

### 3.0 REVISIONS, CLARIFICATIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

---

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines § 15132 (a), this Chapter of the Final EIR provides changes to the Draft EIR that have been made to clarify, correct, or supplement the information provided in that document. These changes and additions are due to recognition of inadvertent errors or omissions, and to respond to comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period. The changes described in this Chapter do not add significant new information to the Draft EIR that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR. More specifically, CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states: “New information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. ‘Significant new information’ requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that “[re]circulation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR... A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”

As demonstrated in this Final EIR, the changes presented in this Chapter do not constitute new significant information warranting recirculation of the Draft EIR as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Rather, the Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA.

Changes to the Draft EIR are indicated below under the respective EIR section heading, page number, and paragraph. Paragraph reference is to the first full paragraph on the page. Deletions are shown with ~~strikethrough~~ and additions are shown with double underline.

## Executive Summary

### 1. Page ES-11, modify text in the last bullet in the second column under Project Design Features (PDF-) as follows:

- To encourage carpooling and the use of electric vehicles by project employees and visitors, the ApplicantCounty shall designate a minimum of eight (8) percent on on-site parking for carpool and/or alternative-fueled vehicles and shall pre-wire, or install conduit and panel capacity for, electric vehicle charging stations for a minimum of five (5) percent of on-site parking spaces.

### 2. Page ES-13, modify text in the second bullet in the second column under Project Design Features (PDF-) as follows:

- The ApplicantCounty shall prohibit heavy-duty construction equipment and truck queuing and staging in front of on-site building entrances and exits.

### 3. Page ES-14, modify text in the second bullet in the second column under Project Design Features (PDF-) as follows:

- The ApplicantCounty shall ensure building air filtration media and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems are serviced, maintained, and replaced per manufacturers specifications and are not compromised from the accumulation of particulate matter and fugitive dust.

### 4. Page ES-43, modify text for PDF-FIRE-1 in the second column under Project Design Features (PDF-) as follows:

**PDF-FIRE-1:** The ~~applicants~~, designers, construction contractors, and tenants for/of development under the Project will implement the conditions of approval identified by LACFD in its November 2014, July 2015, and January 2016 correspondence, which are included in Appendix J-1, Fire Department Correspondence, of this Draft EIR.

### 5. Page ES-43, delete Mitigation Measure MM-FIRE-2 in the third column under Mitigation Measures (MM-) as follows:

~~**MM FIRE-2:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicants for development under the Project will pay the prevailing LACFD Developer Fee.~~

### 6. Page ES-50, modify Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-1 in the third column under Mitigation Measures (MM-) as follows:

**MM TRAF-1: I-110 Southbound Ramps & Carson Street (Intersection #9) – The Subject to approval by Caltrans, the** existing southbound approach on the Interstate I-110 off-ramp shall be restriped to convert the existing left-turn lane to a left-/right-turn lane.

**7. Page ES-50, modify Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-2 in the third column under Mitigation Measures (MM-) as follows:**

**MM TRAF-2: 220<sup>th</sup> Street/I-110 Northbound Ramps & Figueroa Street (Intersection #15)** – ~~An~~ Subject to approval by Caltrans and the City of Carson, an additional northbound through lane shall be striped and the existing through lane shall be restriped as a through/right-turn lane. The eastbound approach shall be restriped from the existing through/left-turn lane and right to a left-turn lane and through/right-turn lane.

**8. Page ES-50, modify Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-3 in the third column under Mitigation Measures (MM-) as follows:**

**MM TRAF-3: I-110 Southbound Ramps & 223<sup>rd</sup> Street (Intersection #20)** - ~~The~~ Subject to approval by Caltrans, the southbound approach would be restriped from the existing left-turn/through and right-turn/through lanes to a right-turn lane and left-turn/through/right-turn lane. The eastbound approach shall be restriped to change the existing right-turn lane to a through/right-turn lane. Under this mitigation, parking shall be removed on 223rd between the Interstate I-110 bridge and Figueroa Street and converted to a dedicated right-turn lane.

