



1045 Olive Project

Environmental Case: ENV- 2016-4630-EIR
State Clearinghouse No.: 2017121047

Project Location: 1033 - 1057 S. Olive Street, Los Angeles, CA 90015

Community Plan Area: Central City

Council District: 14 - Huizar

Project Description: The 1045 Olive Project (Project) involves the construction and operation of a 70-story mixed-use high-rise development, with up to 751,777 square feet of floor area on a 0.96-acre site. The Project would include up to 794 residential units, 12,504 square feet of ground-floor commercial (restaurant/retail) uses, a ground-floor public plaza, and residential open space amenities. A 61-story residential tower would sit atop a nine-level podium structure, with a total building height of up to 810 feet. Eight above-ground levels of automobile parking would be located within the nine-level podium structure and would be partially wrapped with residential units. The Project would also have six subterranean levels of parking (depth of 70 feet) and would require the excavation and export of approximately 87,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition debris. Five existing single-story commercial buildings containing 35,651 square feet of floor area would be removed from the Project Site. The Project is a certified Environmental Leadership Development Project (ELDP).

PREPARED FOR:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

PREPARED BY:

ESA

APPLICANT:

1045 Olive, LLC

February 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	3
Technical Corrections and Clarifications.....	4
Conclusion.....	12
 Appendix A - 1045 Olive Street Mass Excavation	
Appendix B - Haul Route Questionnaire	

1 INTRODUCTION

This Erratum includes clarifications and minor modifications to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 1045 Olive Project (Project). These modifications clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City decision-makers and the public. 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 (PRC) Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 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 “[r]ecirculation 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.”

2 TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This Errata addresses corrections to the EIR necessitated by changes associated with the Project's proposed excavation and hauling activities. Subsequent to preparation of the EIR, the amount of excavation for hauling and the proposed haul route and hours of haul activities were revised. As described further below, these are minor changes in Project activity and would not cause impacts greater than those reported in the Draft EIR.

The Project Description on page II-24 of the Draft EIR states that the amount of excavation requiring truck hauling required for the Project's subterranean structure and foundations would be 80,520 cubic yards of earth materials. Subsequent refinements to the excavation program have increased this estimate to approximately 89,713 cubic yards inclusive of hauling for demolition and site preparation materials. Further, the Draft EIR estimate of 80,520 cubic yards was associated with a 64-foot depth of excavation. The depth of excavation associated with 89,713 cubic yards of haul route material is estimated to be approximately 70 feet.

Further, changes occurred in the haul route and hours of hauling that were used for analyzing Project impacts in the Draft EIR. Following review and recommendations from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), the exiting (i.e., loaded) trucks that were previously assigned to head south on S. Hill Street were reassigned to head south on S. Main Street; and the allowable haul hours were changed from 7:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M. to 9:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

Information regarding these changes are provided in Appendix A, *1045 Olive Street Mass Excavation*, and Appendix B, *Haul Route Questionnaire*, below.)

2.2 IMPACTS REGARDING CHANGES IN THE AMOUNT AND DEPTH OF EXCAVATION

The correction to the amount and depth of excavation would not change any of the impact conclusions in the EIR. The changes only effect impacts during construction that take into account the amount and depth of excavation. The topics in the environmental analysis that take into account the amount of excavation are the construction analyses contained within the following sections included in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR: IV.B, *Air Quality* and IV.C, *Cultural Resources*, IV.E, *Geology and Soils – Paleontological Resources*, IV.H, *Hydrology and Water Quality* and IV.J, *Noise*. No other environmental topics would be effected. The following explains why the construction related impact findings associated with these topics would not change, and why there would not be a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts evaluated in the Draft EIR.

2.2.1 Air Quality and Noise

The amount of excavation affects the number of haul trips that are necessary to dispose of the haul materials taken from the Project Site. Haul trucks generate air quality pollutants and noise. The Air Quality and Noise impact analyses are based on the greatest amount of impacts that could occur on a single day of maximum activity. As reflected in Appendix A and Appendix B

below, the hauling of the soil, demolition, and site preparation materials would require 144 daily haul trips. In contrast, the analyses of these topics in the Draft EIR used conservative assumptions that resulted in an estimate of 260 daily trips for soils and 56 daily trips for demolition and site preparation. This totals to 316 daily trips on a maximum day of activity with overlapping soil export, demolition, and site preparation activities occurring on the same day. Therefore, the impacts regarding air quality and noise emissions associated with 144 daily trips would be substantially below those reported in the Draft EIR. Further, the maximum daily on-site noise associated with excavation at greater depth (i.e., depths between 64 feet and 70 feet) would be less than the noise associated with shallower excavation due to the farther distance from sensitive receptors and baffling effects due to the walls of the excavation.

