



ERRATA TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

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 89,713 cubic yards of soil and demolition materials. 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

January 2020

[This page intentionally blank]

1045 OLIVE PROJECT

Errata to the Environmental Impact Report

A. Introduction

This Errata has been prepared to make a minor technical correction to the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Case Number: ENV- 2016-4630-EIR; State Clearinghouse Number: 2017121047) for the 1045 Olive Project. The information provided herein does not represent significant new information as the term is defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) beyond the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft and Final EIR for the Project. 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 “[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.”

The corrections provided to the Draft and Final EIR in this Errata do not represent significant new information that would deprive 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 that the Applicant has declined to adopt. The City has reviewed the information in this Errata and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the

Final EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

B. Errata to the Draft and Final EIR

Background and Effects of the Changes

This Errata addresses a correction to the amount of excavation that would be required during Project construction. The Project Description on page II-24 of the Draft EIR states that the amount of excavation requiring haul traffic 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. (See Exhibit A, *1045 Olive Street Mass Excavation*, and Exhibit B, *Haul Route Questionnaire*, below.) Further, the Draft EIR estimate of 80,520 cubic yards was associated with a 64-foot depth of excavation. As also shown in Exhibit A, below, the depth of excavation associated with 89,713 cubic yards of haul route material is estimated to be approximately 70 feet.

This 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 EIR: Air Quality and Noise, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils – Paleontological Resources, and Hydrology and Water Quality. 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.

- Air Quality & Noise Impacts

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 shown in Exhibit A, below, and based on the Exhibit B, *Haul Route Questionnaire*, 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 would be less than that associated with shallower excavation due to the further distance from sensitive receptors and baffling effects due to the walls of the excavation.

- 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.)

- Geology and Soils & Hydrology and Water Quality

The analysis of both of these topics addresses the relationship between potential encounters of building foundations with groundwater. As indicated in the 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.

In light of the foregoing, the change in the amount of excavation and excavation depth 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.

Corrections to the EIR to account for the changes in excavation follow. Similar to the Final EIR, deletions are shown with ~~strike through~~ and additions are shown with double underline. Existing

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.

text to remain unchanged is included as plain text, without strikethrough or double underlines, to provide context for the revisions, clarifications, and correction.

Corrections to the EIR

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 4.1, 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.

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.

[This page intentionally blank]

EXHIBIT A

Letter regarding 1045 Olive Street Mass Excavation

[This page intentionally blank]



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', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

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

Cc: Ryan Leaderman, Esq.
Gary Schalman, PhD

EXHIBIT B

Haul Route Questionnaire

[This page intentionally blank]

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