**9. Page ES-51, modify text in the in the third column under Mitigation Measures (MM-) as follows:**

Not Applicable

~~**MM TRAF-4:** The developer shall contribute a fair share contribution to Caltrans toward an analysis or improvements on I-110 (Harbor Freeway) in the Project vicinity to offset the additional Project-generated trips that would result on the freeway mainline segments and that would pass through the affected Caltrans intersections.~~

## 4.B Air Quality

**1. Page 4.B-37, modify text in the third bullet from the top of the page as follows:**

- To encourage carpooling and the use of electric vehicles by project employees and visitors, the ~~Applicant~~ County shall designate a minimum of eight (8) percent on on-site parking for carpool and/or alternative-fueled vehicles and shall pre-wire, or install conduit and panel capacity for, electric vehicle charging stations for a minimum of five (5) percent of on-site parking spaces.

**2. Page 4.B-37, modify text in the last bullet on the page as follows:**

- The ~~Applicant~~ County shall prohibit heavy-duty construction equipment and truck queuing and staging in front of on-site building entrances and exits.

**3. Page 4.B-38, modify text in the second to last bullet on the page as follows:**

- The ~~Applicant~~ County shall ensure building air filtration media and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems are serviced, maintained, and replaced per manufacturers specifications and are not compromised from the accumulation of particulate matter and fugitive dust.

**4. Page 4.B-50, modify text in the first paragraph under Cumulative Impacts as follows:**

There are a number of related projects in the Project area that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the ~~Applicant County~~ has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, any quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that assumes multiple, concurrent construction projects would be speculative. For this reason, the SCAQMD's methodology to assess a project's cumulative impact differs from the cumulative impacts methodology employed elsewhere in this Draft EIR.

**4.K.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Services**

**1. Page 4.K.1-14, modify text in the first paragraph on the page as follows:**

The Project would increase the net floor area, employee population, and annual patient visits at the Project Site by 48 percent (1,178,071 sf), 37 percent (2,030 employees), and 34 percent (185,745 patient visits), respectively. These increases could potentially result in an increase in calls for LACFD fire protection and EMS service from the Project Site. However, several factors would minimize any such increase. First, because the Project would replace many aging on-site buildings that have not been constructed to current Fire Code standards with new buildings constructed to such standards, calls for fire protection service resulting from dangerous or flammable conditions would be expected to decrease. Second, because a portion of the new on-site employees would be expected to be derived from the existing local labor pool, and because patients visiting the Project would already reside in the area, many of the additional employees and most if not all of the additional patients already generate a demand for service from LACFD Fire Stations 36 and 127. Third, the Project Site is already fully developed and already generates service calls from LACFD such that the Project would not generate service demand in an area where service demand does not already exist. Fourth, the Project would include an increase in hospital and other medical uses, such that it is reasonable to assume that a portion of the on-site EMS needs under the Project would be provided by the proposed uses themselves rather than be provided by LACFD. ~~Fifth, per Mitigation Measure FIRE-2, the Project would pay the LACFD Developer Fee which would help pay for any new LACFD equipment/personnel required at LACFD Station 36 to serve the Project.~~ Lastly, the LACFD did not identify the need for new or physically altered fire stations associated with the Project in its comments on the Project's Notice of Preparation or other LACFD correspondence included in Appendix G-1 of this Draft EIR. Therefore, with compliance applicable County Code requirements and implementation of PDF-FIRE 1 ~~and Mitigation Measure FIRE-2~~, Project operation would not be expected to increase calls for LACFD fire protection and EMS service that would require new or physically altered fire stations, and the impact would be less than significant.

**2. Page 4.K.1-11, modify text for PDF-FIRE-1 under Project Design Features, as follows:**

**PDF-FIRE-1:** The ~~applicants~~, designers, construction contractors, and tenants for/of development under the Project will implement the conditions of approval identified by LACFD in its November 2014, July 2015, and January 2016 correspondence, which are included in Appendix G-1, *Fire Department Correspondence*, of this Draft EIR.

