



City of Torrance, Community Development Dept.

3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503 (310) 618-5990

Danny E. Santana, Director

Environmental Checklist Form

- 1. Project Title:** Torrance Industrial Exchange
(EAS19-00003, CUP19-00027, DIV19-00008)
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Oscar Martinez
Planning & Environmental Manager
310.618.5990
- 4. Project Location:** West side of Prairie Avenue, approximately 620 ft. south of 190th Street (APNs: 7352-001-013 and a portion of 7352-002-029)
Torrance, CA 90503
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address:** KP Torrance Prairie Owner, LLC.
1875 Century Park East, Suite 380
Los Angeles, CA 90067
- 6. General Plan Designation:** Light Industrial
- 7. Zoning:** M-2 – District
- 8. Description of the Project:** This is a request to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow the development of an approximately 430,000 sq. ft. industrial/warehouse complex on a 20.7-acre site, resulting in an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.47, in conjunction with a Tentative Parcel Map for subdivision purposes. The project consists of two detached buildings providing ground floor and mezzanine areas, supported by truck yards, vehicular parking/drive aisles and landscaping. The mapping action will provide each building on its own parcel, resulting in a FAR that does not exceed 0.60 per lot.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is located within an urbanized environment, and in an industrial area with nearby industrial uses, including a refinery to the east, railroad and city sump properties to the south, industrial uses to the west, and warehouse/light industrial uses to the north. The 20.7-acre site is located on the west side of Prairie Ave., south of 190th St., by approximately 620 ft. The property consists of partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. It was previously occupied by a top soil distributor, refinery storage tanks, and employee parking.



Environmental Checklist Form

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD); Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control; and Los Angeles County Sanitation District.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

The applicant and the City of Torrance submitted requests to the South Central Coastal Information Center/California Historical Resources Information System (SCCIC) and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), respectively, for a Sacred Lands File Search, as well as for a records search for Native American historical and archeological resources for the proposed project, located within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Torrance, CA 7.5' quadrangle Topographic Map. The SCCIC provided results that no archaeological or built-environment resources were within the project area, one archaeological resource within a ½-mile radius of the project area, and two built-environment resources within ½-mile radius of the project area, with three reports/studies within the project area and eight within ½-mile radius of the project area. The NAHC provided a Tribal Consultation List of California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area, but did not provide any results for the Sacred Lands File Search Database.

The City of Torrance sent notifications regarding the proposed project to Tribes that have submitted to the City a formal request for notification. The following tribes were notified by the City on November 27, 2019: Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, and Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe. A response from Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation was received on December 8, 2019, requesting a consultation.

Multiple appointments for consultation were scheduled by the Kizh Nation, and were subsequently cancelled by them, as follows: February 26, 2020 and February 20, 2020. Additional appointments were attempted by the Kizh Nation for February 28, 2020 when City Hall was closed, and on April 8, 2020, which was rejected by the City as being too distant into the future, with the potential to unduly delay the project.

As no consultation appointment could be scheduled and agreed upon, the City of Torrance emailed the Kizh Nation



City of Torrance, Community Development Dept.

3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503 (310) 618-5990

Danny E. Santana, Director

Environmental Checklist Form

providing a list of potential mitigation measures for their review, and providing them with ten (10) calendar days from February 18, 2020 for review. The Nation responded to the City with an email on March 23, 2020, noting their mitigation measures. Staff reviewed their measures and emailed the Nation on April 16, 2020, with revised mitigation measures, allowing another ten (10) calendar days for their review. The Nation responded on April 21, 2020 requesting reconsideration of our revised measures, and provided revised measures on April 22, 2020. Staff worked with the Nation's attorney to discuss the points of contention and agreed to the measures on April 27, 2020. The measures will be expanded upon in the Tribal Cultural Resources Section (Section 18).

Staff Photographs:



Above: City of Torrance GIS Aerials (circa Spring 2019) highlighting the proposed project and surrounding uses.



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

Danny E. Santana, Director



Above: Northern property line of the project site, showing existing driveway, adjacent to a warehouse/light industrial building (right side).



Above: Northwest view of project site, over Prairie Avenue bridge.



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

Danny E. Santana, Director



Above: Southern property line of the project site, adjacent to the Railroad Right-of-Way (left side).

ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Field Inspections and Assessments By:


Yolanda Gomez, Planning Associate

05-13-20
Date

CONCUR:


Oscar Martinez, Planning & Environmental Manager,
Secretary to the Planning Commission

5/13/20
Date

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provide in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- (a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? 1, 5

According to the Community Resources Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, the San Gabriel Mountains and Pacific Ocean are considered scenic vistas. Recognizing the value of these scenic views, the City has adopted policies for hillside areas, which typically offer scenic vistas of these resources. The project site is not located within the Hillside Overlay District, but is within a highly developed urban and relatively flat area. No scenic views in the vicinity of the project site would be adversely affected. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.
- (b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? 1, 5

The project site is not located near any state scenic highway. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings would be removed from the project site. No scenic resources within a scenic highway or special designated area for street trees would be damaged or removed. The previously disturbed site provides some mature trees and vegetation, which are proposed to be removed during construction; however, they are not considered a scenic resource within a state scenic highway. Staff will require that a landscaping plan, including trees, shrubs and groundcover shall be submitted for approval prior to building permit issuance, which would replace the existing trees. Therefore, no impacts to scenic resources would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.
- (c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? 1, 2, 5

The project site is located within a heavily developed urban environment, in an area with primarily industrial land uses, including a petroleum refinery. There are no scenic views in the vicinity of the site that would be adversely affected by the proposed project. The height of the proposed warehouse/industrial buildings is consistent with the height of other industrial and commercial buildings in the surrounding area. The proposed project would not conflict with the M-2 zone and there are no applicable scenic quality regulations. The proposed project would not degrade the existing character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.
- (d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? 1, 2, 5

The proposed project would not introduce new sources of light or glare which would be incompatible with the surrounding areas or which would pose a safety hazard to motorists using adjacent streets. The area contains numerous sources of night time lighting, including street lights, architectural and security lighting, and automobile headlights. The proposed project's exterior lighting will be directed and shielded to minimize light spillage onto surrounding properties and vehicular traffic. Glare is a common phenomenon in the Southern California area due mainly to the high number of days per year with direct sunlight and the highly urbanized nature of the region, which results in a concentration of potentially reflective surfaces. The use of nonreflective surfaces adjacent to public rights-of-ways, in combination with the provision for landscaping, will reduce heat and glare impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed development will be consistent with the visual character of its surroundings and any light and glare produced will be commensurate with existing uses in the area. Furthermore, should the project be approved, it must comply with the current CALGreen Code. Therefore, impacts associated with new sources of substantial light or glare would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? <i>There are no agricultural resources or operations located at the project site or in the surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts to farmlands would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? <i>The project site is not located within a zone designated for agricultural use or an area that is designated as Williamson Act Contract lands. Therefore, no impacts or conflicts with any existing zoning for agriculture use or Williamson Act Contract would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 4, 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? <i>The project site is located within an urbanized environment in an area that is not designated as forest land, timberland or timber. There are no forest, timberland or timber resources or operations located at the project site or in the immediate area. Therefore, no impacts to forest land zoning or timberland or timber would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? <i>As stated above, the project site is located within an urbanized environment in an area that is not designated as forest land. There are no forest resources or operations located at the project site or in the immediate area. Therefore, no impacts to forest land or conversion of forest land would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? <i>There are no Farmland/agricultural or forestry resources or operations located at, adjacent to or near the project site. The project would not introduce any changes that would result in conversion of Farmland/agricultural or forest land. Therefore, no impact to Farmlands or forest lands would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

(a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	1, 2, 6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	---------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

An Air Quality Impact Study was required to be performed for the proposed project (Attachment 2). The Study determined that construction and operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD and SCAG policies, including the SCAQMD's 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The Study indicated that construction emissions would remain below all regional thresholds, and localized impacts to air quality would be less than significant, according to Tables 3-7 and 3-8 below. The Study also indicates that operational emissions would not exceed any applicable air quality significance thresholds, according to Table 3-9 below. Furthermore, the Study assumes a warehouse use, and indicates that the project would not introduce growth into the project area capable of exceeding projections built into the AQMP modeling forecast, and thereby, would have a less than significant impact.

TABLE 3-7: ESTIMATED REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS – UNMITIGATED						
Construction Activity	Maximum Daily Emissions (Pounds Per Day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
DEMOLITION						
On-Site Emissions	3.2	31.4	21.6	<0.1	6.3	2.2
Off-Site Emissions	0.6	16.3	4.6	<0.1	1.3	0.4
Total	3.8	47.8	26.2	<0.1	7.6	2.6
GRADING						
On-Site Emissions	4.2	46.4	30.9	<0.1	5.4	3.2
Off-Site Emissions	1.5	43.5	11.4	0.1	3.2	1.0
Total	5.7	89.9	42.3	<0.1	8.6	4.2
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION						
On-Site Emissions	1.9	17.4	16.6	<0.1	1.0	0.9
Off-Site Emissions	2.3	15.6	18.1	<0.1	5.3	1.5
Total	4.2	33.0	34.7	<0.1	6.2	2.4
PAVING						
On-Site Emissions	1.9	11.1	14.6	<0.1	0.6	0.5
Off-Site Emissions	0.1	<0.1	0.5	<0.1	0.2	<0.1
Total	2.0	11.2	15.1	<0.1	0.7	0.6
ARCHITECTURAL COATING						
On-Site Emissions	63.6	1.5	1.8	<0.1	0.1	0.1
Off-Site Emissions	0.4	0.2	2.8	<0.1	0.9	0.2
Total	63.9	1.8	4.6	0.1	1.0	0.3
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION + PAVING + ARCHITECTURAL COATING OVERLAP						
On-Site Emissions	67.4	30.1	33.0	<0.1	1.6	1.5
Off-Site Emissions	2.7	15.9	21.5	<0.1	6.3	1.7
Total	70.1	46.0	54.5	0.1	7.9	3.3
REGIONAL ANALYSIS						
Maximum Daily Emissions	70.1	89.9	54.5	0.1	8.6	4.2
Regional Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Emissions modeling files can be found in Appendix A. SOURCE: TAHA, 2019.						

TABLE 3-8: ESTIMATED LOCALIZED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS – UNMITIGATED				
Construction Activity	Maximum Daily On-Site Emissions (Pounds Per Day)			
	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
EMISSIONS ANALYSIS				
Demolition	31.4	21.6	6.3	2.2
Grading	46.4	30.9	5.4	3.2
Building Construction + Paving + Architectural Coating	30.1	33.0	1.6	1.5
IMPACT ANALYSIS				
Maximum Daily Localized Emissions	46.4	33.0	6.3	3.2
Localized Significance Threshold	165	2,783	65	25
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Emissions modeling files can be found in Appendix A. LST values for 2-acre disturbance site in SRA 3 with 200-meter receptor proximity. SOURCE: TAHA, 2019.				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

Sources Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

TABLE 3-9: ESTIMATED DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Operational Activity	Daily Emissions (Pounds Per Day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
EMISSIONS ANALYSIS						
Area Sources	6.5	<0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Energy Sources	<0.1	0.6	0.5	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Off-Road Equipment (Forklifts)	0.6	5.2	4.7	<0.1	0.4	0.4
Mobile Sources	2.5	36.3	31.8	0.2	9.4	2.6
REGIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS						
Daily Regional Operational Emissions	9.6	42.1	37.2	0.2	9.8	3.0
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
LOCALIZED IMPACT ANALYSIS						
Daily Localized Operational Emissions	-	5.8	5.3	-	0.4	0.4
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	-	128	1,158	-	6	2
Exceed Threshold?	-	No	No	-	No	No
Emissions modeling files can be found in Appendix A. SOURCE: TAHA, 2019.						