2.2.2 Cultural Resource & Paleontological Resource Impacts

Potential impacts regarding both of these topics are related to the sensitivity of the Project Site for encountering resources and to some extent the depth of excavation. Potential cultural resources that may be located beneath the Project Site would be located nearer to ground level and such resources would not be expected near to the 64-foot depth, let alone the 70-foot depth. The potential for an encounter with paleontological resources would increase with the added excavation depth. However, it is not known whether cultural or paleontological resources exist under the Project Site that could be encountered during excavation, and the estimated 6-foot increase in excavation depth does not materially change the potential for related impacts identified in the Draft EIR. Furthermore, the mitigation measures for addressing any such encounters with cultural and paleontological resources apply equally regardless of the depth at which the encounter occurs; and would be equally effective below the 64-foot depth level. (Mitigation Measures CULT-MM-1, CULT-MM-2 and CULT-MM-3, respectively, establish procedures for monitoring excavation for the presence of archaeological resources, procedures for protecting and treating resources should they be present, and reporting of resource discovery should it occur. Mitigation Measures GEOL-MM-1, GEOL-MM-2 and GEOL-MM-3 provide procedures for monitoring excavation for the presence of paleontological resources. GEOL-MM-4 provides procedures for the curation, disposition and reporting for paleontological resources that may be present.)

2.2.3 Geology and Soils & Hydrology and Water Quality

The analyses of both of these topics addresses the relationship between potential encounters of building foundations with groundwater. As indicated in the Draft EIR analyses, Project excavation would extend to approximately 64 feet below ground surface (bgs), which would not encounter the static groundwater table below the Project Site that lies at an estimated 120 feet bgs.¹ Hence, a 70-foot depth would also be substantially above the groundwater table of 120 feet bgs. Further, the potential to encounter perched groundwater, is a variable condition not necessarily tied to one depth. The variation is taken into account in the regulatory measures that would be implemented during construction to avoid significant impacts.

¹ Geotechnical Engineering Services, Report of Geotechnical Engineering Services, Proposed High-Rise Tower Development, 1045 South Olive Street, Los Angeles, California. March 2, 2018, page 5. Appendix F of the Draft EIR.

2.3 IMPACTS REGARDING CHANGES TO THE HAUL ROUTE AND HAUL HOURS

The change in the haul routes and hours of hauling activity were made to conform to recommendations from LADOT that are judged to reduce traffic impacts associated with the Project's hauling activities; and as such contribute to reductions in Project's overall impact profile.

The environmental analysis that are based on the haul routes and number of haul trips are located in Section IV.F, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Section IV.J, *Noise*, and Section IV.M, *Transportation and Traffic*, of the Draft EIR. The following explains how these changes reflect upon the analyses previously included in these EIR Sections.

2.3.1 Transportation and Traffic

Reallocating truck loads leaving the Project Site from S. Hill Street to S. Main Street would have negligible effects on traffic. As shown in Table IV.M-4 of the Draft EIR, the intersections in the Project vicinity that are located along both Hill Street and Main Street are both currently operating at Level of Service (LOS) A in both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours; and Main Street is deemed by LADOT to be preferable for accommodating the haul traffic. In addition, construction and hauling activities are temporary in nature and would not cause permanent changes to the LOS levels in the vicinity. Truck activity at the Project Site would, like other components of the Project construction, be subject to the provisions of TRAF-PDF-1, which requires implementation of a Project Construction Management Plan, which would take into account in its preparation such considerations as flagman requirements, minimizing obstruction of traffic lanes, and coordination of truck activity.

Reducing the number of hours in which the estimated daily 144 haul trips would occur from an 8-hour haul period to a 6.5-hour haul period could potentially increase the number of haul trips within a single hour, from 18 trips per hour to 22 trips per hour. However, the analysis of impacts due to haul trips in the Draft EIR was based on very conservative assumptions regarding earlier haul truck information and assumed that haul activities could result in 62 morning peak hour trips on a maximum day of activity. That analysis concludes that impacts on traffic due to haul truck activity would be less than significant. With fewer trips per hour and reallocation of trips to off-peak hours, traffic impacts associated with a shorter period of haul activity would be less than those disclosed in the Draft EIR.

