

13.0 Errata to the Draft EIR



13.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

13.1 INTRODUCTION

The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment from July 14, 2014 to August 27, 2014. The errata presented in this section address the technical comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and resulting text revisions; see also Section 12.0, *Comments and Responses*.

Revisions to the text are presented according to page number and, where appropriate, according to paragraph. Added or modified text is underlined, deleted text has a ~~strike out~~ through the text, and both are included in a box, as the following example shows:

"Text from EIR" ~~Text from EIR~~

It is noted, the revisions to the Draft EIR do not involve significant new information, changes in the Project or environmental setting, or significant additional data. They do not result in any new or substantially greater environmental impacts, as compared to those identified in the Draft EIR. Moreover, the revisions do not affect the Draft EIR's overall conclusions.

13.2 ERRATA

SECTION 5.2 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Draft EIR page 5.2-118, paragraph five, has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

Forecast Long-Range With Project Buildout (Cumulative) Conditions
CMP Study Intersections

- Intersection 7 (Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1)/Lincoln Avenue, Caltrans/CMP);
- Intersection 15 (Sepulveda Blvd (SR-1)/El Segundo Blvd, Caltrans/CMP);
- Intersection 18 (Sepulveda Blvd (SR-1)/Rosecrans Avenue, Caltrans/CMP);
- ~~Intersection 68 (Lincoln Boulevard (SR-1)/Manchester Avenue, Los Angeles City/Caltrans/CMP);~~
- Intersection 69 (Sepulveda Blvd/Manchester Ave, Los Angeles City/CMP);
- Intersection 70 (Pacific Coast Hwy (SR-1)/Artesia Blvd, Manhattan Beach/Hermosa Beach/Caltrans/CMP); and
- Intersection 71 (Pacific Coast Hwy (SR-1)/Torrance Blvd, Redondo Beach/Caltrans/CMP).



SECTION 5.11 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Draft EIR page 5.11-15, paragraph two, has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

The facility, which has a design capacity of 400 MGD, provides both primary and secondary treatment of approximately ~~265.4~~ 264.1 MGD of wastewater.

Draft EIR pages 5.11-39 (beginning paragraph three) through 5.11-40 have been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

SCE maintains and operates the transmission and distribution infrastructure located in the Project area. According to SCE, it anticipates being able to provide electrical service to the Project site, sufficient to meet the electrical demands of the proposed uses. Electrical service to the Project would be provided via the existing customer dedicated substation located in the southwestern portion of the site and ~~electrical~~ 66 kV power line located within the El Segundo Boulevard ROW (south side). Extension of this existing power distribution system, along with a proposed second customer dedicated substation (of between 50 and 200 kV)¹ would be required to provide electrical service to the proposed development. The utility corridor adjacent and southwest of the Project site would not be used to provide electrical service to or impacted by the Project. The Project does not include modification of the power lines in the utility corridor adjacent and southwest of the Project site.

The Project proposes dedication and construction of roadway for an approximately 10 to 22-foot wide (depending upon the location) portion of Project frontage along El Segundo Boulevard, in order to widen the ROW; see ESSCSP Exhibit 13. Therefore, the Project would require relocation of the existing power line along the south side of El Segundo Boulevard. The new substation would be located immediately northwest of the existing substation and would be adequately sized to meet the demands of the proposed development, with an anticipated electrical load of approximately 68,240 kWh/yr. As illustrated on Exhibit 5.11-10, the site's electrical system is proposed to have two connection points to this power line to serve the Project: one connection point to the north in El Segundo Boulevard at the Nash Street Project driveway; and one connection point to the proposed substation. Additionally, as discussed in Section 5.2, Mitigation Measures (TRA-1 through TRA-6, TRA-8, and TRA-9) would widen the approaches of various intersections (Nash Street/Maple Avenue, Nash Street/El Segundo Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard/Marine Avenue, and Sepulveda Boulevard/Mariposa Avenue), where there are power lines. The Project would require relocation of the existing power lines at these intersections. The new substation would be located immediately northwest of the existing substation and would be sized to meet the demands of the proposed development, with an anticipated electrical load of approximately 68,240 kWh/yr.² The financial responsibility for upgrades or additional facilities, if necessary, would be in accordance with SCE's rules and tariffs. As part of the substation's review and approval process, SCE must submit a Permit to Construct application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for approval. The CPUC is the state regulatory agency that grants permits for substations. The CPUC would review the application to ensure the

¹ Written Correspondence: Alkire, Masa, City of El Segundo Principal Planner, December 5, 2014.

² Written Correspondence: Alkire, Masa, Principal Planner, City of El Segundo, August 12, 2013.



substation's compliance with all applicable laws.

As part of the Project's approval process, all plans involving the widening of El Segundo Boulevard and intersection improvements would be submitted to SCE for its review and approval before final City approval of ROW improvements to El Segundo Boulevard. The Project Applicant and SCE, in consultation with City Department of Public Works and Department of Planning and Building Safety staff, would review the Project plans and determine the appropriate methods for SCE facility construction and relocation. Further, the environmental impacts resulting from construction of the electrical facilities are analyzed in Sections 5.1 through Sections 5.11 of this EIR. There would be no significant unavoidable environmental impacts caused by construction of the substation or relocation of the power lines.

The financial responsibility for upgrades or additional facilities, if necessary, must comply with the CPUC's rules and tariffs. The Applicant would be required to pay the applicable fees assessed by SCE to extend electricity construct the substation and relocate the power lines to serve the proposed uses. SCE would not provide service to new developments if there were not adequate electricity supplies and infrastructure to maintain existing service levels and meet the anticipated electricity demands of the specific development requesting service. Before the City issues any grading permit, the Applicant would be required to coordinate with SCE to determine the exact location of the electrical facilities. Therefore, the Project would not have a significant impact on SCE's capacity to provide electrical power services to the service area.