The City of Torrance 2009 General Plan, Community Resources Element, provides objectives and policies for the achievement of air quality standards, including, increased energy efficiency and conservation. The project demonstrates consistency with the General Plan policies by complying with the aforementioned SCAQMD thresholds, in both construction and operation.

Therefore, as the proposed project will be consistent with the AQMP, impacts to the applicable air quality plans would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? 6

As discussed above in 3(a), the Study determined that the project would not exceed any applicable SCAQMD regional mass daily thresholds or localized significance thresholds (LST), during construction and operation of the project. The Study notes that the project would not generate cumulatively considerable emissions or ozone precursors or particulate matter, and would result in a less than significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

- (c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? 6

The Study has identified the following groups who are most likely to be affected by air pollution: children less than 14 years of age, the elderly over 65 years of age, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. Sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, athletic facilities, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. The SCAQMD has established 1,640 feet, as the distance for assessing localized air quality impacts. There are no schools, hospitals, or convalescent care facilities within 1,640 feet of the project site. The northern boundary of the project site is located approximately 700 feet from the edge of Columbia Park and approximately 700 feet from the nearest residence along 190th Street, east of Prairie Avenue and 750 feet from the residences to the west of Prairie Avenue. The southern boundary of the project site is approximately 700 feet from an extended stay hotel.

As discussed above in 3(a), the Study determined that criteria air pollutant daily emissions associated with construction and operation of the project would not exceed any applicable SCAQMD regional or localized air quality significance thresholds, see aforementioned Tables. The Study indicates that the construction of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial criteria pollutant concentrations, and that TAC emissions and pollutant concentrations would result in a less than significant impact. Additionally, the Study indicated that the operation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact at residential receptors for TAC emissions and pollutant concentrations, noting a conservative estimate of 1.84 excess cancers per million, vs. the SCAQMD significance threshold of 10 per million. Lastly, the Study indicates that CO hotspots, which are typically located at intersections, would be less than significant as related to their exposure to sensitive receptors. The

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Study notes that the intersections analyzed do not include any intersections that exceed 10,000 vehicles per hour, which is substantially less than what the AQMP would consider significant. The AQMP is cited as evaluating a 1-hour concentration of CO for an intersection in Los Angeles (outside the project area) at Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue, and noted that the CO was 4.6 ppm, which indicates that the most stringent 1-hour CO standard (20.0 ppm) would likely not be exceeded until the daily traffic at the intersection exceeded more than 400,000 vehicles per day.

Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact to construction and operational emissions. Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (d) | Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Odors, not already addressed in the aforementioned sections, include typical construction-related odors that would be temporary in nature, such as, application of asphalt paving and architectural coatings and finishes, and diesel equipment exhaust. Therefore, impacts associated with construction-related odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Operational odors, not previously addressed, include odors from specific uses, such as, petroleum refineries, chemical plants, wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, agricultural and composting uses, food processing plants, etc. As the specific uses for this project have not been established, future occupants of the site would be subject to applicable County department and City Municipal Code industrial permitting requirements, including, but not limited to, obtaining an Industrial Waste Discharge Permit and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Industrial Activities Stormwater Permit, as well as adhering to the City's best management practices for waste treatment and disposal. Additionally, the operations would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402, which would prohibit any air quality discharge that would be a nuisance or pose any harm to individuals of the public. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to operational odors or other emissions that may have the potential to cause a public nuisance.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | 1, 2, 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|---------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

The project site has long been underutilized and developed as a paved parking lot, topsoil sales, refinery uses including tanks, and vacant land, partially covered with vegetation, located within an urbanized area. The Community Resources Element of the Torrance General Plan does not identify any candidate, sensitive, or special status species that occupies the site. The Biological Resources Technical Report (Attachment 3) cites direct impacts to special-status plants (southern tarplant) and direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of the below mitigation measures BR-1 would ensure the preservation of southern tarplant, and BR-2 would ensure that nesting birds are not impacted by the project.

**BR-1: Direct Impacts to Special-status Plants
Offsite land Acquisition and Preservation.**

As currently designed, the Project will impact the entire population of southern tarplant on site. If the Project cannot be modified to avoid or minimize impacts to the species, then offsite land with similar habitat in the range of the species shall be identified and purchased. The purchase lands shall be designated as an open space preserve and placed within a protective easement for conservation purposes, such as a restrictive covenant or conservation easement. Signage and fencing shall be provided at perimeter locations. Fencing design shall be developed to promote safety of life and property, prevent unauthorized access by pedestrians and vehicles into sensitive areas, and allow limited passage for wildlife species in the local area.

On-site Preservation.

If the Project can be modified to avoid or minimize impacts to southern tarplant, then the Project shall compensate the loss of the species and associated habitat through on-site restoration, creation, and preservation of a minimum of 0.38 acres (1:1). The preserved portion of the site shall be designated as open space preserve and placed within a protective easement for conservation purposes, such as a restrictive covenant or conservation easement. Signage and fencing shall be provided at perimeter locations. Fencing design shall be developed to promote safety of life and property, prevent unauthorized access by pedestrians and vehicles into sensitive areas, and allow limited passage for wildlife species in the local area.

Prepare and Implement Plan for Salvage, Relocation, and/or Propagation of Special-Status Plant Species.

A qualified botanist will prepare a plan before the start of ground-disturbing activities to address monitoring, salvage, relocation, and propagation of special-status plant species. The relocation or propagation of plants and seeds will be performed at a suitable mitigation site approved by the City of Torrance, and as appropriate per species. Documentation will include provisions that address the techniques, locations, and procedures required for the successful establishment of the plant populations. The plan will include provisions for performance that address survivability requirements, maintenance, monitoring, implementation, and the annual reporting requirements.

**BR-2: Direct and Indirect Impacts to Nesting Birds
Nesting Bird Avoidance.**

Initiation of construction activities (i.e., initial vegetation clearing) should avoid the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31), to reduce any potential significant impact to birds that may be nesting on the Project site. If construction activities must be initiated during the migratory bird-nesting season, an avian nesting survey of the Project site and contiguous habitat within 500 feet of all impact areas must be conducted for protected migratory birds and active nests. The avian nesting survey shall be performed by a qualified wildlife biologist within 72 hours prior to the start of construction in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703–712) and California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513.

If an active bird nest is found, the nest shall be flagged and mapped on the construction plans along with an appropriate no disturbance buffer, which will be determined by the biologist based on the species' sensitivity to disturbance (typically 50 feet for common, urban-adapted species, 300 feet for other passerine species, and 500 feet for raptors and special-status species). The nest area shall be avoided until the nest is vacated and the juveniles have fledged. The nest area shall be demarcated in the field with flagging and stakes or construction fencing. A qualified biologist (with the ability to stop work) shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur.

(b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	1, 2, 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	---	---------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is located within an urbanized environment, and provides partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. The site was previously partially occupied by refinery uses, employee parking and a top soil distributor. The Community Resources Element of the Torrance General Plan does not identify any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community present on the site. Therefore, no impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? <i>The project site is located within an urbanized environment, and provides partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. The site was previously partially occupied by refinery uses, employee parking and a top soil distributor. The Community Resources Element of the Torrance General Plan does not identify any wetlands present on the site. As no legally defined wetlands are located on the project site, construction activities would not occur on any state or federally protected wetlands. Therefore, no impacts to state or federally protected wetlands would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2, 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? <i>The project site has been developed as partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. The site was previously partially occupied by refinery uses, employee parking and a top soil distributor, and located within an urbanized environment. The project site is not expected to provide habitat for any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and the Biological Study notes that none were observed during the field surveys. However, with the proposed construction activities, trees and shrubs would be removed as part of the project. These trees and shrubs have the potential to provide suitable nesting habitat for protected bird species, the removal of which particularly during the bird breeding season has the potential to result in significant impacts to nesting birds. Any significant adverse impacts related to nesting birds would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measure (BR-2).</i>	1, 2, 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? <i>The project site is surrounded by industrial/petroleum refinery uses, and not on or near any significant ecological areas. There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources identified in the City of Torrance General Plan that would be applicable to this site. It should be noted that a landscape plan will be required, if the project is approved and trees/vegetation will be planted once construction is complete. Therefore, no impact to biological resources (tree preservation) would occur and no mitigation would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? <i>The project site is surrounded by industrial/petroleum refinery uses, and is not located in an environmentally sensitive area. The project does not conflict with any conservation or preservation plans. The project site does not contain biological resources that are managed under any conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts to conservation plans would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

(a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? <i>The project site is located within an urbanized area and no historical resources exist on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. The Community Resources Element of the City of Torrance General Plan does not list the project site as a location of historic interest to the City.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

The site is immediately adjacent to industrial uses, including a refinery to the east, railroad and city sump properties to the south, industrial uses to the west, and warehouse/light industrial uses to the north. The structures in the project vicinity do not have any unusual characteristics, nor are known to be associated with any national, regional, or local figures of significance that would qualify them as a historical resource or of historic significance. In addition, the project site is not registered under the State or National Register of Historic Places or Resources. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? 1, 2

The project site is located within an urbanized area. The existing conditions at the project site are partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. No prehistoric or historic archaeological sites are known to exist within the project site or in the immediate area. There is no evidence as provided by the General Plan and the General Plan EIR of any known historical, archeological, or paleontological resources on the site. However, although unlikely, implementation of the project would require grading and some soil excavation, and therefore, could potentially uncover and impact previously uncovered archaeological resources. Any significant adverse impacts related to buried archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the following mitigation measures:

CR-1:

In the event that any archaeological materials are encountered during construction activities, all activities must be suspended in the vicinity of the find. An archaeologist shall be obtained and empowered to halt or divert ground disturbing activities, coordinate with Native American Tribal or Band monitors interested in monitoring the remaining onsite grading and excavation activities and establish a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement between the property owner and participating Band or Tribe. Such agreement must include terms for compensation for on-site monitoring and address the treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, sacred sites and human remains that are discovered during project grading and excavation. Said agreement must be instituted and completed before ground-disturbing activities can commence in the area of the find to allow for the recovery of the find. The archaeologist shall describe the find in a professional report which shall receive reasonable wide distribution. Any recovered finds shall be prepared to the point of identification. The property owner shall relinquish ownership of all Native American cultural resources to the appropriate local Tribe or Band for treatment and disposition. If determined to be of non-Native American scientific/historical value, recovered materials shall be deposited with a local institution with facilities for their proper curation, analysis, and display. Final disposition and location of the non-Native American recovered materials shall be determined by the City of Torrance.

Therefore, impacts to archeological resources would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measure (CR-1).

