COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100

JAMES A. NOYES, Director

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

May 29, 2003

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO FILE: PD-2

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

HIGHWAYS-THROUGH-CITIES
ARTESIA BOULEVARD FROM AVIATION BOULEVARD
TO HAWTHORNE BOULEVARD
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
RESOLUTION NO. 3877
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 4
4 VOTES

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration prepared and adopted by the City of Redondo Beach City Council on April 15, 2003, for the improvements of Artesia Boulevard from Aviation Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard; find that the Negative Declaration adequately describes the Artesia Boulevard project for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act; and find that these actions reflect the independent judgment of the County.

2. Adopt the enclosed Resolution finding that the proposed improvements of Artesia Boulevard between the aforementioned limits, within the City of Redondo Beach, are of general County interest and providing that County-aid shall be extended in the amount of $1,000,000.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The City of Redondo Beach is proceeding with a project to resurface the deteriorated roadway pavement on Artesia Boulevard between the subject limits, which are entirely within the City.

The project will also include new sidewalks bow-outs, replacement of landscaping and irrigation in median, and removal and replacement of existing bus shelters and directional signage.

Your Board's adoption of the enclosed Resolution will authorize the expenditure of County Highways-Through-Cities funds in the City of Redondo Beach for this roadway project purpose.

Sections 1680-1683 of the California Streets and Highways Code provide that the board of supervisors of any county may, by a resolution adopted by a four-fifths vote of its members, determine that certain types of road improvements on specified streets are of general county interest and that county-aid shall be extended therefore. County-aid may be provided in the form of labor, equipment and materials, or a direct payment to the city.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the County's Strategic Plan Goal of Organizational Effectiveness by utilizing a collaborative effort to improve Artesia Boulevard. It also satisfies the goal of Service Excellence. By improving the subject roadway, residents of the City and nearby unincorporated County area who travel on this street will benefit from the enhanced safety of the roadway, which will improve their quality of life.

FISCAL/FINANCING IMPACT

The total project cost is estimated to be $6.5 million of which $1 million will be financed by the County. Funding for this project is included in the Fiscal Year 2002-03 Road Fund Budget.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The Resolution has been prepared in the form previously approved by County Counsel.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The California Environmental Quality Act requires public agency decision makers to document and consider the environmental implications of their actions. The City of Redondo Beach is the lead agency for this project.

The enclosed Negative Declaration for Artesia Boulevard from Aviation Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard was prepared by the City of Redondo Beach pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The City approved the Negative Declaration on April 15, 2003. The recommended findings are in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and are required prior to your Board's approval of this Resolution.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Artesia Boulevard from Aviation Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard is on the County's Highway Plan, and the proposed improvements are needed and of general County interest. The City of Redondo Beach has scheduled the construction contract for award in June 2003.

CONCLUSION

Upon the adoption of this Resolution, please return one certified copy to us for transmittal to the City.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. NOYES
Director of Public Works

WAM:yr
C031987
P:\PDPUB\Temp\PB&C NEW\HTC\LETRHD Artesia Blvd Board Resolution .wpd

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

RESOLUTION NO. 3877

IT IS RESOLVED that the improvement of Artesia Boulevard from Aviation Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard, within the City of Redondo Beach, is of general County interest and that County-aid shall be extended, therefore, from the Road Fund, to be expended in accordance with all applicable provisions of law relating to funds derived from the Highway Users Tax, in the amount of $1,000,000, to be made available from the Road Fund for this purpose.

Provided, however, that if the aforementioned work has not been started within 60 days from the date of County warrant in payment, said amount shall be returned to the Director of Public Works and deposited in the Road Fund, and also provided that, immediately upon completion of the work, an itemized statement shall be rendered to the Director of Public Works showing the application of this money for the improvements, and if any portion of said sum shall not have been so used and expended for the work specified, the sum or sums so remaining unexpended shall be returned to the Director of Public Works immediately and deposited in the Road Fund.

//
//
//

The foregoing Resolution was on the _____ day of _____, 2003, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex-officio of the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies, and authorities for which said Board so acts.

VIOLET VARONA-LUKENS
Executive Officer of the
Board of Supervisors of the
County of Los Angeles

By _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LLOYD W. PELLMAN
County Counsel

By _____
Deputy

Artesia 12

redondo BEACH

CITY OF REDONDO BEACH

NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 03-08

In accordance with Chapter 3, Title 10, of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code (Environmental Review Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act), a Negative Declaration is hereby issued for the following project:

1. **PROJECT LOCATION:**

Artesia Boulevard between Hawthorne Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard, and Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Grant Avenue, Redondo Beach, California

2. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Master Improvement Program for Artesia Boulevard from Sepulveda Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue from the Manhattan Beach Boulevard to Grant Avenue.

