size.

The only other remaining site in Torrance is a collection of parcels known as Butcher Hill located along the southern boundary of the City. This is designated Low Density Residential in the City's General Plan and zoned A-1: Hillside Overlay District. This site would result in more potential significant impacts due to land use inconsistency with adjacent residential uses, limited vehicular access, and possible biological and/or scenic resources that may exist on the site. Therefore, an alternative location was not analyzed further in the analysis.

I. Environmentally Superior Alternative

The California Environmental Quality Act requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative to the Proposed Project. If the "No Project" Alternative is designated as the environmentally superior alternative, then an additional environmentally superior alternative is to be identified.

Analysis of the above alternatives found none to be superior to the proposed project and still meet the project objectives. Although the "No Project" Alternative would not remediate existing soil and groundwater contamination of the site, it would avoid new environmental impacts and would be environmentally superior.

Among the remaining alternatives, the Industrial Alternative is identified as environmentally superior. However, as discussed earlier, the Industrial Alternative would still result in a significant and unavoidable ROG and NO_x regional construction air quality impact as well as significant traffic impacts, although six less study intersections would be significantly impacted than the Proposed Project. Moreover, the Industrial Alternative would do less than the Proposed Project to address continuing demand for new medical office use and employment opportunities in the City of Torrance and surrounding region. This demand is acknowledged to be contributing to significant environmental impacts in the area and region, including but not limited to, traffic congestion from commuter trips, and related air quality effects. Thus, it is not clear whether on an overall basis the Industrial Alternative would mitigate environmental impacts as compared to the Proposed Project. Also, it is not clear if the Industrial Alternative would be economically viable given the costs of acquiring and developing the site and market conditions in the area. For the reasons stated above, as well as in the Final EIR, this alternative is rejected.

EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

FOR

ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE # 2007121119)

CITY OF TORRANCE

ADOPTED MARCH 17TH, 2010

**STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
REGARDING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE # 2007121119) FOR THE
ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER**

CEQA requires a decision-making public agency to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the Project. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 provides as follows:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

(b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Planning Commission finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will avoid or substantially lessen most of the significant environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR. Nonetheless, as identified and discussed in Exhibit A to the Final EIR, certain air quality and traffic impacts are unavoidable, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. The Planning Commission finds that notwithstanding these significant unavoidable impacts, there are specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, environmental and other benefits of the Proposed Project that outweigh those impacts and provide sufficient reasons for approving the Proposed Project.

The benefits derived from the Proposed Project are as follows:

- The Project will result in the environmental remediation, and productive reuse, of a former aerospace manufacturing site.
- The Project will develop a first class professional center on one of the largest under-utilized parcels in Torrance, providing an economically productive use of the property that benefits the Torrance community and local businesses. The Project is further consistent with existing land use plans for the site.
- The Project will provide both short and long term employment opportunities for residents in the City of Torrance, including substantial construction work opportunities

and long term local light industrial, professional and medical jobs. Specifically, the Project will employ over 100 construction workers in construction of shell buildings and tenant improvements. Purchase of construction materials will stimulate both local and regional jobs and economies. The completed Project will employ over 1,300 workers. Project businesses will stimulate both local and regional jobs and economies.

- The Project will provide needed medical facilities, which are consistent with the existing medical uses to the west of the project site.
- The Project will enhance the image of the area through new development and landscaping.
- The Project will create an environment suitable for small and medium sized businesses offering professional and technical jobs and services
- The Project will provide a secondary economic benefit to local and regional economy derived from spending of project employees and visitors.
- The Project will generate increased sales tax (from project visitors and employees), as well as increased business license taxes to the City of Torrance.
- The Project will provide increased property taxes from the proposed improvements.
- The Project will improve the job/housing balance in the Project area.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing findings and information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

- a) All significant effects on the environment resulting from approval of Rockefeller Group Professional Center have been reduced to less-than-significant through mitigation where feasible; and
- b) The Planning Commission has balanced the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental risks and hereby determines that the significant benefits of the Project, as set forth above, outweigh those environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated to a level of significance. Therefore, the unmitigated impacts and the decision not to adopt an environmentally superior project alternative are acceptable.