**4. Page 4.K.1-13, modify text in the last paragraph on the page as follows:**

The Project would be subject to the requirements of the County Code (e.g., Building Code, Fire Code, Utilities Code, and Subdivision Code) for new construction that address structural design, building materials, site

access, fire lanes, fire flow requirements, automatic sprinkler systems, alarms, and smoke detectors. Per PDF-FIRE-1, the Project would also implement the LACFD fire protection and EMS conditions of approval identified by LACFD in its November 2014, July 2015, and January 2016 correspondence, including but not limited to: provision multiple ingress/egress for emergency response vehicles; provision of Fire Apparatus Access Roads extending to within 150 feet of all structures; provision of the LACFD-specified fire flow; provision of fire hydrants every 300 feet and no portion of a building exceeding 400 feet from a fire hydrant; and provision of fire sprinklers in all buildings. In addition, the LACFD would review and approve all Project plans at the building permit and plan check phases of the Project to ensure compliance with applicable Fire Code requirements, thereby minimizing the risk of increased operation fire safety hazards. Furthermore, the ~~Applicant-County~~ would be required to submit an Emergency Response Plan for review and approval by LACFD to include, but not be limited to, mapping of site access and emergency exits, evacuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians, and locations of the nearest hospitals and fire stations. Finally, because the Project would replace many aging on-site buildings that have not been constructed to current Fire Code standards with new buildings constructed to such standards, fire safety at the Project Site would be improved. Therefore, with compliance applicable County Code requirements and implementation of Project Design Feature PDF-FIRE-1, Project operation would not have fire safety issues that would require the construction of new or physically altered fire stations, and the impact would be less than significant.

**4. Page 4.K.1-17, modify text under heading 4, Mitigation Measures, as follows:**

In order to reduce impacts related to fire protection and EMS to less than significant, the following mitigation measures are required:

**Mitigation Measure FIRE-1:** The Project construction contractors shall regularly notify and coordinate with the LACFD concerning Project construction activities, including any on- and off-Campus lane closures and other construction activities that could affect emergency access and emergency response times.

~~**Mitigation Measure FIRE-2:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicants for development under the Project will pay the prevailing LACFD Developer Fee, as applicable.~~

**4.K.3 Parks and Recreation**

**1. Page 4.K.3-1, footnote 2 at the bottom of the page is revised as follows:**

<sup>2</sup> ~~*Clement Lau, Department Facilities Planner II, LACDPR, e-mail dated February 22, 2016 and included in Appendix G-3 of this Draft EIR. County of Los Angeles. Los Angeles Countywide Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment. <http://lacountyparkneeds.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/FinalReport.pdf>*~~

**2. Page 4.K.3-5, modify footnote b in Table 4.K.3-1, Public Parks and Recreation Facilities in the Project Vicinity, as follows:**

<sup>b</sup> ~~*Pending approval of a lease agreements with the Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.*~~

**3. Page 4.K.3-9, add the following text following subheading (c), Los Angeles County Parks Proposition A:**

**(d) Los Angeles County Measure A**

As discussed above, Los Angeles County communities for the past 20 years have relied on local, voter-approved funding from the Los Angeles County Safe Neighborhood Parks Acts of 1992 and 1996 (Proposition A) to protect and maintain neighborhood parks, outdoor areas and water resources. However, funding from the 1992 Proposition A ended in 2015 and funding from the 1996 Proposition will end in 2019. The Los Angeles County Safe, Clean Neighborhood Parks and Beaches Measure of 2016 (Measure A), which will be on the ballot in November 2016, asks voters to continue their support for local parks, beaches, open space, and water resources by approving an annual parcel tax of 1.5 cents per square foot of development.

If approved, the estimated tax for the owner of a 1,500 square foot home will be \$22.50 per year, and will be included on the annual property tax bill. Generating approximately \$94 million per year for local parks, beaches, and open space areas, Measure A will replace expiring dedicated funding from the voter-approved Propositions A of 1992 and 1996. Measure A was developed with extensive stakeholder input from throughout Los Angeles County and designed to meet the Countywide Comprehensive Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment of 2016 (see discussion below). The Needs Assessment was an 18-month process which provided detailed information from all 88 cities and unincorporated areas within Los Angeles County about the quality of their local parks, their current access to parks and recreation facilities and overall park needs, including public meetings and project lists developed and prioritized by members of each community.