- (c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? 1, 2

The project site is located within an urbanized area. The existing conditions at the project site are partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. No human remains are known to exist on the project site, and any remains likely would have been removed during prior disturbance of the project site. There is no evidence as provided by the General Plan and the General Plan EIR of any known historical, archeological, or paleontological resources on the site. However, although unlikely, implementation of the project would require grading and excavation, which could potentially uncover and impact previously uncovered human remains. Any significant adverse impacts related to buried human remains would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the following mitigation measure:

CR-2:

If human remains of any kind are found during construction, the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and 2006 Assembly Bill 2641 shall be followed. According to these requirements, all construction activities must cease immediately, and the Los Angeles County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified. The Coroner will examine the remains and determine the next appropriate action based on his findings. If the coroner determines the remains to be of Native American origin, he will notify the Natural American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the most likely descendants (MLD) to be consulted regarding treatment and/or reburial of the remains. If an MLD cannot be identified, or the MLD fails to make a recommendation regarding the treatment of the remains within 48 hours after gaining access to them, the Native American human remains and associated grave goods shall be reburied with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

Therefore, impacts related to human remains would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measure (CR-2).

6. ENERGY. Would the project:

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? 1, 2

See 19(a) for complete discussion on specific utilities and service systems. The Community Resources Element of the City of Torrance General Plan includes a section on energy conservation that lists energy conservation objectives and policies. The City promotes energy conservation through Title 24 building code requirements, and advocates for sustainable building practices in achieving energy efficiency. The project would be subject to all State and local energy requirements during construction and operation. Therefore, impacts to energy would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? 1, 2

As discussed above in 6(a), the project would be subject to all State and local energy requirements, and must be compliant. Therefore, no impacts to state or local energy plans would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- (a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. 1, 2

According to the Safety Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones have been designated within the Torrance City limits. Additionally, the project would be constructed in accordance with the 2019 California Building Code (CBC) seismic safety requirements. Implementation of the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to fault rupture hazards during a seismic event. Therefore, impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? 1, 2

The project site is located in seismically active Southern California and is prone to earthquakes, which may result in hazardous conditions to people within the region. According to the Safety Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, the highest risks from earthquake fault zones in the City of Torrance come from the Palos Verdes fault zone, the Puente Hills Fault, the Newport-Inglewood fault zone, the Elysian Park fault zone, the Malibu Coast-Santa Monica-Hollywood fault zone, and the Whittier fault zone. However, earthquakes and ground motion can affect a widespread area. The potential severity of ground shaking depends on many factors, including distance from the originating fault, the earthquake magnitude and the nature of the earth materials below the site. Although implementation of the project has the potential to result in the exposure of people and structures to strong ground shaking during a seismic event, this exposure is no greater than exposure present in other areas throughout the Southern California region. Also, the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the 2019 CBC, which is anticipated to minimize the potential for damage. Furthermore, prior to the issuance of building permits, a site-specific geotechnical study would be prepared by a licensed engineer to outline structural design elements that would maintain structural integrity to the maximum extent during seismic ground shaking. Therefore, potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? 1, 2

According to the Safety Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, the project site is not located within the mapped seismic-related hazard areas where there is potential to experience liquefaction-induced ground displacement (Figure S-2, Seismic-Related Hazards, of the above noted Safety Element). Also, the project would be built in accordance with the 2019 CBC, which sets procedures and limitations for design of structures based on seismic risk and the type of facility.

All proposed construction would be subject to all applicable provisions of the 2019 CBC and the applicant would be required to submit a grading/drainage plan with soil investigation report prior to the issuance of any building permits. Therefore, impacts associated with seismic related ground failure and liquefaction would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv)	Landslides? <i>According to the Safety Element of the City of Torrance General Plan (Figure S-2, Seismic-Related Hazards, of the above noted Safety Element), the project site is not located within the mapped seismic-related hazard areas where there is potential to experience landslides. Since the project site and area surrounded by the development are relatively flat, there is no risk of landslides occurring. Therefore, no impact associated with landslides would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? <i>The potential exists for minimal amounts of soil erosion to occur during construction activities. However, construction-related soil erosion and loss of topsoil impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant through adherence to the specifications within the General Construction Permit, which would require the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies best management practices.</i> <i>Grading of the project site would be subject to the requirements of the Torrance Municipal Code and the 2019 CBC with regards to soil compaction and drainage. Also, prior to the issuance of building and grading permits the project would be required to develop a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan identifying post-construction best management practices. Therefore, impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? <i>There are no known liquefaction or landslide hazards in or adjacent to the project site. Any unstable materials that may be encountered during routine geotechnical investigations and the grading phase would be removed and replaced with properly engineered, compacted materials, in accordance with the Torrance Municipal Code and the 2019 CBC.</i> <i>As such, potentially significant impacts involving unstable geologic or soil materials would be avoided. Therefore, impacts associated with geologic units or soils that are unstable or may become unstable would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Be located on expansive soil, as identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? <i>Expansive soils (also called adobe or clay) shrink and swell in response to dry and moist conditions and can result in cracking and structural failure of pavement and foundations. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Study (Attachment 4) indicates that the site provides a near surface layer of fine grained sediments below which are interlayered units of sand and silt. According to the Hydrology Study (Preliminary Hydrology Calculations), the soil type is 010 and 013 per the Los Angeles County Hydrology Manual, specifically, Oakley Fine Sand and Ramona Loam, respectively. The expansive characteristics of underlying soils and proper design to mitigate such conditions would be determined in accordance with the Torrance Municipal Code and the 2019 CBC. Site-specific recommendations pertaining to expansive soils would be incorporated into grading and foundation plans. As such, adherence to the Torrance Municipal Code and the 2019 CBC would ensure that any areas containing expansive soils would be properly designed and engineered. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive soils would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.</i>	1, 2, 8, 11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	1, 2, 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

As previously mentioned, the project site is located within an urbanized environment. A Sewer Study Memorandum was prepared for the proposed project. The Memorandum identified an existing 18"-24" truck sewer main in an existing easement located on-site near the south property line and adjacent to the existing BNSF railroad right-of-way. This sewer main is maintained by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD). The project would connect to the County's sewer system, via two new on-site private 6" sewer laterals. According to the Memorandum, the existing trunk sewer and proposed laterals are deep enough to serve the entirety of the two proposed buildings with a gravity system. Therefore, no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

However, should the project pursue the use of alternative wastewater disposal systems, adherence to the Torrance Municipal Code and the 2019 CBC would ensure that these methods would be properly designed and engineered, and ensure that the soils are capable of adequately supporting such systems. Therefore, no impacts related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature? 1, 2

As discussed previously, the project site is located within an urbanized environment. The existing conditions at the project site are partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping. As previously referenced in 5(b), there is no evidence that unique paleontological resources or geologic features are present on the project site. However, although unlikely, implementation of the project would require grading and some soil excavation, and therefore, could potentially uncover and impact previously uncovered paleontological resources or geographic features. Any significant adverse impacts related to buried paleontological resources or geographic features would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the following mitigation measure:

GEOLOGY AND SOILS-1:

In the event that any unique paleontological resources or geographic features are encountered during construction activities, all activities must be suspended in the vicinity of the find. A paleontologist shall be obtained and empowered to halt or divert ground disturbing activities, and monitor the remaining onsite grading and excavation activities. The paleontologist shall describe the find in a professional report which shall receive reasonable wide distribution. Any recovered finds shall be prepared to the point of identification. Recovered materials shall be deposited with a local institution with facilities for their proper curation, analysis, and display. Final disposition and location of recovered materials shall be determined by the City of Torrance.

Therefore, impacts to unique paleontological resources or geographic features would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measure (GS-1).

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- (a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? 10

CEQA does not establish a threshold of significance, but rather provides direction for the Lead Agency to make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data. The City of Torrance has not adopted its own independent quantitative GHG emissions threshold value. A Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Study was required to be performed for the proposed project (Attachment 6). The Study utilized the SCAQMD Tier III methodology, which specifies 10,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MTCO2e) per year threshold for industrial projects. The Study noted that construction emissions would produce approximately 1,049 MTCO2e, or 35 MTCO2e annually over a 30-year period. On Table 3-3 below, the amortized construction emissions are shown reflecting an annual amount, and including the operational emissions, the Study determined that the project would not exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold.

Source	Annual GHG Emissions (MTCO2e per Year)
Construction Emissions Amortized (Direct) /a/	35.0
Area Source Emissions (Direct)	<0.1
Energy Source Emissions (Indirect)	678.2
Off-Road Equipment (Direct)	88.0
Mobile Source Emissions (Direct)	1,312.2
Waste Disposal Emissions (Indirect)	203.2
Water Distribution Emissions (Indirect)	549.2
Total Emissions	2,865.8

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

SCAQMD Draft Interim Significance Threshold	10,000
Exceed Threshold?	No
/a/ Based on SCAQMD guidance, the operational emissions analysis includes construction emissions amortized over a 30-year span. SOURCE: TAHA, 2019.	

Therefore, GHG emissions generated by the project would have less than a significant impact on the environment, and no mitigation measures are required.

- (b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? 10

The City adopted a Climate Action Plan and although it provides targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the strategies with which to achieve those reductions are voluntary. The Study provided the following analysis describing the extent that the proposed project complies with or exceeds performance-based standards included in the regulations outlined in the applicable portions of the Climate Change Scoping Plan, RTP/SCS, and City plans.

The analysis demonstrates that the project would be consistent with GHG reduction plans and long-term goals to reduce Statewide and local GHG emissions. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will result in a less-than-significant impact related to conflicting with the implementation of state, regional, and local GHG emissions reduction plans.

Climate Change Scoping Plan. The goal to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (E.O. S-3-05) was codified by the Legislature as the 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act. The Climate Change Scoping Plan, as required by Assembly Bill 32, has a range of GHG reduction actions which include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and nonmonetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an Assembly Bill 32 implementation fee to fund the program. **Table 3-4** provides an evaluation of applicable reduction actions/strategies by emissions source category.

TABLE 3-4: PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH AB 32 CLIMATE CHANGE SCOPING PLAN GHG REDUCTION STRATEGIES	
Strategy	Project Consistency
Energy Efficiency. Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards and pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies, and new policy and mechanisms.	Consistent. The proposed project would be designed and constructed to meet and exceed Title 24 requirements and will comply with the CalGreen code standards designed to reduce energy consumption.
Green Building Strategy: Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California’s new and existing inventory of buildings.	Consistent. The proposed project would be designed and constructed to meet the CalGreen code and will include several measures designed to reduce energy consumption, such as high efficiency lighting.
Recycling and Waste: Reduce methane emissions at landfills. Increase waste diversion, composting and other beneficial uses of organic materials and mandate commercial recycling. Move toward zero waste.	Consistent. The proposed project would implement a recycling program to divert construction waste from landfills.
SOURCE: CARB, <i>Scoping Plan</i> , 2008 (Applicable Strategies Only); TAHA, 2019.	

Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The California legislature passed SB 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare an SCS in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS is contained within the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. The 2016–2040 RTP/SCS emphasizes the need for an integrated and efficient goods movement infrastructure within the SCAG region as it represents the largest international gateway in the country. Implementation of the proposed project would introduce new local job creation to the project area and expand the existing manufacturing and warehousing capacity near the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

Citywide GHG Reduction Plans. The proposed project would be consistent with the City CAP goal of increasing energy efficiency in new commercial buildings (Goal EE: D) by complying with the 2019 California Building Code (Title 24), including the California Green Building Standards Code, as well as incorporating high efficiency lighting fixtures to reduce lighting electricity consumption by 50 percent. The City CAP explicitly encourages new development that exceed the Title 24 standards, which the proposed project would accomplish. The California Green Building Standard Code, referred to as CALGreen, is the first statewide Green Building Code. CALGreen lays out minimum requirements for newly constructed buildings in California, which will reduce

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

GHG emissions through improved efficiency and process improvements. It requires builders to install plumbing that cuts indoor water use by as much as 20 percent, to divert 50 percent of construction waste from landfills to recycling, and to use low-pollutant paints, carpets, and floors.

Therefore, impacts to the applicable GHG plans will be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

- (a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? 1, 2, 5

The proposal did not specify the future occupant/s. As a warehouse/industrial spec complex, with 43 truck docks, the project is expected to transport materials of unspecified nature. As proposed, the project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project does not specify the use of hazardous materials typical of environmentally significant manufacturing processes. Construction items and normal cleaning materials during operation would fall within typical levels. Should a future tenant propose the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, they will be subject to further environmental review, prior to obtaining any permits or licenses. Additionally, the Torrance Fire Department (TFD) is responsible for implementing the hazardous materials disclosure and the California Accidental Release Program of the California Health and Safety Code. The TFD maintains a Hazardous Materials Response Team, consisting of State Certified Hazardous Material Specialists. Any future tenant that proposes the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, would be required to submit an Emergency Response Business Plan, Emergency Response Plan Certification Business Checklist, and a Hazardous Material Inventory Form to the TFD. Therefore, impacts associated with hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? 1, 2, 5

As stated above in 9(a), the proposed project did not specify the use of hazardous materials. Therefore, no release of hazardous materials into the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions is anticipated, and would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- (c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? 1, 2, 5

Magruder Middle School is located approximately 0.38 miles (1,984 ft.) north of the project site. North High School is located approximately 0.46 miles (2,449 ft.) northeast of the project site. Edison Elementary School is located approximately 0.54 miles (2,831 ft.) northeast of the project site. According to the City's GIS maps and Figure S-4 of the Safety Element of the General Plan, the above three schools are the closest schools to the project site; however, none of them are within one-quarter mile of the proposed site. Additionally, as stated previously, the proposed project has not specified the use of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- (d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? 1, 2, 8, 9

According to the Safety Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, the project site is not located on a hazardous material site, including sites identified as Superfund sites under the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), or sites listed on the Toxic Release Inventory. The site is located within an urbanized environment, with industrial uses adjacent to the site, including a petroleum refinery, which previously utilized the subject site circa 1938 – 2019. The refinery is considered a large quantity generator site and other Toxic Release Inventory listed properties are located nearby.

According to the Report of Findings letter received from the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Los Angeles Region (Attachment 5), the Board found that the site contained contaminants of concern (COCs) that were detected above applicable screening levels for risk to human health in a commercial/industrial scenario. Naphthalene, among other COCs, was detected above risk-based screening levels for soil and benzene, among other COCs, was detected above risk-based screening levels for soil vapors. Therefore, the identified releases of hazardous materials at the Site would pose an unreasonable risk to public health and safety if the Site were to be redeveloped for its intended commercial/industrial use without conducting remedial actions. The Report of Findings shows that COCs were detected at the Site above applicable screening levels for risk to drinking water quality. Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) in the gasoline and diesel range were detected at concentrations above their applicable screening levels, among other COCs. Therefore, the identified releases of hazardous materials at the Site would pose an unreasonable risk to the environment if no remedial actions were conducted.

The Report of Findings documents data that adequately characterizes the extent and nature of the hazardous materials released at the Site to the limits of KP Torrance Prairie Owner, LLC (KP) responsibilities for investigation and cleanup activities per the terms of the Torrance Refining Company LLC-KP agreement (a material term of the California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act [CLRRRA] Agreement). Specifically, KP has adequately characterized the extent and nature of hazardous materials released within the Site property boundary and to a depth of 45 foot above mean sea level (amsl). Under the Torrance Refining Company LLC-KP agreement, Torrance Refining Company LLC remains responsible for investigation and cleanup activities for any hazardous materials released at the Site which may have migrated beyond the property boundary and below the 45 amsl depth. Torrance Refining Company LLC, PBF Energy, Inc., and ExxonMobil Oil Corporation are responsible parties subject to Cleanup and Abatement Orders 88-43 and 89-136, which require investigation and cleanup of releases from the Torrance Refinery, which includes the hazardous materials released at the Site which may have migrated beyond the property boundary and below the 45 amsl depth.

The Report of Findings provides additional reasonably available information about the Site, but not a risk assessment. A risk assessment may be necessary in the future to demonstrate that the Site is safe for its anticipated foreseeable use once remedial actions have been performed and updated data have been collected.

The Report of Findings shows that groundwater underlying the Site is impacted with light nonaqueous phase liquids (LNAPL), benzene, and additional petroleum-related contaminants. However, in the CLRRRA Agreement, the Regional Board agreed that "Torrance Refining Company LLC, PBF Energy, Inc., and ExxonMobil Oil Corporation will remain responsible for all other response actions under the CAO, including without limitation, for all response actions with respect to impacted groundwater."

The Regional Board has determined that a response action is necessary to address any unreasonable risk from hazardous materials at the Site.

Upon review of the Report of Findings, the Regional Board has determined that hazardous materials at the Site are at levels that are not suitable for unrestricted use of the Site and for the reasonably anticipated foreseeable use of the Site.

According to aerial photographs provided in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (Attachment 4), the refinery began to utilize the subject site between 1938 – 1947, when six aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) are seen near the center of the site, along with six additional ASTs along the southeast of the site, with small buildings or processing facilities towards the southern portion. By this period, the adjacent refinery property provided multiple ASTs and production facilities. In the 1954 photo, an additional two ASTs are shown along the southern portion of the subject site. In the 1963 photo, the subject site remained the same, with the adjacent property to the south having undergone development, as a chemical plant with various ASTs and processing units. In the 1970 photo, a new development is shown on the adjacent property to the west. The subject site remains the same except for some type of drainage material along the eastern portion of the subject site to the west side of the adjacent refinery property. The 1977 photo, provides the same general configuration to the subject site, except that the northern portion of the property is disturbed, and is the timeframe when the topsoil company began operating in this portion of the property. The 1983 – 1989 photos show several changes, including the removal of two ASTs in the center of the site, and the removal of all of the ASTs along the southern portion. While the Study indicates that the two remaining ASTs were removed from the site in 1994, the City's aerial photos, show the two remaining ASTs removed between 2018 – 2019.

The Study notes that aside from the ASTs on the subject site, numerous pipelines exist throughout the property. In 2002, the facilities were considered an Area of Concern (AOC) in a RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) Facility Assessment submitted to the DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). In a previous Phase II Study for the refinery, it was documented that a large area of petroleum containing soil was found, from the historic ASTs. The current Study noted oily tarry soil. Releases from the refinery have impacted the groundwater beneath the subject site. Due to the petroleum impacted soil and groundwater beneath the site, the Study finds that the property is a high risk of vapor intrusion. Additionally, due to the age of the two remaining buildings on-site, the Study finds that asbestos containing materials (ACM) are likely present. The Study concludes that due to the historic releases of petroleum products from the former on-site and off-site refinery operations, the property would be considered an REC (Recognized Environmental Conditions). Impacts to the public or the environment would occur without mitigation measures. Any significant adverse impacts related to a significant hazard to the public or the environment related to hazardous materials would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the following mitigation measures:

HAHM-1:

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

A soil and soil gas survey shall be conducted to assess the lateral and vertical extent of petroleum products beneath the Site.

HAHM-2:

A remedial action plan (RAP) shall be developed to address the soil impacts so as to allow development to proceed.

HAHM-3:

A soil management plan should be developed in conjunction with the RAP to guide grading and soil movement during the development process.

HAHM-4:

An asbestos survey should be developed prior to any renovations or demolition to the on-site structures.

Therefore, the impacts to the public or the environment related to hazardous materials would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measures (HAHM-1, HAHM-2, HAHM-3 and HAHM-4).

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (e) | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | 1, 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

As discussed in 13(c), the project is approximately three miles away from the nearest Airport, Torrance Municipal Airport - Zamperini Field. The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (f) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | 1, 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposal will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, as the project will be subject to review by all pertinent City departments/divisions, including, but not limited to, Building & Safety, Fire, Engineering, Environmental and Planning. The driveways would be designed in accordance with all applicable design and safety standards required by the adopted fire, safety, and building codes. The parking lot layout would be designed to meet requirements to allow emergency vehicles adequate access. Although some temporary, partial street closures may be necessary for construction activities, the project would not substantially impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way. Street closures would be regulated by the right-of-way permit process. Therefore, impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (g) | Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | 1, 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

According to the Safety Element of the General Plan, the project is not located within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, which includes the southern hillside portion of the City. The site is located within an urbanized area that does not contain expanses of wildland area; and, therefore, does not pose a potential fire hazard involving wildland fires. Therefore, no impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to wildland fires would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? | 1, 2, 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

A Study providing Preliminary Hydrology Calculations (Attachment 7) was prepared for the proposed project. The Study notes that the following proposed runoff conditions: Runoff from the bulk of building 1, the south drive aisle, and the truck yard (subarea 1A- 3A) will be collected in the private storm drain (line A). The 50-year peak flow rate is approximately 20.4 cfs. The runoff from the western vehicle parking area (subarea 1D) and offsite run-off from the adjacent building roof drains (subarea 2D) will be collected into the private storm drain (line A). The 50-year peak flow rate is approximately 2.3 cfs, from the adjacent lot. Line A storm drain will continue northerly, collecting the runoff from subareas 1E and 2E. The 50-year peak flow rate is approximately 4.6 cfs from these subareas. The storm drain will continue northerly towards the drive aisle. Line B will connect before continuing easterly towards Prairie Avenue. Runoff from building 2, the truck yard, the adjacent drive aisle and a small portion of building 1 (subareas 1 C-SC) will be collected in a series of catch basins. The 50-year peak flow rate is approximately 13.8 cfs from these subareas. Storm drain line B will convey the runoff towards building 2 truck yard then towards line A. The runoff from the north drive aisle (subarea 1F) will be collected and join storm drain line A. The 50-year peak flow rate is approximately 3.7 cfs from these subareas. Runoff from the northwest dirt lot (subarea 1G) will be collected with a cmp riser. The runoff will be conveyed to the on-site storm drain, line A. The 50-year peak flow rate is approximately 4.6 cfs from these subareas. The storm drain will continue easterly where it will join with line C. Line C collects the runoff from the southern portion of eastern drive aisle and a portion of building 1. The 50- year peak flow rate is approximately 6.2 cfs. The private storm drain will ultimately discharge to the existing 42" drain in 190th Street north of the project site, the details for this segment of stormdrain pipe have not been conveyed to the City. Detention: to ensure no adverse effects on downstream areas, runoff from the proposed site will be limited to no more than the allowable flow rate of 0.7cfs/acre or 16.0 cfs, applicant to confirm this allowable flow is acceptable to LACDPW. This will be achieved by temporarily detaining runoff on-site. Runoff from areas tributary to each catch basin will be temporarily detained, allowing the catch basin in the north drive aisle to be released without detention. Proposed onsite storm drains will be downsized in order to detain runoff to the allowable flow rate. Run off from subareas 1F and 1H will not be detained and will release the peak flow without any detention. Please see table below for a summary of discharge before and after detention for the project site.