2.3.2 Noise

As noted above, shortening the number of hours for haul activity could increase the number of haul trips occurring within a single hour. However, the analysis of off-site construction impacts on noise, as reported in Table IV.J-110, *Estimate of Maximum Off-Site Construction Traffic Noise Level*, is based on noise levels that are measured in dBA CNEL, which is a weighted daily noise level, as opposed to an hourly noise measurement. Therefore, the information reported therein would not be adversely affected by hourly variations. Further, the maximum construction truck noise levels are not tied to the haul route activity, but rather to concrete pours for the Project foundations; and are therefore not affected by the changes in the haul truck activity.

2.3.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions takes into account the vehicle miles traveled for haul activities. Relocation of the exit trips from S. Hill Street to S. Main Street through the Downtown

grid would not alter the length of the haul trips from the Project Site to the disposal site. (Also as noted above in regard Air Quality, the number of daily haul trips now anticipated is less than the number of daily haul trips evaluated in the EIR.)

2.4 SUMMARY

As reflected in the above discussion changes associated with the Project's haul activity would not would not alter any of the environmental impact findings in the EIR, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR.

2.5 CORRECTIONS TO THE EIR

Corrections to the EIR to account for the changes in the hauling of excavation and demolition materials follow. Similar to the Final EIR, deletions are shown with ~~strikethrough~~ and additions are shown with double underline. Existing text to remain unchanged is included as plain text, without strikethrough or double underlines, to provide context for the revisions, clarifications, and correction.

Draft EIR

Cover

1. The fifth sentence of the Project Description is revised as follows:

The Project would also have six subterranean levels of parking (depth of ~~64~~ 70 feet) and would require the excavation and export of approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition materials.

Chapter 1, Executive Summary

1. Page ES-17, the column explaining impacts after mitigation in Table ES-1 is revised as follows:

Project construction would result in deeper excavation, to approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet below the ground's surface, than any of the prior documented excavations on-site.

2. Page ES-26, the column explaining impacts after mitigation in the Table ES-1 is revised as follows:

Substantial excavation within the Project Site is planned at depths up to ~~64~~ 70 feet below ground surface, which would intercept older alluvium determined to have a high sensitivity for fossils.

Chapter 2, Project Description

1. Page II-24, the first full paragraph under Subsection 4.I, Anticipated Construction Schedule, is revised as follows:

To provide for the new development, approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition materials would be excavated, all of which is expected to be exported off site.

Section 4.B, Air Quality

1. Page IV.B-42, middle of first paragraph is revised as follows:

The Project would export approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition materials and generate approximately ~~3,410~~ cubic yards of demolition debris that would need to be hauled away (asphalt, interior and exterior building demolition, and general construction debris).

Section 4.C, Cultural Resources

1. Page IV.C-18, middle of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Project construction would also result in deeper excavation, to approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet below the ground's surface, than any of the prior documented residential and single-story commercial uses on the Project Site.

Section 4.E, Geology and Soils – Paleontological Resources

1. Page IV.E-19, the middle of the continued paragraph at the top of the page is revised as follows:

The Project would not exacerbate these environmental conditions, which could cause in whole or in part seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, because the proposed depth of excavation of the Project is ~~64~~ 70 feet, inclusive of ~~10 feet for a mat foundation~~, which would not penetrate the groundwater under the site.

2. Page IV.E-21, the middle of the second paragraph is revised as follows:

The lowest subterranean level, inclusive of foundations, would be ~~64~~ 70 feet below the existing ground surface. Thus, the proposed structure would not be adversely impacted by hydrostatic pressure due to the static groundwater table which is estimated at 120 feet bgs.

3. Page IV.E-22, the middle of the paragraph under *Threshold f)* is revised as follows:

Substantial excavation within the Project Site during construction for subterranean parking, deep excavation for excavation shoring, and excavation for ancillary uses or infrastructure improvements are planned at depths up to ~~64~~ 70 feet below ground surface, which would intercept older alluvium determined to have a high sensitivity for fossils, pursuant to the guidelines of the SVP.

Section IV.H, Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Page IV.H-31, the middle of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Project excavation would extend to approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet bgs (~~54 feet to bottom of building plus and estimated 10 feet for the foundation~~). Thus, excavation for the proposed structure would not encounter the static groundwater table below the Project Site at an estimated at 120 feet bgs.

2. Page IV.H-31, the middle of the third paragraph is revised as follows:

Accordingly, the proposed Project excavation to ~~64~~ 70 feet has the potential to encounter perched groundwater pockets.

3. Page IV.H-36, first sentence of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Since the groundwater table at the Project Site was encountered at a depth of 120 feet bgs, and the depth of the Project's lowest subterranean level and foundation would be ~~64~~ 70 feet bgs, the building structures are not expected to encounter the groundwater table below the Project Site.