EXHIBIT C

MITIGATION MONITORING
AND REPORTING PROGRAM

FOR

ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE # 2007121119)

CITY OF TORRANCE

ADOPTED MARCH 17TH, 2010

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
REGARDING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE # 2007121119) FOR THE
ROCKEFELLER GROUP PROFESSIONAL CENTER**

6.1 LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Effective January 1, 1989, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was amended to add Section 21081.6, implementing Assembly Bill (AB) 3180.

As part of CEQA (state-mandated) environmental review procedures, AB 3180 requires a public agency to adopt a monitoring and reporting program for assessing and ensuring efficacy of any required mitigation measures applied to proposed developments. As stated in Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code,

...the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted, or made a condition of project approval, in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

AB 3180 provides guidelines for implementing monitoring and reporting programs. Specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements, to be enforced during project implementation, shall be defined prior to final approval of the project proposal by the responsible decision maker(s). In response to established CEQA requirements and those of AB 3180 (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the proposed mitigation monitoring program shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for consideration prior to completion of the environmental review process to enable the decision maker's appropriate response to the proposals.

6.2 PROGRAM STRUCTURE

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMP") for the Rockefeller Group Professional Center is designed to ensure compliance with specific mitigation measures ("Mitigation Measures") adopted in order to mitigate or avoid the significant impacts on the environment identified by the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR").

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Each Mitigation Measure recommended in the FEIR is listed in this MMP. Mitigation Measures are categorized by the environmental category to which they pertain. The MMP designates the nature of the mitigation to be monitored (e.g. design requirement, operation requirement). For each measure, an implementing entity is specified (the "Responsible Entity"). If the Responsible Entity is a City of Torrance agency, then this entity is also responsible for monitoring and reporting compliance with the Mitigation Measures. If the Responsible Entity is not a City of Torrance agency, a City of Torrance monitor is also identified which is responsible for monitoring and reporting as further discussed below.

MONITORING TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE

Design Requirements

Compliance with Mitigation Measures which pertain to project design (“Design Requirements”) shall be ensured as follows: No final certificate of occupancy for the Project shall be issued unless City inspection has confirmed that all Design Requirements have been implemented. Further, no Design Requirement can be omitted or modified without City of Torrance Planning Commission or City Council approval.

Operational Requirements

Compliance with Mitigation Measures which pertain to project operation (“Operational Requirements”) shall be ensured as follows: Operational Requirements are to be implemented and monitored on an on-going basis. The Responsible Entity shall implement the Operational Requirements for which it is responsible. Instances of non-compliance shall be reported to the City Code Enforcement Division. In those cases where a monitoring entity is designated (“Monitoring Entity”) in addition to the Responsible Entity, the Monitoring Entity shall confirm implementation of the Operational Requirements by initial (and thereafter periodic) inspections or inquiries and report any instances of non-compliance to the City Code Enforcement Division in writing. Where appropriate and deemed necessary by the Monitoring Entity, the Monitoring Entity may also request written confirmation of compliance by the Responsible Entity. The Monitoring Entity shall also retain any reports of non-compliance in its files.

Project Coordinator(s) – City of Torrance

The City of Torrance shall be responsible for overall implementation and administration of the MMP for the Project. The City shall designate one or more staff persons to serve as the project coordinator(s) (“Project Coordinator(s)”) of all mitigation monitoring among the various government agencies, construction contractors, and interested residents. The Project Coordinator will ensure coordination even when the listed Monitoring Entity is not a City of Torrance Department or Division. The Project Coordinator(s) will oversee all Mitigation Measures and ensure that measures are completed in a timely manner and completed to the standards specified in the FEIR. The Project Coordinator(s) will also be responsible for ensuring that the MMP included in the FEIR is completed.