The main project components are as follows:

- **Artesia Boulevard Signal Improvements:** Five existing traffic signals will be replaced with new protective/permissive left turn signals with LED, conduit and mast-arm replacement.

- **Artesia Boulevard Resurfacing:** 2 ½ miles of asphaltic concrete road surface will be replaced with rubberized asphaltic concrete.

- **Other Artesia Boulevard Improvements:** Existing curb, gutter and sidewalk will be replaced at various locations as required. "Bow-outs" will be constructed at 21 locations along Artesia Boulevard.

- **Artesia Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue Streetscape Improvements:** Existing landscaping and irrigation systems will be replaced in medians on Artesia Boulevard between Hawthorne Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard and on Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Grant Avenue. Existing landscaping and irrigation systems will be replaced in parkways on Inglewood Avenue between Artesia Boulevard and Grant Avenue. Existing bus shelters, entry signs and directional signs will be replaced on Artesia Boulevard.

3. **PROJECT SPONSOR:**

City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
(310) 318-0637

4. **FINDING(S) OF THE DECISION-MAKING BODY:**

The City of Redondo Beach City Council, as decision-making body, has reviewed the Initial Environmental Study (IES 03-08) and has considered all comments and responses to comments received during the 21-day public review period. On the basis of these documents and public testimony presented at the public hearing held on April 15, 2003, the City Council finds that the proposed Master Improvement Program for Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue, as modified by design review and conditions of approval, will not result in any potentially significant impacts upon the environment, according to the criteria for determining significant effect, as set forth in Article 2 of Chapter 3, Title 10 of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code.

redondo BEACH

CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY NO. 03-08

1.	**Project Title:**	**Artesia Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue Improvement Project**
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:**	City of Redondo Beach 415 Diamond Street Redondo Beach, CA 90277
3.	**Contact person and phone number:**	Anita Kroeger, Senior Planner (310) 318-0637
4.	**Project Location:**	Artesia Boulevard between Hawthorne Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard, and Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Grant Avenue
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**	City of Redondo Beach 415 Diamond Street Redondo Beach, CA 90277
6.	**General Plan Designation:**	Not applicable
	Zoning:	Not applicable

8. **Description of Project:** *(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)*

In 2001, the City of Redondo Beach approved the "Artesia Boulevard Relinquishment Agreement" with Caltrans, thereby giving the City full authority over and responsibility for the operation and maintenance of Artesia Boulevard. Since that time the City has adopted a Master Improvement Program, which recognizes the need to undertake a variety of improvements on Artesia Boulevard from Sepulveda Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard and on Inglewood Avenue from the Manhattan Beach Boulevard to Grant Avenue.

The main project components are as follows:

- **Artesia Boulevard Signal Improvements:** Five existing traffic signals will be replaced with new protective/permissive left turn signals with LED, conduit and mast-arm replacement.

- **Artesia Boulevard Resurfacing:** 2 ½ miles of asphaltic concrete road surface will be replaced with rubberized asphaltic concrete.

- **Other Artesia Boulevard Improvements:** Existing curb, gutter and sidewalk will be replaced at various locations as required. "Bow-outs" will be constructed at 21 locations along Artesia Boulevard.

- **Artesia Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue Streetscape Improvements:** Existing landscaping and irrigation systems will be replaced in medians on Artesia Boulevard between Hawthorne Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard and on Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Grant Avenue. Existing landscaping and irrigation systems will be replaced in parkways on Inglewood Avenue between Artesia Boulevard and Grant Avenue. Existing bus shelters, entry signs and directional signs will be replaced on Artesia Boulevard.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)*

The City of Redondo Beach is located south and west of the City of Los Angeles, along the coastline of the Santa Monica Bay. The City is bounded by the Pacific Ocean and the cities of Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Torrance.

Originally incorporated in 1897, Redondo Beach contains a mixture of both older and new types of development. Virtually all land within the City has been developed. Therefore, current trends in development are primarily of an "infill" or "recycling" nature. The majority of the City is devoted to residential land uses, although commercial, light industrial and recreational uses are also important to the overall composition of the area.