Section IV.J, Noise

1. Page IV.J-35, last full sentences at the bottom of the page is revised as follows:

Thus, the route for outbound trucks would be a left turn from the Project Site heading north on S. Olive Street, a right turn onto W. Olympic Boulevard, a right turn onto ~~Hill~~ S. Main Street, a left turn onto W. 18th Street, and merging onto the Interstate 10 freeway.

Section IV.M, Traffic

1. Page IV.M-34, the third paragraph is revised to read as follows:

The construction haul route from the Project Site would travel north on Olive Street, east on Olympic Boulevard, south on ~~Hill~~ S. Main Street, east on 18th Street and via the Los Angeles Street on-ramp to the eastbound I-10 freeway. The route to the Project Site would exit the westbound I-10 freeway at Los Angeles Street, travel west on 17th Street and north on Olive Street to the Site. This haul route may be modified in compliance with City policies, provided LADOT and/or the Department of Street Services approves any such modification.

2. Page IV.M-34, fourth paragraph through Page IV.M-35, second full paragraph is revised as follows:

The highest volume of truck trips would occur during the ~~four months of the~~ Project's excavation and grading phase (with the exception of the mat pour discussed separately below). ~~During this phase there would be a maximum of 250 daily truckloads expected for approximately 23 days of hauling (for the remaining days the total truckloads would be lower).~~ Off-site staging would be used when necessary to ensure trucks do not wait or line up on streets adjacent to or near the Project Site. Available, suitable off-site locations that are safe and that do not adversely affect street parking and residential areas would be identified at the time of Project construction, and haul trucks would be radioed in as they are needed at the Project Site.

~~Haul traffic generally occurs prior to 3:00 P.M. per City Haul Route Guidelines, and as haul trucks try to avoid peak hour traffic and must allow time to reach their unload destinations. For purposes of providing a conservative analysis it was assumed that there would be 250 daily truck Therefore, assuming these trips that would be spread equally over an eight-hour workday between 7:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M., resulting in there would be up to 31 truckloads per hour. This conservative analysis provides a basis for comparing impacts to the more sensitive A.M. peak hour period that was analyzed for Project Operations, even though haul trucks are not necessarily expected to occur prior to 9:00 A.M. This~~ The 31 truckloads represents a total of 62 morning peak hour truck trips

(31 trips in to the site and 31 trips out from the site). The Transportation Research Board (2010 Highway Capacity Manual) identifies a passenger car equivalent (PCE) factor of 2.0 for trucks (as trucks are larger and less maneuverable than passenger cars), so 62 hourly truck trips is the equivalent of 124 passenger car trips (62 trip inbound and 62 trips outbound).

Daily truck activity would typically be completed prior to the afternoon peak hour, with truck trips contributing to the morning peak hour traffic. It is estimated that the existing uses on the Project Site currently add approximately 8 trips to the local roadway system during the morning peak hour resulting in a net PCE increase of 116 PCE trips. The peak estimate increase of 116 net PCE trips per hour would be less than 196 net morning peak hour trips that would be generated on a regular basis by Project operations upon completion. The Existing with Project analysis for the Project presented below concludes that the Project, with its greater amount of trip generation, would not cause any significant impacts in the morning or afternoon peak hours.

Chapter 5, Alternatives

1. Page V-18, first sentence of the last paragraph is revised as follows:

Construction activities for the Project would include excavation of approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards (cy) of soil and demolition materials, all of which would be exported off-site, and maximum excavation depths of approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet below ground surface (bgs).

2. Page V-20, first sentence of the fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

In comparison, the Project would require substantial excavation within the Project Site during construction for subterranean parking and excavation shoring at depths up to ~~64~~ 70 feet bgs, which would intercept older alluvium determined to have a high sensitivity for fossils.

3. Page V-25, second sentence of the fifth paragraph is revised as follows:

Construction activities for the Project would include excavation of approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards (cy) of soil and demolition materials., all of which would be exported off-site, and maximum excavation depths of approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet below ground surface (bgs).

4. Page V-54, second full paragraph; and page V-58, fourth paragraph, are revised as follows:

Alternative 2 would require excavation for one subterranean parking level and foundation structures, as compared to the Project, which would require excavation for six levels of subterranean parking and foundation structures reaching a depth of approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet.

5. Page V-64, second sentence of the first paragraph; and Page V-104, fourth paragraph, are revised as follows:

Construction activities for the Project would include excavation of approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cy of soil and demolition materials, all of which would be exported off-site, for the development of six subterranean parking levels and foundation structures.