Some of the duties of the Project Coordinator(s) may include the following:

- Coordinate with applicable agencies that have mitigation monitoring and reporting responsibility;
- Coordinate activities with the Project Construction Manager (defined below);
- Coordinate activities of all in-field monitors;
- Develop a work plan and schedule for monitoring activities;
- Conduct routine inspections and reporting activities;
- Handle citizen inquiries and complaints;
- Review, maintain, and compile Verification Report (defined below) forms that are

submitted by the Construction Manager;

- Maintain the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist or other suitable mitigation compliance summary; and
- Coordinate and assure implementation of corrective actions or enforcement measures, as needed.

Construction Manager/Coordinator(s) – Project Applicant

The Project Applicant shall be responsible for overall completion of specific tasks, assignments and programs contained in the MMP for the Project. The Project Applicant shall designate one or more persons to serve as construction managers and/or coordinators (“Construction Manager/Coordinator(s)”) of all preconstruction, construction and operational measures specified in the MMP and to coordinate activities among construction contractors, sub-contractors, vendors and other individuals responsible for completing measures. Additionally, the Construction Manager/Coordinator(s) shall be responsible for submitting timely verbal and written reports, updates, applications, specifications, data and related materials to the City’s designated Project Coordinator(s).

Some of the duties of the Construction Manager/Coordinator(s) may include the following:

- Coordinate with applicable agencies that have mitigation monitoring and reporting responsibility;
- Coordinate activities with the City’s Project Coordinator;
- Coordinate activities with the construction team;
- Coordinate activities of all in-field monitors;
- Develop a work plan and schedule for reporting monitoring activities;
- Coordinate activities of consultants hired by the developer when such expertise and qualifications are necessary;
- Conduct routine inspections and reporting activities;
- Conduct meetings with City staff;
- Assure follow-up and response to citizen inquiries and complaints;
- Develop, maintain, and compile Verification Report forms that will be reviewed by the Project Coordinator;
- Maintain a Mitigation Monitoring Checklist or other suitable mitigation compliance summary; and
- Coordinate and assure implementation of corrective actions or enforcement measures, as needed.

Mitigation Monitoring

The implementation of Mitigation Measures shall be monitored at two levels. The first level of monitoring is done through the use of a formal verification report ("Verification Report"). This report is to be completed for Mitigation Measures by the in-field monitor, responsible agency, or Construction Manager (whichever is appropriate for the given action and Mitigation Measure). Frequency of report completion will vary based on the type of Mitigation Measure and a determination made by the Project Coordinator in consultation with other Department and Division staff. For example, measures that require modification of final design drawings will only require that the Verification Report be completed at the time the final drawings are completed and again when they are approved. However, in-field monitoring for activities such as construction may require that a Verification Report be completed daily.

Once a Mitigation Measure has been completed and the measure needs no further monitoring or follow-up, the in-field monitor, responsible agency, or Construction Manager/Coordinator(s) shall notify the Project Coordinator that the measure has been completed. The Project Coordinator shall be responsible for collecting and maintaining completed Verification Reports. Copies of these reports shall be maintained by the City.

If the Project Coordinator, in-field monitor, responsible agency, or Construction Manager determines that non-compliance has occurred, a written notice shall be submitted or prepared by the Project Coordinator describing the non-compliance and requiring compliance within a reasonably specified period of time. If non-compliance still exists at the expiration of the specified period of time, construction may be halted and penalties may be imposed upon the party responsible for implementation, at the discretion of the City; provided, however, if compliance cannot be achieved due to a cause outside of the control of the party charged with compliance, the period for compliance shall be extended until the responsible party can reasonably be expected to achieve such compliance.