Artesia Boulevard is a four-lane east-west major arterial. Commercial uses are the primary use abutting Artesia Boulevard between Aviation Boulevard and Hawthorne Boulevard, while residential uses are the primary use along Artesia Boulevard west of Aviation Boulevard except for commercial uses at Artesia and Sepulveda in Manhattan Beach. Other uses abutting Artesia Boulevard include the north branch Redondo Beach Public Library and Mira Costa High School.

Inglewood Avenue is a north-south major arterial providing four through lanes north of 190th Street. A raised median exists north of Grant Avenue. Residential uses are the primary use abutting Inglewood Avenue. Commercial uses are located at the intersection of Inglewood Avenue and Artesia Boulevard and at the intersection of Inglewood Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard. North of Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Inglewood Avenue provides access to the San Diego Freeway.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required: *(e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)*

City of Hermosa Beach, City of Lawndale and City of Manhattan Beach.

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.

☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Transportation/Circulation	☐ Public Services
☐ Population and Housing	☐ Biological Resources	☐ Utilities and Service Systems
☐ Geological Problems	☐ Energy and Mineral Resources	☐ Aesthetics
☐ Water	☐ Hazards	☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Air Quality	☐ Noise	☐ Recreation
☐ 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A 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 significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

	March 21, 2003
Signature	**Date**
Anita Kroeger, Senior Planner	City of Redondo Beach
Printed Name	**For**

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source #'s: 1, 2, 3, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (1, 2, 3, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (3)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (1, 3)	☐	☐	☐	☒
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a) Fault rupture? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Seismic ground shaking? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Landslides or mudflows? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Subsidence of the land? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expansive soils? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Unique geologic or physical features? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (1)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (1, 3, 9)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in a water body? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Stormwater system discharges from areas for materials storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery or loading docks or other work areas? (1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
k) A significantly environmentally harmful increase in the flow rate or volume of stormwater runoff? (1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
l) A significantly environmentally harmful increase in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
m) Stormwater discharges that would significantly impair the beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefits (e.g. riparian corridors, wetlands, etc.)? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
n) Harm to the biological integrity of drainage systems and water bodies? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
5. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (1, 3, 4, 14)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create objectionable odors? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? (1, 3, 4, 6)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (1)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (1, 3)	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				
a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Wetland habitat (e.g.. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (1, 3)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? (1, 3)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:				
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? (1, 2)	☐	☐	☐	☒
10. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Increases in existing noise levels? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (1, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☒
11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:				
a) Fire protection? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Police protection? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Other governmental services? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a) Power or natural gas? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Communications systems? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Sewer or septic tanks? (1, 3, 4, 13)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Storm water drainage? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Solid waste disposal? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Local or regional water supplies? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
13. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (1, 3)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (1)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create light or glare? (1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒
14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) Disturb paleontological resources? (1, 3, 4, 8)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Disturb archaeological resources? (1, 3, 4, 8)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Affect historical resources? (1, 3, 4, 7)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
15. RECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒
16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to 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, 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) 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.)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

17. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

*a) **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.*

*b) **Impacts adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.*

*c) **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.*

LIST OF SOURCES/ATTACHMENTS *(These reports are available at the City of Redondo Beach Planning Department, Door E, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California 90277):*

1) Discussion of Environmental Evaluation
2) General Plan Map of Redondo Beach
3) Redondo Beach General Plan, 1992
4) General Plan EIR, 1992
5) Redondo Beach Zoning Ordinance
6) Institute of Traffic Engineer's Trip Generation Manual
7) Historic Resources Surveys, 1986, 1996
8) Archeological Research and Site Identification for Resources Reported to be Located within the City of Redondo Beach, 1996
9) Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Map
10) C of A refers to a condition of approval of the resolution. This does not necessarily signify that a significant environmental impact has been identified but rather may be a way to reduce even insignificant impacts or may be a standard condition of approval.
11) Harbor/Civic Center Specific Plan, 1992
12) Municipal Code Title 2, Chapter 24 (Noise Ordinance)
13) Wastewater System Master Plan and Wastewater Revenue Rate Analysis (WSMP), prepared in January, 1994 by Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
14) South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993

ATTACHMENT 1
DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

1. Land Use and Planning

The proposed project does not change present or planned land uses. The proposed project involves improvements to the public right-of-way along Artesia Boulevard between Hawthorne Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Grant Avenue. The improvements include signal improvements on Artesia Boulevard, the resurfacing of Artesia Boulevard, the replacement of curbs, gutters and sidewalks at various locations and the construction of bow-outs at various locations along Artesia Boulevard, streetscape and landscape improvements along Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue.