**(e) Los Angeles Countywide Comprehensive Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment**

In March 2015, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved a motion to initiate the Countywide Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment. This represented an unprecedented effort to document existing parks and recreation facilities in cities and unincorporated communities and to use these data to determine the scope, scale, and location of park need in Los Angeles County. The Parks Needs Assessment will help local officials, park agencies, and residents understand the future steps that need to be taken to ensure all communities have adequate access to thriving parks. Park projects in Los Angeles County are currently funded in part by Proposition A, the Safe Neighborhoods Park Tax that is set to expire in 2019. Once this tax sunsets, funding for park projects will be greatly reduced. The results of the Parks Needs Assessment will help inform planning and decision-making regarding future funding. In initiating the Parks Needs Assessment, the Board of Supervisors has affirmed the importance of parks as essential infrastructure in the County. Healthy, safe communities have thriving parks that contribute to public health and well-being, create a sense of place, increase community cohesion, improve the environment, and boost the economy. The Parks Needs Assessment proposes a new way to understand and think about parks, recreation, and open space by: (1) Considering parks as key infrastructure needed to maintain and improve the quality of life for all County residents; (2) Using a new series of metrics to determine park need; (3) Supporting a need-based allocation of funding for parks and recreation; and (4) Emphasizing both community priorities and deferred maintenance projects.

**4. Page 4.K.3-13, modify text in the second paragraph under subheading e., Cumulative Impacts, as follows:**

The development of the 17 related projects within a two-mile radius of the Project Site that are identified in Table 4.K.3-3, along with the proposed Project, would increase the demand for public parks and recreational facilities from the County and the Cities of Los Angeles, Carson and Torrance. However, residential subdivisions in the County and City of Los Angeles are required to dedicate parkland or pay in-lieu fees to serve their respective populations, so that any of the 17 related projects that represent residential subdivisions would not be expected to contribute to the cumulative demand for public parks and recreation facilities. Furthermore, non-residential Projects, such as the proposed Project and roughly half of the related projects, generate an indirect rather than a direct demand for parks and recreational facilities and typically provide on-site parks and recreational facilities to help meet this indirect demand. In addition, the Project and the 17 related Projects would pay property and other taxes and fees which could be used by the County and the Cities of Los Angeles, Carson and Torrance to develop new parks, and voters have approved propositions and bonds (for example, Los Angeles County Proposition A), and potentially Measure A on the November 2016 ballot, to help fund new park development. Furthermore, pending approval of lease agreements with the Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the County will ~~shortly~~ be opening a new Neighborhood Park at 1000 W. 204<sup>th</sup> Street in Carson to serve the West Carson community, anticipated in September 2018, which would be operated and maintained by DPR and would help serve the Project and related projects. Lastly, as indicated in the analysis in Subsection d, *Project Impacts*, above, the Project would not be expected to generate a substantial demand for public parks and recreational facilities for several reasons, such that it would not be expected to contribute substantially to cumulative demand for public parks and recreational facilities. For all these reasons, cumulative parks and recreation impacts would be less than significant.

#### **4.L Transportation and Traffic**

**1. Page 4.L-84, modify text in Mitigation Measure TRAF-1 as follows:**

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-1: I-110 Southbound Ramps & Carson Street (Intersection #9) - The Subject to approval by Caltrans, the** existing southbound approach on the Interstate I-110 off-ramp shall be restriped to convert the existing left-turn lane to a left-/right-turn lane.

**2. Page 4.L-84, modify text in Mitigation Measure TRAF-2 as follows:**

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-2: 220<sup>th</sup> Street/I-110 Northbound Ramps & Figueroa Street (Intersection #15) - An Subject to approval by Caltrans and the City of Carson, an** additional northbound through lane shall be striped and the existing through lane shall be restriped as a through/right-turn lane. The eastbound approach shall be restriped from the existing through/left-turn lane and right to a left-turn lane and through/right-turn lane.

**3. Page 4.L-85, modify text in Mitigation Measure TRAF-3 as follows:**

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-3: I-110 Southbound Ramps & 223<sup>rd</sup> Street (Intersection #20) - The Subject to approval by Caltrans, the** southbound approach would be restriped from the existing left-turn/through and right-turn/through lanes to a right-turn lane and left-turn/through/right-turn lane. The eastbound approach shall be restriped to change the existing right-turn lane to a through/right-turn lane. Under this

mitigation, parking shall be removed on 223rd between the Interstate I-110 bridge and Figueroa Street and converted to a dedicated right-turn lane.