The second level of monitoring shall be done through the completion of a formal mitigation monitoring checklist consistent with this Chapter 6.0 ("Mitigation Monitoring Checklist"). The purpose of the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist is to provide a summary of the status of adopted mitigation measures for the City, other public officials and concerned citizens. The Project Coordinator shall update the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist on a regular basis. The Project Coordinator shall update the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist by reviewing the Verification Reports and contacting the in-field monitors, responsible agencies, and the Construction Manager/Coordinator(s) to review the status of their respective Mitigation Measures. A copy of the most current Mitigation Monitoring Checklist shall be maintained at the Community Development Department.

ENFORCEMENT

The City Code Enforcement Division shall be responsible for investigating reports and/or allegations of non-compliance with Mitigation Measures related to the construction of the Project. The enforcement section may require that complaints and/or allegations of non-compliance filed by person or entities other than the City of Torrance staff be filed in writing.

A Code Enforcement Manager shall investigate complaints and/or allegations of non-compliance as soon as is practical. If investigation confirms an instance of non-compliance to the satisfaction of the

Code Enforcement Manager, a written communication shall be issued to the appropriate City entity instructing the entity to comply, or, if the non-compliance is attributed to a third party, issue a written notice of violation.

Following the issuance of a written request for compliance, the Code Enforcement Manager may, if necessary, initiate: hearings to review instances of non-compliance, administrative proceedings to impose fines and/or penalties, and/or judicial actions (through the City Attorney's Office) to abate the complained of alleged non-compliance. The Code Enforcement Division shall retain any report of non-compliance, and the action taken, in its files.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

It should be noted that although not required by CEQA, the FEIR analyzes certain non-environmental impacts and less-than-significant environmental impacts, and recommends mitigation in connection therewith. In addition, although not required by CEQA or Section 21081.6, this Mitigation Monitoring Program contains monitoring provision with respect to such mitigations and refers to the same as Mitigation Measures. The inclusion of such mitigations shall not be construed to enlarge the responsibilities of the City pursuant to CEQA.

6.3 MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING

3.1 LAND USE

- 3.1(1) The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace."

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation: | Issuance of first building permit |

3.2 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING

City of Torrance

- 3.2(2) **Hawthorne Boulevard at Torrance Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Hawthorne Boulevard at Torrance Boulevard consists of the addition of an eastbound right-turn overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing these improvements would require Caltrans approval.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of an eastbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the traffic Mitigation Protocol (defined below). If Caltrans

disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from issuance of first building permit for the Project |

- 3.2(4) Hawthorne Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure at the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a second northbound right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase. Construction of this traffic control improvement is feasible within the existing right-of-way. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing this improvement would require Caltrans approval.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a second northbound right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from issuance of first building permit for the Project |

- 3.2(5) Hawthorne Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Hawthorne Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard consist of the addition of the following traffic control improvements: (1) a second northbound left-turn lane, (2) a northbound right-turn lane, (3) a fourth southbound through lane, and (4) a westbound right-turn overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require Caltrans approval.

The City of Torrance is in the process of acquiring right-of-way on the southeast corner of this intersection. An entitled development has been conditioned to dedicate the necessary right-of-way to complete the referenced traffic improvements (1) and (2). Should the area not be dedicated, or if the entitled development completes the entirety of the improvement, the subject project will not be responsible for their fair share to complete the identified improvement. Referenced traffic control improvements (3) and (4) could be constructed within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a second northbound left-turn lane, a northbound right-turn lane, a fourth southbound through lane, and a westbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows one or more of these improvements, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy the disallowed Mitigation Measures.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Transportation Planning Division
Type of Requirement: Design
Implementation Phase: Issuance of the first building permit
Monitoring Phase: Five (5) years from issuance of first
building permit for the Project

3.2(6) Hawthorne Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway. The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Hawthorne Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway consist of the addition of the following traffic control improvements: (1) a northbound right-turn lane with overlap phase, (2) a southbound right-turn overlap phase, and (3) a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require Caltrans approval.