2. Population and Housing

The proposed project does not alter or expand any land use and will not result in additional employment opportunities or otherwise create a demand for additional housing.

3. Geologic Problems

The proposed project has no impact on geologic substructures, soil, and ground surface relief features, and will not result in exposure of people or property to geologic hazards.

In Redondo Beach, as in most of Southern California, there is the potential for seismic ground shaking from seismic activity in the region. Areas of the City may also contain liquefiable materials, resulting from locally perched groundwater. Although exposed to regional and local seismic risks, the proposed project will be designed according to the seismic building code requirements.

4. Water

The proposed project does not impact marine waters and does not increase impervious surfaces or otherwise increase water runoff or potential for flooding.

As required, a Site Specific Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan has been prepared (see attached) to mitigate the potential for pollutants to contaminate the stormwater runoff. In order to mitigate the potential for pollutants to contaminate the stormwater runoff the following BMPs will be instituted:

- Trash receptacles will be placed at all bus stops within the Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue public right-of-ways
- Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue will be swept twice a week.

- All parking lots with 25 or more spaces, adjoining Artesia Boulevard and within the City limits will be swept the remove debris once a month.
- Because Artesia Blvd drains into a much larger drainage area it is not practical to try to treat this drainage area. Therefore, in lieu of the installation of a treatment BMP on this storm drain system, a treatment BMP will be installed on an adjoining system that primarily drains the area around the South Bay Galleria. This area is also has extensive commercial development with significant paved areas exposed to rainfall. Therefore the pollutants of concern are the same as this project. The area proposed to be treated will cover approximately 95 acres.

5. Air Quality.

The proposed project does not contribute to additional air emissions or impact air movement and climate. The project does not increase traffic.

The site is located within the South Coast Air Basin. Air quality in the Basin exceeds State and Federal ambient air quality standards. The 1991 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was adopted in order to regulate pollution sources in the Basin, including mobile and vehicular sources that are considered the major source of emissions in the Basin. The AQMP relies on the Environmental Protection Agency, the Air Resources Board, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), as well as local governments for implementation. The rules, permits, and review authority of these various agencies provide for ongoing regulation of activities in the Basin that may negatively impact air quality.

Grading and construction activities would result in dust generation. These short-term impacts would be mitigated by periodic sprinkling of graded areas with water and by street sweeping in compliance with the City's Building Code regulations. Dust and dirt from construction activities would not be environmentally significant. Exhaust emissions from construction equipment would have only short-term impacts and, therefore, would not have a significant effect on State or local air quality standards. Therefore, this project will not result in substantial emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality; any alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature; or any change in climate.

6. Transportation/Circulation

Artesia Boulevard is classified has an east-west major arterial, formerly State Highway 91, throughout the limits of the proposed street improvement project. The street starting on the west end with the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway (Sepulveda Boulevard) forms the border between the Cities of Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach. Between the intersections of Harper Avenue and Aviation Way this street forms the border between the Cities of Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach. From Aviation Way eastward to Inglewood Avenue, this major arterial lies entirely within the City of Redondo Beach. East of Inglewood Avenue, the street forms the border between the Cities of Lawndale and Redondo Beach.

Traffic volumes vary from 27,000 vehicles per day at Pacific Coast Highway on the west end, 31,000 vehicles per day at the intersection of Aviation Boulevard, 40,000 vehicles per day at the intersection of Inglewood Avenue, and 35,000 vehicles per day at Hawthorne Boulevard, the east end of the project.

The street is a major east-west commuter route for drivers wanting to access the 91, 110 and the 405 freeways. Also, this corridor is used by travelers to access the beaches and the piers within Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach. The City of Redondo Beach has a major commercial corridor bordering the street. Locals use this street to access the South Bay Galleria Mall, adjacent to Hawthorne Boulevard and other commercial sites along Hawthorne Boulevard. This street is traveled by many bus routes as a result of the transit center located at the South Bay Galleria Mall. This transit center serves Torrance Transit lines 2 & 8, Gardena Line 3 and MTA routes 40, 130, 211 and 442. These various bus routes have connections to downtown Los Angeles, the MTA Green Line, Los Angeles International Airport, Del Amo Mall in the City of Torrance, and the peninsula Cities.

