

1. *Executive Summary*

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed City of Torrance General Plan update. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An environmental impact report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide the public and local and state governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making. This document focuses on those impacts determined to be potentially significant as discussed in the initial study completed for this project (see Appendix A).

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, and the City of Torrance's CEQA procedures. The City, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel from other departments and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this DEIR was obtained from on-site field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, global climate change, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems).



1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The six main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are:

- 1) To disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- 2) To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- 3) To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- 4) To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- 5) To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- 6) To enhance public participation in the planning process.

1. Executive Summary

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 EIR Format

This DEIR has been formatted as described below.

Section 1. Executive Summary: Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this EIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

Section 2. Introduction: Describes the purpose of this EIR, background on the project, the Notice of Preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final EIR certification.

Section 3. Project Description: A detailed description of the project, the objectives of the proposed project, the project area and location, approvals anticipated to be included as part of the project, the necessary environmental clearances for the project, and the intended uses of this EIR.

Section 4. Environmental Setting: A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective. The environmental setting provides baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Section 5. Environmental Analysis: Provides, for each environmental parameter analyzed, a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance of the adverse impacts of the project after mitigation is incorporated; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

Section 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

Section 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, and a Reduced Intensity Alternative.

1. Executive Summary

Section 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant: Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined not to be significant by the Initial Study and were therefore not discussed in detail in this EIR.

Section 9. Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project: Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

Section 10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project: Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

Section 11. Organizations and Persons Consulted: Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.

Section 12. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR: Lists the people who prepared this EIR for the proposed project.

Section 13. Bibliography: A bibliography of the technical reports and other documentation used in the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.

Appendices. The appendices for this document (presented in PDF format on a CD attached to the front cover) contain the following supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
- Appendix B: NOP Responses/Service Letter Correspondence
- Appendix C: Community Profile Report
- Appendix D: Air Quality Modeling Data
- Appendix E: Madrona Marsh Management Plan
- Appendix F: Cultural and Historical Resources Report
- Appendix G: Technical Background Report
- Appendix H: Economic Conditions and Trends Report
- Appendix I: Noise Analysis
- Appendix J: Traffic Impact Analysis
- Appendix K: Urban Water Management Plan



1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This DEIR

This DEIR has been prepared as a Program EIR in accordance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City's Rules for the Implementation of CEQA. In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3):

An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

As provided in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project that are related either 1) geographically; 2) as logical parts of a chain of contemplated events; 3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or 4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and have generally similar environmental effects that

1. Executive Summary

can be mitigated in similar ways. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168[b]) encourages the use of program EIRs, citing five advantages:

1. Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR or an individual action.
2. Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis.
3. Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations.
4. Allow the lead agency to consider broad policy alternatives and programwide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts.
5. Allow reduction in paperwork.

Although the legally required contents of a program EIR are the same as those of a project EIR, program EIRs are typically more conceptual and may contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than a project EIR. Once a program EIR has been prepared, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether an additional CEQA document needs to be prepared. However, if the program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the program EIR scope and additional environmental documents may not be required (Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a Program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities (Guidelines Section 15168[c][1]). If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new initial study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a negative declaration. In this case, the program EIR still serves a valuable purpose as the first-tier environmental analysis.

1.3 PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The proposed project is the City of Torrance General Plan update, which consists of six elements and an implementation program. The primary purpose of the general plan Update is to integrate components of city governance documents into a single guidance system that shapes the community 20 or more years into the future.

1.4 PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.4.1 Project Location

The City of Torrance is in southwestern Los Angeles County, in the highly urbanized South Bay region. The South Bay consists of the cities and communities of Compton, Gardena, Carson, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes Estates, Lomita, Rolling Hills Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, San Pedro, Wilmington, Harbor City, portions of Long Beach, and Torrance.

Communities directly adjacent to Torrance include Rolling Hills Estates and Palos Verdes Estates to the south, Redondo Beach to the west, Gardena and Lawndale to the north, and City of Los Angeles to the east. The Pacific Ocean forms a small portion of the western border of the City. Interstate 405 (I-405) transects the northern portion of the City, and provides regional access, along with I-110.