An entitled development has been conditioned to dedicate the necessary right-of-way to complete the referenced traffic improvement (1). Should the area not be dedicated, or if the entitled development completes the entirety of the improvements, the project will not be responsible for their fair share to complete the identified improvement. Referenced traffic control improvements (2) and (3) could be constructed within the new right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn lane with overlap phase, a southbound right-turn overlap phase and a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows one or more of these improvements, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy the disallowed Mitigation Measures.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Transportation Planning Division
Type of Requirement: Design
Implementation Phase: Issuance of the first building permit
Monitoring Phase: Five (5) years from issuance of first
building permit for the Project

3.2(9) Crenshaw Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard. The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Crenshaw Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a northbound right-turn overlap phase.

Construction of referenced traffic control improvement can be incorporated into the signal phasing.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn overlap in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from issuance of first building permit for the Project |

- 3.2(11) Crenshaw Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Crenshaw Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway consist of the addition a northbound right-turn overlap phase. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require Caltrans approval.

Construction of referenced traffic control improvement can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from issuance of first building permit for the Project |

- 3.2(12) Arlington Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Arlington Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of converting the southbound right-turn lane to a second southbound through/right-turn lane. This improvement is feasible within the existing right-of-way and will mitigate project impacts at this intersection.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of converting the southbound right-turn lane to a second southbound through/right-turn lane in accordance with the traffic Mitigation Protocol.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Transportation Planning Division
Type of Requirement: Design
Implementation Phase: Issuance of the first building permit
Monitoring Phase: Five (5) years from issuance of first
building permit for the Project

- 3.2(13) Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project’s fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Transportation Planning Division
Type of Requirement: Design
Implementation Phase: Issuance of the first building permit
Monitoring Phase: Five (5) years from issuance of first
building permit for the Project

City of Lomita

- 3.2(15) Pennsylvania Avenue at Lomita Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measures for Pennsylvania Avenue at Lomita Boulevard consist of adding a northbound left-turn lane.

Construction of referenced traffic control improvement is feasible. However, the City of Lomita has not (a) promulgated a plan to construct these improvements, (b) identified these improvements in any current or future Capital Improvement Program (CIP), or (c) adopted any financing plan to obtain the funding necessary for construction of the improvement.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project’s fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If the City of Lomita disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Transportation Planning Division
Type of Requirement: Design
Implementation Phase: Issuance of the first building permit
Monitoring Phase: Five (5) years from issuance of first
building permit for the Project

City of Los Angeles

- 3.2(19) Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard consists of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane. This improvement is feasible within existing right-of-way. This intersection is under the City of Los Angeles' jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvements would require the City of Los Angeles' approval.

Mitigation Measure: The Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of a second northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If the City of Los Angeles disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from issuance of first building permit for the Project |

- 3.2(20) Western Avenue at Pacific Coast Highway.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Western Avenue at Pacific Coast Highway consists of the addition of a second southbound left-turn lane. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the referenced traffic control improvements would require Caltrans approval.

Constructing referenced traffic control improvement can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of adding a second southbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from the issuance of the first building permit for the Project |

- 3.2(22) I-110 southbound at Pacific Coast Highway.** The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for I-110 southbound at Pacific Coast Highway consists of

converting the second southbound right-turn lane to a shared left-turn/right-turn lane. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvement would require Caltrans approval.

Construction of this traffic control improvement could be accommodated within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of converting the second southbound right-turn lane to a shared left-turn/right-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from the issuance of the first building permit for the Project |

3.2(23) Figueroa Street at I-110 northbound. The Recommended Feasible Mitigation Measure for Figueroa Street at I-110 northbound consists of signalizing the intersection. This intersection is under Caltrans jurisdiction; constructing the identified improvement would require Caltrans approval.