6. Page V-95, third paragraph; and Page V-99, third paragraph are revised as follows:

Alternative 3 would involve excavation for three subterranean parking levels and foundation structures, as compared to the Project, which would involve excavation for six levels of subterranean parking and foundation structures reaching a depth of approximately ~~64~~ 70 feet.

Final EIR

Cover

1. The fifth sentence of the Project Description is revised as follows:

The Project would also have six subterranean levels of parking (depth of ~~64~~ 70 feet) and would require the excavation and export of approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition materials.

Chapter 1, Introduction

1. Page 1-2, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

The Project would also have six subterranean parking levels, requiring the excavation and hauling of approximately ~~80,520~~ 89,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition materials.

3 CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented above, the changes to the EIR set forth in this Erratum do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the information included in this Erratum does not disclose any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an impact already identified in the Draft EIR, nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible alternative or mitigation measure that the Applicant has declined to adopt. All of the information added in this Erratum merely clarifies, corrects, adds to, or makes insignificant modifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Erratum and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the EIR.

APPENDIX A

Letter regarding 1045 Olive Street Mass Excavation



January 14, 2020

Elliott Kahn
 1045 Olive, LLC
 2200 Biscayne Blvd.
 Miami, FL 33137

Re: 1045 Olive Street Mass Excavation

Dear Elliott,

David Evans and Associates, Inc. has reviewed the proposed excavation for the 1045 Olive Project. We have calculated the following quantities for the excavation. There will be approximately 89,713 cubic yards of excavated material and demolition debris that will be removed from the 1045 Olive Project Site.

	SF	FL to FL	CY Subtotal
Site Prep / Demo			3,930.00
B1	36,480.00	9.00	12,160.00
B2	37,704.00	9.00	12,568.00
B3	37,704.00	9.00	12,568.00
B4	37,704.00	9.00	12,568.00
B5	37,704.00	9.00	12,568.00
B6	28,159.00	9.00	9,386.33
Foundations*	37,704.00	10.00	13,964.44

TOTAL 89,713 (89,712.77)

*Foundation depth based on 16-foot deep mat foundation at tower and four to six feet at podium areas.

Based on the quantities above, an average production rate for off haul will be approximately, 1,011 cubic yards per day. The excavated material will leave the site in double bottom trucks at 14 yards per truck resulting in



approximately 72 trips per day. The overall duration for the excavation hauling would be 91 days or approximately 4.5 months.

Please let me know if you require and further information.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alex Moore', is written over a horizontal blue line.

Alex Moore, AICP
Associate | BU/COE Sr. Manager I
David Evans and Associates, Inc.

Cc: Ryan Leaderman, Esq.
Gary Schalman, PhD

APPENDIX B

Haul Route Questionnaire

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY

ATTACHMENT 1

HAUL ROUTE QUESTIONNAIRE

JOB ADDRESS: _____

LEGAL DESCRIPTION Tract: _____ Block: _____ Lot(s): _____

IMPORT: _____ cubic yards; EXPORT: _____ cubic yards

From: _____ To: _____
(Address) (Address)

LOADED TRUCK ROUTE: _____

EMPTY TRUCK ROUTE: _____

LOCATION OF STAGING AREA: _____; Max # of trucks staged: _____
(i.e. street name, on site, etc.)

Type of Truck: Bottom Dump; 18-Wheeler; 5-Axle; Truck and Trailer; 10-Wheeler Dump

Total # of trips per day: _____; Truck capacity: _____ cubic yards; Total amount of _____
(a) (b) cubic yards per day (a) x (b) = (c)

Total number of _____; Total Export/ _____ cubic yards; Max Gross _____
hauling days: (d) Import (c) x (d) Truck Wt.:

Proposed Hauling Days: M T W Th F Sat Sun Hours: From _____ a.m., To _____ p.m.
(check)

Owner's Name: _____ Telephone: _____ (alt): _____

Address: _____
Street City Zip Code

Applicant's Name: _____ Telephone: _____ (alt): _____

Address: _____
Street City Zip Code

Hauling Contractor's Name: _____ Telephone: _____

Address: _____
Street City Zip Code



Applicant's Signature

Print Name

Date

Clarification of information on Haul Route Questionnaire:

- 72 Truck trips per day assumes one way trips for 144 total trips.
- The total export of 89,713 cubic yards includes:
 - 85,783 cubic yards of soil
 - 520 cubic yards of material
 - 3,410 cubic yards of demolished materials