The street improvements will entail the replacing/resurfacing of the asphalt resulting in the removal of the pot holes and cracks. A much smoother driving surface for the traveling public will result. As a result of the new paving, new striping must also be installed. The traffic signals at the intersections of Green Lane, Slauson Lane, Vail Avenue, Mackay Lane and Felton Lane will be upgraded to include protective/permissive left turn arrows for the east-west traffic on Artesia Boulevard. New mast arms, LED signals and other related equipment will be included in these upgrades. Safer left turns for drivers turning onto the residential streets at these locations are the reasons for this improvement. The signalized intersection of Mackay Lane will also be improved with an audible pedestrian signal for the visually impaired.

The intersection of Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue will be upgraded with dual left turn lanes for eastbound drivers to turn northbound onto Inglewood Avenue. A new signal mast arm and poles for the eastbound driver will be included in this improvement. This improvement is the result of the conditional use permit requirements resulting from the City's allowing the building of the Expo Design Center. The installation of these dual left turn lanes will improve the level of service at the intersection.

The installation of bow-outs, curb extensions into the parking lane along Artesia Boulevard, will benefit people walking along the street with the new landscaping and benches for relaxing. These bow-outs will result in a much more pedestrian friendly street. A secondary benefit of the installation of the bow-outs will be the slowing of the vehicular traffic along the street.

The result of the improvements will be safer and more efficient traffic flow along this major corridor. The protective-permissive left turn arrows create safer turning movements for drivers onto the residential streets. The installation of the eastbound dual left turn lanes on Artesia Boulevard to turn northbound onto Inglewood Avenue will result in more efficient travel through this intersection. The pavement repairs and resurfacing will result in a much smoother ride for vehicles and buses along this major arterial.

7 Biological Resources

The proposed project has no significant impact on biological resources including coastal wetlands, native grasslands, wildlife corridors, vernal pool habitats, riparian wetlands, freshwater marshes, natural animal habitat, marine habitat or any sensitive species.

The proposed project includes the removal and replacement of the existing landscaping along Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue. Existing landscaping and irrigation systems will be replaced in medians on Artesia Boulevard between Hawthorne Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard and on Inglewood Avenue between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Grant Avenue. Existing landscaping and irrigation systems will be replaced in parkways on Inglewood Avenue between Artesia Boulevard and Grant Avenue.

More specifically, the project includes the removal of all existing 53 Ficus trees and the replacement of them with 131 equivalently-sized, large specimen quality trees including such species as Torrey Pine, Italian Stone Pine, Arbutus Marina, Australian Tea Tree, Peppermint Willow, and Melaleuca Nesophila. All existing 35 Crepe Myrtle trees have already been removed and relocated to park sites nearby. The majority of the 188 Rapholepis parkway trees will be removed and transplanted to sites in the general vicinity of Artesia. Additionally, many of the smaller shrubs such as the Agapanthus and Day Lilies will be re-used elsewhere on City properties.

All of the existing Metrosideros trees on the medians and the west parkway will be removed. These will be replaced with equivalently-sized, large specimen quality trees including such species as Torrey Pine, Italian Stone Pine, Arbutus Marina, Australian Tea Tree, Peppermint Willow, and Melaleuca Nesophila of an equivalent size. The Rapholepis shrubs on the medians will be replaced as well, with a greater number of different shrubs.

A small park is to be constructed at the southwest corner of Artesia Boulevard at Ford Avenue on a vacant piece of City-owned property. The new park will contain 11 new large trees where none existed before, as well as new walkway park benches, and a drinking fountain.

None of the trees or other landscape materials that are to be removed are of a rare or endangered species, nor are they designated for preservation or protection by any state, local or other legislation or regulations. Where possible and feasible, trees and other landscape materials will be relocated elsewhere in the City. Overall, the number of trees, the amount of other landscaping materials and the variety of landscape materials will all increase as a result of this project.

8. Energy and Mineral Resources

The proposed project is not of the nature, location, or extent to significantly affect natural resources. Impacts to natural resources are considered significant if project implementation results in an unmitigated loss of nonrenewable resources such as minerals and/or construction materials. This project is not expected to have a substantial impact on natural resources because it consists of various improvements to existing public right-of-ways that are already developed and used public streets.

9. Hazards

The proposed project is not of the nature, location, or extent to pose a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances. This project does not involve any interference with an emergency response plan or create any significant health hazard.

10. Noise

The proposed project will not have any long-term effect on potential noise impacts from or on residential dwellings.