Subarea	Acreage (ac)	Q50 (cfs)	Qdischarge (cfs) (post detention)	Detention Volume Required (cf)	Approximate Ponding Depth (ft)
1A-3A	7.7	20.4	2.0	20,321	1.0
1B-2B	2.95	6.2	1.5	2,814	1.0
1C-5C	6.7	13.8	3.3	9,044	0.7
1D-2D	0.8	2.3	1.0	379	0.5
1E-2E	1.6	4.6	3.3	272	0.4
1G	1.6	4.6	1.1	1,520	0.7
1F	1.4	3.7	N/A	N/A	N/A
1H	0.05	0.1	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	22.8	55.7			

City Engineering Staff notes that the above table provides four areas that exceed the maximum ponding depth of 6", for subareas 1A-3A, 1B-2B, 1C-5C and 1G. The total discharge from the site will be 16.0 cfs, which is the allowable flow rate for the project. Applicant to confirm this allowable flow is acceptable to LACDPW.

There is the potential for short-term surface water quality impacts to occur during the grading and construction phases of the project. Such impacts include runoff of loose soils and/or a variety of construction wastes and fuels that could be carried off-site in surface runoff and into local storm drains and streets that drain eventually into water resources protected under federal and state laws. These water quality impacts would be avoided through compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations set forth under Section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act. Pursuant to the NPDES regulations, the contractor would be required to file a Notice of Intent for a General Construction Permit with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. To obtain this permit, the contractor would prepare a SWPPP that specifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that the project does not violate any water quality standards or any waste discharge requirements during the construction phases. BMPs would include erosion and sediment controls such as silt fences and/or straw wattles or bails, runoff water quality monitoring, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, prevention and containment of accidental fuel spills or other waste releases, inspection requirements, etc. This permit would cover the entire grading footprint area of the project site, including the off-site improvement areas. Compliance with the approved permit would ensure that the project does not violate any water quality standards or any waste discharge requirements during construction. Therefore, impacts to water quality or waste discharge requirements would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the

	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

As part of this review, the City's Grading Division has reviewed the plans and this Study, and has provided a number of conditions that will need to be met prior to building and/or grading permit issuance, which include providing grading plans, geotechnical report, final drainage study, erosion control plan, drainage plans incorporating post-construction BMPs, project specific LID plans, and a SWPPP. The applicants will be required to implement low impact development techniques that provide sufficient groundwater infiltration and low water use fixtures and landscape palettes to minimize water demand while promoting infiltration. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies or recharge would be considered less than significant. No mitigation would be required.

(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: 1, 2

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 1, 2

The site currently drains easterly, under Prairie Avenue, to the refinery site. This route will be terminated and a new route to 190th Street is proposed by the applicant. As mentioned in 10(a) and (b), the proposed project will be subject to further reviews and requirements by the City's Grading Division, incorporating multiple studies and plan reviews to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation both on- and off-site does not occur, during construction and post-construction. The proposed site does not contain any water courses that would be affected by the proposed project during construction. Therefore, impacts to the existing drainage pattern would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; 1, 2

Peak storm water flows will be detained on-site in ponding areas and discharged off peak. As part of the proposed project, new on-site storm drains, catch basins and connections will be provided. The project would be required to meet the LID Standards Manual practices. Prior to the issuance of building and grading permits, the project would be required to develop a SWPPP identifying post-construction BMPs. The SWPPP should require infiltration which should reduce the amount of runoff, and clean the stormwater prior to discharge. As such, implementation of the project is not expected to result in impacts to the existing drainage pattern, to the rate, or to the amount of surface runoff, such that it would result in on- or off-site flooding. Therefore, impacts to the existing drainage pattern or the rate or amount of surface runoff would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or 1, 2, 11

The proposed on-site detention/ponding is to store storm water above allowable flows on-site until the peak of a design and/or 50-year storm passes. As discussed earlier, the Study provides a proposal that includes new storm drains, catch basins and connections that are calculated to meet allowable flow rates. The entire project site would be required to meet the LID Standards Manual practices to mitigate potential water quality impacts from stormwater and non-stormwater discharges. In addition, a SWPPP identifying post-construction BMPs is required for the project. As such, implementation of the project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?? 1, 2, 5

According to the Safety Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, the project site is not located within a flood hazard area. In addition, the project site does not contain any watercourses, drainage areas or courses, or flood flows that would be affected by the project. Therefore, no impact to impeding or redirecting flood flow would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? 1, 2, 5

The project site is not located within a flood hazard area. Furthermore, the project site is not located near a large body of water that would be subject to tsunamis or seiches, nor to canyons, slopes, drainage courses, or other natural features on or near the project site which could generate mudflows or risk release of pollutants during heavy rainstorms. Therefore, no impacts from project inundation would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? <i>The project is subject to all federal, state, and local water quality control and sustainable groundwater management regulations and requirements, and must be compliant. Therefore, no impacts to a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

(a)	Physically divide an established community? <i>The proposed project would not divide an established community, as the project is redeveloping a site that has been previously developed as partially disturbed land, partial paving, an out building and ornamental landscaping, located within an urbanized area surrounded by mainly industrial uses. The project would not place any structures in an established community that would physically divide that community and thereby prevent interaction between members of the community. The project would be developed within the confines of the project site, and would not create a physical barrier. Therefore, the project will not physically divide an established community and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 4, 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? <i>Per the Land Use Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, the City of Torrance is a charter city and is governed on the basis of a charter that establishes its powers and authorities, as contrasted with a general law city, which enjoys only those powers specifically granted to it by the State. While general law cities are required by Section 65860 of the California Government Code to have zoning ordinances that are consistent with the General Plan, zoning ordinances in charter cities, like Torrance, are not required to be consistent with the General Plan. Nonetheless, the City of Torrance strives to have a zoning ordinance that is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs in the General Plan.</i> <i>While the proposed property is zoned M-2, Heavy Manufacturing Zone, the General Plan Designation is Industrial-Light Industrial (I-LT), which provides an inconsistency. The I-LT designation is implemented by the M-1, M-L, and PD Zones. While the M-2 Zone would be in conflict, the proposed use, warehouse/industrial, is permitted in the M-1, Light Manufacturing Zone, and thereby, permitted in the M-2 Zone. Additionally, the I-LT GP designation description includes a wide range of industrial uses where manufacturing or assembly is primarily limited to enclosed buildings, professional and medial office, research and development, warehouse and wholesale uses. The Land Use Element of the GP notes that the City will work to ensure GP and zoning consistency by prohibiting zoning of an isolated parcel in a manner which is inconsistent or incompatible with surrounding zoning or land uses, and reviewing development proposal for consistency with all applicable land use regulations. The properties surrounding the proposed site, to the north, west and south, all exhibit the same inconsistencies, and similar uses as the proposal. The City has already identified these inconsistencies, and as part of a larger city-wide project, would review this and other similar locations that exhibit trends in usage to resolve inconsistencies. Because, the project was required to apply for a Conditional Use Permit, based on its size, the entirety of the project will be evaluated, including the GP inconsistency.</i> <i>Therefore, the impacts due to any conflicts with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2, 3, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

(a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? <i>According to the Community Resources Element of the City of Torrance General Plan, there are four Mineral Resources Zone (MRZ) designations that have been established for the classification of sand, gravel and crushed rock resources. The project site is predominately located within MRZ-3, which is described as a zone where the significance of mineral deposits cannot be determined from the available data. A small portion of the northeastern property is located within MRZ-1, which is described as no significant mineral deposits are present or likely to be present. Therefore, the proposed development will not negatively impact the mineral resources as defined by the California State Mining and Geology Board. The project would not result in loss of availability of any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region, and the residents of the state. Therefore, no impacts to known mineral resources would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.</i>	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

- (b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? 1, 2

As stated in 12(a), project site is not located within a significant or known mineral resources zone, nor are any locally-important minerals specified in the General Plan. Therefore, no impacts to locally-important mineral resource recovery sites delineated in the General Plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- (a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? 1, 2, 3, 12

The City's General Plan Noise Element provides that noise generated within Region 1 (the predominately industrial areas in and around the refineries and industrial uses on the western edge of the City), where the subject site is located, shall not exceed 70 db(A) during the day (7AM – 10PM) or 65 db(A) at night (10PM-7AM). The Torrance Municipal Code, Division 4, Chapter 6, provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to operate power construction tools, equipment, or engage in the performance of any outside construction or repair work on buildings, structures, or projects in or adjacent to a residential area, involving the creation of noise beyond 50 db as measured at property lines, except between the hours of 7:30AM to 6PM Monday through Friday, and 9AM to 5PM on Saturdays. Construction shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays observed by City Hall. The Community Development Director may allow expanded hours and days of construction if unusual circumstances and conditions exist. Such requests must be made in writing and must receive approval by the Director prior to any expansion of the hour and day restrictions listed above. Properties zoned as industrial are exempted from the above day and hour restrictions, if a minimum buffer of 300 feet is maintained from the subject property's property line to the closest residential property. The Community Development Director, may, however, revoke such exemption for a particular project if the noise level exceeds 50 decibels (db) at the property line of a residential property beyond the 300 linear foot buffer. According to Staff's calculations, the nearest residential area would be the single family residences on 190th Street, east of Prairie Avenue, which are approximately 770 ft. from the subject property line; the condominiums on 190th Street, west of Columbia Park/Prairie Avenue are approximately 880 ft. from the subject property line; the Staybridge Suites, extended stay hotel, at 19901 Prairie Avenue, is approximately 660 ft. from the subject property. Therefore, based on distance, the subject project, would appear to be exempt from the City's Noise restrictions, with the caveat that such exemption may be revoked, based on residential complaints of noise exceeding the above limits at the residential property lines.

A Noise and Vibration Impact Study (Attachment 8) was required to be prepared for the proposed project. Table 3-4 below provides typical construction equipment noise level ranges. The Study notes that construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers.

Construction Equipment	Noise Level at 50 feet (dBA)
Backhoe (small bulldozer)	73.6
Crane	72.6
Dozer	77.7
Drum Mixer	77.0
Dump Truck	72.5
Excavator	76.7
Front End Loader	75.1
Jackhammer	81.9
Man Lift	67.7
Paver	74.2
Welder/Torch	70.0

SOURCE: FHWA, *Roadway Construction Noise Model*, Version 1.1.

Table 3.5 below provides the noise levels by construction phase, and takes into account the likelihood that multiple pieces of construction equipment would be operating simultaneously and the typical overall noise levels that would be expected for each

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

phase of construction. When considered as an entire process with multiple pieces of equipment, demolition activity would be the loudest phase of construction and would generate a noise level of approximately 85.5 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet.