**4. Page 4.L-85, modify text under subheading (3), Caltrans Facilities, as follows:**

**(a) Freeway Mainlines and Intersections (Threshold TRAF-4)**

Significant impacts have been identified with regard to freeway segments and intersections under Caltrans jurisdiction. ~~As such, mitigation measures are recommended.~~ Although the Project would increase traffic on the freeway mainline segments, in light of the nature of regional nature of the freeway system, improvements to Caltrans freeway facilities tend to be beyond the feasibility of any individual Project to implement. Thus, Caltrans allows development projects to pay a fair share or an equitable percentage contribution toward the estimated cost of an improvement. However, given the lack of an established program to fund such future improvements, as well as other uncertainties regarding the timing and nature of such improvements, no mitigation regarding fair share payments is proposed for the Project.

~~The following mitigation measure is recommended to address the potentially significant impacts that were identified on the freeway mainline segments and the intersections that are under Caltrans' jurisdiction:~~

~~**Mitigation Measure TRAF-4:** The developer shall contribute a fair share contribution to Caltrans toward an analysis or improvements on I-110 (Harbor Freeway) in the Project vicinity to offset the additional Project-generated trips that would result on the freeway mainline segments and that would pass through the affected Caltrans intersections.~~

~~The fair share is calculated as the Project's percentage of the total projected traffic growth on a freeway mainline segment over a 25-year period. The fair share is a contribution toward the improvement and maintenance of a shared facility that benefits the Project and the region.~~

**5. Page 4.L-89, modify text under subheading (3), Caltrans Facilities, as follows:**

**(a) Freeway Mainlines and Intersections (Threshold TRAF-4)**

~~Mitigation Measure TRAF-4 requires that the developer make a fair share contribution to address potentially significant impacts on freeway mainline segments, intersections under Caltrans jurisdiction, and off ramps. Caltrans generally considers fair share contributions to constitute full mitigation of a significant impact. In addition, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(3) fair share contribution could be considered adequate mitigation for cumulative traffic impacts. Options for addressing the impacts were identified, but because there are no existing projects that identified by Caltrans that would lower the impact below the significance threshold, the significant impacts identified above to Caltrans facilities are conservatively determined to be significant and unavoidable. Investigation of potential mitigation measures were conducted as described above, including potential fair share contributions, but in the absence of specific improvements linked to a reasonable mitigation plan tied to actual mitigation of the impacts, no fair share contribution can be calculated or made as an adequate mitigation measure. Therefore, impacts to these intersections are concluded to be significant and unavoidable.~~

## 5. Alternatives

### 1. Page 5-32, modify text under subheading (3), Caltrans Facilities, as follows:

#### (a) Freeway Mainlines and Intersections

As under the Project, development of Reduced Intensity Alternative A would increase existing employee population and annual patient visits at the Medical Center Campus, and would increase operational traffic at the northbound I-110 Freeway at 228<sup>th</sup> Street, the southbound 110 Freeway at El Segundo Boulevard, and the northbound I-405 Freeway at the I-710 Freeway. ~~Potential mitigation measures, which include a contribution of a fair share to proposed Caltrans projects to address congestion in the study area (MM TRAF-4) relies on Caltrans cooperation and approval. Because this is out of the County's control~~ No feasible mitigation exists that could reduce the significance of impacts to these facilities, and thus impacts at the three freeway segments are considered significant and unavoidable. However, because Reduced Intensity Alternative A would have incrementally fewer new vehicle trips than under the Project, impact levels would be less. Reduced Intensity Alternative A would also significantly impact the arterial intersection of Western Avenue (State Route 213) and Carson Street because, as with the Project, it would add more than 50 vehicle trips to this intersection. Although incrementally less under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, the impact at this intersection would be considered significant and unavoidable.

### 2. Page 5-56, modify text under subheading (3), Caltrans Facilities, as follows:

#### (a) Freeway Mainlines and Intersections

As under the Project, development of Reduced Intensity Alternative B would increase existing employee population and annual patient visits at the Medical Center Campus, and would increase operational traffic at the northbound I-110 Freeway at 228<sup>th</sup> Street, the southbound 110 Freeway at El Segundo Boulevard, and the northbound I-405 Freeway at the I-710 Freeway. ~~Potential mitigation measures, which include a contribution of a fair share to proposed Caltrans projects to address congestion in the study area (MM TRAF-4) relies on Caltrans cooperation and approval. Because this is out of the County's control~~ No feasible mitigation exists that could reduce the significance of impacts to these facilities, and thus impacts at the three freeway segments are considered significant and unavoidable. However, because Reduced Intensity Alternative B would have incrementally fewer new vehicle trips than under the Project, impact levels would be less. Reduced Intensity Alternative B would also significantly impact the arterial intersection of Western Avenue (State Route 213) and Carson Street because, as with the Project, it would add more than 50 vehicle trips to this intersection. Although incrementally less under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, the impact at this intersection would be considered significant and unavoidable.