1.4.2 Project Summary

The proposed project is an update to the City of Torrance General Plan. This update involves a revision to the land use map and a revision to elements required by the State of California. The general plan update contains revisions to the following state-mandated elements:

- Land Use
- Circulation and Infrastructure
- Community Resources
- Safety
- Noise
- Housing

The general plan update also includes an implementation program, which identifies the specific actions the City will undertake to implement goals and policies.

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA states that an EIR must address “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” (14 Cal. Code of Reg. 15126.6(a)). As described in Section 7.0 of this DEIR, three project alternatives were identified during the scoping process and analyzed for relative impacts compared to the proposed project.

- No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative
- Mixed-Use Development Alternative
- Increased Residential Land Use Alternative

1.5.1 No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the No Project Alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the effects of continued implementation of the City’s existing general plan. This alternative assumes the existing general plan remains as the adopted long-range planning policy document for the City. Development would continue to occur within the City in accordance with the existing general plan, zoning code, and specific plans. Buildout pursuant to the existing general plan would allow current development patterns to remain.

The existing general plan land use map consists of various land use designations. Broad categories of these designations include residential, commercial, industrial, public/quasi-public/open space, and airport. Tables 3-1 and 3-2 summarize the residential and nonresidential buildout estimates of the current general plan, respectively. Residential development represents the predominant land use in Torrance, with housing covering 49 percent of the City’s land area. Industrial uses occupy the second largest land area, with 2,276 acres (22 percent). Public/Quasi-Public/Open Space uses represent the third largest land use in the City (12 percent). Torrance has a limited supply of vacant land. Of the 116 acres of vacant land, most of the area (94 percent) lies within commercial and industrial areas. The remainder (6 percent) lies within residential areas.



1. Executive Summary

1.5.2 Mixed-Use Development Alternative

The Mixed-Use Development Alternative would concentrate a high-density corridor of mixed-use development likely along the length of Hawthorne Boulevard or Sepulveda Boulevard, to take advantage of the proximity to residential uses that could benefit from and support the development alternative, and the availability of alternative transportation opportunities. The Mixed-Use Development Alternative was considered to reduce the traffic, greenhouse gas emission, air quality, and noise impacts of the proposed project through a reduction of vehicle trips within the City. The development would support buildings consisting of first-floor retail establishments (assumes 250,000 square feet of retail use and 490 additional employees), up to four stories of residential uses (at approximately 40 du/ac, assumes 1,000 total units throughout the project), and allow for future development of a regional transit hub.

1.5.3 Increased Residential Land Use Alternative

SCAG often asserts that a jobs/housing ratio of 1.50 typifies a “balanced” city. Since it is projected that the jobs/housing ratio in Torrance would be approximately 1.90, a jobs-rich ratio, this alternative will allow a look at what impacts would result from increased residential uses in the City. In comparison to the proposed General Plan Update, residential land uses have been increased by 10 percent, resulting in 63,290 estimated dwelling units, and a subsequent 10 percent increase in population, resulting in approximately 161,790 residents. Nonresidential land uses have been decreased by 10 percent, resulting in approximately 55,947,600 square feet. Projected employment opportunities would be reduced 10 percent, resulting in a forecast of approximately 95,120 jobs, and a jobs/housing ratio of 1.50.

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as:

1. Whether this DEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
2. Whether the benefits of the project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the project besides the mitigation measures identified in the DEIR.
6. Whether there are any alternatives to the project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

A public scoping meeting was held on November 12, 2008, to determine the concerns of the community regarding the general plan update. Comments on the NOP included concerns about environmental impacts related to cultural resources, traffic, hazardous materials, and noise. These environmental issues are fully addressed in Sections 5 and 6 of this DEIR. This DEIR has taken into consideration the comments received

1. Executive Summary

from the public, various agencies, and jurisdictions in response to the NOP. Written comments received on the NOP/Initial Study are in Appendix B.

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis in this EIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant and for all significant, impacts mitigation measures are identified. The level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures is also presented.