TABLE 3-5: CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVEL BY PHASE	
Noise Source	Noise Level (dBA) L_{eq} at 50 Feet
DEMOLITION	
Concrete Saw	82.6
Dozer	77.7
Excavator	76.7
Backhoe	73.6
Excavator	76.7
Demolition Combined Noise Level	85.5
GRADING	
Grader	81.0
Backhoe	73.6
Dozer	77.7
Excavator	76.7
Scraper	79.6
Grading Combined Noise Level	85.4
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION	
Forklift	79.4
Generator	77.6
Backhoe	73.6
Welder	70.0
Crane	72.6
Building Construction Combined Noise Level	85.4
PAVING	
Pavers	74.2
Rollers	73.0
Paving Combined Noise Level	76.7
ARCHITECTURAL COATING	
Compressor	73.7
Architectural Coating Combined Noise Level	73.7
SOURCE: FHWA, Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) Version 1.1.	

Table 3-6 below provides the unmitigated construction noise levels. It should be noted that the Study's table uses the distance to sensitive receptors to construction centroid, while the City above noted linear ft. from property lines, based on TMC. Additionally, the Study cites 75 db as the threshold, which, as the City noted above, is actually 55 db at residential properties, for daytime construction. Lastly, as noted in the below table, the typical construction noise level at the sensitive receptors would be in the 56 db range, slightly higher than the 55 db limits, and with the 5 db correction noted in the TMC for repetitive impulse noise such as hammering or riveting and steady whines, screeches or hums, the proposed unmitigated noise levels, would be in the 60+ db range, and would potentially be a significant impact. Environmental Staff of the Community Development Department has provided a mitigation measure to address these potential disturbances.

N-1:

That noise attenuation devices shall be provided during construction activities to attenuate noise levels at sensitive receptors to 55 db or lower at the sensitive receptors property lines. That noise readings shall be taken during construction activities, and logged in, during the various construction activities, in order to confirm that the attenuation devices are reducing the noise levels to TMC maximums for sensitive receptors.

TABLE 3-6: UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS					
Sensitive Receptors	Distance to Construction Centroid (feet) /a/	Existing Ambient Noise Level (dBA, L_{eq})	Typical Construction Noise Level at Sensitive Receptor (dBA, L_{eq})	Threshold (dBA)	Exceed?
Columbia Park	1,400	72.7	56.6	75	No

Less Than Significant

Potentially Significant **With Mitigation Incorporation** **Less than Significant** **No Impact**

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: **Sources** **Impact** **Incorporation** **Impact** **Impact**

Staybridge Suites	1,400	71.4	56.6	75	No
Residences on 190 th St., east of Prairie Ave.	1,500	72.7	56.0	75	No
Residences on 190 th St., west of Prairie Ave.	1,650	72.7	55.1	75	No
/a/ The construction centroid represents the distance from the center of the project site to the sensitive land uses. This distance is a reasonable representation of the typical source distance anticipated from heavy-duty equipment as the equipment moves around the project site. SOURCE: TAHA, 2019.					

Table 3-7 of the Study, shown below, provides the existing truck haul route traffic volumes. Per the Study, the proposal would make approximately 80 trips per day, which is 10 truck trips per hour. The Study notes that a doubling of traffic volume is typically needed to audibly increase noise levels along a roadway segment. The anticipated truck volume would not double the existing traffic volumes, and therefore, would not audibly change the average daily noise levels.

TABLE 3-7: HAUL ROUTE TRAFFIC VOLUMES	
Roadway	PM Peak Hour Traffic Volume (2019)
Crenshaw Blvd. North of 190 th St.	4,110
190 th St. between Prairie Ave. and Crenshaw Blvd.	3,246
Prairie Ave. between 190 th St. and Del Amo Blvd.	3,596
SOURCE: RK Engineering Group Inc., Torrance Prairie Avenue Warehouse Project Traffic Impact Study, July 26, 2019.	

Based on the above discussion, there is the potential for significant impacts related to construction noise levels in excess of established standards. Construction noise would be less than significant, with the additional of Staff's mitigation measure.

In regards to potential noise impacts related to operations, the Study assessed stationary and mobile sources. The stationary sources included HVAC systems, truck loading docks and parking. Based on the db corrections noted above for hums or steady type noises, the TMC would limit daytime noise to 65 dBA and nighttime noise to 60 dBA. Per the Study, none of the aforementioned operational stationary noise sources would exceed these limits. Typically, Staff requires an equipment noise study during the plan check process, in order to ascertain that the specific equipment will not exceed the City's limits. The mobile sources included passenger vehicle and truck trips. According to the Study, roadway noise attributed to the project would be less than 3 dBA on the local roadway network, and it is not anticipated that there would be a perceptible change in sound level. Therefore, impacts related to operational stationary and mobile noise levels would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

- (b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? 3, 12

In regards to potential vibration impacts, the Study assessed construction and operations. The Study notes that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published guidance stating that engineered concrete and masonry buildings (e.g., typical commercial buildings) can withstand peak particle velocity levels of at least 0.3 inches per second without experiencing damage. Vibration is a localized event and attenuates rapidly with distance and at this distance vibration damage would not occur. Heavy-duty equipment operating within 12 feet of a structure would generate vibration levels that exceed 0.3 inches per second. Construction equipment would not operate within 12 feet of an existing, off-site building. The nearest structures are located north and west of the project site and would be at least 25 feet from heavy-duty equipment activities (e.g., grading passbys). The maximum vibration level at 25 feet would be 0.089 inches per second. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to building damage from construction vibration.

The Study notes that land uses particularly sensitive to vibration annoyance during daytime construction hours, including, but not limited to, hospitals, schools, museums, concert halls, television studios, recording studios, auditoriums, theatres, or research facilities with sensitive equipment, have not been identified adjacent to the project site. Therefore, impact related to annoyance/disruption from construction vibration would be less than significant.

In regards to operations, the Study notes that the project does not propose stationary sources of vibration, such as heavy-duty industrial equipment, that would exceed FTA thresholds. Therefore, construction and operational impacts related to vibration would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

- (c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private air strip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? 4, 12

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The project is approximately three miles away from the nearest Airport, Torrance Municipal Airport - Zamperini Field. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip, or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | 1, 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The majority of the subject site has been unoccupied for many years. As stated previously, the site is located within an urbanized area, surrounded by predominately industrial users, in a city that is largely built-out. The existing conditions at the project site are partially disturbed land, partial paving, a small out building and ornamental landscaping. Zoned as heavy manufacturing, the TMC permits warehouse and industrial uses. While the site has been partially vacant and underutilized for many years, the development of a warehouse/industrial project should not result in a substantial unplanned population growth. As no specific use or tenant/s have been identified, Staff is reevaluating the project based on a generic warehouse/industrial project, as it relates to population growth and infrastructure. While the typical warehouse/industrial project will likely create some job opportunities, it is expected that local and regional workers would be available to serve the needs of the proposed project, and the employees are not necessarily expected to relocate to the City of Torrance, thereby creating a permanent increase in population. Staff would be able to evaluate future occupants' request for business licenses, based on use and whether their operations would have a potential to significantly impact population growth or infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in a significant impact on the environment with respect to population, housing growth projections and infrastructure, and impacts would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (b) | Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | 1, 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

As mentioned in 14(a), the project site is unoccupied, and is developed with partially disturbed land, partial paving, a small out building and ornamental landscaping. No residential housing is provided; therefore, the project would not displace people or housing. No impacts to housing displacement would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (i) | Fire protection? | 1, 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|------------------|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
- The proposed in-fill project would not increase the demand for fire protection services that would result in the need for new or expanded fire protection facilities. The closest fire station (Fire Station 5) is located approximately 0.69 miles from the project site. On-site fire protection services will be incorporated in the project, including fire hydrants, fire mains, sprinklers, and alarms. Additionally, since November 2005, the City of Torrance has collected a Development Impact Fee (DIF) at plan check. The DIF is a one-time cost, other than a tax or special assessment fee, that is charged by a local government agency. The DIF is applied to pay a portion of the costs identified for public facilities used for transportation services, undergrounding of utilities, sewer and storm drains. As of January 2007, the DIF fees were also extended to cover Police and Fire Facilities. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact with regard to fire protection and no mitigation measures would be required.

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (ii) | Police protection? | 1, 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------|--------------------|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

The proposed in-fill project would not increase the demand for police protection services that would result in the need for new or expanded police protection facilities. As discussed in 15(a)(i) above, the City of Torrance has collected a DIF, which includes Police Facilities. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact with regard to police protection and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (iii) Schools? 1,2

The proposed project does not include any residential development, and would not result in an increased demand for school services. Therefore, the project would not result in the need to alter existing schools or construct new schools, the construction of which could result in significant impacts on the physical environment. Additionally, pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the construction of an industrial structure would be changed school impact fees, which are used to fund the construction or reconstruction of school facilities within the district for which they are collected. Therefore, no impacts to schools would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (iv) Parks? 1, 2

The proposed project does not include any residential development or significant population growth; therefore, it would not result in an increased demand for park facilities. Consequently, the project would not accelerate the deterioration of existing parks; therefore, the construction of new or rehabilitated park facilities would not be required. Therefore, impacts to parks would be considered less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (v) Other public facilities? 1, 2

Other public facilities, not previously mentioned above, may include, but are not limited to, building and planning services; libraries; recreational facilities that are not parks (parks were addressed in 15(a)(iv)); public works/maintenance services (trash, street sweeping, sewers, storm drains, transit, etc.). As previously mentioned, the City collects a DIF, and applies a portion of the costs for public facilities used for transportation services, undergrounding of utilities, sewer and storm drains. The proposed project, as an in-fill warehouse/industrial use, is not expected to increase the use of public facilities, beyond what has been previously assessed for the zone and GP designation. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact with regard to public facilities and no mitigation measures would be required.

16. RECREATION:

- (a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? 1, 2

As referenced in 15(a)(iv) and (v), the project does not include any residential development; therefore, no substantial increase in population is anticipated, which would trigger an increase use of parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would not require the construction of a new park facility or expansion of an existing park facility or other recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? 1, 2

As discussed in 16(a), the project does not provide a residential component, nor propose any recreational facilities on- or off-site; therefore, the project is not expected to significantly increase demand for public recreational services. The project does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which would have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, no mitigation measures would be required.

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:

- (a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? 1, 2, 13, 22

A Traffic Impact Study (Attachment 9) was required to be prepared, to evaluate and assess the traffic and circulation impacts for the proposed project. The Study was reviewed by City of Torrance Public Works Department-Traffic Engineering Staff, and met their guidelines and requirements, which are patterned after the Los Angeles County Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines for compliance with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP). Additionally, these guidelines are in concert with the Circulation and Infrastructure Element of the City's General Plan. The analysis evaluates AM and PM peak hours, calculating the operating level of service (LOS) of the intersections based on both the delay-based Highway Capacity Manual

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		

(HCM) analysis methodology, as well as, the capacity-based Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) analysis methodology. Level of service (LOS) grades A through F are used to describe the operation of an intersection or roadway; LOS A represents unimpeded/un-congested LOS operation, while LOS F represents severely congested LOS operation. The HCM intersection analysis methodology correlates LOS operation to seconds of delay experience by motorists at an intersection, while the ICU analysis methodology correlates LOS operation to the amount of intersection capacity utilized by vehicles passing through the intersection.