During the course of construction on the site, normal construction noise will occur. Site preparation and construction activities would increase short-term noise levels and would exceed normally acceptable levels. Construction noise from the project would not represent unusual construction noise circumstances in an urban environment and would not be greater than for other similar construction projects in the area. It has been requested that work on the project may occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. However, evening and night-time construction activities will be limited to those activities that generate the least amount of noise. The construction will strictly follow the regulations contained in the City of Redondo Beach Municipal Code, Section 4-24.401 for noise standards and Section 4-25.503(c) for construction activities. Construction noise increases will be short-term in nature and with compliance with the City's noise regulations, significant impacts are not expected to occur.

11. Public Services

The proposed project does not affect the need for new or altered governmental services.

12. Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project will not impact services of power, natural gas, communications, water treatment and distribution, solid waste or water supply.

13. Aesthetics

An aesthetic impact would be considered significant if the project would result in

- the blocking of public views from designated open space, roads, or parks to significant visual landmarks or scenic vistas;
  a substantial degrading of the existing visual character or quality of a site or its surroundings;
- a new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The proposed project would enhance the aesthetic character of Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue by providing new landscaping, bus shelters, and entry sign. The new landscaping would replace and intensify the existing landscaping.

14. Cultural Resources

The proposed project will not result in the displacement of or impact any known existing archeological resources.

15. Recreation

This proposed project will not impact any recreational opportunities.

16. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

The proposed project does not have the potential to 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, 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.

As identified in all impact discussions herein, no significant unmitigated impacts would occur with the proposed project. The project does not alter the uses of land or intensity of development. The project would not be expected to sacrifice short-term environmental goals at the expense of long-term environmental goals. No significant cumulative impacts have been identified in connection with the proposed project and, the proposed project poses no threat to human health or safety.

ARTESIA BLVD. – INGLEWOOD AVE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
SITE SPECIFIC STORMWATER MITIGATION PLAN

Prepared by the City of Redondo Beach, Engineering Department
March 19, 2003

Project Description: This project includes the construction of improvements on two major streets in Redondo Beach. The work consists of:

- Resurfacing approximately 2 ½ miles of the existing asphaltic concrete road surface along Artesia Blvd. The resurfacing will consist of grinding 2 ½" of existing surface and overlaying with 2 ½" rubberized asphaltic concrete.
- Remove and replace existing concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk at spot locations along Artesia Blvd.
- Construct new concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk to create "Bow-outs". Approximately 21 of these will be space along Artesia Blvd. in the parking lane.
- Replace five existing traffic signal with new protective/permissive left turn signal with LED, conduit and mast-arm replacement along Artesia Blvd.
- Streetscape improvements including
    - Replacing existing landscaping and irrigation in median on Artesia Blvd. between Hawthorne Blvd. and Aviation Blvd.
    - Replace existing landscaping and irrigation in the median on Inglewood Ave. between Manhattan Beach Blvd. and Grant Ave.
    - Replace landscaping in parkway on Inglewood Ave. between Artesia Blvd. and Grant Ave.
    - Remove and replace existing bus shelters, entry sign and directional signage on Artesia Blvd. with the Redondo Beach city limits.

The improvements within Artesia Blvd. with cover approximately 30 acres. The project is considered "Redevelopment" and is replacing existing impervious surfaces that are not part of routine maintenance activity. Therefore, the project is subject to the requirements of Planning Element of the City's Stormwater Regulations.

Existing Setting: Artesia Blvd. is located at a high point in the drainage area. The runoff flow on the surface to connecting street therefore there are no storm drain facilities within the limits of the project. The runoff is collected in a series of collector storm drains which flow into a major Los Angeles County Drain. This drain travels north and eventually leaves the City at Manhattan Beach and Inglewood. Ultimately the runoff enters Dominquez Channel.

Artesia is primarily bordered by Commercial development. For this reason the pollutants of concern are trash/litter and oil/grease.

Regulation Requirements: The regulations specify that a Site Specific Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan must be prepared to mitigate the pollutants of concern. To address this pollutants the following BMPs will be instituted:

- Trash receptacles will be placed at all bus stops within the Artesia and Inglewood right of ways
- Artesia and Inglewood will be swept twice a week.
- All parking lots with 25 or more spaces, adjoining Artesia Blvd and within the City limits will be swept the remove debris once a month.
- Because Artesia Blvd drains into a much larger drainage area it is not practical to try a treat this drainage area. Therefore, in lieu of install a treatment BMP on this storm drain system, a treatment BMP will be installed on an adjoining system that primarily drains the area around the South Bay Galleria. This area is also has extensive commercial development with significant paved areas exposed to rainfall. Therefore the pollutants of concern are the same as this project. The area proposed to be treated will cover approximately 95 acres.