1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.1 AESTHETICS			
5.1-1: Implementation of the General Plan Update would not substantially alter the visual appearance of the City.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.1-2: The proposed project would generate additional light and glare.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.2 AIR QUALITY			
5.2-1: Buildout of the City of Torrance in accordance with the Proposed Land Use Plan would potentially conflict with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Air Quality Management Plan.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
5.2-2: Construction activities associated with buildout of the Torrance General Plan Update would generate short-term emissions that exceed the south coast air quality management district's regional significance thresholds for VOC, CO, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} ; cumulatively contribute to the South Coast Air Basin nonattainment designations for O ₃ , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} ; and potentially elevate concentrations of air pollutants at sensitive receptors.	Potentially significant	2-1 The City of Torrance Building Department shall require that all new construction projects incorporate feasible mitigation measures to reduce air quality emissions. Potential measures shall be incorporated as conditions of approval for a project and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring fugitive dust control measures that exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 403, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion. • Applying water every four hours to active soil-disturbing activities. • Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials. • Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 or more restrictive exhaust emission limits. • Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. • Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes. • Using super-compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on 	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		the South Coast Air Quality Management District's website: http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf .	
5.2-3: Buildout of the Torrance General Plan Update would generate long-term operational phase emissions that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's regional significance thresholds for VOC, CO, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} and cumulatively contribute to the South Coast Air Basin nonattainment designations for O ₃ , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} .	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
5.2-4: Increase in traffic congestion in the City of Torrance at buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.2-5: Approval of residential and other sensitive land uses in the vicinity of substantial pollutant generators would result in exposure of persons to substantial concentrations of air pollutant emissions.	Potentially significant	2-2 The City of Torrance shall evaluate new development proposals in the City for potential air quality incompatibilities according to the California Air Resources Board's <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective</i> (April 2005). New development that is inconsistent with the recommended buffer distances shall only be approved if feasible mitigation measures, such as high-efficiency minimum efficiency reporting value filters have been incorporated into the project design to protect future sensitive receptors from harmful concentrations of air pollutants as a result of proximity to existing air pollution sources.	Significant and unavoidable
5.2-6: Development associated with the Torrance General Plan Update would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
5.3-1: Implementation of the general plan update would not adversely impact sensitive species, sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, or federally protected wetland within the city of Torrance.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.3-2: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on wildlife movement.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
5.4-1: Development in accordance with the proposed general plan land use designations could impact an identified historical resource.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.4-2: Development pursuant to general plan implementation could impact archaeological resources or paleontological resources.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.4-3: Grading activities in the City of Torrance would comply With the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 so as not to disturb human remains.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
5.5-1: Buildout of the Torrance General Plan would expose residents, occupants, employees, visitors, etc., to potential seismic-related hazards.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.5-2: Unstable geologic units and soils conditions, including soil erosion, are within the boundaries of the City of Torrance.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
5.6-1: Buildout of the City of Torrance would generate greenhouse gas emissions that would significantly contribute to global climate change impacts in California.	Potentially significant	<p>The City of Torrance shall prepare a Climate Action Plan within 18 months after adopting the proposed Torrance General Plan update. The climate action plan shall include an updated inventory of greenhouse gas emission sources, including those from municipal government operations and the community as a whole (community-wide), and a quantifiable greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. Local measures to reduce municipal government operations and communitywide greenhouse gas emissions by a minimum of 15 percent from existing levels or by a minimum of 0.7 million metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO_{2e}) emissions at buildout shall be detailed in the climate action plan and measures shall be enforceable. The City shall monitor progress toward the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal and prepare reports every five years that detail that progress. Measures listed below shall be considered for all new development between the time of adoption of the proposed Torrance General Plan update and adoption of the climate action plan. Local measures considered in the climate action plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require all new or renovated municipal buildings to seek silver or higher Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standard, or compliance with similar green building rating criteria. (municipal government operations strategy) • Require all municipal fleet purchases to be fuel-efficient vehicles for their intended use based on the fuel type, design, size, and cost efficiency. (municipal government operations strategy) • For new development projects in Torrance that require demolition, require a demolition plan to reduce waste by recycling and/or salvaging nonhazardous construction and demolition debris. (community-wide strategy) • Require that new developments design buildings to be energy efficient by siting them to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping, and sun screening to reduce energy required for cooling. (community-wide strategy) • Require that cool roofs and cool pavement be incorporated into the site design for new development. (community-wide strategy) • Evaluate the feasibility of implementing a public transit fee to support the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in developing additional transit service in the City. (community-wide strategy) 	Less than significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require diesel emission reduction strategies to eliminate and/or reduce idling at warehouses throughout the City. (community-wide strategy) • Install energy-efficient lighting and lighting control systems in all municipal buildings. (municipal government operations strategy) • Require all new traffic lights installed be energy-efficient traffic signals. (municipal government operations strategy) • Require all new landscaping irrigation systems installed in the City to be automated, high-efficient irrigation systems to reduce water use, and require use of bubbler irrigation; low-angle, low-flow spray heads; or moisture sensors. (community-wide strategy) • Conduct energy efficiency audits of existing municipal buildings by checking, repairing, and readjusting heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems; lighting; water heating equipment; insulation; and weatherization. (municipal government operations strategy) <p>6-2 Pursuant to a goal of overall consistency with the sustainable communities strategies, the City of Torrance shall evaluate new development with the development pattern set forth in the sustainable communities strategies plan or alternative planning strategy, upon adoption of the plan by the Southern California Association of Governments or South Bay Cities Council of Governments.</p>	