The traffic analysis study area included the below four intersections and one driveway, all within the City of Torrance jurisdiction:

1. Prairie Avenue / 190th Street (Signalized)
2. Prairie Avenue / Project Site Access (Unsignalized)
3. Prairie Avenue / Del Amo Boulevard (Signalized)
4. Crenshaw Boulevard / 190th Street (Signalized)
5. Crenshaw Boulevard / Del Amo Boulevard (Signalized)

The analysis evaluates traffic conditions of the study intersections and driveways for the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions
- Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Ambient Growth Conditions (Existing traffic plus ambient growth)
- Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Ambient Growth With Project Conditions (Existing traffic plus ambient growth plus proposed project)
- Forecast Opening Year (2021) Without Project Conditions (Existing traffic plus Ambient Growth plus Cumulative Projects)
- Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Project Conditions (Existing traffic plus Ambient Growth plus Cumulative Projects plus Proposed Project)

According to the Study, the total combined trip generation for the proposed project is 947 daily PCE-adjusted trips-weekday; with 93 PCE-adjusted trips (71 inbound, 22 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour-weekday; and with 104 PCE-adjusted trips (29 inbound, 75 outbound) produced in the PM peak hour-weekday.

The Study's LOS analysis for the six scenarios showed that two intersections analyzed resulted in a significant traffic impact, requiring mitigation measures.

INTERSECTION 1 - Prairie Avenue / 190th Street. Six of the following scenarios identified significant traffic impacts: Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions (With Traffic Signal Alternative); Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions (Without Traffic Signal Alternative); Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Ambient Growth With Project Conditions (With Traffic Signal Alternative); Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Ambient Growth With Project Conditions (Without Traffic Signal Alternative); Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Project Conditions (With Traffic Signal Alternative) and Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Project Conditions (Without Traffic Signal Alternative). The Study provided the below identical mitigation measure to address these impacts.

T-1

Implement right-turn overlap phasing for the northbound Prairie Avenue approach, at the Prairie Avenue/190th Street intersection.

INTERSECTION 5 - Crenshaw Boulevard / Del Amo Boulevard. One of the scenarios identified significant traffic impacts: Forecast Opening Year (2021) With Project Conditions (Without Traffic Signal Alternative). The Study provided the below mitigation measure to address these impacts.

T-2

Restripe the southbound Crenshaw Boulevard approach, at the Crenshaw Boulevard/Del Amo Boulevard intersection, from one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane to consist of one left-turn lane, three through lanes and one right-turn lane.

As discussed in the Study, with Mitigation Measures T-1 and T-2, the proposed project would not degrade traffic operations below those acceptable in the City of Torrance General Plan, and would not change roadway designations from those in the General Plan. The proposed project would be consistent with the City's adopted program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Any significant adverse impacts related to traffic would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measures.

(b)	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	1, 2, 13, 22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	--------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

As mentioned in 17(a), the City of Torrance, Traffic Engineering Staff have reviewed the project, based on their guidelines and requirements, which are patterned after the Los Angeles County Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines for compliance with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP). Their review concurred with the Study's evaluation of the project and the two Mitigation Measures. Therefore, there are no impacts in determining the criteria for analyzing transportation impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3), and no mitigation measures would be required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (c) | Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | 1, 3, 5, 13 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|---|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The plans provide two driveway access points to the site, one where the existing driveway is located along the northern portion of the property, on Prairie Avenue, and one approximately 35 ft. south of the northern driveway. While the northern driveway is designed at a 90-degree angle, which may make large truck movements difficult, the secondary driveway is designed horizontally with the frontage, which may be the preferred access for trucks. Prior to building permit issuance, Traffic Engineering Staff will review truck turning templates for this project, to assure that access is achievable.

The site is zoned M-2, Heavy Manufacturing District, which permits a variety of industrial uses. As no specific use or tenant has been identified, any prospective tenant's occupancy would be reviewed by Planning Staff prior to business license issuance to ascertain the use is compatible with the zone.

Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to the geometric design features of the project and incompatible uses would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (d) | Result in inadequate emergency access? | 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project was reviewed by the Fire and Police Departments, and no comments were received regarding access issues. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: | 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (i) | Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | 14, 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search and Tribal Consultation List
 The City of Torrance submitted a request to the NAHC for a Sacred Lands File Search and a Tribal Consultation Contact List for the proposed project located within the USGS Torrance Quadrangle California – Los Angeles County 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Map. The NAHC provided a Tribal Consultation List of California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area, but did not yield any sites within their Sacred Lands File Search Database. (Attachment 11).

South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) – California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Record Search
 The Applicant, KP Torrance Prairie Owner, LLC, submitted a request to the SCCIC for a record search of the CHRIS of Native American historical and archeological resources, within the project site of the USGS Torrance Topographic Map (Attachment 10). The SCCIC provided results that no archaeological or built-environment resources were within the project area, with three archaeological and built-environment resources within a ½ -mile project radius. Additionally, this assessment revealed no evidence of any known historical, archeological, or tribal cultural resources on the project site listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). While no archaeological or tribal cultural resources were identified within the project site, there is the potential that buried and previously unrecorded resources could be encountered during construction.

Assembly Bill No. 52 (AB 52)

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

The City of Torrance sent notifications regarding the proposed project to tribes that have submitted to the City a formal request for notification. The following tribes were notified by the City on November 27, 2019: Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, and Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe. A response from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation was received on December 9, 2019 requesting a consultation.

Multiple appointments for consultation were scheduled by the Kizh Nation, and were subsequently cancelled by them, as follows: February 26, 2020 and February 20, 2020. Additional appointments were attempted by the Kizh Nation for February 28, 2020 when City Hall was closed, and on April 8, 2020, which was rejected by the City as being too distant into the future, with the potential to unduly delay the project. As no consultation appointment could be scheduled and agreed upon, on February 18, 2020, the City of Torrance emailed the Kizh Nation, providing a list of potential mitigation measures for their review, and providing them with ten (10) calendar days for review. The ten days elapsed on February 28, 2020, without comment from the tribe. However, out of an abundance of caution, due to a City email interruption between February 27, 2020 and March 16, 2020, Staff emailed the Nation on March 23, 2020, and the Nation responded to the City with an email on March 23, 2020, noting their mitigation measures. Staff reviewed their measures and emailed the Nation on April 16, 2020, with revised mitigation measures, allowing another ten (10) calendar days for their review. The Nation responded on April 21, 2020 requesting reconsideration of the City's revised measures, and provided their revised measures on April 22, 2020. The City worked with the Nation's attorney to discuss the points of contention and mutually agreed to the mitigation measures on April 27, 2020, thereby, concluding the AB 52 consultation requirement.

Listed below are the mutually agreed upon mitigation measures to reduce any significant adverse impacts related to discovery of any unknown archaeological or tribal cultural resources, at the project site, to less than significant:

TCR-1:

Retain a Native American Monitor/Consultant: The Project Applicant shall be required to retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is both approved by the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government (as the consulting Tribe on this project) and is listed under the NAHC's Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. Retention of a Native Monitor shall be conducted directly with the Tribe and not through a 3rd party consultant agency (i.e., archaeologists or historians). The monitor/consultant will only be present on-site during the construction phases that involve ground disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities are defined as activities that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the project area. The Tribal Monitor/Consultant will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and Monitor/Consultant have indicated that the site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.

TCR-2:

Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural and Archaeological Resources: Upon discovery of any archaeological or tribal cultural resources, cease construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find until the find can be assessed. All tribal cultural resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by the tribal monitor/consultant. If the resources are Native American in origin, the tribal monitor/consultant shall coordinate with the landowner regarding treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Tribe will request preservation in place or recovery for educational purposes. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, mitigation takes place (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f)). If a resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to constitute a "historical resource" or "unique archaeological resource", time allotment and funding sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures, or appropriate mitigation, must be available. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. All Tribal Cultural Resources shall be returned to the Tribe. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, they shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

TCR-3:

Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects: Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in PRC 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. Health and Safety Code 7050.5 dictates that any discoveries of human skeletal material shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner and excavation halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the NAHC and PRC 5097.98 shall be followed.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

TCR-4:

Resource Assessment and Continuation of Work Protocol: Upon discovery of human remains, the tribal monitor will immediately divert work at minimum of 50 feet and place an exclusion zone around the burial. The monitor will then notify the Tribe, the qualified lead archaeologist, and the construction manager who will call the coroner. Work will continue to be diverted while the coroner determines whether the remains are Native American. The discovery is to be kept confidential and secure to prevent any further disturbance. If the finds are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the NAHC as mandated by state law who will then appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD).

TCR-5:

Tribal Procedures for Burials and Funerary Remains: If the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation is designated as the MLD, the Koo-nas-gna Burial Policy shall be implemented. The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones. In ancient as well as historic times, Tribal Traditions included, but were not limited to, the burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains. These remains are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated funerary objects are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later; other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains can also be considered as associated funerary objects.

TCR-6:

Treatment Measures: Prior to the continuation of ground disturbing activities, the land owner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to recommend diverting the project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. The Tribe will work closely with the qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be taken which includes at a minimum detailed descriptive notes and sketches. Additional types of documentation shall be approved by the Tribe for data recovery purposes. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure complete recovery of all material. If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the location is considered a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created. Once complete, a final report of all activities is to be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does not authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive diagnostics on human remains.

Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items should be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site but at a location agreed upon between the Tribe and the landowner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.

TCR-7:

Professional Standards: Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction projects will be consistent with current professional standards. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be taken. Principal personnel must meet the Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology and have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator.

Therefore, impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measures (TCR-1, TCR-2, TCR-3, TCR-4, TCR-5, TCR-6 and TCR-7).

(ii)	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

As described in 18(a)(i), there is no evidence of any known historical, archeological, or tribal cultural resources on the project site that is determined to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024. 1. While no archaeological or tribal cultural resources were identified within the project site, there is the potential that buried and previously unrecorded resources could be encountered during construction. Any significant adverse impacts related to discovery of an unknown archaeological tribal cultural resource at the project site would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures TCR-1 through TCR-7, as referenced in 18(a)(i).

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

(a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	1, 2, 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

WATER: The Torrance General Plan anticipated that existing water service would meet the needs of the General Plan's buildout projections. The site is located within the Torrance Municipal Water Department's (TMWD) service area. The TMWD is a direct member agency of the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), which currently provides approximately 80 percent of the City's potable water supply. The remaining 20 percent comes from local water sources. Per the Public Works Department, next year the percentages will change favoring local water sources, including City wells, providing approximately 50% local water. Therefore, impacts to water facilities would be considered less than significant, as no expansion of existing facilities for this specific project, will be required. No mitigation measures would be required

WASTEWATER TREATMENT/STORMWATER DRAINAGE: The Public Works Department of the City of Torrance maintains local sewer and storm drain systems. The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles Count (LACSD) is the regional agency responsible for the collection and treatment of wastewater, including the construction, operation, and maintenance of sanitation facilities. The nearest wastewater treatment facility is the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in Carson. The JWPCP treats approximately 320 million gallons of wastewater a day. The Sewer Study Memorandum (Attachment 13) provided a letter from the LACSD noting that wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge directly to the Districts' North Torrance Trunk Sewer, located in a private right of way along the south boundary of the project site. The Districts' 24-inch diameter trunk sewer has a capacity of 4.4 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 3.2 mgd when last measured in 2017. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Carson JWPCP, which has a capacity of 400 mgd and currently produces an average flow of 254.7 mgd. The LACSD letter provided the expected average wastewater flow from this project to be 9,125 gallons per day; however, they reviewed a project of 365,000 sf, which is 63,020 sf shy of the proposal's 428,020 sf size. According to the City's Engineering Department, the difference in size is not significant to substantially change the LACSD's assessment. Therefore, impacts to water systems or wastewater systems would be considered less than significant as no expansion of existing facilities will be required. No mitigation measures would be required.