Construction of this improvement is feasible within the existing right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure: Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of signalizing the intersection in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. If Caltrans disallows this improvement, the Project Applicant shall not be required to satisfy this Mitigation Measure.

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Transportation Planning Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Issuance of the first building permit |
| Monitoring Phase: | Five (5) years from the issuance of the first building permit for the Project |

Traffic Mitigation Protocol

For all purposes of Section 3.2 of this Chapter 6, the term "Traffic Mitigation Protocol" shall mean the following:

Where the Mitigation Measure requires the Project Applicant to contribute the Project's fair share of the cost of a Mitigation Measure set forth in the MMP, the Project Applicant will, prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the Project, post security in a form acceptable to the Community Development Director and City Attorney for the City of Torrance securing the obligation to contribute the Project's fair share (as expressed in a percentage of the estimated improvement costs). For purposes of determining the estimated cost of a particular traffic improvement, the costs shall be based upon a good faith estimate prepared by Oltmans Construction Company based upon unit pricing and taking into account existing site conditions.

If within five (5) years of the posting of the security described in the preceding paragraph, the applicable agency(ies) with jurisdiction over the intersection in which the referenced traffic improvement is to be constructed has either 1) secured and duly allocated the remaining funds necessary to proceed with construction of the applicable traffic improvement, or 2) adopted a fair share program that is reasonably calculated to produce the remaining funding necessary to proceed with construction of applicable traffic improvement, the Project Applicant shall be required to pay the Project's fair share percentage by paying the amount of that fair share contribution to the applicable agency, or to another entity as directed by the agency with jurisdiction over the applicable intersection. If neither action is taken by the applicable agency within five (5) years from the posting of the security by the Project Applicant, the security will be released to the Project Applicant or its successor-in-interest.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

- 3.3(1) Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces in sufficient quantity to prevent generation of dust plumes.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Operational |
| Implementation Phase: | Construction |
| Monitoring Phase: | Construction |

- 3.3(2) Track-out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation, and track-out shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday.

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Operational |
| Implementation Phase: | Construction |
| Monitoring Phase: | Construction |

- 3.3(3) A wheel washing system shall be installed and used to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

- 3.3(4) All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall maintain at least six inches of freeboard in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

- 3.3(5) All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

- 3.3(6) Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department -
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

- 3.3(7) Operations on unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

- 3.3(8) Heavy equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.3(9) On-site stockpiles of debris, dirt, or rusty materials shall be covered or watered at least twice per day.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.3(10) Grading activity shall be limited to no more than 5 acres during any one day.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.3(11) Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.3(12) Contractors shall utilize electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators, as feasible.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.3(13) Spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as the electrostatic spray gun or manual coatings application (e.g., paint brush and hand roller), shall be used to reduce VOC emissions, to the maximum extent feasible.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.3(14) Architectural coating shall have a VOC content of 75 grams per liter or less. The coatings shall be purchased from a super-compliant architectural coating manufacturer as identified by the SCAQMD (http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf).

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.4 NOISE

3.4(1) All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.4(2) Grading and construction contractors shall use quieter equipment as opposed to noisier equipment (such as rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment).

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.4(3) Equipment staging areas shall be located on the eastern portion of the project site, as far away as possible from the Bread of Life Church.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational

Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.4(4) During building construction, a temporary 6-foot sound wall constructed out of solid material (e.g., plywood) shall be located such that line of sight from construction activity and the Bread of Life Church is blocked. The wall shall extend for approximately 400 feet from the northwest corner of the project site toward the south and along the project site boundary.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department –
Development Review Division
Type of Requirement: Design/Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction

3.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

3.5(1) The Applicant shall comply with all mitigation requirements of the DTSC with regards to the response plan. These requirements include but are not limited to:

- Shallow polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)-impacted and diesel-impacted soil in the vicinity of previous sample point GS-18 shall be excavated and removed from the project site.
- The existing vapor extraction system shall continue to be operated to remediate off-gassing from impacted groundwater at the project site and to reduce the possible threat of vapor intrusion into proposed buildings.
- Groundwater shall be remediated using in-situ chemical oxidation in order to bring the groundwater into compliance with the RWQCB guidelines and reduce the long-term vapor threat. As an interim measure intended to minimize/eliminate any vapor inhalation risk during the groundwater remediation process, vapor barriers shall be installed under the future buildings.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: State of California Department of Toxic
Substances Control
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction

3.5(2) Proper soil management procedures shall be prepared in cooperation with the DTSC and City of Torrance Fire Department. The SMP will include specific protocols to address mitigation items 3.5(4) and 3.5(5).

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant

Monitoring Entity: Torrance Fire Department - Hazardous Materials Division, State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction

3.5(3) Should field conditions encountered require training under 29 CFR 1910.120 (HAZWOPER) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA) 8CCR5192, the contractor shall implement necessary measures for compliance with the standard. If such conditions requiring the implementation of the HAZWOPER standards are identified, personnel not having the training shall cease work in the area. The contractor shall be responsible for proper identification and mitigation of identified potentially hazardous conditions.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Torrance Fire Department - Hazardous Materials Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction, Construction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction, Construction

3.5(4) Separate stockpiling and characterization of impacted soils with TPH concentrations above cleanup levels, and/or odorous soil encountered during excavation shall be performed. These soils shall be screened for chemicals of concern to evaluate proper management methods.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Torrance Fire Department - Hazardous Materials Division, Torrance Community Development Department - Building and Safety Division
Type of Requirement: Operational
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction, Construction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction, Construction

3.5(5) Subdrains and waterproofing measures shall be provided during excavation, where appropriate. The design of subdrains shall be subject to review and approval by the Division of Building and Safety. Subdrain discharges shall be chemically analyzed to determine if the water meets the standards of the RWQCB.

Responsible Entity: Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division, Torrance Public Works Department
Type of Requirement: Design/Operational
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction, Construction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction, Construction

- 3.5(6) Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant shall submit a grading/drainage plan with a soil investigation report showing all existing and proposed grades, structures, required improvements and any proposed drainage structures.
- Responsible Entity:** Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division
- Type of Requirement:** Design
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction
- 3.5(7) Hazardous materials use, storage and/or transport shall comply with all appropriate state and local regulations.
- Responsible Entity:** Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Torrance Fire Department - Hazardous Materials Division
- Type of Requirement:** Design/Operational
Implementation Phase: Preconstruction/Construction
Monitoring Phase: Preconstruction/Construction
- 3.5(8) If during construction, an abandoned oil well is found within the project boundaries, it would be uncovered, leak tested and if necessary, reabandoned in accordance with the Public Resources Code. All work related to well testing and reabandonment will be performed in compliance with DOGGR requirements.
- Responsible Entity:** Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Torrance Fire Department - Hazardous Materials Division, Torrance Community Development Department - Environmental Division
- Type of Requirement:** Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction
- 3.5(9) An emergency response plan for evacuation of commercial workers shall be developed by the Applicant and reviewed with the local emergency personnel.
- Responsible Entity:** Project Applicant
Monitoring Entity: Torrance Fire Department - Hazardous Materials Division
- Type of Requirement:** Operational
Implementation Phase: Construction
Monitoring Phase: Construction
- 3.5(10) The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 “Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace.”

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Preconstruction |
| Monitoring Phase: | Preconstruction |

3.6 UTILITIES

3.6(1) A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) shall be initiated prior to, during, and after construction in accordance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Water Quality Control Board Standards.

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division, Torrance Public Works Department |
| Type of Requirement: | Operational |
| Implementation Phase: | Preconstruction, Construction |
| Monitoring Phase: | Preconstruction, Construction |

3.6(2) The project shall include implementation of a comprehensive stormwater pollution prevention plan.