5.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
5.7-1: Future industrial and commercial development in accordance with the proposed City of Torrance general plan could involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.7-2: The City of Torrance has sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.7-3: The Torrance General Plan Update would be compatible with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Torrance Municipal Airport, located within the City's boundaries.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.7-4: Project development could affect the implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.7-5: Portions of Torrance are in very high hazard severity zones and could expose structures and/or residences to fire danger.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
5.8-1: Development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the city and would therefore increase surface water flows into drainage systems within the Dominguez and lower Santa Monica bay watersheds.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-2: Development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update increases the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and would therefore impact opportunities for groundwater recharge.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-3: Portions of the city proposed for development are in a 100-year flood hazard area.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-4: During implementation of the general plan update, there is the potential for short-term unquantifiable increases in pollutant concentrations. After implementation, the quality of storm runoff (sediment, nutrients, metals, pesticides, pathogens, and hydrocarbons) may be altered.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.8-5: Portions of the city are within the inundation area of the Walteria reservoirs.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-6: implementation of the proposed general plan update would not result in substantial hazards arising from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
5.9-1: Project implementation would not divide an established community.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9-2: Project implementation would not conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.10 MINERAL RESOURCES			
5.10-1: Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.11 NOISE			
5.11-1: Buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would not result in a substantial increase in the existing noise environment.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.11-2: Noise-sensitive uses could be exposed to elevated noise levels from transportation sources.	Potentially significant	11-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for any project that involves a noise-sensitive use within the 60 dBA CNEL contour along major roadways, freeways, or railway, the project property owner/developers shall retain an acoustical engineer to conduct an acoustic analysis and identify, where appropriate, site design features (e.g., setbacks, berms, or sound walls) and/or required building acoustical improvements (e.g., sound transmission class rated windows, doors, and attic baffling), to ensure compliance with the City's Noise Compatibility Guidelines and the California State Building Code and California Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations).	Significant and unavoidable
5.11-3: Construction activities associated with buildout of the individual land uses associated with the Proposed Land Use Plan would expose sensitive uses to strong levels of groundborne vibration.	Potentially significant	11-2 Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, near sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses (i.e., exceed the Federal Transit Administration vibration-annoyance criteria of 78 VdB during the daytime), additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., drilled piles to eliminate use of vibration-intensive pile driver).	Significant and unavoidable
5.11-4: Vibration-sensitive land uses Could be exposed to strong levels of groundborne vibration.	Potentially significant	11-3 Prior to the issuance of building permits for any project that involves a vibration-sensitive use directly adjacent to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railway, the development project application shall retain an acoustical engineer to evaluate potential for trains to create perceptible levels of vibration indoors. If vibration-related impacts are found, mitigation measures shall be implemented, such as use of concrete, iron, or steel, or masonry materials to ensure that levels of vibration amplification are within acceptable limits to building occupants, pursuant to the Federal Transit Administration vibration-annoyance criteria.	Less than significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.11-5: Construction activities associated with buildout of the individual land uses of the Proposed Land Use Plan would substantially elevate noise levels in the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses.	Potentially significant	11-4 Construction activities associated with new development that occurs near sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential noise impacts. Mitigation measures—such as installation of temporary sound barriers for adjacent construction activities that occur adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive structures, equipping construction equipment with mufflers, and reducing nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five minutes—shall be incorporated into the construction operations to reduce construction-related noise to the extent feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