ELECTRIC POWER: Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electric power services to the City, including installations and maintenance of mainline systems. The distribution systems adequately serve local customers, and they provide upgrades over time as needed to meet the changing demands. Additionally, the City requires that new projects meet the 2019 California Energy Code (Title 24) and 2019 California Green Building Code, which reduces energy consumption from the previous code. Therefore, impacts to electric facilities would be considered less than significant as no expansion of existing facilities will be required. No mitigation measures would be required.

NATURAL GAS: Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) provides natural gas services to the City, including installations and maintenance of mainline systems. The distribution systems adequately serve local customers, and they provide upgrades over time as needed to meet the changing demands. Additionally, the City requires that new projects meet the 2019 California Energy Code (Title 24) and 2019 California Green Building Code, which reduces energy consumption from the previous code. Therefore, impacts to natural gas facilities would be considered less than significant as no expansion of existing facilities will be required. No mitigation measures would be required.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES: Telecommunications includes media and technologies, including radio, fiber optics, television, telephone, data communication, and computer networking. The advancement of telecommunications has changed dramatically with the use of the Internet, wireless networking, portable computers, cell phones, global positioning systems, and other technological advancements. Increasingly, campuses, business complexes, hotels, and coffee houses offer wireless connections. In the years to come, technology will continue to advance, and the nature of telecommunications will continue to evolve.

Considerable growth in the flow of information in telecommunication systems is expected in the future. Fortunately, much of the increase is expected to occur through better utilization of existing facilities, which will require relatively limited physical expansion beyond the established infrastructure. Substantial investments may be made in upgrading wire systems to optical fiber and in upgrading central facilities to handle higher capacities. Providing high-capacity data and video links may be important in reducing vehicle trips by increasing the potential for telecommuting and teleconferencing and allowing more people to work from home.

Continued growth will, however, require expansion to the existing network to serve new development. As with the electrical system, the City actively pursues its policy of undergrounding these utilities. The City recognizes the benefits to be achieved by requiring all new utilities to be placed underground and to retrofit existing aboveground systems, where possible, in association with new construction. Often, undergrounding of these telecommunication systems can be coordinated with SCE undergrounding activities. The City utilizes residential and non-residential undergrounding impact fees to further this goal. Therefore, impacts to telecommunications facilities would be considered less than significant as no expansion of existing facilities will be required. No mitigation measures would be required.

(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

As mentioned in 19(a), the City's water sources are adequate to serve the proposed development, and within the next year, will double local water supplies, with additional wells coming online. The Engineering Division has placed conditions and code requirements on the project to ensure adequate service to the site. It should be noted that the City of Torrance has implemented a DIF and that a portion of the fee is used towards maintenance and improving infrastructure in the area. Also, the project will be required to comply with the California Green Code standards for water conservation, such as installation of high efficiency water fixtures and low-flow irrigation systems for landscape areas. Therefore, impacts to water supplies would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- (c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? 1, 2, 16

As mentioned in 19(a), the Sewer Study Memorandum provided a letter from the LACSD indicating that they should have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to the project's projected demanded in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Therefore, no mitigation measures would be required.

- (d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? 1, 2, 3

The project will be serviced by a private waste hauler and conditions of approval will require recycling to reduce demand for landfill area. Per TMC, waste haulers must divert at least 50% of the solid waste collected. The project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. The Environmental Division has provided conditions that recyclable bins be included within the trash enclosures proposed. Therefore, impacts to solid waste disposal would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

- (e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? 3

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. In addition, a Waste Management Plan (WMP) would be prepared in order to recycle or reuse at least fifty percent of the materials that leave the project site, as noted in 19(d). Therefore, no impacts to regulations related to solid waste would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- (a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 21

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), the City of Torrance is not within a State or Federal responsibility area, nor classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ). However, the project is near/adjacent to Palos Verdes Estates and Rolling Hills, which are VHFHSZ. As mentioned in 9(f), the project will be reviewed by the applicant City departments/divisions prior to building permit issuance, to assure that all fire and safety codes are addressed. The project is located within an urbanized area that does not contain expanses of wildland area. Therefore, impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- (b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? 21

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant		
			With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

As mentioned in 20(a), the project is not located within a VHFHSZ, but near two hillside City's that are VHFHSZ, approximately 3.5 miles south of the subject site. However, the project site is located within an urbanized environment, relatively flat, surrounded by industrial and commercial uses, and not near any wildland areas. Therefore, project impacts to project occupants exposed to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (c) | Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | 21 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|---|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

As mentioned above, the project is not located within a VHFHSZ, but near two hillside City's that are VHFHSZ, approximately 3.5 miles south of the subject site. The project site is located in a largely urbanized area, relatively flat, surrounded by industrial and commercial uses, and not near any wildland areas. Therefore, no installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure will be required, other than typical improvements to existing infrastructure for industrial developments. These improvements will be reviewed by applicable City staff, including Building & Safety, Fire, etc., to make sure the improvements meet all applicable building and safety codes to assure that the improvements do not exacerbate any fire risks or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (d) | Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | 21 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

As mentioned above, the project is not located within a VHFHSZ, but near two hillside City's that are VHFHSZ, approximately 3.5 miles south of the subject site. The project site is located in a largely urbanized area, relatively flat, surrounded by industrial and commercial uses, and not near any wildland areas. Furthermore, the project site is not located near a canyon, slope, drainage course, stream, or other natural feature which could expose people or structures to runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides. Therefore, no impacts from project development would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As described in the analysis above, the construction of the proposed warehouse/industrial project has the potential to result in significant impacts to the southern tarplant and nesting birds through the grading of the site and the removal of trees, and to buried paleontological / archaeological / tribal resources during grading activities. However, any significant adverse impacts would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures (i.e. BR-1, BR-2, CR-1, CR-2, HAHM-1, HAHM-2, HAHM-3, HAHM-4, N-1, T-1, T-2, TCR-1, TCR-2, TCR-3, TCR-4, TCR-5, TCR-6 and TCR-7). Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitats of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. No additional mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (b) | Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | 1, 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|---|------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The analysis above has determined that the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts; however, regulatory compliance and mitigation measures would reduce those potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. With the implementation of mitigation measures: BR-1, BR-2, CR-1, CR-2, HAHM-1, HAHM-2, HAHM-3, HAHM-4, N-1, T-1, T-2, TCR-1, TCR-2, TCR-3, TCR-4, TCR-5, TCR-6 and TCR-7, the analysis above has determined that the project would not have any individually limited, but cumulatively considerable impacts.

The long-term cumulative impacts of development in the City, pursuant to the Torrance General Plan, were assessed in the General Plan Update Final EIR. The EIR identified certain cumulative impacts, such as, generation of air pollution, 100-year flood protection, traffic congestion, limited solid waste disposal facilities in Los Angeles County, and limited water supply for Southern California. These cumulative impacts are considered to be previously assessed and the development does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Therefore, with the incorporation of the aforementioned mitigation measures that would reduce any significant impacts to less than significant, no additional mitigation measures would be required.

(c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	1, 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

As described in the analysis above, with the implementation of mitigation measures, the construction and operation of the project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The impacts that the project could have on human beings have been reduced to less than significant via mitigation measures BR-1, BR-2, CR-1, CR-2, HAHM-1, HAHM-2, HAHM-3, HAHM-4, N-1, T-1, T-2, TCR-1, TCR-2, TCR-3, TCR-4, TCR-5, TCR-6 and TCR-7, along with existing regulations and standard conditions of approval.

As the environmental impacts of this project are herein determined to be less than significant with the above noted mitigation measures, there is no evidence to indicate that adverse impacts will be caused to human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

22. EARLIER ANALYSIS:

This Initial Study incorporates information contained in the City of Torrance General Plan. The General Plan Update Final EIR, 2009, is a program EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(d), a program EIR may (1) provide the basis in an initial study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects, (2) be incorporated by reference to deal with regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole, and (3) focus an EIR on a later activity to permit discussion solely of new effects which had not been considered before.

20. SOURCE REFERENCES:

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City of Torrance General Plan (2009) and Land Use Map 2. General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, SCH #2008111046 (2009) 3. City of Torrance Municipal Code (TMC) - https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Torrance/ 4. City of Torrance Zoning Map 5. Project Plans (Site Plans, Floor Plans, Roof Plans, Sections, Elevations, Renderings) 6. Air Quality Impact Study – August 2019 Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc. 7. Biological Resources Technical Report – September 2019 Dudek 8. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment – June 10, 2019 Hazard Management Consulting, Inc. 9. Report of Findings Letter – April 29, 2020 Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board 10. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Study – August 2019 Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc. 11. Preliminary Hydrology Calculations Report – September 26, 2019 Thienes Engineering 12. Noise and Vibration Impact Study – August 2019 Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc. 13. Traffic Impact Study – September 27, 2019 RK Engineering Group, Inc. 14. California Historical Resources Information System Report (CHRIS) – August 13, 2019 South Central Coastal Information Center 15. Sacred Lands File Search and Tribal Consultation List, Native American Heritage Commission, January 8, 2020 16. Sewer Study Memorandum – August 16, 2019 Thienes Engineering, Inc. 17. State of California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program & Williamson Act Program (http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Index.aspx) and (https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca) 18. Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (http://www.lacsd.org) 19. City of Torrance Expansive Soil Foundation Map for Residential Construction (https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/building) 20. City of Torrance Climate Action Plan (https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/sustainability/greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-climate-change) 21. CALFIRE Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) Map (https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/) 22. City of Torrance Citywide Traffic Analysis – March 21, 2019 Albert Grover & Associates (https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/public-works/traffic-engineering) 					

21. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Location and Zoning Map
2. Air Quality Impact Study – August 2019 Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc.
3. Biological Resources Technical Report – September 2019 Dudek
4. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment – June 10, 2019 Hazard Management Consulting, Inc.
5. Report of Findings Letter – April 29, 2020 Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Study – August 2019 Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc.
7. Preliminary Hydrology Calculations Report – September 26, 2019 Thienes Engineering
8. Noise and Vibration Impact Study – August 2019 Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc.
9. Traffic Impact Study – September 27, 2019 RK Engineering Group, Inc.
10. California Historical Resources Information System Report (CHRIS) – August 13, 2019 South Central Coastal Information Center
11. Sacred Lands File Search and Tribal Consultation List, Native American Heritage Commission, January 8, 2020
12. Formal Notification Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1, City of Torrance, November 27, 2019
13. Sewer Study Memorandum – August 16, 2019 Thienes Engineering, Inc.