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division, Torrance Public Works Department |
| Type of Requirement: | Operational |
| Implementation Phase: | Construction, Operation |
| Monitoring Phase: | Construction, Operation |

3.6(3) An on-site water storage facility shall be designed to retain storm water runoff as directed by the City of Torrance Community Development and Public Works Departments.

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Entity: | Project Applicant |
| Monitoring Entity: | Community Development Department – Building and Safety Division, Torrance Public Works Department |
| Type of Requirement: | Design |
| Implementation Phase: | Preconstruction, Construction, Operation |
| Monitoring Phase: | Preconstruction, Construction, Operation |

TABLE 6-1 - SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM ASSIGNMENTS

| FEIR Mitigation Measure | Proposed Monitoring Entity | | | | | | | Type of Requirement | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------|---------------------|-----------|---|
| | Community Development | | Development Department | | Torrance Public Works | Torrance Fire Dept. | DTSC | Design | Operation | |
| | Development Review Division | Building and Safety Division | Transportation Planning Division | Environ. Division | | | | | | |
| 3.1 LAND USE | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1(1) | The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace." | | | | | | | X | | X |
| 3.2 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2(2) | Hawthorne Boulevard at Torrance Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of an eastbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | | | | | | | X |
| 3.2(4) | Hawthorne Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a second northbound right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | | | | | X | | X |
| 3.2(5) | Hawthorne Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a second northbound left-turn lane, a northbound right-turn lane, a fourth southbound through lane, and a westbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | | | | | X | | X |
| 3.2(6) | Hawthorne Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a southbound right-turn overlap phase and a westbound right-turn lane | | | | | | | X | | X |

Mitigation Monitoring Program

TABLE 6-1 - SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM ASSIGNMENTS

| FEIR Mitigation Measure | Proposed Monitoring Entity | | | | | | | Type of Requirement | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------|--------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | Community Development Department | | | Torrance Public Works | Torrance Fire Dept. | DTSC | Design | Operation | |
| | Development Review Division | Building and Safety Division | Transportation Planning Division | | | | | | Environ. Division |
| | with overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2(9) | Crenshaw Boulevard at Sepulveda Boulevard Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | X | | | | | X |
| 3.2(11) | Crenshaw Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of a northbound right-turn overlap phase in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | X | | | | | X |
| 3.2(12) | Arlington Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of two percent (2%) toward the cost of converting the southbound right-turn lane to a second southbound through/right-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | X | | | | | X |
| 3.2(13) | Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of one percent (1%) toward the cost of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | X | | | | | X |
| 3.2(15) | Pennsylvania Avenue at Lomita Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's fair share of three percent (3%) toward the cost of a northbound left-turn lane in accordance with the Traffic Mitigation Protocol. | | | X | | | | | X |
| 3.2(19) | Western Avenue at Sepulveda Boulevard. Project Applicant shall contribute the Project's | | | X | | | | | X |

TABLE 6-1 - SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM ASSIGNMENTS

| FEIR Mitigation Measure | | Proposed Monitoring Entity | | | | | | | | Type of Requirement | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|
| | | Community Development | | Transportation | | Torrance Public Works | Torrance Fire Dept. | DTSC | Design | Operation | | |
| | | Review Division | Building and Safety Division | Planning Division | Environ. Division | | | | | | | |
| 3.5(10) | The Applicant shall submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the FAA in accordance with Federal Aviation regulation Part 77 "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace." | | X | | | | | | | X | | |
| 3.6 UTILITIES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6(1) | A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) shall be initiated prior to, during, and after construction in accordance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Water Quality Control Board Standards. | | X | | | | | X | | | | X |
| 3.6(2) | The project shall include implementation of a comprehensive stormwater pollution prevention plan. | | X | | | | | X | | | | X |
| 3.6(3) | An on-site water storage facility shall be designed to retain storm water runoff as directed by the City of Torrance Community Development and Public Works Departments. | | X | | | | | X | | | X | |