## 6. Other CEQA Considerations

### 1. Page 6-4, modify text in the paragraph under subheading (b) Freeway Mainlines and Intersections, as follows:

~~Mitigation Measure TRAF-4 requires that the developer make a fair share contribution to address potentially significant impacts on freeway mainline segments, intersections under Caltrans jurisdiction, and off-ramps. Caltrans generally considers fair share contributions to constitute full mitigation of a significant impact. In addition, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(3) fair share contribution could be considered adequate mitigation for cumulative traffic impacts. Options for addressing the impacts were identified, but because~~

~~there are no existing projects that identified by Caltrans that would lower the impact below the significance threshold, the significant impacts identified above to Caltrans facilities are conservatively determined to be significant and unavoidable. Investigation of potential mitigation measures were conducted as described in Section 4.L, including potential fair share contributions, but in the absence of specific improvements linked to a reasonable mitigation plan tied to actual mitigation of the impacts, no fair share contribution can be calculated or made as an adequate mitigation measure. Therefore, impacts to these intersections are concluded to be significant and unavoidable.~~

**2. Page 6-8, modify text in the paragraph under subheading (f), Public Services, as follows:**

Impacts regarding some public services (e.g., parks and recreation, schools, and libraries) would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Therefore, no significant adverse secondary effects would occur due to the implementation of mitigation measures for these environmental topics. However, with regard to fire protection and emergency services, Mitigation Measure FIRE-1 requires that the County Department of Public Works and/or their contractors regularly notify and coordinate with the LACFD concerning Project construction activities, including any on- and off-Campus lane closures and other construction activities that could affect emergency access and emergency response times. ~~Mitigation Measure FIRE-2 requires that prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicants for development under the Project will pay the prevailing LACFD Developer Fee.~~ With regard to Sheriff protection, Mitigation Measure SHER-1 requires that security features and personnel be provided throughout construction, Mitigation Measure SHER-2 requires that emergency access be provided during construction, while Mitigation Measure SHER-3 requires that the Project construction contractors regularly notify and coordinate with the LACSD concerning Project construction activities, including any on- and off-Campus lane closures and other construction activities that could affect emergency access or emergency response times. Thus, implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in additional physical impacts to the environment beyond those already anticipated for the Project as discussed in Chapter 4.0 of this Draft EIR.

**3. Page 6-8, delete the last paragraph on the page as follows:**

~~Mitigation Measure TRAF-4 requires the developer to contribute fair share funding to Caltrans toward an analysis or improvements on I-110 (Harbor Freeway) in the Project vicinity to offset the additional Project-generated trips that would result on the freeway mainline segments that pass through the affected Caltrans intersection. No physical impacts would occur under this mitigation measure (any future improvement of the I-110 and associated intersections would be subject to separate CEQA review and would be too speculative to evaluate in the current Draft EIR). Therefore, no significant adverse secondary effects would occur.~~

## 7. References

**1. Page 7-1, modify text at the bottom of the page as follows:**

~~*Banker's Hill, Hillcrest, Park West Community Preservation Group v. City of San Diego*, 139 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 249, 279 (2006).~~

~~Battelle Technology Partnership Practice, Final Draft Report: Feasibility Assessment and Master Plan for Advancing the Bioscience Industry Cluster in Los Angeles County. Prepared for Los Angeles County – Chief Executive Office. August 2014. Available online at:~~

[http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/bc/217012\\_REPORTONCONSULTANTEVALUATIONFORAPOTENTIALCOUNTYWIDEBIOTECHNOLOGY.pdf](http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/bc/217012_REPORTONCONSULTANTEVALUATIONFORAPOTENTIALCOUNTYWIDEBIOTECHNOLOGY.pdf). Accessed November 2016.

Bies & Hansen, Engineering Noise Control, 1988.