General Order No. 131-D (Order 131-D) was adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to be responsive to CEQA requirements, among other objectives. According to Order 131-D, no electric public utility is allowed to begin construction on power line facilities or substations, which are designed for immediate or eventual operation at any voltage between 50 kV and 200 kV, without the CPUC having first issued a Permit to Construct, in accordance with the provisions of Sections IX.B, X, and XI.B (see Order 131-D Section III.B). As described above, the Project proposes construction of a customer dedicated substation (between 50 and 200 kV) and to relocate 66 kV power lines. According to Order 131-D Section III.B.1.c, the new substation and relocated power lines would be exempt from Section IX.B (which requires filing a Permit to Construct), given they satisfy the following criteria for exemption:

- Power lines or substations to be relocated or constructed which have undergone environmental review pursuant to CEQA as part of a larger project, and for which the final CEQA document finds no significant unavoidable environmental impacts caused by the proposed line or substation.

According to Order 131-D Section X.A, the new substation and relocated power lines would be exempt from Section X.A (which addresses electric and magnetic fields (EMFs)), given an application for Permit to Construct would not be required. According to Order 131-D Section XI.B, the new substation and relocated power lines would be subject to compliance with Section XI.B, which requires that SCE give notice of the construction of power line facilities or substations between 50 kV and 200 kV deemed exempt from Section III (see discussion above).



Draft EIR page 5.11-46 has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

State of California Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region Website, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/la_ms4/2012/Order%20R4-2012-0175%20-%20A%20Final%20Order%20revised.pdf, Accessed May 8, 2013.

Water Code §§ 10910–10915.

Written Correspondence: Alkire, Masa, Principal Planner, City of El Segundo, August 7, 2013.

Written Correspondence: Alkire, Masa, Principal Planner, City of El Segundo, August 12, 2013.

Written Correspondence: Alkire, Masa, City of El Segundo Principal Planner, December 5, 2014.

Written Correspondence: Raza, Adriana, Customer Service Specialist, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, November 28, 2012.

SECTION 7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Draft EIR page 7-3, paragraph nine, has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

Forecast Long-Range With Project Buildout Conditions CMP Study Intersections

- Intersection 7 (Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1)/Lincoln Avenue);
- Intersection 15 (Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1)/El Segundo Boulevard);
- Intersection 18 (Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1)/Rosecrans Avenue);
- ~~Intersection 68 (Lincoln Boulevard (SR-1)/Manchester Avenue);~~
- Intersection 69 (Sepulveda Blvd/Manchester Ave);
- Intersection 70 (Pacific Coast Hwy (SR-1)/Artesia Boulevard); and
- Intersection 71 (Pacific Coast Hwy (SR-1)/Torrance Boulevard).

Draft EIR page 7-14, paragraph three, has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

As concluded in Section 5.2, the addition of Phase 1 Project-generated trips is forecast to result in a significant unavoidable impact at study Intersection 48 under forecast near-term with Phase 1 Project conditions. As also concluded in Section 5.2, the addition of Project buildout-generated trips is forecast to result in significant unavoidable impacts at the following intersections (with feasible mitigation incorporated) for forecast long-range with Project buildout conditions:

- Study Intersections 29, 32, 38, 48, 50, 51, 53, 55, 62, and 69;
- State Highway study Intersections 7 and 13; and
- CMP study Intersections 7, 15, 18, ~~68~~, 69, 70, and 71.



Draft EIR page 7-23, paragraph one, has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

As concluded in Section 5.2, the addition of Phase 1 Project-generated trips is forecast to result in a significant unavoidable impact at study Intersection 48 under forecast near-term with Phase 1 Project conditions. As also concluded in Section 5.2, the addition of Project buildout-generated trips is forecast to result in significant unavoidable impacts at the following intersections (with feasible mitigation incorporated) for forecast long-range with Project buildout conditions:

- Study Intersections 29, 32, 38, 48, 50, 51, 53, 55, 62, and 69;
- State Highway study Intersections 7 and 13; and
- CMP study Intersections 7, 15, 18, ~~68~~, 69, 70, and 71.

Draft EIR page 7-50, beginning with paragraph two, has been revised in the Final EIR as follows:

As shown in Table 7-14, with the addition of Project buildout-generated trips, the same CMP study intersections (Intersections 7, 15, 18, 69, 70, and 71) would be significantly impacted with this Alternative, as with the proposed Project, ~~with one exception; impacts to Intersection 68 would be avoided.~~

Forecast Long-Range With Project Buildout Under Coral Circle Alternative Conditions Mitigation Measures

Similar to the proposed Project, Mitigation Measures at CMP study Intersections 7, 15, 18, 69, 70, and 71 are considered infeasible due to right-of-way limitations and existing structures.

Overall, the traffic impacts at CMP study Intersections 7, 15, 18, 69, 70, and 71 would remain significant and unavoidable for forecast long-range with Project buildout under Coral Circle Alternative conditions. Comparatively, the significant unavoidable impacts at CMP study intersections with the Coral Circle Alternative are generally the same as with the proposed Project, ~~with the exception of the significant unavoidable impact AT CMP study Intersection 68, which would be avoided.~~

Therefore, regarding transportation and traffic, the Coral Circle Alternative is slightly environmentally superior to the proposed Project; this Alternative would avoid the Project's significant unavoidable impact at study Intersection 50 and ~~CMP study Intersection 68~~ for forecast long-range with Project buildout conditions.



This page intentionally left blank.