5.11-6: Noise-sensitive land uses would not be located within the 60 DBA CNEL noise contour of the Torrance Airport; therefore, noise-sensitive land uses would not be exposed to substantial levels of airport-related noise.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING			
5.12-1: The proposed General Plan Update would directly result in population growth in the project area.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.13 PUBLIC SERVICES			
FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES			
5.13-1: The proposed General Plan Update would introduce new structures and residents/workers into the Torrance Fire Department service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for fire protection facilities and personnel.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
POLICE PROTECTION			
5.13-2: The proposed General Plan Update would introduce new structures and Residents/Workers into the Torrance Police Department service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for police protection facilities and personnel.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
SCHOOL SERVICES			
5.13-3: Implementation of the General Plan Update would generate new students who would impact the school district enrollment capacities of area schools.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
LIBRARY SERVICES			
5.13-4: The proposed General Plan Update would generate additional population, increasing the service demands on local libraries.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.14 RECREATION			
5.14-1: The General Plan Update would generate additional residents that would increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.14-2: Project implementation would not result in environmental impacts to provide new and/or expanded recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
5.15-1: Project-related trip generation would impact levels of service for the existing area roadway system.	Potentially significant	15-1 The general plan circulation element identifies those roadways that are planned to accommodate current development and future growth established by the Land Use Element. The following improvements identified in Table 5.15-8 will be necessary to maintain acceptable levels of service within the anticipated theoretical buildout of the general plan:	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anza Avenue/Sepulveda Boulevard – Widen eastbound Sepulveda Boulevard approach from one left-turn lane, one through lane and one shared through/right-turn lane to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. Crenshaw Boulevard/190th Street - Widen the westbound Crenshaw Boulevard approach from two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane. Crenshaw Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1) - Modify the northbound Crenshaw Boulevard traffic signal phasing to include a northbound right-turn overlap, which will preclude movement from westbound to eastbound Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1). Hawthorne Boulevard (SR-107)/Sepulveda Boulevard - Modify the northbound Hawthorne Boulevard (SR-107) traffic signal phasing to include a northbound right-turn overlap, which will preclude U-turn movement from westbound to eastbound Sepulveda Boulevard. Hawthorne Boulevard (SR-107)/Lomita Boulevard - Modify the westbound Lomita Boulevard traffic signal phasing to include a westbound right-turn overlap, which will preclude U-turn movement from southbound to northbound Hawthorne Boulevard (SR-107). 	
5.15-2: Air traffic patterns would not be affected by the General Plan Update.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.15-3: Adequate parking would be provided throughout the city provided that future projects comply with the City's parking code.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.15-4: Project circulation improvements have been designed to adequately address potentially hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc.), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.15-5: The proposed project complies with adopted policies, plans and programs for alternative transportation.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
5.16-1: Water supply and delivery systems are adequate to meet project requirements.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-2: Buildout of the Torrance General Plan update would generate additional wastewater, which would be adequately treated in accordance the regional water quality control board and California department of public health requirements.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-3: Upon buildout of the General Plan Update, existing and/or proposed storm drainage systems would be adequate to serve the drainage requirements of the proposed project.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-4: Buildout of the General Plan would be served by landfills with sufficient capacity for project-generated solid waste	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-5: The proposed General Plan Update would comply with federal, state, and local laws and regulations related to solid waste.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-6: Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated utility demands.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant