From: Mindy Nguyen <Mindy.Nguyen@lacity.org>

Sent time: 09/14/2020 09:14:47 AM

To: undisclosed-recipients:;

BCc: Jorge Castaneda <jcastaneda@labcoatmeerkat.com>; Jon Ritner <jon@churchinhollywood.com>; Nyla Arslanian <nyla@discoverhollywood.com>; George Skarpelos <george@myhunc.com>; Rohan Abeckett <rohan_abeckett@hotmail.com>; Michael Morrison <mike_morrison@me.com>; Judith Whitman <4ignatz@gmail.com>; Adam Bregman <adam.bregman@icloud.com>; Adam Burke <adam@adamburkelegal.com>; Adam Miller <adam@myhunc.com>; Adria Navarro <adrianavarro2011@gmail.com>; Adam Fischer <afisch@gmail.com>; Anne Friedrich <afriedrich@mhfla.org>; Aaron Jansen <ajansen@sbcglobal.net>; AJCT aol <ajctrust@aol.com>; Alexa Iles <alexa@hollywooddell.com>; Alison Leslie <alison@marleahleslie.com>; Armando Marsella <almarsella@me.com>; Alycia Rosenberg <alyciamr@gmail.com>; Anne Marie Otey <amotey@laocbuildingtrades.org>; Alina Mullins <amullins@aqmd.gov>; Amy Turk <AmyT@downtownwomenscenter.org>; Anastasia Mann <anastasia@corniche.com>; Anna Josenhans <annamjosenhans@gmail.com>; anne crawford <annecraw4d@gmail.com>; Ann Haugen <annhaugen3@gmail.com>; Antonio Le Mons <antonio.le.mons@skidrow.org>; Brian Dyer <area3chair@hhwnc.org>; Touran Saed <arki2r@gmail.com>; Anita Rosenberg <arstudio@aol.com>; ANGUS SUTHERLAND <asutherl@gmail.com>; alyssa van breene <avanbreene@gmail.com>; Barbara Meltzer <barbara@meltzerpr.com>; Benjamin Birnbaum <benbirnbaum@hotmail.com>; Beverly Freeman <bevsvine@pacbell.net>; Bill Tetz <bill.tetz@revolutionprep.com>; Billy Mallery <billy@malleryscores.com>; Barbara Mitchell <bjm@barbarajmitchell.com>; Blumes Tracy <blumestracy@gmail.com>; Barbra Mclendon <bmclendon@alzla.org>; BABCNC Board <board@babcnc.org>; Brandi Orton (BOrton@sbssla.org) <borton@sbssla.org>; Beverly Grossman Palmer <bpalmer@strumwooch.com>; Branden <branden@hollywoodsda.org>; Brandon Nuckelt <brandon.nuckelt@gmail.com>; Hunter Jackson <brandonhunterjackson17@gmail.com>; B Long <breelong@gmail.com>; Brett King <brettking@gmail.com>; Brian Folb <Brian@hollywoodoffices.com>; Janet Heinritz-Canterbury <canterburyjh@gmail.com>; Caprice Young <capricelosangeles@gmail.com>; James Carmicle <carmicle@pacbell.net>; Julie Carter <carterjulie@me.com>; cynthia <cbee43@aol.com>; Chanel Frampton <chanel@glaaacc.org>; Cherilyn Smith <cheriks@ca.rr.com>; Chiara Santi <chiara.santi@bhhscaproperties.com>; Cody Winchester <codywin@icloud.com>; Coles Johnson <colesjohnson12@gmail.com>; Catherine Palmer <council@babcnc.org>; Crissi Avila <crissiann@gmail.com>; C. Stephen Grant <cstephengrant@gmail.com>; Cyrus Kashfian <cyruskashfian@gmail.com>; Daisy Holden <daisyjholden@gmail.com>; Dan Wright <Dan@robertsilversteinlaw.com>; Danny Sherman <danny@thruline.com>; David Benz <david@vaughanbenz.com>; dean katz <deanbrandonkatz@gmail.com>; David E Gordon <degordon@fwcook.com>; Duke Gallagher <dgallagher@cox.net>; Dwayne Gathers <dgathers@gathersstrategies.com>; Marc Silverman <dhalgrn@gmail.com>; Diane Weiss <dleaweiss@earthlink.net>; Donna Grayson <donnahollywood@mail.com>; Swami Atmatattwananda <dougshiva@gmail.com>; Diane Alancraig <dralancraig@sbcglobal.net>; Dante Alencastre <Droa70@msn.com>; Eric Dowdy <edowdy@leadingageca.org>; edward stanza <edwardstanza@gmail.com>; Eileen Kim <ekim.bean@gmail.com>; Elena Beecher <elena@kilterfilms.com>; Elisha Greenwolf <elisha@greenwolf.la>; Eric MacIver <ericmaciver@gmail.com>; Erin Penner <Erin@myhunc.com>; Esther Pamir <esther.pamir@gmail.com>; Esther Kornfeld <Esther@robertsilversteinlaw.com>; Evan Saona <evancurtissaona@gmail.com>; ellen vinitsky <evedeane@earthlink.net>; Frank Nemceff <f6362333@sbcglobal.net>; Weaver <fawholywood@yahoo.com>; Floy Biggs <Floy@agingnext.org>; Francie Kelley <Francie@franciekelley.com>; Frank Chindamo <frankchindamo@me.com>; Luminita R <galu567@yahoo.com>; GARY BUCHSCHACHER JR. <gbuchschacher@ucla.edu>; George Abbott Clark <gclark8505@gmail.com>; Gary Clemmer <gclemmer@churchinhollywood.com>; Priscilla Gibbs <gibbsps@pacbell.net>; Michel Keeler <girlmonk@aol.com>; George Sunga <gjsunga@mac.com>; Gretchen Brickson <gretchen.brickson@csh.org>; Greg Thompson <gthompson@pascla.org>; Giulia Zammit <gzammit6@gmail.com>; Hannah Beavers <hanlouise7@gmail.com>; Hunter Photography <heysuzhunter@gmail.com>; Tree Lockie <hkcc4tree@aol.com>; Hilary H. McLeod <hmcleod@earthlink.net>; Hollywood Heritage <hollywood.heritage1980@gmail.com>; Arik hayrapetyan <hollywoodelounge@gmail.com>; Terri Tilton <hollywoodterri@sbcglobal.net>; Stacie S. <hyerokr@aol.com>; HHA <info@hollywoodland.org>; Jack Humphreville <JackH@targetmediapartners.com>; Kent Beyda <jazzfan5@att.net>; John M. Bowman <JBowman@elkinskalt.com>; Jonathan posell <jdp4edit@gmail.com>; Jonathan Ducrest <jducrest@me.com>; jeff straebler <jeff.straebler@gmail.com>; Jeff Pomerantz <jeffpomerantz@gmail.com>; Jeremy Lehrer-Graiwer <jerlehrer@gmail.com>; Joseph Gharib <Jgharib@carpark.com>; Jessica Traci Jew <JJew@lacare.org>; Jack Sojka <jjwalke@gmail.com>; Jason Moriarty <jmoriarty@picf.org>; Joanna Sotomura <joannasotomura@gmail.com>; John Given <john@johngiven.com>; John McCarthy <john@mccarthymusic.com>; John Woo <johnwoo5566@gmail.com>; Jono Hart <jonohart@earthlink.net>; Judy Kass Dowden <judykass@sbcglobal.net>; Kadee Rosales <kadeerosales@gmail.com>; Kara Grant <kara@grant-law.net>; Kathleen Martin <kathipearl@icloud.com>; AT&T <katiehaupt@att.net>; Kevin Jobe <kevinajobe@gmail.com>; Kitty Gordillo <kgordillo@hollywoodpal.org>; Kevin Hryciw <khryciw@ausd.net>; Kiera Pollock <kierapollock@gmail.com>; Jodi <knoprob@gmail.com>; Farham Aliyev <Kristinazamanova@gmail.com>; Kelly Takasu <ktakasu@alzla.org>; Kwock Koe <kwockk@yahoo.com>; Lauren Beyda <laurenbeyda@gmail.com>; Lawren Markle <lawren.markle@laedc.org>; Leslie Blumberg <lb@leslieblumberg.com>; Linda Deutsch <lcdeutsch@yahoo.com>; Leo Mellace <leojoseph@me.com>; leslie Hendry <lesliehendry@gmail.com>; Ellen Greenman <lngreenman@gmail.com>; LC Blair <lockebarrels@gmail.com>; Lorena Sanchez <lorenas@downtownwomenscenter.org>; Lauren Soroky <lsoroky@gmail.com>; Lynn Rosenberg <lsrosenberg@aol.com>; Alex Lyras <lyrasalex@gmail.com>; Mikhail Tsipis <m.tsipis@gmail.com>; Mac Goodspeed <mackenzie.goodspeed@gmail.com>; Todd Manion <manion.todd@gmail.com>; Margaret Martin <margaretmartin08@gmail.com>; Maria Margarita Chon <mariamargaritachon@gmail.com>; Mariel Lacina <mariellacina@gmail.com>; Marina Krasnow <marinakrasnow@gmail.com>; Marina Palmier <marinapalmier@me.com>; Mario Alvare <mariobrayan@sbcglobal.net>; marla luben <marlamluben1@gmail.com>; Mary Brown <marysfilm@gmail.com>; Martha Palacios <maspalacios@att.net>; Maureen Toth <maureen@easterntalent.net>; Mark Bobrosky <mbobrosky@gmail.com>; Michael Shaner <mchl703@cs.com>; Meghan <meg_maureen@yahoo.com>; Michael Popwell <michael@mpopwell.com>; Michael Klastorin <michaelklastorin@mac.com>; Michael Doyle <mikey@oasisofhollywood.org>; Milan K <milank01@aol.com>; Missy Kelly <missykly@gmail.com>; MLVJR Nsf <mlvjr4g@gmail.com>; marva murphy <mm@2m4pr.com>; Micki Nozaki <mnozaki@cahealthadvocates.org>; Monet Corso <monetcorso@mac.com>; Mathias Sapper <msapper@me.com>; Kathleen York <msbirdyork@gmail.com>; Mark Manos <msmanos@gmail.com>; Mynor Rosales <mynorrosales7@gmail.com>; info@hollywoodbid.org; vendredi423@gmail.com; avalente@trammellcrow.com; tzimbardi@amda.edu; kchambers@nederlander.com; devin@devintait.com; dgreen@nederlander.com; mubatit@yahoo.com; mubafit@yahoo.com; nima@thelistinggroup.com; stephenkrawchur@hotmail.com; tbarnes@esassoc.com; lorin@hollywoodbid.org; emma.e.stark@gmail.com; leron@hollywoodchamber.net; Adler, Noah <nadler@manatt.com>; Monique_sbg@hotmail.com; RampartVillage@gmail.com; stiguitars@hotmail.com; Suzanne_england@sbcglobal.net; kris@hollywoodbid.org; wachtel.leana@gmail.com; avalonte@trammellcrow.com; tzimbardi@adma.com; dgreen@nederalander.com; rachaelroservnc@gmail.com; aaronep@pacbell.net; adelmancharles2@gmail.com; AKlurfeld@lacare.org; Lin, Alan S@DOT <alan.lin@dot.ca.gov>; alex@mcapus.com; ametronav@gmail.com; amy@bessonebot.com;

Anita@anitarosenberg.com; azoueihid@picf.org; belaircpa90077@gmail.com; Bescher Éric Pascal <bescher@ucla.edu>; Bobsod1@yahoo.com; bryan@graybillddb.com; Gurich, Connie G. <CGurich@hertz.com>; christine@silverlakeheritage.org; david.howden@csh.org; davidwgajda@gmail.com; dogStar@greenmail.net; Pettit, David <dpettit@nrdc.org>; emma.riordan@aol.com; fkalantaridds@aol.com; Francisca Alegría <francisca.alegria.z@gmail.com>; georgesarco@gmail.com; grtscott7@aol.com; hilo33@aol.com; info@glaaacc.org; jsaidoff@hotmail.com; jsimmons@picf.org; kerryhmorrison@gmail.com; kpollock@lalgbtcenter.org; latview@aol.com; Ling, Shine <LingS@metro.net>; mas4reel@aol.com; Struhl, Mine@DOT <mine.struhl@dot.ca.gov>; Edmonson, Miya R@DOT <miya.edmonson@dot.ca.gov>; msepls@aol.com

Subject: Letter of Determination for Hollywood Center Project Vesting Tentative Tract No. 82152

Attachments: VTT-82152 LOD_9 14 20.pdf AppealFilingOptions_COVID-19.pdf

Hello,

You are receiving this email because you are an interested party and/or a mandated recipient of the **Letter of Determination** for **Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 82152**, attached.

Please be advised that related Case Nos. CPC-2018-2114-DB-CU-MCUP-SPR and CPC-2018-2115-DA are tentatively scheduled for a City Planning Commission meeting on October 15, 2020. More information will be provided following the close of the appeal period for VTT No. 82152.

Thank you.
--

LOS ANGELES CITY PLANNING

Mindy Nguyen
City Planner
Los Angeles City Planning
221 N. Figueroa St., Suite 1350
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Planning4LA.org
T: (213) 847-3674

E-NEWS

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICES
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

VACANT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Mailing Date: September 14, 2020

Appeal Period Ends: September 23, 2020

MCAF Vine LLC, 1750 North Vine LLC, 1749 North Vine Street LLC, 1770 Ivar LLC, 1733 North Argyle LLC, and 1720 North Vine LLC (A)(O)
350 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

MCAF Vine LLC (A)
350 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Mayer Brown LLP (R)
Edgar Khalatian
350 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

RE: Vesting Tentative Tract Map No.: 82152
Address: 1720-1770 North Vine Street; 1746-1764 North Ivar Avenue; 1733-1741 North Argyle Avenue; 6236, 6270, and 6334 West Yucca Street
Community Plan: Hollywood
Zone: C4-2D-SN
Council District: 13 – O'Farrell
CEQA No.: ENV-2018-2116-EIR

Pursuant to Sections 21082.1(c) and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Advisory Agency has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project, which includes the Draft EIR, ENV-2018-2116-EIR (State Clearinghouse House No. 2018051002), dated April 16, 2020, and the Final EIR, dated September 3, 2020 (Hollywood Center Project EIR), as well as the whole of the administrative record, and

CERTIFIED the following:

1) The Hollywood Center Project EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
2) The Hollywood Center Project EIR was presented to the Advisory Agency as a decision-making body of the lead agency; and
3) The Hollywood Center Project EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency.

ADOPTED the following:

1) The related and prepared Hollywood Center Project EIR Environmental Findings;
2) The Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
3) The Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the Hollywood Center Project EIR.

Pursuant to Section 17.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), the Advisory Agency **APPROVED:**

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 82152 (Alternative 8), located at 1720-1770 North Vine Street; 1746-1764 North Ivar Avenue; 1733-1741 North Argyle Avenue; 6236, 6270, and 6334 West Yucca Street, to allow the merger of 16 existing lots totaling 194,495 square feet (4.46 acres) and 5,876 square feet (0.135 acres) of public right-of-way (including a 1,003 square-foot merger of a portion of an alley and a 4,873 square-foot merger of portions along the sidewalk of Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and both sides of Vine Street), dedicating five-foot-wide sidewalk easements over said sidewalk merger areas, and the subsequent re-subdivision into three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots for a total of 13 lots; an associated haul route for the export of 542,300 cubic yards of soil; and the removal of 16 street trees.

The subdivider is hereby advised that the LAMC may not permit this maximum approved density. Therefore, verification should be obtained from the Department of Building and Safety, which will legally interpret the Zoning Code as it applies to this particular property.

The Advisory Agency's approval is subject to the following conditions:

The final map must record within 36 months of this approval, unless a time extension is granted before the end of such period.

NOTE on clearing conditions: When two or more **agencies** must clear a condition, subdivider should follow the sequence indicated in the condition. For the benefit of the Project Applicant, subdivider shall maintain record of all conditions cleared, including all material supporting clearances and be prepared to present copies of the clearances to each reviewing agency as may be required by its staff at the time of its review.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

(Additional BOE Improvement Conditions are listed in "Standard Condition" section)

1. That the City Department of Transportation in a letter to the City Engineer shall determine that the merger areas are not necessary for current and future Public Street purposes.

2. That the Department of City Planning in a letter to the City Engineer also determine that the proposed merger areas are consistent with all applicable General Plan Elements of Highway and Circulation Elements for LA Mobility Plan.

3. In the event that Department of Transportation and Department of City Planning have no objections to the street merger, then 5-foot-wide sidewalk areas measured from the property lines along both sides of **Vine Street** adjoining the tract be permitted to be merged with the remainder of the tract map pursuant to Section 66499.20.2 of the State Government Code, and in addition, the following conditions be executed by the applicant and administered by the City Engineer:

    a. That consents to the street being merged and waivers of any damages that may accrue as a result of such mergers be obtained from all property owners who might have certain rights in the area being merged.

    b. That satisfactory arrangements be made with all utility agencies, cable companies and franchises maintaining existing facilities within the area being merged.

4. That 5-foot-wide public sidewalk easements be provided on the final map within the 5-foot-wide merger areas along both sides of Vine Street adjoining the tract including a 15-foot radius easement line return at the intersection with Yucca Street.

5. In the event that Department of Transportation and Department of City Planning have no objections to the street merger, then an approximately 3-foot-wide sidewalk area measured from the property line along **Yucca Street** adjoining the tract be permitted to be merged with the remainder of the tract map pursuant to Section 66499.20.2 of the State Government Code, and in addition, the following conditions be executed by the applicant and administered by the City Engineer:

    a. That consents to the street being merged and waivers of any damages that may accrue as a result of such mergers be obtained from all property owners who might have certain rights in the area being merged.

    b. That satisfactory arrangements be made with all utility agencies, cable companies and franchises maintaining existing facilities within the area being merged.

6. That a 3-foot-wide public sidewalk easement be provided on the final map within the 3-foot-wide merger area along Yucca Street adjoining the tract.

7. In the event that Department of Transportation and Department of City Planning have no objections to the street merger then a 4-foot wide sidewalk area measured from the property line along **Argyle Avenue** adjoining the tract be permitted to be merged with the remainder of the tract map pursuant to Section 66499.20.2 of the State Government Code, and in addition, the following conditions be executed by the applicant and administered by the City Engineer:

    a. That consents to the street being merged and waivers of any damages that may accrue as a result of such mergers be obtained from all property owners who might have certain rights in the area being merged.

    b. That satisfactory arrangements be made with all utility agencies, cable companies and franchises maintaining existing facilities within the area being merged.

8. That a 4-foot wide public sidewalk easement be provided on the final map within the 4-foot wide merger area along Argyle Avenue adjoining the tract.

9. In the event that Department of Transportation and Department of City Planning have no objections to the alley merger then portion of the existing alley turning area adjoining the tract be permitted to be merged with the remainder of the tract map on a layout satisfactory to the City Engineer pursuant to Section 66499.20.2 of the State Government Code, and in addition, the following conditions be executed by the applicant and administered by the City Engineer:

    a. That consents to the alley being merged and waivers of any damages that may accrue as a result of such mergers be obtained from all property owners who might have certain rights in the area being merged.

    b. That satisfactory arrangements be made with all utility agencies, cable companies and franchises maintaining existing facilities within the area being merged.

10. That any surcharge fees in conjunction with the street mergers and alley merger requests be paid.

11. That certified Survey Plans be submitted showing the areas being merged for the final map check.

12. That the subdivider make a request to the Central District Office of the Bureau of Engineering to determine the capacity of existing sewers in this area.

13. That a set of drawings for airspace lots be submitted to the City Engineer showing the following:

    a. Plan view at different elevations

    b. Isometric views

    c. Elevation views

    d. Section cuts at all locations where air space lot boundaries change.

14. That the owners of the property record an agreement satisfactory to the City Engineer stating that they will grant the necessary private easements for ingress and egress purposes to serve proposed airspace lots to use upon the sale of the respective lots and they will maintain the private easements free and clear of obstructions and in safe conditions for use at all times.

15. See Condition S-3(i) for Bureau of Engineering Improvement conditions where applicable.

Any questions regarding this report should be directed to Mr. Georgic Avanesian of the Land Development Section, located at 201 North Figueroa Street, Suite 290, or by calling (213) 808-8588.

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, GRADING DIVISION

16. Comply with any requirements with the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division for recordation of the final map and issuance of any permit.

17. The Tract Map recorded with the County Recorder shall contain the following statement: “Prior to the issuance of grading/building permits, a design-level geotechnical/soils report shall be submitted to the Grading Division to provide recommendations specific to the proposed development.”

18. See Condition 34 regarding the requirement for the developer to excavate another exploratory trench to demonstrate, or rule out, the presence of an active fault in the southerly part of the Project Site.

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, ZONING DIVISION

19. A clearance letter will be issued stating that no Building or Zoning Code violations exist relating to the subdivision on the subject site once the following items have been satisfied:

a. Provide copy of building records, plot plan, and certificate of occupancy of all existing structures to verify the last legal use and the number of parking spaces required and provided on each site.

b. Required parking spaces for the remaining structures are required to be maintained on each lot (Ground Lot). Obtain a permit to capture the required parking for each building on its own proposed lot (Ground Lot), as well as to relocate any driveway and all required parking spaces for each building onto its corresponding proposed lot. Show location of all parking spaces and access driveways. Provide copies of permits and final inspection cards, for any restriping of parking spaces.

c. For Proposed Ground Lot 2, provide the total floor area count of the existing buildings to verify compliance of the allowable FAR for the site.

d. Provide copy of a Certificate of Compliance for the lot cuts of Lot 1 of Tract 18237.

e. Provide a copy of affidavits AFF-20478, AFF-20772, AFF-35097, AFF-35104, AFF-43826, AFF 001966012, AF-95-853223-MB, AF-01-0390387, AF-01-1243919, and PKG-3714. Show compliance with all the conditions/requirements of the above affidavits as applicable. Termination of above affidavit(s) may be required after the Map has been recorded. Obtain approval from the Department, on the termination form, prior to recording.

f. Provide a copy of CPC case CPC-2018-2114-DB-CU-MCUP-SPR. Show compliance with all the conditions/requirements of the CPC case as applicable.

g. Show all street dedications as required by Bureau of Engineering and provide net lot area after all dedications. “Area” requirements shall be re-checked as per net lot area after street dedication.

h. Record a Covenant and Agreement for each ground lot with air space lots (Ground Lots 1 and 3) to treat the buildings and structures located in an Air Space Subdivision as if they were within a single lot.

Notes:

The proposed building plans have not been checked for and shall comply with Building and Zoning Code requirements. With the exception of revised health or safety standards, the subdivider shall have a vested right to proceed with the proposed development in substantial compliance with the ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the time the subdivision application was deemed complete. Plan check will be required before any construction, occupancy or change of use.

If the proposed development does not comply with the current Zoning Code, all zoning violations shall be indicated on the Map.

An appointment is required for the issuance of a clearance letter from the Department of Building and Safety. The applicant is asked to contact Laura Duong at (213) 482-0434 to schedule an appointment.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

20. A minimum of 60-foot and 40-foot reservoir space(s) be provided between any ingress security gate(s) and the property line when driveway is serving more than 300 and 100 parking spaces respectively. A minimum of 20-foot reservoir space(s) be provided between any ingress security gate(s) and the property line when driveway is serving less than 100 parking spaces or to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.

21. Parking stalls shall be designed so that a vehicle is not required to back into or out of any public street or sidewalk. LAMC 12.21 A.

22. A parking area and driveway plan be submitted to the Citywide Planning Coordination Section of the Department of Transportation for approval prior to submittal of building permit plans for plan check by the Department of Building and Safety. Transportation approvals are conducted at 201 N. Figueroa Street Room 550. For an appointment, call (213) 482-7024.

FIRE DEPARMENT

23. Prior to the recordation of the final map, a suitable arrangement shall be made satisfactory to the Fire Department, binding the subdivider and all successors to the following:

    a. Submittal of plot plans for Fire Department review and approval prior to recordation of Tract Map Action.

    b. Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.

    c. One or more Knox Boxes will be required to be installed for LAFD access to the project. Location and number to be determined by LAFD Field Inspector (Refer to FPB Req #75).

    d. 505.1 Address identification. New and existing buildings shall have approved building identification placed in a position that is plainly legible and visible from the street or road fronting the property.

    e. The entrance to the Residential lobby must be within 50 feet of the desired street address curb face.

    f. The entrance or exit of all ground dwelling units shall not be more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway or an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.

    g. Where above ground floors are used for residential purposes, the access requirement shall be interpreted as being the horizontal travel distance from the street, driveway, alley, or designated fire lane to the main entrance of individual units.

2014 CITY OF LOS ANGELES FIRE CODE, SECTION 503.1.4 – (EXCEPTION)

    h. When this exception is applied to a fully fire sprinklered residential building equipped with a wet standpipe outlet inside an exit stairway with at least a 2 hour rating the distance from the wet standpipe outlet in the stairway to the entry door of any dwelling

unit or guest room shall not exceed 150 feet of horizontal travel AND the distance from the edge of the roadway of an improved street or approved fire lane to the door into the same exit stairway directly from outside the building shall not exceed 150 feet of horizontal travel.

It is the intent of this policy that in no case will the maximum travel distance exceed 150 feet inside the structure and 150 feet outside the structure. The term “horizontal travel” refers to the actual path of travel to be taken by a person responding to an emergency in the building.

i. This policy does not apply to single-family dwelling or to non-residential buildings.

j. No building or commercial portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.

k. The Fire Department may require additional vehicular access where buildings exceed 28 feet in height.

l. Building designs for multi-storied residential buildings shall incorporate at least one access stairwell off the main lobby of the building; But, in no case greater than 150 ft horizontal travel distance from the edge of the public street, private street or Fire Lane. This stairwell shall extend onto the roof.

m. Entrance to the main lobby shall be located off the address side of the building.

n. Any required Fire Annunciator panel or Fire Control Room shall be located within a 20-foot visual line of site of the main entrance stairwell or to the satisfaction of the Fire Department.

o. All parking restrictions for fire lanes shall be posted and/or painted prior to any Temporary Certificate of Occupancy being issued.

p. Plans showing areas to be posted and/or painted, “FIRE LANE NO PARKING” shall be submitted and approved by the Fire Department prior to building permit application sign-off.

q. Electric Gates approved by the Fire Department shall be tested by the Fire Department prior to Building and Safety granting a Certificate of Occupancy.

r. All public street and fire lane cul-de-sacs shall have the curbs painted red and/or be posted “No Parking at Any Time” prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or Temporary Certificate of Occupancy for any structures adjacent to the cul-de-sac.

s. Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of Fire Department aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.

t. The width of private roadways for general access use and fire lanes shall not be less than 20 feet, and the fire lane must be clear to the sky.

u. Fire lanes, where required and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be required.

v. Submit plot plans indicating access road and turning area for Fire Department approval.

w. Adequate off-site public and on-site private fire hydrants may be required. Their number and location to be determined after the Fire Department's review of the plot plan.

x. The following recommendations of the Fire Department relative to fire safety shall be incorporated into the building plans, which includes the submittal of a plot plan for approval by the Fire Department either prior to the recordation of a final map or the approval of a building permit. The plot plan shall include the following minimum design features: fire lanes, where required, shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width; all structures must be within 300 feet of an approved fire hydrant, and entrances to any dwelling unit or guest room shall not be more than 150 feet in distance in horizontal travel from the edge of the roadway of an improved street or approved fire lane.

y. Site plans shall include all overhead utility lines adjacent to the site.

z. Any roof elevation changes in excess of 3 feet may require the installation of ships ladders.

SECTION 5101.1 – EMERGENCY RESPONDER RADIO COVERAGE IN NEW BUILDINGS

aa. All new buildings shall have approved radio coverage for emergency responders within the building based upon the existing coverage levels of the public safety communication systems of the jurisdiction at the exterior of the building. This section shall not require improvement of the existing public safety communication systems.

bb. Recently, the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) modified Fire Prevention Bureau (FPB) Requirement 10. Helicopter landing facilities are still required on all High-Rise buildings in the City. However, FPB's Requirement 10 has been revised to provide two new alternatives to a full FAA-approved helicopter landing facility.

cc. Each standpipe in a new high-rise building shall be provided with two remotely located FDC's for each zone in compliance with NFPA 14-2013, Section 7.12.2.

The Applicant is further advised that all subsequent contact regarding these conditions must be with the Hydrant and Access Unit. This would include clarification, verification of condition compliance and plans or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished **BY APPOINTMENT ONLY**, in order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting please call **(213) 482-6509.** You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER

24. This tract can be supplied with water from the municipal system subject to the Los Angeles

Department of Water and Power's (LADWP) Water System Rules and upon payment of regular service connection charges. Upon compliance with these conditions and requirements, LADWP's Water Services Organization will forward the necessary clearances to the Bureau of Engineering. (This condition shall be deemed cleared at the time the City Engineer clears Conditions No. S-1(c)).

BUREAU OF STREET LIGHTING

25. See Condition S-3(c) for Street Lighting Improvement conditions where applicable.

BUREAU OF SANITATION

26. Wastewater Collection Systems Division of the Bureau of Sanitation has inspected the sewer/storm drain lines serving the subject tract and found no/or potential problems to their structure or potential maintenance problem, as stated in the memo dated July 2, 2018. There are easements contained within the aforementioned property. Any proposed development in close proximity to the easements must secure Department of Public Works approval. Note: This approval is for the Tract Map only and represents the Office of the Bureau of Sanitation/WCSD. The Applicant may be required to obtain the necessary Clearances/Permits from the Bureau of Sanitation and appropriate District Office of the Bureau of Engineering. Upon compliance with its conditions and requirements, the Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Collection Systems Division will forward the necessary clearances to the Bureau of Engineering. (This condition shall be deemed cleared at the time the City Engineer clears Condition No. S-1. (d)).

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY

27. To assure that cable television facilities will be installed in the same manner as other required improvements, please email cabletv.ita@lacity.org that provides an automated response with the instructions on how to obtain the Cable TV clearance. The automated response also provides the email address of three people in case the Applicant/Owner has any additional questions.

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

28. That the Project dedicate land to the City or provide a combination of land dedication and fee payment, in order to fulfill the Project's requirements under provisions of LAMC 12.33.

URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

29. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a plot plan prepared by a reputable tree expert, indicating the location, size, type, and condition of all existing trees on the site shall be submitted for approval by the Department of City Planning. All trees in the public right-of-way shall be provided per the current Urban Forestry Division standards.

NOTE: Removal of all trees in the public right-of-way shall require approval of the Board of Public Works. Contact: Urban Forestry Division at: (213) 485-5675. Failure to comply with this condition as written shall require the filing of a modification to this tract map in order to clear the condition.

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING-SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

30. Prior to the issuance of a building permit or the recordation of the final map, the subdivider shall prepare and execute a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6770) in a manner satisfactory to the Planning Department, binding the subdivider and all successors to the following:

    a. Under Alternative 8, the proposed development shall be limited to three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots. Alternative 8 shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit A as follows:
        i. A maximum of 903 residential dwelling units, of which 133 units shall be set aside for senior affordable units;
        ii. A maximum of 365,943 square feet of office uses; and
        iii. A maximum of 26,874 square feet of commercial uses.
        iv. A maximum total new floor area of 1,287,100 square feet.

    b. That a solar access report shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency prior to obtaining a grading permit.

    c. That the subdivider considers the use of natural gas and/or solar energy and consults with the Department of Water and Power and Southern California Gas Company regarding feasible energy conservation measures.

31. Prior to the issuance of the building permit or the recordation of the final map, a copy of CPC-2018-2114-DB-CU-MCUP-SPR shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency. In the event that CPC-2018-2114-DB-CU-MCUP-SPR is not approved, the subdivider shall submit a tract modification.

32. Prior to the recordation of the final map, the owner shall execute a covenant to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) to make the number of affordable senior housing units approved by Case No. CPC-2018-2114-DB-CU-MCUP-SPR available for rental solely to Very Low Income senior households at a rental price determined to be affordable to Very Low Income households by HCIDLA, for a period of 55 years. Said units shall be comparable in size, number of bedrooms, distribution, and amenities to the non-income-restricted units in the development.

33. Haul Route Conditions

    a. Recommended Haul Route for 1720-1770 North Vine Street:

        Option 1:

        Loaded Truck: Exit jobsite onto Vine St (Northbound); Right turn onto Yucca Street (Eastbound); Left turn onto Argyle Avenue (Northbound); Right turn onto S/B Hollywood Fwy On-Ramp (US-101); Merge onto E/B San Bernardino Fwy (I-10); Continue to Disposal Site outside of City Limit.

        Empty Truck: W/B San Bernardino Fwy (I-10); Merge onto N/B Hollywood Fwy (US-101); Exit towards Gower St; Left turn onto Gower St (Southbound); Right turn onto Yucca St (Westbound); Left onto Vine St (Southbound) to jobsite.

Option 2:

Loaded Truck: Exit jobsite onto Vine St (Southbound); Left turn onto Hollywood Bl (Eastbound); Right turn onto S/B Hollywood Fwy On-Ramp (US-101); Merge onto E/B San Bernardino Fwy (I-10); Continue to Disposal Site outside of City Limit.

Empty Truck: Reverse Directions.

b. Recommended Haul Route for 1746-1760 North Ivar Avenue:

Option 1:

Loaded Truck: Exit jobsite onto Ivar Ave (Northbound); Right turn onto Yucca Street (Eastbound); Left turn onto Argyle Avenue (Northbound); Right turn onto S/B Hollywood Fwy On-Ramp (US-101); Merge onto E/B San Bernardino Fwy (I-10); Continue to Disposal Site outside of City Limit.

Empty Truck: W/B San Bernardino Fwy (I-10); Merge onto N/B Hollywood Fwy (US-101); Exit towards Gower St; Left turn onto Gower St (Southbound); Right turn onto Yucca St (Westbound); Left onto Vine St (Southbound) to jobsite.

Option 2:

Loaded Truck: Exit jobsite onto Ivar Ave (Southbound); Left turn onto Hollywood Bl (Eastbound); Right turn onto S/B Hollywood Fwy On-Ramp (US-101); Merge onto E/B San Bernardino Fwy (I-10); Continue to Disposal Site outside of City Limit.

Empty Truck: Reverse Directions.

c. Days and Hours of Hauling Operation:

i. Hauling shall be from 9 AM to 3 PM weekdays, and 8 AM to 4 PM on Saturdays. No hauling shall be performed on Sundays or holidays.

d. Staging Area:

i. All trucks shall be staged on jobsite. No more than one truck may be queued up adjacent to jobsite.

NOTE: No interference to traffic, access to driveways must be maintained at all times.

e. Additional Comments and/or Requirements:

i. Contractor shall contact LADOT at (213) 485-2298 at least four business days prior to hauling to post “Temporary Tow Away Stopping” signs adjacent to jobsite if needed for hauling operations.

ii. Flagger control should be provided during the hauling operations to assist with and pedestrian traffic, and ingress and egress of truck traffic on Vine Street per latest WATCH Manual. Truck warning signs should be placed 300 feet in

advance of the exit in each direction. If you have any questions, please call Bhuvan Bajaj at (323) 957-6843.

iii. The Emergency Operations Division, Specialized Enforcement Section of the Los Angeles Police Department shall be notified prior to the start of hauling (213) 486-0777.

iv. Streets shall be cleaned of spilled materials at the termination of each work day.

v. The final approved haul routes and all the conditions of approval shall be available on the job site at all times.

vi. The owner or contractor shall keep the construction area sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by grading and hauling, and at all times provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind.

vii. Hauling and grading equipment shall be kept in good operating condition and muffled as required by law.

viii. All loads shall be secured by trimming, watering or other appropriate means to prevent spillage and dust.

xi. All trucks are to be watered at the job site to prevent excessive blowing dirt.

xii. All trucks are to be cleaned of loose earth at the job site to prevent spilling. Any material spilled on the public street shall be removed by the contractor.

xiii. The applicant shall be in conformance with the State of California, Department of Transportation, policy regarding movements of reducible loads.

xiv. All regulations set forth in the State of California Department of Motor Vehicles pertaining to the hauling of earth shall be complied with.

xv. A Truck Crossing warning sign shall be placed 300 feet in advance of the exit in each direction.

xvi. One flag person(s) shall be required at the job and dump sites to assist the trucks in and out of the project area. Flag person(s) and warning signs shall be in compliance with Part II of the 1985 Edition of Work Area Traffic Control Handbook.

xvii. The City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation, telephone (213) 485-2298, shall be notified 72 hours prior to beginning operations in order to have temporary No Parking signs posted along the route.

xviii. Any desire to change the prescribed routes must be approved by the concerned governmental agencies by contacting Street Services Investigation and Enforcement Division at (213) 847-6000 before the change takes place.

xix. The permittee shall notify Street Services Investigation and Enforcement Division, (213) 847-6000, at least 72 hours prior to the beginning of hauling

operations and shall also notify the Division immediately upon completion of hauling operations.

xx. A surety or cash bond shall be posted in an amount satisfactory to the City Engineer for maintenance of haul route streets. The forms for the bond will be issued by the Central Los Angeles District Engineering Office, 201 N. Figueroa Street, Land Development Section, Suite 1150, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Further information regarding the bond may be obtained by calling (213) 202-3495.

34. Prior to the issuance of any permit which authorizes excavation on the Project Site, the project engineering geologist (a California licensed Certified Engineering Geologist or Professional Geologist who is experienced with fault investigations, at the discretion of the Grading Division of the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS)) shall directly observe, by exploratory trench overlapping the transect investigation performed on the southern portion of the East Site, continuous strata of late Pleistocene age to rule out "active fault traces" (as defined by California Code Regulations, title 14, division 2, chapter 8, section 3601, subdivision (a)) on the Project Site. LADBS' reviewing geologist, California Geological Survey (CGS) geologists, and other paleoseismic experts shall be invited to observe the trench after the trench has been secured; shored or benched; cleaned, and a string line or grid reference system is in place. Once the field exploration and geologic analysis are completed, the project engineering geologist shall prepare a Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation Report to the satisfaction of LADBS, and submit the Report to the City.

If the investigation performed by the project engineering geologist, as documented in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation Report, concludes that there are no active fault traces traversing the southern portion of the East Site, no Project-related construction activity may proceed until LADBS provides written approval of the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation Report to the Applicant and the Department of City Planning.

If the investigation performed by the project engineering geologist, as documented in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation Report, concludes that there are active fault traces traversing the southern portion of the East Site, construction of the Project, as proposed, shall not proceed. In compliance with CGS' and LADBS' guidance, the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation Report shall include recommendations for building setbacks from any identified active fault trace(s), subject to LADBS review and approval. No ground disturbance or other construction activity shall take place on the Project Site until all of the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning:

a. Applicant shall meet with the Department of City Planning and LADBS to determine what modifications need to be made to the Project to address the existence of the active fault traces on the Project Site, including any building setbacks recommended in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation Report approved by LADBS.

b. Applicant shall submit revised plans to the City that include the project modifications needed to address the existence of the active fault traces on the Project Site.

c. The Department of City Planning and LADBS shall determine what, if any, additional environmental review, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), is necessary to analyze the Project modifications, and complete the additional environmental review.

d. The City shall review the appropriate environmental clearance and proposed entitlements for the Project, as modified. Following this review, the City may, but is not required to, approve the modified Project and related clearances and entitlements. However, such approval is required before any ground disturbance or other construction activity may occur on the Project Site.

35. Tribal Cultural Resource Inadvertent Discovery. In the event that objects or artifacts that may be tribal cultural resources are encountered during the course of any ground disturbance activities (excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity), all such activities shall temporarily cease on the project site until the potential tribal cultural resources are properly assessed and addressed pursuant to the process set forth below:

a. Upon a discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource, the Applicant shall immediately stop all ground disturbance activities and contact the following: (1) all California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project; (2) and the Department of City Planning.

b. If the City determines, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(2), that the object or artifact appears to be tribal cultural resource, the City shall provide any effected tribe a reasonable period of time, not less than 14 days, to conduct a site visit and make recommendations to the Applicant and the City regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered tribal cultural resources.

c. The Applicant shall implement the tribe's recommendations if a qualified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated tribal monitor, both retained by the City and paid for by the Applicant, reasonably conclude that the tribe's recommendations are reasonable and feasible.

d. The Applicant shall submit a tribal cultural resource monitoring plan to the City that includes all recommendations from the City and any affected tribes that have been reviewed and determined by the qualified archaeologist and by a culturally affiliated tribal monitor to be reasonable and feasible. The Applicant shall not be allowed to recommence ground disturbance activities until this plan is approved by the City.

e. If the Applicant does not accept a particular recommendation determined to be reasonable and feasible by the qualified archaeologist or by a culturally affiliated tribal monitor, the Applicant may request mediation by a mediator agreed to by the Applicant and the City who has the requisite professional qualifications and experience to mediate such a dispute. The Applicant shall pay any costs associated with the mediation.

f. The Applicant may recommence ground disturbance activities outside of a specified radius of the discovery site, so long as this radius has been reviewed by the qualified archaeologist and by a culturally affiliated tribal monitor and determined to be reasonable and appropriate.

Copies of any subsequent prehistoric archaeological study, tribal cultural resources study or report, detailing the nature of any significant tribal cultural resources, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any significant tribal cultural resources shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton.

36. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigation Costs.

Applicant shall do all of the following:

(i) Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.

(ii) Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.

(iii) Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than $50,000. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).

(iv) Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).

(v) If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the Applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the Applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the Applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the Applicant

of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING-ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES.

37. Implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), attached as "Exhibit B" and part of the case file, shall be enforced throughout all phases of the Project. The Applicant shall be responsible for implementing each Project Design Features (PDF) and Mitigation Measure (MM) and shall be obligated to provide certification, as identified below, to the appropriate monitoring and enforcement agencies that each PDF and MM has been implemented. The Applicant shall maintain records demonstrating compliance with each PDF and MM. Such records shall be made available to the City upon request.

38. Construction Monitor. During the construction phase and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall retain an independent Construction Monitor (either via the City or through a third-party consultant), approved by the Department of City Planning, who shall be responsible for monitoring implementation of PDFs and MMs during construction activities consistent with the monitoring phase and frequency set forth in this MMP.

    The Construction Monitor shall also prepare documentation of the Applicant's compliance with the PDFs and MMs during construction every 90 days in a form satisfactory to the Department of City Planning. The documentation must be signed by the Applicant and Construction Monitor and be included as part of the Applicant's Compliance Report. The Construction Monitor shall be obligated to immediately report to the Enforcement Agency any non-compliance with the MMs and PDFs within two businesses days if the Applicant does not correct the non-compliance within a reasonable time of notification to the Applicant by the monitor or if the non-compliance is repeated. Such non-compliance shall be appropriately addressed by the Enforcement Agency.

39. Substantial Conformance and Modification. After review and approval of the final MMP by the Lead Agency, minor changes and modifications to the MMP are permitted, but can only be made subject to City approval. The Lead Agency, in conjunction with any appropriate agencies or departments, will determine the adequacy of any proposed change or modification. This flexibility is necessary in light of the nature of the MMP and the need to protect the environment. No changes will be permitted unless the MMP continues to satisfy

the requirements of CEQA, as determined by the Lead Agency.

The Project shall be in substantial conformance with the PDFs and MMs contained in this MMP. The enforcing departments or agencies may determine substantial conformance with PDFs and MMs in the MMP in their reasonable discretion. If the department or agency cannot find substantial conformance, a PDF or MM may be modified or deleted as follows: the enforcing department or agency, or the decision maker for a subsequent discretionary project related approval finds that the modification or deletion complies with CEQA, including CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, which could include the preparation of an addendum or subsequent environmental clearance, if necessary, to analyze the impacts from the modifications to or deletion of the PDFs or MMs. Any addendum or subsequent CEQA clearance shall explain why the PDF or MM is no longer needed, not feasible, or the other basis for modifying or deleting the PDF or MM, and that the modification will not result in a new significant impact consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Under this process, the modification or deletion of a PDF or MM shall not, in and of itself, require a modification to any Project discretionary approval unless the Director of Planning also finds that the change to the PDF or MM results in a substantial change to the Project or the non-environmental conditions of approval.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - STANDARD CONDITIONS

S-1. (a) That the sewerage facilities charge be deposited prior to recordation of the final map over all of the tract in conformance with Section 64.11.2 of the LAMC.

(b) That survey boundary monuments be established in the field in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer and located within the California Coordinate System prior to recordation of the final map. Any alternative measure approved by the City Engineer would require prior submission of complete field notes in support of the boundary survey.

(c) That satisfactory arrangements be made with both the Water System and the Power System of the Department of Water and Power with respect to water mains, fire hydrants, service connections and public utility easements.

(d) That any necessary sewer, street, drainage and street lighting easements be dedicated. In the event it is necessary to obtain off-site easements by separate instruments, records of the Bureau of Right-of-Way and Land shall verify that such easements have been obtained. The above requirements do not apply to easements of off-site sewers to be provided by the City.

(e) That drainage matters be taken care of satisfactory to the City Engineer.

(f) That satisfactory street, sewer and drainage plans and profiles as required, together with a lot-grading plan of the tract and any necessary topography of adjoining areas be submitted to the City Engineer.

(g) That any required slope easements be dedicated by the final map.

(h) That each lot in the tract complies with the width and area requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

(i) That one-foot future streets and/or alleys be shown along the outside of incomplete public dedications and across the termini of all dedications abutting non-subdivided property. The 1-foot dedications on the map shall include a restriction against their use of access purposes until such time as they are accepted for public use.

(j) That any 1-foot future street and/or alley adjoining the tract be dedicated for public use by the tract, or that a suitable resolution of acceptance be transmitted to the City Council with the final map.

(k) That no public street grade exceeds 15 percent.

(l) That any necessary additional street dedications be provided to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

S-2. That the following provisions be accomplished in conformity with the improvements constructed herein:

(a) Survey monuments shall be placed and permanently referenced to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. A set of approved field notes shall be furnished, or such work shall be suitably guaranteed, except where the setting of boundary monuments requires that other procedures be followed.

(b) Make satisfactory arrangements with the Department of Transportation with respect to street name, warning, regulatory and guide signs.

(c) All grading done on private property outside the tract boundaries in connection with public improvements shall be performed within dedicated slope easements or by grants of satisfactory rights of entry by the affected property owners.

(d) All improvements within public streets, private streets, alleys and easements shall be constructed under permit in conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Bureau of Engineering.

(e) Any required bonded sewer fees shall be paid prior to recordation of the final map.

S-3. That the following improvements shall be either constructed prior to recordation of the final map or that the construction be suitably guaranteed:

(a) Construct on-site sewers to serve the tract as determined by the City Engineer.

(b) Construct any necessary drainage facilities.

(c) Install street lighting facilities to serve the tract as required by the Bureau of Street Lighting as required below:

No street lighting improvements if no street widening per BOE improvement conditions. Otherwise relocate and upgrade street lights; two (2) on Ivar Ave, four (4) on Yucca St, one (1) on Argyle Ave, and five (5) on Vine St.

Note: The quantity of streetlights identified may be modified slightly during the plan

check process based on illumination calculations and equipment selection.

Conditions set: 1) in compliance with a Specific Plan, 2) by LADOT, or 3) by other legal instrument excluding the Bureau of Engineering conditions, requiring an improvement that will change the geometrics of the public roadway or driveway apron may require additional or the reconstruction of street lighting improvements as part of that condition.

(d) Plant street trees and remove any existing trees within dedicated streets or proposed dedicated streets as required by the Street Tree Division of the Bureau of Street Maintenance. All street tree plantings shall be brought up to current standards. When the City has previously been paid for tree planting, the subdivider or contractor shall notify the Street Tree Division (213-485-5675) upon completion of construction to expedite tree planting.

(e) Repair or replace any off-grade or broken curb, gutter and sidewalk satisfactory to the City Engineer.

(f) Construct access ramps for the handicapped as required by the City Engineer.

(g) Close any unused driveways satisfactory to the City Engineer.

(h) Construct any necessary additional street improvements to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

(i) That the following improvements be either constructed prior to recordation of the final map or that the construction be suitably guaranteed:

i. Improve Ivar Avenue and Argyle Avenue adjoining the subdivision by the construction of new 2-foot wide integral concrete curbs and gutters together with any necessary removal and construction of existing improvements.

ii. Construct any new driveways along Vine Street in accordance with Hollywood Walk of Fame Specifications and details satisfactory to the City Engineer and Department of Transportation.

iii. Improve the alley adjoining the subdivision by removal and reconstruction of any existing bad order sections including reconstruction of the alley intersection with Argyle Avenue all satisfactory to the City Engineer.

iv. Improve Yucca Street adjoining the subdivision by removal and reconstruction of any existing bad order concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk all satisfactory to the City Engineer.

v. Repair and/or replace any damaged/cracked or off-grade concrete curb, gutter, existing terrazzo sidewalk, and AC pavement along both sides of Vine Street adjoining the tract in accordance with Hollywood Walk of Fame specifications and details satisfactory to the City Engineer.

NOTES:

Approval from Board of Public Works may be necessary before removal of any street trees

in conjunction with the improvements in this tract map through Bureau of Street Services Urban Forestry Division.

Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Power System, to pay for removal, relocation, replacement or adjustment of power facilities due to this development. The subdivider must make arrangements for the underground installation of all new utility lines in conformance with LAMC Section 17.05 N.

The final map must record within 36 months of this approval, unless a time extension is granted before the end of such period.

The Advisory Agency hereby finds that this tract conforms to the California Water Code, as required by the Subdivision Map Act.

The subdivider should consult the Department of Water and Power to obtain energy saving design features that can be incorporated into the final building plans for the subject development. As part of the Total Energy Management Program of the Department of Water and Power, this no-cost consultation service will be provided to the subdivider upon his request.

FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)

I. INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which includes the Draft EIR, is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision-makers and the general public regarding the significant environmental effects of the Hollywood Center Project, the possible ways to minimize the significant effects and the reasonable alternatives to this project (hereinafter referred to as the "Original Project"), located at 1720-1770 North Vine Street; 1746-1764 North Ivar Avenue; 1733-1741 Argyle Avenue; and 6236, 6270, and 6334 West Yucca Street, generally bounded by Yucca Street on the north, Ivar Avenue on the west, Argyle Avenue on the east, and adjacent development and Hollywood Boulevard on the south (Project Site), and bifurcated by Vine Street, The portion of the Project Site located between Ivar Avenue and Vine Street is identified as the "West Site", and the portion located between Vine Street and Argyle Avenue is identified as the "East Site".

The Draft EIR for the Original Project included the analysis of eight alternatives, including the Office, Residential and Commercial Alternative (Alternative 8). The City has determined that Alternative 8 is a feasible and preferred alternative by the Lead Agency that meets the Project Objectives identified in the Draft EIR. Alternative 8 provides a significant increase of commercial office use with a modest reduction of retail and restaurant uses and reduces the total number of residential units from 1,005 to 903 units, which still include 133 affordable senior units. As the Project Site is located in the Hollywood Center area of the Hollywood Community Plan (Community Plan), where the Community Plan states that the "center area shall function 1) as the commercial center for Hollywood and surrounding communities and 2) as an entertainment center for the entire region," Alternative 8 best meets the Community Plan's functions for the Hollywood Center area since Alternative 8 proposes a greater balance of jobs-producing uses while providing housing, including the same number of senior affordable units as the Original Project. Moreover, the environmental impacts of Alternative 8 are similar to the Original Project, in that Alternative 8 would be constructed on the same Project Site and does not elevate any impacts identified as less-than-significant, or less-than-significant with mitigation under the Original Project to a significant and unavoidable impact. Additionally, as discussed in the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 shall be subject to all regulatory measures, project design features and mitigation measures identified for the Original Project.

Alternative 8 involves the preservation of the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building (Capitol Records Complex), removal of other remaining existing uses (surface parking lots and a storage structure) on a 4.46-acre Project Site, and the development of up to 903 residential units, comprised of 770 market-rate and 133 senior affordable units, up to 386,347 square feet of office uses, and up to 27,140 square feet of retail/restaurant space, within three new mixed-use buildings (West Building, West Senior Building and East Office Building). Alternative 8 would include approximately 33,105 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which includes a paseo through the East and West Sites, connecting Argyle Avenue to Ivar Avenue. Alternative 8 would have a maximum FAR of 7:1, which includes 1,287,100 square feet of new development and the existing, approximately 114,303-square-foot Capitol Records Complex (consisting of the 92,664-square-foot Capitol Records Building and the 21,639-square-foot Gogerty Building), for a total floor area of 1,401,403 square feet.

Due to refinements to the architectural plans for Alternative 8, the Project, as approved, is a modified version of Alternative 8, which proposes up to 365,943 square feet of office uses, and up to 26,874 square feet of retail/restaurant space, whereas the Draft EIR analyzed up to 386,347

square feet of office uses, and up to 27,140 square feet of retail/restaurant space. As the unit mix and count and total square footage associated with the proposed development remain unchanged, the modified version of Alternative 8 is slightly reduced in scope for the purposes of CEQA analysis. Therefore, all statements, findings and conclusions related to Alternative 8 would also apply to the modified version of Alternative 8.

The City of Los Angeles (City), as Lead Agency, has evaluated the environmental impacts of implementation of Alternative 8 by preparing an EIR (Case Number ENV-2018-2116-EIR/State Clearinghouse No 2018051002). The EIR was prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq. (CEQA) and the California Code of Regulations Title 15, Chapter 6 (CEQA Guidelines). The findings discussed in this document are made relative to the conclusions of the EIR.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION BACKGROUND.

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for Alternative 8 includes (but is not limited to) the following documents:

Initial Study. The Original Project was reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of City Planning (for the City of Los Angeles, the Lead Agency) in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA (PRC 21000 et seq.). The City prepared an Initial Study in accordance with Section 15063(a) of the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.).

Notice of Preparation. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City then circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to State, regional and local agencies, and members of the public for a 30-day period commencing on August 30, 2018, and ending on September 27, 2018. The NOP also provided notice of a Public Scoping Meeting held on September 12, 2018. The purpose of the NOP and Public Scoping Meeting was to formally inform the public that the City was preparing a Draft EIR for the Original Project and to solicit input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR. Written comment letters responding to the NOP and Public Scoping Meeting were submitted to the City by various public agencies, interested organizations and individuals. The NOP, Initial Study, Scoping Meeting Materials, and NOP and Scoping Meeting comment letters are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

Draft EIR. The Draft EIR evaluated in detail the potential effects of the Original Project. It also analyzed the effects of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Original Project, including a “No Project” Alternative and Alternative 8, the Office, Residential and Commercial Alternative. The Draft EIR for the Original Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2018051002), which includes Alternative 8, incorporated herein by reference in full, was prepared pursuant to CEQA and the City’s CEQA Guidelines (City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines). The Draft EIR was circulated for a 47-day public comment period beginning on April 16, 2020 and ending on June 1, 2020. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was distributed on April 16, 2020, to all property owners and occupants (including businesses) located within 500 feet of the Project Site and all interested parties, which informed them of where they could view the document and how to comment.

The Draft EIR, including the documents referenced in the Draft EIR, were available for public review online at the Department of City Planning’s website, in the following location: https://planning.lacity.org/development-services/eir/hollywood-center-project-1.

The Draft EIR, including the documents referenced in the Draft EIR, were also available for

purchase on CD-ROM, USB flash drive or in hard copy by containing the Project Planner; however, when a request was made to the Department of City Planning for a copy, the copy was provided without charge. The Draft EIR, including the documents referenced in the Draft EIR, and the whole of the case file, was made available for public review, by appointment only, at the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, during office hours Monday - Friday, 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Finally, although public libraries serving the area involved were closed during the Draft EIR public review period, copies of the Draft EIR, including the documents referenced in the Draft EIR, were provided to the following Library Branches: 1) Los Angeles Central Library, 630 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, CA 90071; 2) Frances Howard Goldwyn – Hollywood Regional Library, 1623 North Ivar Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90028; 3) Will & Ariel Durant Branch Library, 7140 West Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90046; 4) John C. Fremont Branch Library, 6121 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90038. Notices were filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk on April 16, 2020.

Notice of Completion. A Notice of Completion was sent with the Draft EIR to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse for distribution to State Agencies on April 16, 2020, and notice was provided in newspapers of general and/or regional circulation.

Final EIR. The City released a Final EIR for the Original Project, including all alternatives, on September 3, 2020, which is hereby incorporated by reference in full. The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR which is incorporated by reference. Pursuant to Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City, as Lead Agency, reviewed all comments received during the review period for the Draft EIR and responded to each comment Chapter 2, *Responses to Comments*, of the Final EIR. On September 3, 2020, responses were sent to all public agencies that made comments on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to certification of the EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b). Notices regarding availability of the Final EIR were also sent to property owners and occupants within a 500-foot radius of the Project Site, as well as anyone who commented on the Draft EIR, and interested parties.

Public Hearing. A noticed public hearing for the Original Project, including Alternative 8, was held by the Deputy Advisory Agency/Hearing Officer on behalf of the City Planning Commission on August 26, 2020.

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for Alternative 8, includes (but is not limited to) the following documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record upon which the City approved Alternative 8. The following information is incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these Findings of Fact:

- All Original Project and Alternative 8 plans and application materials including supportive technical reports;
- The Draft EIR and Appendices, and the Final EIR and Appendices, and all documents relied upon or incorporated therein by reference;
- The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) prepared for Alternative 8;
- The City of Los Angeles General Plan and related EIR;
- The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)'s 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016-240 RTP/SCS) and related EIR (SCH No. 2015031035);
- The City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), including, but not limited, to the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance;
- All records of decision, resolutions, staff reports, memoranda, maps, exhibits, letters, minutes of meetings, summaries, and other documents approved, reviewed, relied upon, or prepared

by any City commissions, boards, officials, consultants, or staff relating to the Original Project and Alternative 8;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings of Fact, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any and all other materials required for the record of proceedings by PRC Section 21167.6(e).

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from the Department of City Planning, as the custodian of such documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings, located at the City of Los Angeles, Figueroa Plaza, 221 North Figueroa Street, Room 1350, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

In addition, copies of the Draft EIR and Final EIR are available on the Department of City Planning's website at http://planning.lacity.org (to locate the documents, click on the "Development Services" tab, then under the Environmental Review header, click on the "Published Documents" link, followed by the "Environmental Impacts Reports" tab, and search for "Hollywood Center Project", where the Draft and Final EIR are made available), at the Department of City Planning, and made available to anyone who requests a digital or hard copy.

Environmental Leadership Development Program (ELDP). On August 16, 2018, the Project was certified by the Governor as an ELDP Project under the Jobs and Economic Improvement through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011 (AB 900), which is codified in PRC Sections 21178 through 21189.3. While not otherwise required for EIRs, as an ELDP Project, the City, as Lead Agency, has prepared the record of proceedings concurrently with the administrative process, and posted all documents and other materials placed in the record of proceedings on, and in downloadable form, the City's website commencing with the date of the release of the Draft EIR.

III. FINDINGS REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY LEAD AGENCY UNDER CEQA

CEQA Section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." CEQA Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in CEQA Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See CEQA Section 21081[a]; CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[a].) For each significant environmental impact identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding, based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record, reaching one or more of the three possible findings, as follows:

1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts as identified in the EIR.

2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been, or can or should

be, adopted by that other agency.

3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the Final EIR for Alternative 8 as fully set forth therein. Although Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely "potentially significant," these findings nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR for the purpose of better understanding the full environmental scope of Alternative 8. For each environmental issue analyzed in the EIR where the environmental impacts are either no impact or a less-than-significant impact without mitigation, a summary is provided. For each environmental issue analyzed in the EIR where the environmental impacts are less-than-significant with mitigation or significant and unavoidable, the following information is provided:

The findings provided below include the following:

- Description of Significant Effects - A description of the environmental effects identified in the EIR.

- Project Design Features - A list of the project design features or actions that are included as part of Alternative 8 (with all references to "Project" meaning Hollywood Center Project – Alternative 8).

- Mitigation Measures - A list of the mitigation measures that are required as part of Alternative 8 to reduce identified significant impacts (with all references to "Project" meaning Hollywood Center Project – Alternative 8).

- Finding - One or more of the three possible findings set forth above for each of the significant impacts.

- Rationale for Finding - A summary of the rationale for the finding(s).

- Reference - A reference of the specific section of the EIR which includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives, a public agency, after adopting proper findings based on substantial evidence, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's benefits rendered acceptable its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines §15093, 15043[b]; see also CEQA § 21081[b].)

IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Alternative 8 involves the preservation of the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building (Capitol Records Complex), removal of other remaining existing uses (surface parking lots and a storage structure) on a 4.46-acre Project Site, and the development of up to 903 residential units,

comprised of 770 market-rate and 133 senior affordable units, up to 386,347 square feet of office uses, and up to 27,140 square feet of retail/restaurant space, within three new mixed-use buildings (West Building, West Senior Building and East Office Building). Alternative 8 would include approximately 33,105 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which includes a paseo through the East and West Sites, connecting Argyle Avenue to Ivar Avenue. Alternative 8 would have a maximum FAR of 7:1,[1] which includes 1,287,100 square feet of new development and the existing, approximately 114,303-square-foot Capitol Records Complex (consisting of the 92,664-square-foot Capitol Records Building and the 21,639-square-foot Gogerty Building), for a total floor area of 1,401,403 square feet. The total FAR would be the same as under the Original Project, although the total overall floor area for Alternative 8 would be 50 square feet less than the Original Project.

The West Site would be developed with two residential structures. The West Building, along Vine Street, would be 48 stories (with an additional rooftop mechanical level) and reach a height of 545 feet at the top of the 48th story and 595 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The West Senior Building, at the southeast corner of Yucca Street and Ivar Avenue, would be 13 stories and reach a height of 169 feet at the top of the 13th story and 209 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The East Site would be developed with the East Office Building containing 386,347 square feet of office uses. The building would be 17 stories and reach a height of 317 feet at the top of the 17th story and 367 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The commercial uses would be distributed between the East and West Sites, with a commercial space located at the ground floor on the corner of Yucca Street and Ivar Avenue and along Vine Street on the West Site, and along Argyle Avenue on the East Site. Alternative 8 includes a five-level subterranean parking garage with one level of enclosed at-grade parking on the West Site, and a seven-level subterranean parking garage on the East Site containing a total of 2,237 parking spaces.

Due to refinements to the architectural plans for Alternative 8, the Project, as approved, is a modified version of Alternative 8, which proposes up to 365,943 square feet of office uses, and up to 26,874 square feet of retail/restaurant space, whereas the Draft EIR analyzed up to 386,347 square feet of office uses, and up to 27,140 square feet of retail/restaurant space. As the unit mix and count and total square footage associated with the proposed development remain unchanged, the modified version of Alternative 8 is slightly reduced in scope for the purposes of CEQA analysis. Therefore, all statements, findings and conclusions related to Alternative 8 would also apply to the modified version of Alternative 8.

Alternative 8 is a mixed-use residential and commercial development located on an infill site as the Project Site is within an urban area that had been previously developed. The Project Site is located entirely within a transit priority area (TPA), as defined by the City and PRC Section 21099, and within a Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) designated High Quality Transit Area (HQTA) as it is located 600 feet north of the Metro Red (B) Line Hollywood/Vine Station within one-half mile (2,640 feet) of a major transit stop. An HQTA is defined as a generally walkable transit village or corridor that is within one-half mile of fixed guideway transit stop or a bus transit corridor where buses pick up passengers at a frequency of every 15-minutes or less during peak commute hours. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to focus housing and employment

[1] The Draft EIR, the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer Notice of Public Hearing, and the VTT Staff Report identified a 6.973:1 FAR, as it was assumed that the Applicant's requested sidewalk and alley mergers would be approved and, thus, were included as part of the lot area when calculating the total FAR. However, the Deputy Advisory Agency only partially approved the requested mergers which results in a slight change in the FAR calculation to 6.994:1. It should be noted that the square footage of the proposed uses remains the same.

growth within HQTAs.

V. NO IMPACT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITHOUT MITIGATION

A. ENVIRONMENTAL TOPICS DETERMINED TO BE NO IMPACT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT IN THE INITIAL STUDY.

The Department of City Planning prepared an Initial Study, which was included as Appendix A-2 of the Draft EIR. The Initial Study provided a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons that each topical area was or was not analyzed further in the Draft EIR and determined which impact area had no impact or a less-than-significant impact; these determinations are equally applicable to the alternatives considered in Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR. The City determined through the Initial Study and, where applicable, the Draft EIR, that as described for the Original Project in the Initial Study, all of which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, there is no substantial evidence that Alternative 8 could cause significant environmental effects in the following areas for the following reasons:

1. Agricultural and Forest Resources: The Project Site is currently developed with commercial buildings and ancillary surface parking. No agricultural uses or related operations or farmland designations are present on the Project Site or in the surrounding urbanized area.

2. Biological Resources: Due to the urbanized nature of the Project Site and surrounding area, the Project Site does not support habitat for candidate, sensitive, or special status species, beyond potential tree habitat for nesting birds. Similarly, the Project Site does not include any wildlife corridors, wetlands or conflict with regulation protecting biological resources, including the City's protected tree ordinance. Should nesting in the trees that would be removed during Alternative 8 construction be encountered on-site, Alternative 8 would comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to protect and avoid disturbance of the nesting birds.

3. Landslides: The Project Site is located in an urbanized area on relatively flat terrain and is not located in proximity to any mountains or steep slopes. As such, there is no potential for landslides to occur on or near the Project Site.

4. Septic Systems: The Project Site is located in an urbanized area where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. Alternative 8 would connect to existing infrastructure and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

5. Flooding: The Project Site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area; as such, Alternative 8 would not place structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

6. Habitat Conservation Plans: The Project Site is not located within or near a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or a sensitive ecological area and does not contain vegetation and natural habitat and, thus, does not support sensitive natural communities or violate habitat conservation plans.

7. Mineral Resources: The Project Site is not (1) classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits; (2) located near any oil fields and no oil extraction activities have historically occurred at the Project Site; or (3) designated as a mineral production area or extraction area.

8. Airstrips or Airport Proximity or Plans: There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project Site, and the Project Site is not located in a City-designated Airport Hazard Zone or an airport land use plan.

9. Population or Housing Displacement: There is no housing currently on the Project Site, and, therefore, Alternative 8 would not displace housing or people. Alternative 8 would not create a physical barrier or otherwise disrupt the physical arrangement of an existing community since it includes physical enhancements to pedestrian activities and, therefore, encourages connectivity to and through the Project Site.

10. Air Traffic Patterns: As the nearest airport is approximately 6.5 miles from the Project Site, Alternative 8 would not be within any flight paths, does not propose any construction that would require notification of the Federal Aviation Administration, and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including increases in traffic levels or changes in location that would result in substantial safety risks.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITHOUT MITIGATION BY THE EIR.

Impacts of the Original Project that were determined to be less than significant in the EIR and that require no mitigation are identified below. The City has reviewed the record and determined that for the reasons set forth in Section IV, *Impacts Analysis,* which apply equally to Alternative 8, and in Chapter V, *Alternatives*, pages V-272 to V-315, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections of the Draft EIR,* and Appendix B-1, *Plans, Renderings and Visual Drawings*; Appendix B-2, *Supplemental Resources Analysis*; Appendix B-3, *Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis*; Appendix B-4, *Supplemental Transportation Analysis*; Appendix C, *Tribal Correspondence*; Appendix D, *LADOT Correspondence*; and Appendix E, *Supplemental Project Construction Air Quality Analysis,* of the Final EIR, the impacts of Alternative 8 on each of the following environmental topical areas would be the same as, less than the less-than-significant impacts, or greater than but still less-than-significant without mitigation as the Original Project, and, therefore, no mitigation and no additional findings as to Alternative 8 are needed. The following information does not repeat the full discussions of environmental impacts contained in the EIR. The City ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR.

1. Aesthetics

(a) Impact Summary:

As described on page V-279 of Chapter V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 represents infill development proposed within a TPA, and, therefore, pursuant to PRC Section 21099(d)(1) and the City's Zoning Information (ZI) File No. 2452, aesthetic impacts on the environment are not considered significant. Evaluation of Alternative 8's physical impacts associated with aesthetics is not required in the EIR.

2. Air Quality (Other than Cumulative Increase of Criteria Pollutants and Construction Toxic Air Contaminants [TACs])

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Consistency or Conflict with Air Quality Management Plan:

As described on page V-282 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would include new development on the Project Site that would generate new criteria pollutant emissions. However, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would be consistent with the goals of SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and growth projections in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), since the growth would occur in a HQTA and a TPA. As with the Original Project, Alternative 8 would be consistent with the AQMP in its incorporation of appropriate control strategies for emissions reduction during construction and operation. In addition, Alternative 8 would also be consistent with applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the Air Quality Element of the General Plan that support and encourage pedestrian activity in the Hollywood area and land uses that contribute to a land use pattern addressing housing needs while reducing vehicle trips and air pollutant emissions within a TPA. For all of these reasons, impacts under Alternative 8 with respect to consistency with air quality management plans would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Cumulative Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Other than Nitrogen Oxide):

As described on page V-283 of the Draft EIR, construction and operational emissions of Alternative 8 would not exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for attainment, maintenance, or unclassifiable criteria air pollutants of ozone precursors of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). With respect to the State-identified criteria pollutants (i.e., sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, visibility reducing particles, and vinyl chloride), Alternative 8 would either not emit them (i.e., hydrogen sulfide and vinyl chloride) or they were accounted for as part of the pollutants estimated in the Draft EIR analysis (i.e., sulfates and visibility reducing particles). Therefore, Alternative 8 impacts related to criteria pollutant emissions (with the exception of NO_X) would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations:

a. Localized Emissions:

As described on pages V-283 through V-284 of the Draft EIR and page 3-49 of the Final EIR, maximum localized construction emissions for sensitive receptors would be below the localized screening thresholds for NO_X, CO, PM10, and PM2.5, and, therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant without mitigation under Alternative 8 and similar to the Original Project. However, although Alternative 8 would have a similar scale of construction and overall building massing when compared to the Original Project, natural gas usage, which is an indicator of localized emissions, would be approximately 10 percent higher compared to the Original Project. As such, Alternative 8's impacts related to localized emissions would be less than significant without mitigation but greater than the Original Project as the increase would not cause Alternative 8 to exceed thresholds of significance.

b. Carbon Monoxide:

As described on page V-284 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-4 of the Final EIR, vehicle trips would be higher under Alternative 8 than under the Original Project. However, total traffic volumes would likely have to more than double to cause or contribute to a CO hotspot impact. As with the Original Project, Alternative 8 would not cause traffic volumes to double at the maximum impacted

intersection of Vine Street and Sunset Boulevard. Thus, Alternative 8 would not cause or contribute considerably to the formation of CO hotspots, and impacts would be less than significant without mitigation. However, because Alternative 8 would have a greater increase in daily vehicle trips, impacts would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant as the increase would not double the traffic volumes.

c. Operation TACs:

As described on pages V-284 through V-285 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 operation would only result in minimal TAC emissions since Alternative 8 uses are not those types of uses associated with significant TAC emissions (such as truck stops and warehouse distribution centers). Commercial users would be required to comply with applicable regulations, such as SCAQMD rules for restaurant operations and with respect to consumer products. However, with its office component, there would be more delivery trucks to the Project Site under Alternative 8 than under the Original Project. Nonetheless, toxic or carcinogenic air pollutants are not expected to occur in any substantial amounts in conjunction with operation of the proposed land uses within the Project Site. Based on the uses expected on the Project Site, as with the Original Project, potential long-term operational impacts associated with the release of TACs under Alternative 8 would be minimal, regulated, and controlled, and would not be expected to exceed the applicable SCAQMD numerical significance thresholds. Therefore, operation of Alternative 8 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations, and operational impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iv) Other Emissions Affecting a Substantial Number of People:

As described on pages V-285 through V-286 of the Draft EIR, activities under Alternative 8 would potentially generate other emissions, such as those leading to odors. These may include the use of architectural coatings and solvents, as well as the combustion of diesel fuel in on-and off-road equipment. SCAQMD Rule 1113 would limit the amount of VOCs in architectural coatings and solvents. In addition, Alternative 8 would comply with the applicable provisions of the CARB Air Toxics Control Measure regarding idling limitations for diesel trucks. Through mandatory compliance with SCAQMD rules, construction activities and materials are not expected to result in emissions that would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Additionally, operation of Alternative 8 would not involve land uses typically associated with odor complaints, such as agricultural uses or food processing plants. Thus, Alternative 8 is not expected to discharge contaminants into the air in quantities that would cause a nuisance, injury, or annoyance to the public or property pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402. Therefore, odor and other emissions impacts under neither Alternative 8 construction nor operation would result in emissions of odors which would affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.B-74 through IV.B-77 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the City has determined, pursuant to SCAQMD guidance that the approach to address the cumulative air quality impacts, the Lead Agency would use the same significance thresholds for project-specific and cumulative impacts. Therefore, when project-specific impacts are determined to be significant, cumulative impacts are deemed to be significant as well. Accordingly, similar to the Original Project for all air quality impacts discussed above where Alternative 8 would have less-than-significant impacts without mitigation, Alternative 8's cumulative impacts would also be less than significant without mitigation. However,

for Alternative 8 air quality impacts that are potentially significant, mitigation measures are required to reduce the impact to less than significant at the Project-level and cumulative level.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features) described below in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section of these Findings, will allow Alternative 8 to achieve a LEED Gold Certification level or equivalent, which will reduce emissions from Alternative 8. However, while the residential component of Alternative 8 would achieve LEED Gold Certification, the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification.

(d) Conclusion:

As described on pages V-282 through V-286 and pages IV.B-46 through IV.B-58 and pages IV.B-64 through IV.B-74 of the Draft EIR, and summarized above, the City has determined that, with implementation of applicable Project Design Features and compliance with applicable regulations, Alternative 8 would have less-than-significant impacts without mitigation with regards to the following: construction, operation, and cumulative impacts related to conflicts with implementation of applicable air quality plans; exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, other than TACs during construction; and exposure to other emissions, such as those leading to odors. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and no additional findings are required.

3. Cultural Resources (Other than Off-Site Historical Resources)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Historical Resources

a. Direct Impacts Only Other than to the Hollywood Walk of Fame:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-51 through IV.C-53 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-286 of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix B-2, *Supplemental Historical Resources*, of the Final EIR, the on-site Capitol Records and Gogerty Buildings are historical resources. However, Alternative 8 does not involve the demolition, relocation, rehabilitation, alteration, or conversion of these buildings. All of their exterior character-defining features, as well as the Capitol Records Building's interior recording studios and reverberation chambers, would remain and continue to convey their historical significance.

As to the Capitol Records Building, as described on pages IV.C-51 through IV.C-52 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 or the Final EIR, while Alternative 8 may alter a portion of the existing surface parking lot located on the Capitol Records Building parcel immediately east of the Capitol Records Building at the building's rear, if it were to occur, Alternative 8 would reconfigure a small portion of the southern end of the parking lot, where it abuts the adjoining parking lot to the south, as landscape area. This alteration would not remove or destroy any portion of the Capitol Records Building, and the building's existing massing, form, and architectural features would remain intact and unchanged. Thus, Alternative 8 would not affect the integrity of location, design, materials, or workmanship of the Capitol Records Building. Because the Capitol Records Building would retain integrity of location, design,

materials, and workmanship, it would continue to reflect its architectural significance. Therefore, integrity of feeling would also remain unaffected because all the existing physical elements that characterize the Capitol Records Building would continue to convey the property's historic significance, and, as such, integrity of association would also remain unaffected by Alternative 8. As described on pages V-279 through V-280 and V-286 though V-287 of the Draft EIR, the only aspect of integrity with the potential for substantial adverse effects associated with Alternative 8 is setting. As described on pages IV.C-58 through IV.C-59 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, the protection of the historical significance of the Capitol Records Building is a stated objective of the Original Project. To meet that objective, Alternative 8 includes setbacks, grade-level open space, and tower massing that would maintain important public street views to the Capitol Records Building and would ensure that new construction would be appropriately distanced so that the mass and scale would not obscure the distinctive shape and architectural features of the Capitol Records Building from public view.

Similar to the Original Project, architecture has been purposely designed to respond to the architectural character of the Capitol Records Building, with the curving façades of the East and West Buildings facing the Capitol Records Building echoing the cylindrical form of the Capitol Records Building. As such, Alternative 8 has been designed to complement the architectural character of the Capitol Records Building. Therefore, as Alternative 8 would not affect the location, design, materials, or workmanship of the Capitol Records Building, the direct impacts of Alternative 8 would not materially impair the building such that it would no longer convey its historic significance. As such, Alternative 8's direct impacts to the Capitol Records Building would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

As to the Gogerty Building, as described for the Original Project on page IV.C-53 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-286, of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, alteration of the Gogerty Building's surroundings would not affect the integrity of location, design, materials, or workmanship of the Gogerty Building. The building would remain intact in its current location. Therefore, integrity of feeling would also remain unaffected because all the existing physical elements that characterize the Gogerty Building would continue to convey the property's historic significance. Since the Gogerty Building would retain integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, it would continue to reflect its architectural significance; therefore, integrity of association would also remain unaffected by Alternative 8. The only aspect of integrity with potential for substantial adverse effects associated with Alternative 8 is setting. Setting features important to the Gogerty Building, however, are limited to the configuration of street and sidewalk fronting the building's north- and west-facing façades, which would remain unchanged by Alternative 8. The larger setting, particularly parcels immediately north, south, east, and west have all been redeveloped since the original construction of the Gogerty Building and are not an important aspect of its surroundings. Therefore, the Gogerty Building would also retain integrity of setting, and its historic integrity would be retained. After construction of Alternative 8, the Gogerty Building would remain intact and in its original location, and all of the building's important character-defining features, including the two-story massing, curved street-facing façade, recessed window and door openings, stepped entry surrounds and decorative vertical piers, would remain unchanged and continue to convey its historic significance. Therefore, no direct impacts on the Gogerty Building would occur, and impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

As to the historical resources adjacent to the Project Site, (Pantages Theatre, Avalon Hollywood, and Art Deco Building at 6316-6324 Yucca Street), as described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-53 through IV.C-57 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 does not include the demolition, relocation,

rehabilitation, alteration, relocation, or conversion of these buildings. Therefore, they would remain unchanged and in their original location after implementation of Alternative 8. As such, their significance as historical resources would remain intact and their eligibility as a historical resource would be unaffected. Therefore, since no direct impacts on these adjacent historical resources would occur, Alternative 8 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.C-56 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, in addition to the historical resources located on and adjacent to the Project Site, there are many other historical resources located in the vicinity, including, but not limited to, a number of contributing and non-contributing buildings to the historic Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District (Hollywood Boulevard District), the Vista Del Mar/Carlos District, and the Hollywood North Multi-Family Residential District. Alternative 8 does not include the demolition, relocation, rehabilitation, alteration, or conversion of any of these individually eligible or contributing or non-contributing historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site. These historical resources are separated from the Project Site and would remain physically intact after implementation of Alternative 8. Therefore, as there would be no direct impacts on historical resources in the vicinity, Alternative 8 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of these historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and similar to the Original Project.

b. Indirect Impacts (Other than Off-Site Resources with the Exception of the Hollywood Walk of Fame):

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-57 through IV.C-63 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on pages V-286 through V-287 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, like the Original Project, Alternative 8 would not demolish or cause an adverse material change in the eligibility of any historical resources within the Project Site. As described in Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, while both the East Building and West Building would be taller than the Capitol Records Building, on the East Site, height and density would be reduced substantially under Alternative 8, in comparison with the Original Project. Alternative 8 would construct a single building that rises to 17 stories at its western end facing Vine Street, and steps down to 12 stories at its eastern end facing Argyle Avenue. In contrast, the Original Project included a 46-story tower and a second 11-story building on the East Site. Nonetheless, the juxtaposition of the taller buildings would alter the visual perception of the Capitol Records Building, which historically has been one of the taller and more prominent buildings on the Hollywood skyline until the late 1960s when several taller buildings were constructed on Sunset Boulevard. Similar to the Original Project, maintaining the historical significance of the Capitol Records Building is an important component of Alternative 8, which would have the added benefit of reduced height and density on the East Site immediately south of the 13-story Capitol Records Building. As with the Original Project, Alternative 8 includes setbacks, grade-level open space, and tower massing that would maintain important public street views to the Capitol Records Building and would ensure that new construction would be appropriately distanced so that the mass and scale would not obscure the distinctive shape and architectural features of the Capitol Records Building from public view.

Additionally, similar to the Original Project, the West and East Buildings under Alternative 8 would be asymmetrically centered on Vine Street, to highlight the Capitol Records Building prominently. Both tower portions of the East Building and West Building would be convex shaped in plan with

both buildings sited so that the tower mass tapers in toward Vine Street. On the East Site, the southwest corner of the proposed new tower building would be set back from Vine Street with the tower façade curving away from Vine Street and pulling away from the Capitol Records Building. A grade-level public plaza and paseo would create a “buffer zone” between the East Site new development and the Capitol Records Building so that Capitol Records Building’s visual prominence along Vine Street is maintained. The plaza and paseo would also provide new public opportunities for closer viewing of the south and east façades of the Capitol Records Building. Similarly, on the West Site, the West Tower would be set back 15 feet from Vine Street at the southeast corner and curve away from Vine Street along the eastern façade. In this way, important views from Vine Street and from US-101 would be maintained.

However, as with the Original Project, the maximum building heights under Alternative 8 (48 stories and 13 stories on the West Site and 17 stories on the East Site) would alter the larger setting of the area and, potentially, the historic setting of the Hollywood Boulevard District. As with the Original Project, the Hollywood Boulevard District is primarily characterized by low massing compared to larger, taller buildings under Alternative 8. Hollywood has been characterized by such juxtapositions since the late 1950s when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed and larger scale development ensued, altering the former low-scale setting of the area. While the introduction of additional tall buildings would continue this pattern of development and change to the historic setting, the historic significance of historical resources in the area would not be materially impaired. Alternative 8’s tallest West Building (48 stories) would be two stories taller than the Original Project’s tallest 46-story East Building; however, the East Office Building under Alternative 8 at 17 stories would be shorter than the 35-story West Building under the Original Project. Due to the varying building heights and masses, the extent of indirect impacts between Alternative 8 and the Original Project would not be substantially different. Therefore, indirect impacts associated with contrasting building heights and massing would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

As to the indirect impacts on the Hollywood Walk of Fame, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-63 through IV.C-64 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, the larger setting of the Hollywood Walk of Fame would remain largely unaffected as this setting would remain essentially unchanged with Alternative 8, with the exception of the removal of five existing curb cuts. Although elimination of these curb cuts would alter the current setting, these changes would improve and help restore continuity to the Hollywood Walk of Fame as a continuous element oriented towards pedestrians, by reducing vehicle conflicts and interference with pedestrian activity at these junctures. Therefore, the Hollywood Walk of Fame would retain its integrity of setting after construction of Alternative 8 and would continue to convey its historical significance as a decorative sidewalk oriented towards pedestrian circulation. While Alternative 8 would alter the immediate surroundings, this alteration would not materially impair the Hollywood Walk of Fame such that it would no longer convey its historic significance. Therefore, Alternative 8 would cause less-than-significant impacts related to setting without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

With respect to all other historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-79 through IV.C-80 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, these resources are physically separated from the Project Site by other buildings, streets, or distance. Nonetheless, the possibility exists for the majority of these historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site to have views of it. However, these possible views would not indirectly impact the historical resource’s integrity in terms of setting, feeling, and association, given that the views would not be from the primary façades and the distance between these historical resources and the Project Site. As described in Table IV.C-

5, *Summary of View Analysis for Identified Historical Resources in the Project Vicinity,* of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the indirect impacts related to setting these resources would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

In regard to the setting of Alternative 8 as it relates to the Hollywood Boulevard District, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-71 through IV.C-79 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would be located on surface parking areas and would not have a significant adverse impact on the historic setting that contributes to the eligibility of historical resources on the Project Site or in the immediate vicinity. In addition to the fact that there are buildings located between the Project Site and the Hollywood Boulevard District, the historic setting that contributes to the eligibility of the Hollywood Boulevard District is largely contained within and experienced from inside the Hollywood Boulevard District. Adding considerable height and mass north of the Hollywood Boulevard and outside of the Hollywood Boulevard District's boundaries would not adversely affect the setting of the Hollywood Boulevard District such that its listing in the National Register would be threatened. While Alternative 8 would introduce new high-rise buildings onto the parking areas on the Project Site, and these high-rise buildings would be partially visible in the background behind the Hollywood Boulevard District when viewed from the south from the Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street intersection north to the Capitol Records Building and the Project Site, they would not have a significant impact on the Hollywood Boulevard District. When viewed along the main north-south and east-west corridors along Vine Street and Yucca Street, respectively, the Capitol Records Building would remain visually prominent, and existing views of the primary façades of the Gogerty Building, the commercial buildings along Yucca Street, and the Art Deco storefronts on Yucca Street would remain. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not materially impair the historic setting of historical resources on the Project Site or in the Project vicinity.

For all the foregoing reasons, indirect impacts would be less than significant in regard to the historic setting without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Human Remains:

As described on page V-287 of the Draft EIR, although no human remains were identified during a survey of the Project Site and no known human remains have been recorded within the Project Site or a 0.5-mile radius, the overall sensitivity of the Project Site with respect to archaeological resources is moderate to high in light of the level of excavation proposed for Alternative 8 that would encounter previously unexcavated areas. In the event that human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, compliance with applicable regulatory mandates including PRC Section 5097.98 with regard to tribal human remains, ensure that Alternative 8's impacts on human remains would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impact:

For the reasons set forth for the Original Project, on pages IV.C-88 through IV. 92 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would have less-than-significant direct impacts on historical resources other than the Hollywood Walk of Fame, which is discussed under Cultural Resources below, and, therefore, it would not have a significant contribution to cumulative impacts related to direct impacts. Additionally, Alternative 8, would have a less-than-significant impacts related to indirect impacts other than to certain off-site buildings discussed under Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of these Findings. As a result, Alternative 8 cumulative

impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

For the reasons set for the Original Project on pages IV.C-92 through IV.C-93 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, impacts related to archaeological resources related to human remains are in most cases site-specific because they occur on a project level as a result of a project's ground disturbance activities during construction. Additionally, as with Alternative 8, the related projects would be required to comply with applicable laws regarding human remains. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not have a significant contribution to cumulative impacts on human remains and, as a result, impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with respect to cultural resources.

(d) Conclusion:

As described on pages V-286 through V-287 of the Draft EIR, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8 would require excavation for the subterranean parking would have less-than-significant direct impacts on historical resources and less-than-significant cumulative impacts. Therefore, the Project-specific and cumulative impacts with regard impacts to historical resources would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

As to human remains, although no known human remains are likely on the Project Site, in the event that any are uncovered during construction, Alternative 8 would be required to comply with applicable regulations. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and California Code of Regulations Section 15806.5(e), any discovery of unrecorded human remains would require the immediate halting of construction or ground-disturbing activities and notification of the County Coroner. Additionally, if the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, a most likely descendent would be contacted to assist in determining appropriate treatment for the remains. Since related projects would be required to comply with the same regulations and since the impact on archeological resources such as human remains generally is project site-specific, Alternative 8's contribution to impacts to human remains would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Project-specific and cumulative impacts with regard to human remains would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

4. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

(a) Impact Summary:

As described on page IV.E-43 of the Draft EIR, in the absence of any adopted quantitative threshold, the significance of a project's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is evaluated consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(2) by considering whether the project complies with applicable plans, policies, regulations and requirements adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. As explained in the Draft EIR, compliance with a GHG emissions reduction plan renders a less-than-significant impact. The analyses in the Draft EIR, demonstrate that Alternative 8 is consistent with the applicable GHG emission reduction plans and policies included within the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the City of L.A.'s Green New Deal (Sustainable City pLAn 2019), and Los Angeles Green Building Code. Therefore,

Alternative 8 would be consistent with the applicable GHG reduction plans and policies. The following is a summary of the analysis of Alternative 8's impacts related to GHG emissions:

(i) Project Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies:

The construction and operation of the Project Site under Alternative 8 would increase GHG emissions over existing conditions. The analysis of the Original Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies described in the Draft EIR is equally applicable to Alternative 8.

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.E-43 through IV.E-79 of the Draft EIR, and described in Table IV.E-3, *Consistency with Applicable Climate Change Scoping Plan Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies*, which contains a list of GHG-reducing strategies applicable to the Original Project, all of which would be equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would be in compliance and, therefore, consistent, with the strategies outlined in the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan to reduce GHG emissions. Specifically, Alternative 8 would implement Project Design Features and incorporate characteristics to reduce energy use, conserve water, reduce waste generation, and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) consistent with Statewide strategies and regulations.

Moreover, as described on pages V-273 and V-277 of the Draft EIR, for the proposed residential buildings on the West Site, Alternative 8 would incorporate LEED Gold Certification, while the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification. Examples of the LEED Platinum sustainability features include the following: (i) 40-percent reduction in water consumption; (ii) low-flow bathroom fixtures; (iii) storm water collection and reuse; (iv) improved daylighting on office floors to maximize the reach of natural light into the floor plates; (v) energy optimization through high-performance design; (vi) enhanced commissioning to ensure building systems are achieving their desired efficiency; (vii) self-sustaining green vegetative roofs to decrease storm water runoff, reduce heat island effect and increase biodiversity; (viii) use of regional materials to reduce the need to transport building materials; (ix) recycling room and building-wide trash and recycling; (x) bicycle program, including bicycle storage, bicycle repair and valet, bicycle share; (xi) use of recycled content, material reuse, and low-emitting materials; (xii) green power purchasing program; (xiii) on-site transit information; (xiv) enhanced refrigerant management to offset global warming potential; (xv) implementation of green cleaning throughout the Project; and (xvi) parkSmart certified parking garage, with electric charging stations, car share, rideshare, and green cleaning.

Although the listed items are the same as under the LEED Gold Certification (see Section O, *Energy Conservation and Infrastructure*, of the Draft EIR), LEED Platinum requires more points of compliance with options offered under the LEED Certification program and, therefore, is held to a higher conservation standard than under LEED Gold. The WELL Gold Certification program for Alternative 8 focuses on features that contribute to the health and well-being of occupants and visitors. The combination of the LEED Platinum and WELL Gold Certifications would create a building with exceptional sustainability benefits. Example WELL Gold Certification features include: (i) enhanced ventilation in all floors, with 30 percent more fresh air than comparable buildings; (ii) fresh air systems, with advanced air filtration with 95-percent efficiency; (iii) rigorous air and water quality testing providing high quality fresh air and high quality water; (iv) office common amenities that will provide healthy food and beverage options; (v) state-of-the-art fitness center that includes fitness equipment and programming; and (vi) showering facilities for those that bike to work and/or use the fitness center.

As a result, Alternative 8 would not conflict with applicable State Climate Change Scoping Plan

strategies and regulations to reduce GHG emissions.

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.E-43 through IV.E-79, of the Draft EIR, and described in Table IV.E-4, *Consistency with Applicable Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) Regional Transportation/Sustainable Communities (2016-2040 RTP/SCS) Actions and Strategies*, for the Original Project, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would be consistent with and support the goals and benefits of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS that are applicable to Alternative 8. As a result, Alternative 8 would be consistent with, and would not conflict with, applicable 2016-2040 RTP/SCS actions and strategies to reduce GHG emissions.

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.E-60 through IV.E-67 of the Draft EIR, and described in Table IV.E-5, *Comparison of Project Characteristics to Applicable City of Los Angeles Green New Deal Goals and Actions,* which contains a list of GHG emission-reducing strategies applicable to the Original Project, all of which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would be consistent with and would not conflict with the applicable goals and actions of these plans. In addition, due to the GHG emissions reducing features of Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would also result in GHG reductions beyond those specified by the City and would minimize its GHG emissions by incorporating energy efficient design features and VMT reduction characteristics. Therefore, as Alternative 8's GHG emissions would be generated in connection with a development located and designed to be consistent with the applicable City plan goals and actions for reducing GHG emissions, Alternative 8 would not conflict with these City plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.E-67 through IV.E-68 of the Draft EIR, and as memorialized in Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 and Project Design Feature WS-PDF-1, all of which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would comply with the Los Angeles Green Building Code to reduce GHG emissions by increasing energy-efficiency beyond requirements, reducing indoor and outdoor water demand, installing energy-efficient appliances and equipment, and complying with the 2016 California Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. As per Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1, Alternative 8 would be designed to optimize energy performance and reduce building energy cost by a minimum of 11.6 percent for new construction compared to the Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (2016), which would exceed the minimum building energy standards of the Los Angeles Green Building Code.

Alternative 8's GHG impacts would be less than significant due to its incorporation of green building features and its location within a HTQA and a TPA. Further, in consideration of the Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1 and AQ-MM-2 and Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 to reduce GHG emissions, Alternative 8 would continue be consistent with applicable strategies outlined in CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan, SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, Sustainable City pLAn, and the City's Green Building Code. were also considered as they would further contribute to the As such, similar to the Original Project, impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be less than significant under Alternative 8.

Alternative 8 would result in increased traffic and higher mobile emissions compared to the Original Project, and, therefore, maximum GHG operational emissions would be higher than the Original Project. However, Alternative 8 GHG emission impacts would be less than significant. As discussed under the transportation Findings below, Alternative 8 would result in a 4.5 household VMT per capita and a 5.0 employee VMT per capita. As such, Alternative 8 would not

exceed the household VMT threshold standard of 6.0 or the employee threshold standard of 7.6. Additionally, Alternative 8's VMT would result in lower per resident GHG emissions than the Original Project. Alternative 8's employee VMT per capita of 5.0 would be higher than its resident VMT per capita of 4.5; however, office uses associated with Alternative 8 typically generate fewer trips and VMT on weekend days when many offices are closed, which may help to limit the overall annual VMT increase of Alternative 8 as compared to the Original Project. As a result, Alternative 8 with its lower household per capita VMT compared to the Original Project and its low work VMT per employee compared to the threshold would meet the objectives of adopted policies and land use strategies to reduce GHG emissions through mixed-use development within the TPA to a higher extent than the Original Project, and, thus, impacts related to GHG reduction policies would be less than the Original Project.

(ii) GHG Emissions:

a. Construction:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.E-68 through IV.E-70 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, construction emissions are temporary in nature but are still analyzed in conjunction with operation emissions to determine GHG emission impacts. Pursuant to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) direction, due to the potential persistence of GHGs in the environment, impacts are based on annual emissions and, in accordance with SCAQMD methodology, construction-period impacts are not assessed independent of operational-period impacts.

b. Operation:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.E-70 through IV.E-77 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and as described on page V-290 of the Draft EIR and pages 3-49 through 3-50 of the Final EIR, and discussed above in Subsection V.B.2(a)(i), the combined emissions from operation and construction, while adding to GHG emissions in the area, would not be sufficient to impact GHG emissions standards. Alternative 8 would result in a 4.5 household VMT per capita and a 5.0 employee VMT per capita. As such, Alternative 8 would not exceed the household VMT threshold standard of 6.0 or the employee threshold standard of 7.5. With incorporation of Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features), combined with compliance with applicable air quality plans, Alternative 8 would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. As such, impacts would be less than significant. However, since Alternative 8 would result in increased traffic and higher mobile emissions, maximum GHG operational emissions would be higher than the Original Project but still less than significant.

(iii) Post Buildout Emissions:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.E-77 through IV.E-79 of the Draft EIR, all of which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would be consistent with Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-25, which establish a goal to reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.E-79 through IV.E-82 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, given Alternative 8's consistency with State,

SCAG, and City GHG emission reduction goals and objectives, Alternative 8 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. In the absence of adopted standards and established significance thresholds, and given this consistency, Alternative 8's contribution to GHG emissions and their effects on climate change would not be cumulatively considerable, and Alternative 8's cumulative contribution to global climate change would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1, set forth below, and the water conservation features in Project Design Feature WS-PDF-1, set forth under the Water Supply Section of these Findings, and incorporated into Alternative 8, further reduce the less-than-significant GHG emissions impacts of Alternative 8. However, while the residential component of Alternative 8 would achieve LEED Gold Certification, the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification.

GHG-PDF-1: Green Building Features. The Project will achieve the USGBC LEED Gold Certification and will be designed and operated to meet or exceed the applicable requirements of the State of California Green Building Standards Code and the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code. A summary of key green building and LEED measures are provided below:

- The Project will incorporate heat island reduction strategies for 50 percent of the Project Site hardscapes or provide 100 percent structured parking and incorporate heat island reduction strategies for the Project roof areas.
- The Project will promote alternatives to conventionally fueled automobiles by designating a minimum of 8 percent of on-site non-residential parking for carpool and/or alternative-fueled vehicles and shall pre-wire, or install conduit and panel capacity for a minimum of 30 percent of the Code-required parking spaces, with 10 percent of the Code-required spaces further improved with electric vehicle charging stations.
- The Project will optimize building energy performance with a 20 percent reduction from the LEED Version 4 (v4) baseline consistent with LEED requirements (equivalent to approximately 11.6 percent reduction from the 2016 Title 24 standards).
- The Project will reduce water consumption by 40 percent for indoor water and 100 percent for outdoor water from the LEED v4 usage baseline. The reductions would be achieved through potential strategies such as the installation of water efficient fixtures that exceed applicable standards and water efficient landscaping.

(d) Conclusion:

Alternative 8's consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans and policies plan as presented through Table IV.E-3, Table IV.E-4, and Table IV.E-5 of the Draft EIR for the Original Project, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, demonstrate that Alternative 8 would be consistent with regulations and policies and comply with or exceed the regulations and reduction actions/strategies outlined in the Climate Change Scoping Plan, 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the L.A.'s Green New Deal (Sustainable City pLAn 2019), and the Los Angeles Green Building Code. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative GHG emission impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Project-specific and cumulative impacts with regard to GHG emissions would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

5. Geology and Soils (Other than Paleontological Resources During Construction)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Fault Rupture:

As described on pages V-287 through V-288 of the Draft EIR, the Project Site is located within the designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for the Hollywood Fault; however, underlying soil horizons indicate the Project Site has not experienced fault movement for at least 120,000 years, and active faulting does not occur beneath the Project Site. Similar to the Original Project, excavation for Alternative 8's subterranean parking would remove the loose sand deposit and require suitable engineered stabilization in accordance with applicable City and California Building Code (CBC) building regulations.

As described on pages IV.D-15 through IV.D-23 and IV.D-32, and Appendix G, of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-3 of the Final EIR, the site-specific 2015 and 2019 Fault studies included a soil profile horizons evaluation and other investigations that concluded that there is no active faulting beneath the Project Site or extending toward the Project Site. The underlying soil horizons indicate the Project Site has not experienced fault movement for at least 120,000 years. Therefore, because the 2015 and 2019 Fault Studies concluded there is no active faulting beneath the Project Site, and because the 2018 geophysical survey to identify and locate faults in the area of and adjacent to the Project Site and reported in May of 2020, (the USGS-CGS *2018 U.S. Geological Survey–California Geological Survey, Fault-Imaging Surveys Across the Hollywood and Santa Monica Faults, Los Angeles County, California*) does not include a site-specific investigation which contradicts the 2015 and 2019 Fault Studies, development of Alternative 8 would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, and, as such, the impact relative to fault rupture would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Seismic ground shaking:

As described on pages IV.D-22 through IV.D-23, IV.D-33 through IV.D-34, and pages V-287 through V-288 of the Draft EIR, while there is no active faulting beneath the Project Site, the Project Site is located within the seismically active region of Southern California. This is a preexisting condition of the Project Site which would not be exacerbated by the Project; that is, neither construction nor operation activities would impact the existing condition. Moreover, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements (i.e., the City of Los Angeles Building Code and the CBC) and incorporation of the recommendations contained in the Final Geotechnical Report would reduce the potential for significant damage to structures resulting from strong seismic ground shaking and the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, to the maximum extent practical. Therefore, development of Alternative 8 would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking hazards, and, as such, the impact relative to ground shaking would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction:

As described on pages IV.D.23 through 24 and IV.D.34 through IV.D-35 of the Draft EIR, according to the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation, Appendix G of the Draft EIR, site-specific

liquefaction analysis indicated that the Project Site is mostly underlain by soils that are not considered susceptible to liquefaction or lateral spreading or to settlement or slope stability issues. Nonetheless, with compliance with applicable regulations and the recommendations contained in the Final Geotechnical Report related to seismic safety and design requirements for foundations, retaining walls/shoring and excavation, development of Alternative 8 would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure hazards, including liquefaction, and, as such, the impact relative to seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iv) Soil erosion or loss of topsoil:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.D-25 and IV.D-36 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-288 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 construction would result in ground surface disruption during excavation, grading, and trenching that would create the potential for erosion to occur. Excavation for parking structures associated with Alternative 8 would reach depths of 64 feet on the East Site and 60 feet on the West Site. While construction of Alternative 8 would increase soil exposure and risk of soil erosion, the potential for erosion would be reduced by the implementation of standard erosion control measures during site preparation and grading activities. Similar to the Original Project, compliance with all applicable regulatory measures, including SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), and implementation of standard erosion control measures during site preparation and grading activities, as discussed in Section IV.G, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Draft EIR, would ensure that the Project Site would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of top soil. Following construction, the Project Site would be covered completely by pavement, structures, and landscaping, which would not leave any exposed areas of bare soil susceptible to erosion. Thus, with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, impacts associated with substantial erosion or loss of topsoil as a result of Alternative 8 construction and operation of Alternative would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

. **(v) Lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse:**

As described on pages IV.D-37 through IV.D-38 and pages V-288 through V-289 of the Draft EIR, the Project Site is not susceptible to liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or impacts associated with landslides. However, with incorporation of the recommendation in the Final Geotechnical Report and compliance with all applicable regulations, impacts associated with unstable geologic units or soils on the Project Site as a result of the construction would be less than significant without mitigation measures. Once constructed, all surfaces would be covered by pavement, landscaping, or buildings. Therefore, Alternative 8's construction and operation would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(vi) Risk to life or property from expansive soils:

As described on pages IV.D-38 and V-289 of the Draft EIR, compliance with the Final Geotechnical Report recommendations addressing expansive soils and building code regulations pertinent to foundation stability would ensure that expansive soils are removed, as necessary. Therefore, development of Alternative 8 would not be located on expansive soils creating substantial risks to life or property. Once constructed, all surfaces would be covered by pavement, landscaping, or buildings. As such, Alternative 8's construction and operation impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(vii) Landslides and septic tanks.

As discussed above, in Section V.A of these Findings, the City determined through the Initial Study, Appendix A-2 of the Draft EIR, that the Original Project would have no impacts related to landslides or septic tanks because the Project Site is located in an urbanized area on relatively flat terrain and is not located in proximity to any mountains or steep slopes and where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place so that the development would connect to existing infrastructure and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Since Alternative 8 would be constructed on the same Project Site as the Original Project, Alternative 8 would have no impacts related to landslides and septic tanks and would be similar to the Original Project.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.D-41 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would have no impacts to paleontological resources during operation as there would be no continuous groundbreaking and excavation activities during operation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(viii) Paleontological Resources (During Operation):

As described for the Original Project on page IV.D-41 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would have no impacts to paleontological resources during operation as there would be no continuous groundbreaking and excavation activities during operation. Therefore, Alternative 8 operational impacts would be less than significant without mitigation, and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project, on pages IV.D-41 through IV.D-42 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, due to the site-specific nature of geological conditions, geology impacts are typically assessed on a project-by-project basis. However, as with Alternative 8, related projects would be required to comply with all applicable regulatory measures related to geological conditions, including the City's building code. As such, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and Alternative 8's cumulative impacts regarding geology and soils would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

For the reasons described for the Original Project on page IV.D-42 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, with regard to paleontological resources during operation, given that Alternative 8 operation would not involve disturbance of the subsurface of the Project, and the fact that related projects have uses which equally would not involve disturbance of the subsurface after construction, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and Alternative 8's cumulative impacts regarding paleontological resources would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to geology, soils or paleontology.

(d) Conclusion:

For the reasons summarized above, Project-level and cumulative impacts related to geology and

soils and paleontological resources during operation would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project, and no mitigation measures are required.

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Other than Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials and Use of Hazardous Materials within One-Quarter Mile of a School):

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Transportation, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials:

a. Construction:

As described on pages V-290 though V-291 of the Draft EIR, construction of Alternative 8 would include demolition of existing parking surfaces and structures other than the Capitol Records Complex. Construction equipment and materials, such as fuels, oils and lubricants, solvents and cleaners, adhesives, paints and thinners, degreasers, cement and concrete, and asphalt mixtures, which are all commonly used in construction, would be used, stored, and disposed of in consumer quantities and in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and manufacturers' instructions. As such, impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during demolition and construction of Alternative 8 would be less than significant without mitigation. Due to the similarity in the scale of Alternative 8 and the Original Project, impacts with respect to the routine transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project.

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.F-25 through IV.F-26 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would remove the single-story building constructed in 1978 located on the Project Site. This building could contain lead based paint, asbestos, or PCBs. However, compliance with regulatory measures regarding the removal and disposal of these materials would ensure that impacts associated with Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs), Lead-Based Pants (LBPs), and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described on page V-290 through V-291 of the Draft EIR, operation of Alternative 8 would involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of those used in residences, offices, and restaurants, including cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, and other materials used for landscaping. In addition, hazardous materials on the Project Site would continue to be acquired, handled, used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with all manufacturers' specifications and all applicable federal, State, and local requirements. As such, impacts related to the routine transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials during operation of Alternative would be less than significant without mitigation and similar to the Original Project.

In addition, the California Occupational Health and Safety Administration regulates worker exposure to airborne contaminants during operation, requiring administrative or engineering controls, where required, to meet exposure limits, and implementation of written health and safety programs, worker training, emergency response training, and medical surveillance. Finally, the Project Site is not located within a City-designated Methane Hazard Zone, and the Project Site radon concentrations do not exceed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's indoor action level for radon. Thus, vapor encroachment from methane or radon is not a significant concern at

the Project Site, and Alternative 8 operational impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project

(ii) Hazardous Materials Sites:

As described on page V-292 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 is not located on a Governmental Code Section 65962.5 site and, therefore, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. As such, no impact would occur similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Emergency Response Plans:

As described on pages V-292 through V-293 of the Draft EIR, construction of Alternative 8 would not interfere with emergency response plans. The roads adjacent to the Project Site are not designated as disaster routes. Moreover, construction of Alternative 8 would occur within the boundaries of the Project Site and within the rights-of way of adjacent streets. While temporary pedestrian or vehicular public right-of-way closures may be necessary during the construction phase for construction staging, equipment access, and pedestrian safety, temporary partial lane closures are not anticipated to significantly affect emergency vehicle circulation around the Project Site since emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for dealing with traffic and congestions, such as using their sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.L, *Transportation*, and pages V-292 through V-293 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would implement Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-2, which requires preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan. This Plan will include street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes, and a staging plan and will be submitted to the City for review and approval. Thus, construction of Alternative 8 would not substantially impede public access, create severe consequences for emergency response vehicles, substantially impede travel upon a public right-of-way, or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, construction impacts related to emergency response plans under Alternative 8 would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

As described on page V-293 of the Draft EIR, during operation, Alternative 8 would be required to establish, implement, and maintain an emergency response plan. The emergency response plan, which would be submitted to the LAFD for inspection and approval prior to implementation, would be inspected annually by the LAFD and include evacuation procedures. Compliance with existing fire code regulations would ensure that an adequate emergency response plan is established for Alternative 8. Overall impacts under Alternative 8 with respect to conflicts with or interfering with emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant without mitigation. However, because Alternative 8 would generate more daily vehicle trips and result in higher occupancy than the Original Project, impacts with regard to emergency response would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant.

(iv) Wildfire:

As described on page IV.F-31 on the Draft EIR, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area with no wildland present on the Project Site or surrounding area. In addition, the Project Site is not located within any designated fire hazard area. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not expose people or structures, directly or indirectly, to a significant risk involving wildland fire, and no impacts would occur and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.F-32 through IV.F-33 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 and the related projects are not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or environment because the potentially hazardous materials typically used in such developments are limited to relatively small volumes of commonplace materials. In addition, each of the related projects would be required to comply with its site-specific development standards and applicable hazardous materials handling and transporting regulations and manufacturer's specifications. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative significant hazardous materials impacts regarding (1) the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, (2) a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, or (3) emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, Alternative 8's hazards and hazardous materials cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.F-33 through IV.F-34 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, with regards to cumulative impacts on emergency response/evacuation plans, as with Alternative 8, the related projects would be required to prepare construction traffic management plans, which would include street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes, and a staging plan, which would be submitted to the City for review and approval to minimize traffic conflicts and maintain emergency access on area roadways. As with Alternative 8, related projects would be designed to comply with applicable Los Angeles Building Code and Fire Code requirements to establish, implement, and maintain on file an emergency response plan, which would be inspected annually by the LAFD. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts relative to significant hazards and hazardous materials would not be cumulatively considerable and, thus, cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No Project Design Features are proposed with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

(d) Conclusion:

For the reasons set forth above, with the exception of accidental release of hazardous materials during construction and use of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school, with compliance with applicable regulations, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project, and no mitigation measures are required.

7. Hydrology and Water Quality

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Water Quality Standards:

a. Construction:

As described on pages V-293 through V-294 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would include construction activities, including earth moving, maintenance/operation of construction equipment,

potential dewatering, and handling/storage/disposal of materials, that could contribute to pollutant loading in stormwater runoff from the construction site. Also, wind could convey exposed and stockpiled soils at the construction site into nearby storm drains during storm events, and on-site water activities for dust suppression purposes could contribute to pollutant loading in runoff from the construction site. Alternative 8, would excavate for subterranean garages to a maximum depth of 64 feet on the East Site and 60 feet on the West Site and reach deeper levels for foundation features. Groundwater depths range from less than 49.2 below ground surface (bgs) to approximately 98.3 feet bgs across the Project Site.

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-32 through IV-G-34 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8's construction would be required to comply with all relevant National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements related to the treatment and disposal of the dewatered water and would comply with the requirements of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Broad's (LARWQCB) Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. In addition, the Applicant would be required to comply with the City's grading permit regulations set forth in LAMC, Chapter IX, Article 1, which include standard erosion control measures and inspections to reduce sedimentation and erosion. Moreover, if construction should occur during the rainy season (i.e., October 1 to April 14), a wet weather erosion control plan (WWECP) would be prepared pursuant to the City's "Manual and Guideline for Temporary and Emergency Erosion Control." As discussed in Section IV.G, *Hydrology and Water Quality,* of the Draft EIR, best management practices (BMPs) for non-stormwater discharge management and materials management would be incorporated into Alternative 8's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would not result in discharges that would cause regulatory standards to be violated. Impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

Alternative 8 has the potential to encounter groundwater during construction. Dewatering, which is subject to LARWQCB's Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, may be required. The potential impact related to pollutant loading or groundwater quality that would cause exceedances of water quality standards would be reduced to less-than-significant levels for Alternative 8 through compliance with regulatory requirements, BMPs, and Building Code grading procedures. However, because the construction footprint and the depth of excavation under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project, the potential exposure of excavated soils to the elements and encroachment into the water table would be similar to the Original Project. As such, the potential impact with respect to violations of water quality standards during construction under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-34 through IV,G-36 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would be designed with BMPs to ensure proper treatment and disposal of stormwater discharges during operation. Alternative 8 would comply with the City's Low Impact Development Ordinance (LID) requirements, including stormwater and capture and use systems to reduce the amount of runoff that flows into the stormwater conveyance system and good housekeeping measures for removal of trash and maintenance of driveways and parking areas and proper storage and disposal of pesticides, all of which would prevent pollutants from entering the local groundwater supply by percolation into landscaped

areas with permeable surfaces. Additionally, on-site use of hazardous materials would be used, stored, and disposed in compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements. As described on page V-293 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would incorporate a drainage collection and conveyance system that would detain and treat/filter runoff in compliance with the City's LID Manual requirements to reduce the quantity of, and improve the quality of, rainfall runoff leaving the Project Site. With the implementation of such a system and BMPs, Alternative 8 would result in an improvement in the quality of stormwater runoff from the Project Site compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, Alternative 8 impacts related to water quality standards 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Decreases in Groundwater Supplies or Recharge:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-36 to IV.G-38 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on pages V-294 through V-295 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would not require groundwater withdrawal. However, excavation for the foundations and the subterranean garages during construction would have the potential to intercept the groundwater table and, as such, some groundwater removal through dewatering may be required during construction. Such dewatering would not result in the substantial removal of groundwater that would reduce the local groundwater table or continue post-construction. Additionally, subterranean parking would be below the redeveloped areas of the Project Site resulting in no material change to the amount of stormwater that would percolate into the groundwater table compared to existing conditions. Therefore, pre- and post-Alternative 8 infiltration volumes would be relatively equivalent under Alternative 8. Accordingly, there would not be a substantial reduction in groundwater recharge from current conditions, and Alternative 8 would not introduce activities that could impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Overall, Alternative 8 would not cause substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, the impact regarding groundwater recharge or depletion under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Alteration of Drainage Patterns:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-38 through IV.G-40 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-295 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would implement a SWPPP that includes specific BMPs and erosion control measures during construction and would comply with all applicable City grading requirements which would avoid flooding, substantially increasing surface water runoff into a water body, or permanently adversely change the movement of surface water. Additionally, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-40 through IV.G-47 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and V-293 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would improve conditions over existing conditions with implementation of the City's LID BMP requirements during operation. As a result, Alternative 8 construction and operation would not cause erosion of siltation on- or off-site, increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, impede or redirect flood flows, or exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Impacts regarding alteration of drainage patterns under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iv) Pollutant Release in Flood Hazard, Tsunami, or Seiche Zones:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-47 through IV.G-49 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and pages V-295 through V-296 of the Draft EIR, Alternative

8 is not located within a 100-year floodplain, within the range to be at risk for a tsunami nor close enough to the Hollywood Reservoir to be at risk for a release of pollutants due to inundation by a seiche. Moreover, Alternative 8's implementation of BMPs and compliance with applicable regulatory measures to minimize pollutants within the Project Site would ensure that even if there is a failure of the nearby Hollywood Reservoir, Alternative 8 would not result in the release of significant types or quantities of pollutants. Impacts regarding pollutant release during inundation would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(v) Water Quality Control Plans:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-49 through IV.G-50 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-296 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would incorporate into its design an on-site drainage system that would meet regulatory requirements for the protection of water resources, including installation of a recapture and reuse system. As such, Alternative 8 would improve water quality over existing conditions and impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.G-50 through IV.G-53 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, related projects would be subject to the same regulatory requirements to avoid significant impacts on drainage/flooding conditions and the quality of water reaching the public drainage system, and, therefore, cumulative hydrology (drainage) and surface water quality impacts would be less than significant. As such, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to hydrology and water quality.

(d) Conclusion:

With compliance with existing regulations, Project-level and cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project, and no mitigation measures are required.

8. Land Use and Planning

(a) Impact Summary:

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on page IV.H-17 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would not physically divide an established community, and, therefore, Alternative 8 would have a less than significant impact and would be similar to the Original Project.

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.H-17 through IV.H-28 and Appendix J, *Land Use Plans and Policies: Project Consistency Tables,* of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would be consistent with and would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, including SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, the City's Framework Element, Hollywood

Community Plan, Hollywood Redevelopment Plan, and LAMC, and impacts would be less than significant without mitigation. Like the Original Project, Alternative 8 would be subject to the revised entitlement requests set forth in Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR*, of the Final EIR.

(i) SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS:

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.H-19 through IV.H-20 of the Draft EIR, and shown in Table LU-1, *Consistency of the Project with Applicable Goals of the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016–2040 RTP/SCS)*, provided in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-297 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would not conflict with applicable goals of the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. The goals of the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS are focused on such priorities as promoting land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit use and active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking), reducing VMT, and encouraging energy efficiency. As described therein, Alternative 8 would be consistent with and not conflict with applicable goals of the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, which were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts with respect to consistency with the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element:

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on page IV.H-20 of the Draft EIR, and Table LU-2, *Comparison of the Project to Applicable Objectives and Policies of the Framework Element*, provided in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-297 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would not conflict with applicable objectives and policies of the Framework Element, which sets forth a Citywide comprehensive long-range growth strategy and establishes Citywide policies regarding land use, housing, urban form, neighborhood design, open space and conservation, economic development, transportation, infrastructure, and public services. Alternative 8 would site a mixed-use development within approximately 600 feet of the Metro Red (B) Line Hollywood/Vine Station, intensifying development, addressing housing and employment needs, and facilitating a reduction in per capita vehicle miles traveled and air pollution. Alternative 8's neighborhood-serving commercial and restaurant uses, and publicly accessible open space would also serve to activate the ground floor and provide much-needed publicly accessible open space. As such, Alternative 8 would not conflict with applicable objectives and policies of the Framework Element, which were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts with respect to the Framework Element would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Hollywood Community Plan:

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.H-20 through IV.H-21 of the Draft EIR and Table LU-3, *Comparison of the Project to Applicable Objectives and Policies of the Hollywood Community Plan*, provided in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-290 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would increase population density in close proximity to the various high quality transit options, as well as provide new restaurant/retail and residential uses, which would activate the street frontage in a manner consistent with accepted planning principles and standards as the retail and restaurant uses would be provided at ground level in a pedestrian-friendly setting, with a paseo and plazas adjacent to the Hollywood Walk of Fame and the Capitol Records Building. As such, Alternative 8 would not conflict with applicable policies of the Hollywood Community Plan, which were

adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts with respect to Hollywood Community Plan would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iv) Hollywood Redevelopment Plan:

For the reasons discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.H-21 through IV.H-23 of the Draft EIR, and Table LU-4, *Comparison of the Project to Applicable Objectives and Policies of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan*, provided in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, while the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan includes many sections which are not applicable to Alternative 8, certain goals and objectives of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan provide guidelines for development in the designated Hollywood Redevelopment area in which Alternative 8 is located. As presented in Table LU-4, Alternative 8 would be consistent with and not conflict with the applicable Hollywood Redevelopment Plan goals related to employment, land use and design, housing, sound residential neighborhoods, circulation, and open space/recreation. Through compliance with the requirements for the State Density Bonus Law and the City Density Bonus Law, and with appropriate findings, impacts with respect to the applicable goals and policies of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan, which were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, would be less than significant, and Alternative 8 would be consistent with and not conflict with the applicable goals set forth in the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan, and impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(v) City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC):

As discussed on pages IV.H-22 through IV.H-25 of the Draft EIR, the Project Site is zoned C4-2D-SN. The C4 Zone permits similar commercial and multiple family residential uses as described above for the C2 Zone. The “2” indicates Height District 2 and SN indicates Sign District. While the Height District does not impose a height limit, the “D” indicates a Development Limitation, which limits most of the Project Site to a 3:1 FAR and one assessor parcel to a 2:1 FAR. Alternative 8’s height, residential density, open space, and setbacks would be consistent with the applicable LAMC provisions. With respect to Alternative 8’s FAR and request for on-site and off-site alcohol consumption in conjunction with Alternative 8’s commercial uses, with approval of the requested discretionary actions, as updated in Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR*, of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would be consistent with and not conflict with the provisions of the LAMC governing land use and planning. Therefore, impacts with respect to provisions of the LAMC governing land use and planning would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(vi) Health Risk Assessment for Freeway Adjacent Projects:

As discussed on pages IV.H-25 through IV.H-27 of the Draft EIR, the Project Site at its closest point is located approximately 380 feet south from US-101, as shown in Figure IV.H-3 of the Draft EIR. Although the City does not require a health risk assessment (HRA), an HRA was prepared for the Original Project which is equally applicable to Alternative 8. As summarized on pages IV.H-25 through IV.H-27 of the Draft EIR and based on the HRA performed for the Original Project, with supporting calculations provided in Appendix E of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would provide an adequate health based separation distance from the freeway and non-cancer impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.H-28 through IV.H-29 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the Project Site and the related projects surrounding the Project Site are located within a TPA. While each related project will be evaluated for compliance with plans and zoning regulations, together they represent mixed-use, urban infill that would increase density in the area consistent with applicable land use plans, regulations and policies. Alternative 8 and the related projects would provide a range of much needed housing and high-quality neighborhood and visitor-serving commercial and entertainment uses concentrated with a Regional Center that would not conflict with the plans and goals to concentrate high-density, mixed-use development in TPAs. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to land use and planning policy, and its impacts would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to land use and planning.

(d) Conclusion:

With compliance with existing regulations, Alternative 8 would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to land use policy and planning. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to land use and planning transportation would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Project-level and cumulative impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

9. Noise (Operation)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Noise Standards (Operation):

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-46 through IV.I-52 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on pages V-298 to V-299 of the Draft EIR, and page 3-49 of the Final EIR, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would increase off-site traffic and generate on-site composite noise associated with fixed mechanical equipment, vehicle activity, and human outdoor activity. However, Alternative 8 would increase overall off-site vehicle trips per day from a maximum of 3,865 trips per day for the Original Project to 5,336 trips per day under Alternative 8; therefore, operational mobile source noise impacts would be greater under Alternative 8 than the Original Project. However, the differences in off-site mobile source noise level increases along the studied roadway segments between the Original Project and Alternative 8 would be negligible (i.e., below the 3-dBA CNEL that would be perceptible for all analyzed roadway segments). Therefore, this difference in mobile source noise would not be perceptible, and, as such, traffic noise impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

Similar to the Original Project, on-site noise levels would be generated by fixed mechanical equipment and outdoor spaces, including, but not limited to the Plaza, Lounge and Garden, the performance stage, the Level 2 amenity deck and the East Senior Building rooftop terrace. As shown on Table IV.I-12, *Operational Noise Levels,* of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, on-site noise would not generate noise that would exceed the ambient noise levels by more than 5 dBA, the threshold of significance. Specifically, the mechanical equipment, such

as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units and cooling towers, would be located on the rooftops of buildings located on both the West and East Sites. Due to their position on the rooftop, equipment noise levels would attenuate greatly before reaching sensitive receptors. Additionally, emergency generators would be located on the rooftops but within enclosures that would minimize noise levels and would be subject to Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-4 as set forth below. As shown in Table IV.I-12 for the Original Project, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the noise contribution from mechanical equipment would be minimal and far less than the ambient noise levels at the sensitive receptors. As for the outdoor spaces on the West and East Sites, noise levels would be below the ambient noise levels at all sensitive receptor locations due to noise attenuation over distance and, in some cases, the presence of intervening structures that interrupt the line-of-sight to receptors.

As described on page V-298 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would also include a paseo that could host events of a similar type and size as the Original Project. As such, noise generated from the paseo under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project. Similar to the Original Project, any outdoor performances under Alternative 8 would be subject to the noise restrictions in Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-3, which would limit noise levels from adversely affecting nearby noise sensitive receptors, and all applicable LAMC noise requirements and restrictions. Thus, in general, noise generated from the paseo at off-site noise sensitive locations under Alternative 8 would be largely similar to the Original Project with the outdoor performance sound restrictions in place. As such, noise generated from the paseo under Alternative 8 would be similar or less than the Original Project when considering fewer on-site residents would attend these events under Alternative 8. Overall, composite operational noise levels would be less than significant without mitigation would be required and would be similar to the Original Project
.
As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-51 through IV.I-52 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the parking facilities at both the West and East Sites would consist of completely enclosed below grade or at grade parking. Similarly, loading docks and trash delivery would be fully enclosed and, therefore, shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. As such, noise from these sources would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Groundborne Vibration and Human Annoyance (Operation):

As described on page V-300 of the Draft EIR, day-to-day operations under Alternative 8, as with the Original Project, would include typical commercial-grade stationary mechanical and electrical equipment, which would produce vibration at low levels that would not cause damage or annoyance impacts to on-site or off-site environment. As described for the Original Project on page IV.I-81 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, according to America Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE), pumps or compressor would generate groundborne vibration levels of 0.5 in/sec PPV at 1 foot. At 25 feet, this vibration level drops to approximately 0.004 in/sec PPV at 25 feet (approximately 60 VdB), which is below the threshold of 72 dBA at off-site sensitive uses and 75 VdB at off-site institutional uses. Mechanical equipment, including air handling units, condenser units, and exhaust fans, under Alternative 8, would be located on building rooftops. Therefore, groundborne vibration from the operation of such mechanical equipment under Alternative 8 would not impact any of the off-site sensitive receptors. As such, impacts with respect to operational noise from Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

Since mechanical equipment would not exceed impact thresholds at nearby sensitive receptors, the primary sources of transient vibration would include vehicle circulation within the proposed

parking areas, which would be confined to the immediate area and would not be expected to be perceptible off the Project Site. As described on page V-300, both above grade and below grade parking would be completely enclosed, In addition, as described on page IV.C-81 of the Draft EIR, according to the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), if the roadway is fairly smooth, the vibration from rubber-tired traffic is rarely perceptible, with the threshold of perception for humans at approximately 65 VdB. Alternative 8's parking areas would be paved with smooth and maintained surfaces, and vehicles would be traveling at very low speeds minimizing vibration levels. Parking area vibration would also be confined to the immediate area and would not be expected to be perceptible off the Project Site. Therefore, parking area vibration would not exceed the significance threshold of 72 dBA at off-site sensitive uses and 75 VdB at off-site institutional uses. Therefore, vibration impacts from Alternative 8 operation would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

(i) Operation Noise:

1) Noise (Off-Site):

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-90 through IV.I-118 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, cumulative off-site noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to operation of Alternative 8 and the related projects as traffic is the greatest source of operational noise in the Project area. Cumulative off-site traffic-generated noise impacts were assessed based on a comparison of the noise levels generated by the future cumulative traffic volumes to the noise levels generated by the existing base traffic volumes. The future cumulative analysis in the Draft EIR represented an estimate of the ambient background growth, related projects traffic, and the Original Project volumes. Therefore, the cumulative increase represented the increase in traffic volumes attributed to ambient background growth, related project traffic, and the Original Project traffic volumes over existing conditions. As stated on page V-298 of the Draft EIR, while Alternative 8 would increase traffic compared to the Original Project, the increase would result in negligible differences that would be below the 3-dBA CNEL that would be perceptible. As such, the analysis in the Draft EIR for the Original Project's off-site noise impacts is equally applicable to Alternative 8.

As shown in Table IV.I-20, *Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts – Future (2027) Project Cumulative Increment,* of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8 as stated above, combined with the related projects, Alternative 8 would not exceed thresholds of significance for all but two roadway segments. However, as shown in Table IV.I-14 for the Original Project, the Original Project's contribution to the Future (Year 2027) Plus Project increase noise levels on one roadway segment would be 0.0 dBA CNEL and on the other segment 0.2 dBA CNEL. Thus, the noise level increase would not exceed the 5-dBA significance threshold for the "conditionally acceptable" category for residential uses for either the Original Project or the somewhat higher Alternative 8. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to the cumulative noise levels would be greater than the Original Project but substantially below the 3-dBA change in ambient noise levels that would be perceptible.

As shown in Table IV.I-20 of the Draft EIR, no other roadway segments, aside from Franklin Avenue west of N. Highland Avenue as discussed above, would have a cumulative increase of more than 5 dBA for areas normally or conditionally acceptable or a cumulative increase of more than 3 dBA for areas normally unacceptable or clearly unacceptable. Although there would be a cumulative impact along one roadway segment with residential uses, as with the Original Project,

Alternative 8's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable under future year 2027 conditions. Accordingly, cumulative impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and greater than the Original Project but still less than significant since the noise emissions would be below applicable thresholds of significance.

2) Noise (On-Site):

For the reasons described for the Original Project on page IV.I-118 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, as is the case for the Original Project, implementation of Project Design Features NOI-PDF-3 and NOI-PDF-4, set forth below, and compliance with the LAMC-required provisions that limit stationary source noise from sources, such as mechanical equipment, would ensure that noise levels would be less than significant at the property line for each related project. In addition, on-site noise generated by each related project would be sufficiently distant from the Project Site that it would not result in an additive increase to Project-related noise levels. Further, noise from other on-site sources, including parking facilities, open space activity, emergency generator, and loading docks would be limited to areas in the immediate vicinity of each related project. Although each related project could potentially impact an adjacent sensitive use, that potential impact would be localized to that specific area and would not contribute to cumulative noise conditions at or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 8, when considered together with related projects, would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact, and no mitigation would be required; impacts would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Operation Groundborne Vibration and Human Annoyance:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on page IV.I-118 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, due to the rapid attenuation characteristics of groundborne vibration and distance from each of the related projects to the Project Site, there is no potential for cumulative operational impacts with respect to groundborne vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 8, when considered together with related projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact, and no mitigation would be required; impacts would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features: The City finds that Project Design Features NOI-PDF-3 (Outdoor Performance Sound Restrictions) and NOI-PDF-4 (Emergency Generators), set forth below, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the less-than-significant operation noise impacts.

NOI-PDF-3: Outdoor Performance Sound Restrictions. The Project will not require or allow operation of an amplified sound system in the outdoor plaza areas for performances, including the East Site Level 1 Performance Stage. Acoustic performances or ambient music speakers with prerecorded, low-level, background music on the East Site Level 1 Performance Stage will be limited to a sound level equivalent to 85 dBA measured at 25 feet from the performers. Compliance with this performance standard will be ensured through pre-performance noise tests/measurements for performances or ambient music speakers with potential to exceed the sound level, along with any necessary adjustments to the location and nature of proposed performances or ambient music speakers. Ambient music speakers for use on the Amenity Decks (Level 2) on both the East Site and the West Site will be downward or inward facing and used for background music only.

NOI-PDF-4: Emergency Generators. Emergency generators will be designed to meet the requirements of LAMC Chapter XI, Section 112.02. Section 112.02 of the LAMC requires that any mechanical system within any zone of the City not cause an increase in ambient noise levels on any other occupied property or if a condominium, apartment house, duplex, or attached business, within any adjoining unit to exceed the ambient noise level by more than 5 dBA.

(d) Conclusion:

For the reasons set forth above, with implementation of Project Design Features NOI-PDF-3 and NOI-PDF-4 and compliance with applicable noise regulations, Alternative 8's noise impacts related to operation noise, groundborne vibrations and human annoyance would be less than significant. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to operation noise and groundborne vibration and human annoyance would not be considerable. As such, Alternative 8's Project-level and operational noise cumulative impacts would be less than significant without mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

10. Population and Housing

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Construction:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.J-12 through IV.J-13 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, construction of Alternative 8 would not generate new population as construction is temporary and the nature of construction employment is such that workers move from construction site to construction site and, therefore, are no likely to relocate as a result of construction of Alternative 8. Therefore, construction of Alternative 8 would not induce substantial increase in population either directly or indirectly. Impacts regarding induced growth would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Operation:

As described on pages V-300 through V-301, Alternative 8 would generate a population increase of 2,186 new residents, which would represent approximately 0.90 percent of SCAG's 2018-2027 population growth projection of 241,442 and approximately 0.34 percent of SCAG's 2018-2040 population growth projection of 635,275. Alternative 8's 1,849 new employees would represent approximately 1.26 percent of SCAG's 2018-2027 employment growth projection of 146,255 and approximately 0.58 percent of SCAG's 2019-2040 employment growth projection of 320,375. As such, Alternative 8 would not exceed SCAG's growth projections, would help the City meet its housing obligation under SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation, and would provide the type of transit oriented development encouraged in the General Plan and SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS policies. No existing residences would be displaced. On a local level, Alternative 8's contribution to population growth constitutes an infill pattern in a TPA that is encouraged by the City's plans and policies while Alternative 8's contribution to housing where none currently exists is in compliance with the City's goal to establish new multi-family housing in proximity to local transit. Alternative 8's employment generation would be consistent with regional and local goals to balance housing and jobs and thereby reduce VMT and GHG emissions. As such, Alternative 8 would result in less-than-significant population and housing impacts.

Although Alternative 8 would not implement the objectives of SCAG's RHNA allocation or concentrate transit-oriented development to the same extent as under the Original Project,

because SCAG population and housing projections would not be exceeded, impacts with respect to substantial unplanned population growth under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.J-21 through IV.J-24 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 combined with the related projects would not induce substantial population growth or exceed regional and local projections for population, housing, or employment. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution related to population and housing impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to population, housing and employment.

(d) Conclusion:

Growth under Alternative 8 and the related projects reflects the regional and local policies for higher density development in proximity to public transit and is within the projections for the City. The increase in housing stock in the City provides opportunities for residents to locate within a TPA, thereby reducing the demand for development in lower-density areas and achieving greater efficiency in the provision and use of services and infrastructure. The additional employment opportunities would increase the number of jobs adjacent to residential areas and public transit, which would support City and regional policies intended to reduce VMT. The increase in employment also furthers SCAG and City goals of providing employment opportunities within an easily accessible employment center. Therefore, project-level and cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

11. Public Services

Section 35 of Article XIII of the California Constitution at subdivision (a)(2), which was adopted by the voters in 1993 under Proposition 172, provides: "The protection of public safety is the first responsibility of local government and local officials have an obligation to give priority to the provision of adequate public safety services." Proposition 172 directed the proceeds of a 0.50-percent sales tax to be expended exclusively on local public safety services. California Government Code Sections 30051-30056 provide rules to implement Proposition 172. Public safety services include fire protection. Section 30056 mandates that cities are not allowed to spend less of their own financial resources on their combined public safety services in any given year compared to the 1992-93 fiscal year. Therefore, an agency is required to use Proposition 172 to supplement its local funds used on fire protection services, as well as other public safety services. In *City of Hayward v. Board of Trustee of California State University* (2015) 242 Cal. App. 4th 833, the court found that Section 35 of Article XIII of the California Constitution requires local agencies to provide public safety services, including fire protection and police services, and that it is reasonable to conclude that the city will comply with that provision to ensure that public safety services are provided. The following is a summary of the analysis of Alternative 8's impacts related to public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreation, and libraries:

(a) Fire Protection

(i) Impact Summary:

a. Construction:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.K-14 through IV.K-15 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would comply with all applicable regulations, including the City's Fire and Building Codes. As described on pages V-301 through V-302 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would incorporate Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-2 to provide a Construction Traffic Management Plan to improve vehicular access around the construction site and Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-3, which would identify and enforce parking location requirements for construction workers. The implementation of these Project Design Features would facilitate emergency access. As such, similar to the Original Project, construction under Alternative 8 would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to emergency response times and emergency access.

Additionally, as described for the Original Project on page IV.K-15 of the Draft EIR, construction impacts are temporary in nature and do not cause lasting effects and partial lane closures, if determined necessary, would not significantly affect emergency vehicles, which have various methods to clear traffic paths. Accordingly, Alternative 8 construction would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.K-16 through IV.K-19 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-302 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would comply with City and State regulations related to fire safety including, but not limited to, applicable OSHA, Building Code, Fire Code, other LAMC and LAFD requirements and recommendations, which would reduce demand on LAFD facilities and equipment without creating the need for new or expanded fire facilities. In addition, the Project Site is located within a highly urbanized area accessed via an established street system and within the LAFD's maximum prescribed response distances. Due to urban proximity and facilitated travel for high priority emergency calls, impacts on emergency response would not be significant. Alternative 8, as with the Original Project, would also be consistent with LAMC fire flow requirements. As such, Alternative 8 would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than significant. However, because Alternative 8 would increase Project Site occupancy (employees plus residents) compared to the Original Project, impacts related to fire protection services under Alternative 8 would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant as the increase would not be sufficient to require the construction of expanded or new fire facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts.

(ii) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.K-19 through IV.K-27 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, similar to Alternative 8, the related projects

would be required to comply with State and local regulations related to fire safety. Moreover, the Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-2 would require that Alternative 8 and the City coordinate with any related projects whose construction may overlap with Alternative 8's construction to ensure that emergency access is not significantly impacted. Accordingly, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative fire services impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and, therefore, Alternative 8's cumulative impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Project Design Features:

While no specific Project Design Features are required for fire services, the City finds that Project Design Features TRAF-PDF-2 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) and TRAF-PDF-3 (Construction Worker Parking Plan) set forth below in the Transportation Section of these Findings, will further reduce the less-than-significant impacts on fire services under Alternative 8. No additional fire protection-related Project Design Features are applicable to Alternative 8.

(iv) Conclusion:

Alternative 8 would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, Alternative 8 impacts on fire protection would be less than significant. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to fire services would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, Project-level and cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(c) Police Protection

(i) Impact Summary:

a. Construction:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.K.2-14 through IV.K.2-16 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on pages V-302 through V-304 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would implement various safety and control features during construction that would reduce the potential for incidents that would require police responses. Alternative 8's construction phase, although of shorter duration than that of the Original Project, could increase potential demand for LAPD services related to theft or vandalism and increased worker activity, as well as construction traffic that could affect emergency response times. To reduce LAPD demand during construction, Alternative 8 would implement a number of security measures, such as Project Design Feature POL-PDF-1 to limit access to construction areas, including private security construction fencing, and locked entry; Project Design FeatureTRAF-PDF-2, a Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available at the Project Site during construction activities; and Project Design FeatureTRAF-PDF-3, a Construction Worker Parking Plan to identify and enforce parking location requirements for construction workers. Additionally, most construction staging for Alternative 8 would occur on the Project Site, and construction workers would generally start and end their workdays in advance of peak traffic hours, thus, reducing their potential effect on traffic and emergency response times. Furthermore, construction-related traffic generated by Alternative 8, as with the Original Project, would not significantly impact LAPD response times within the Project Site vicinity as LAPD vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic during construction.

Additionally, construction impacts are temporary in nature and do not cause lasting effects, and partial lane closures, if determined necessary, would not significantly affect emergency response vehicles, which have various methods to clear traffic paths. Accordingly, Alternative 8 construction would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described on pages V-303 through V-304 of the Draft EIR, according to LAPD service population generation factors, assuming that 85 percent of Alternative 8's 903 residential units, or768 units, were one- and two-bedroom units, which would generate an estimated service population gain of 2,304 residents, and 15 percent of Alternative 8's 903 units (136 units) were three-bedroom units or more, which would generate a gain of 544 residents, Alternative 8 would result in a gain of 2,848 in residential service population. Alternative 8 would generate 1,849 employees. In total, Alternative 8 would increase the LAPD service population by 4,697. As discussed in Section IV.K.2, *Police Protection*, of the Draft EIR, LAPD does not provide crime rates for non-resident population. However, the Draft EIR analysis of impacts to police services to be conservative, evaluated the residential and nonresidential populations as requiring police protection services and determined that the potential crime rate, one factor used by LAPD to determine need, would be higher than for the Original Project. To help off-set the increased service population, Alternative 8 would incorporate Project Design Feature POL-PDF-2 to provide a 24-hour/seven-day security program to ensure the safety of its employees and site visitors, which would reduce demand on police services during operation. As a result, Alternative 8 would not increase police services demand to the extent that the addition of a new police facility, or the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of an existing facility, would be required to maintain service. As such, Alternative 8 would not result in potential physical impacts associated with construction of police facilities and impacts with respect to police protection would be less than significant. However, as crime rates and Project Site occupancy would be greater, impacts to police protection services under Alternative 8 would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant.

(ii) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.K.2-21 through IV.K.2-25 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, as with Alternative 8, the related projects would be required to implement a construction traffic management plan to ensure that adequate emergency access to the property and neighboring properties is maintained and would be required to implement similar security measures as under Alternative 8 to limit access to construction areas, such as hiring private security, installing construction fencing, and including security lighting. With regards to operational traffic impact of emergency vehicle response times, as with Alternative 8, related projects are expected to include design features and may include mitigation measures that would serve to reduce traffic impacts. Additionally, similar to Alternative 8, the related projects would contribute revenue to the City's General Fund, which could fund LAPD expenditures as necessary to offset the cumulative incremental impact on police services. With regard to cumulative impacts on police protection, as explained Section IV.K.2.3.b.(1) of the Draft EIR, the obligation to provide adequate police protection services is the responsibility of the City. Accordingly, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative police protection impacts would not

be cumulatively considerable, and, therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Feature POL-PDF-1 (Security Features During Construction) and Project Design Feature POL-PDF-2 (Security Features During Operation), set forth below, and Project Design FeatureTRAF-PDF-2 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) set forth below under Transportation Section of these Findings, and incorporated into Alternative 8, will further reduce the less-than-significant impacts on police services under Alternative 8.

POL-PDF-1: Security Features During Construction. Private security personnel will monitor vehicle and pedestrian access to the construction areas and patrol the Project Site, construction fencing with gated and locked entry will be installed around the perimeter of the construction site, and security lighting will be provided in and around the construction site.

POL-PDF-2: **Security Features During Operation**. During operation, the Project will incorporate a 24 hour/seven-day security program to ensure the safety of its residents, employees, patrons, and site visitors. The Project's security will include, but not be limited to, the following design features:

a. Installing and utilizing a 24-hour security camera network throughout the underground and above-ground parking garages, the elevators, the common and amenity spaces, the lobby areas, and the rooftop and ground level outdoor open spaces. All security camera footage will be maintained for at least 30 days, and such footage will be provided to the LAPD, as needed.
b. Full-time security personnel. Duties of the security personnel will include, but would not be limited to, assisting residents and visitors with Project Site access, monitoring entrances and exits of buildings, and managing and monitoring fire/life/safety systems.
c. Staff training and building access/design to assist in crime prevention efforts and to reduce the demand for police protection services.
d. Controlled access to all housing units, hotel areas, and residential common open space areas through the use of key cards, site security and/or other means, as appropriate.
e. Maintenance of unrestricted access to commercial/restaurant uses, publicly accessible open space areas, and the paseo during business hours, with public access (except for authorized persons) prohibited after the businesses have closed via the use of gates, signage security patrols and/or other means determined appropriate.
f. Lighting of entryways, publicly accessible areas, and common building and open space areas associated with the housing units and hotel rooms for security purposes.
g. Regarding public events in the open space areas, following event completion and attendee dispersal, barricades to be placed on the stages, and regularly scheduled security patrols, as well as camera surveillance, to reduce the potential for undesirable activities within the publicly accessible open space.

(iv) Conclusion:

Alternative 8 would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts and, therefore, Project impacts on police protection would be less than significant. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to police services would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, Project-level and cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(d) Schools

(i) Impact Summary:

a. Construction:

As described for the Original Project on page IV.K.3-10 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, construction of Alternative 8 would require employees who are anticipated to be hired from a mobile regional construction work force that moves from project to project, and, given the temporary nature of these construction jobs, construction employees would not be expected to relocate residences (and, therefore, a student population) within this region or move from other regions. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would not result in a notable increase in the resident population or generate new students needing to attend local schools. Therefore, construction would not adversely affect the operation and enrollment capacities of nearby schools and would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts on schools would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described on page V-304 of the Draft EIR, based on the Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) student generation rates for residential, office, and commercial uses within their 2018 Developer Fee Justification Study, Alternative 8 would generate approximately 417 elementary school students, 116 middle school students, and 240 high school students totaling 773 students compared to approximately 441 students for the Original Project. The additional students generated by Alternative 8 could potentially exceed the number of seats available at local schools. However, pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the Project Applicant would be required to pay fees in accordance with SB 50. Payment of such fees is intended for the general purpose of addressing the construction of new school facilities, whether schools serving Alternative 8 are at capacity or not and, pursuant to Section 65995(h), payment of such fees is deemed to be full mitigation of a project's development impacts. As such, impacts to schools under Alternative 8 would be less than significant. However, because Alternative 8 would generate more school-age children than the Original Project, impacts on schools would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant.

(ii) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.K.3-15 through IV.K.3-19 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the impacts of cumulative development on local schools is likely to be overstated since, amongst other reasons, it assumes that none of the future residents or employees with families would already have students attending the schools that would serve the Project area. Additionally, all related projects would be required to pay developer fees under the provisions of the Government Code to fully address the impacts of new development on school facilities. Accordingly, Alternative 8 and related projects would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for schools. Therefore, Alternative 8's incremental contribution towards school impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to schools.

(iv) Conclusion:

Alternative 8 would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, and, therefore, impacts on school facilities would be less than significant. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to school facilities would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, Project-level and cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(e) Parks and Recreation

(i) Impact Summary:

a. Construction:

As explained for the Original Project on pages IV.K.4-25 through IV.K.4-26 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the distance of the nearest park for the Project Site (approximately 0.35 miles away) and the intervening development would avoid potential noise or conflict with construction activities. While a small number of construction workers may visit the park during or after a workday, these construction workers are temporary employees with high turnover associated with the various phases of construction, so such park use would be rare and short-term. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration would occur or be fully accelerated. As such, Alternative 8's impacts on parks and recreation would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described on pages V-304 through V-305 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would generate approximately 2,186 new residents that would utilize parks and recreation facilities compared to approximately 2,433 new residents under the Original Project. Alternative 8 would comply with LAMC Section 21.10.3, which requires a dwelling unit construction tax of $200 for each new residential unit for City acquisition of new park space. Furthermore, Alternative 8 would meet the requirements of LAMC Sections 12.21 and 17.12, and 21.10.3(a)(1) regarding the provision of useable open space. Although Alternative 8, as with the Original Project, would not meet the parkland provision goals set forth in the Park Recreation Plan, which recommends 2.0 acres each of neighborhood and community recreational sites and facilities per 1,000 residents and 6.0 acres of regional recreational sites and facilities per 1,000 residents, these are Citywide goals and are not intended to be requirements for individual development projects. Moreover, Alternative 8's provision of on-site recreational amenities and open space would reduce the use of area parks and recreational facilities by Alternative 8 residents, and payment of in-lieu park fees consistent with the LAMC requirements would further supplement any potential impacts on the regional or local park and recreational facilities. Thus, similar to the Original Project as described on pages IV.K.4-17 through IV.K.4-24 of the Draft EIR, operation of Alternative 8 would not exacerbate the existing shortfalls in parkland relative to City standards to the extent that new or physically altered park or recreational facilities would need to be constructed, the construction of which would cause

significant adverse physical environmental impacts. Thus, impacts with respect to parks and recreation would be less than significant under Alternative 8. However, since Alternative 8 would generate less population and a proportionate decrease in demand for park space than the Original Project, impacts would be less than the Original Project.

(ii) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.K.4-28 through IV.K.4-30 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, all related projects with residential uses would be required to comply with LAMC Sections 12.21 and 12.33, which require the provision of on-site open space and park facilities and/or payment of in-lieu fees to offset a project's impact to off-site park and recreational facilities. Therefore, with the provision of on-site open space and recreational facilities, as well as payment of applicable fees, Alternative 8 and related projects would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks. Accordingly, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to parks and recreation.

(iv) Conclusion:

Alternative 8 and the related projects would be required to comply with applicable LAMC requirements and payment of fees related to open space, parks and recreational facilities. Alternative 8 would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated or new facilities we need to constructed the construction of, which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to parks and recreation facilities would not be cumulatively considerable, and Project-level and cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(f) Libraries

(i) Impact Summary:

a. Construction:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.K.5-9 through IV.K.5-10 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, due to the temporary and short-term nature of the construction projects and jobs, there would be no notable increase in library usage at the libraries serving the Project Site. As such, construction of Alternative 8 would not exceed the capacity of local libraries to adequately serve the existing residential population based on target service populations or as defined by the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL), which would

result in the need for new or altered facilities, or substantially increase the demand for library services for which current demand exceeds the ability of the facility to adequately serve the population. Impacts on library facilities during construction would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operational:

As described on page V-305 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8's residential population would increase demand for library services. The LAPL has indicated they have no plans for a new branch library in the Project Site vicinity. There are also three libraries within one mile of the Project Site which could serve Alternative 8. Furthermore, in consideration of Alternative 8's ability to provide internet service, generate revenue to the City's General Fund, and LAPL's ongoing expansion and availability of online resources, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8's increase in demand to any one local library would not be expected to result in a substantial increase in demand that would necessitate new or physically altered facilities. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not create the need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which would result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or objectives and impacts to libraries under Alternative 8 would be less than significant. However, because Alternative 8 would generate less residential population, impacts relative to libraries would be less than the Original Project.

(ii) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.K.5-14 through IV.K.5-18 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, based on the related projects' ability to provide internet service, generate revenue to the City's General Fund, and LAPL's ongoing expansion and availability of online resources, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts on libraries would not be cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts on libraries would be less than significant and less than the Original Project.

(iii) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to tribal resources.

(iv) Conclusion:

Alternative 8 would not create the need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which would result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or objectives. Additionally, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to libraries would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, Project-level and cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

12. Transportation

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Conflict with Programs, Plans, Ordinances, or Policies Addressing the Circulation System, Transit, Roadways, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities:

As described on page V-305 of the Draft EIR and Appendix B-4, *Supplemental Transportation*

Analysis for the Hollywood Center Project Alternative 8, of the Final EIR, Alternative 8, as with the original Project, would support multimodal transportation options and a reduction in VMT, as well as promote transportation-related safety in the Project area. For the reasons described for the Original Project in Table IV.L-3, *Consistency of the Project with Applicable Policies and Programs of Mobility Plan 2035*, of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Attachment A to Appendix B-4 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would not conflict with any of the applicable policies, issues, or programs of the Mobility Plan 2035. Similarly, for the reasons described for the Project on pages IV.l-38 through IV.L-42 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and as stated on page V-305 of the Draft EIR and Attachment A to Appendix B-4 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would not conflict with the applicable provisions of Hollywood Community Plan, the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan's Objective 6 to coordinate land use densities and to promote the use of transit, the LADOT Manual of Policies and Procedures, the Vision Zero Plan, the LAMC, the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles, the Citywide Design Guidelines, the Mobility Hubs Reader's Guide, or the Walkability Checklist. Thus, Alternative 8 would not conflict with policies of Mobility Plan 2035 and the City of Los Angeles Complete Streets Design Guide, adopted to protect the environment and reduce VMT. Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-1 under Alternative 8 would implement a TDM Program to address parking, transit, commute trip reductions, shared mobility, bicycle use, and pedestrian access, and TDM management strategies. TDM measures to promote bicycle use include bicycle parking spaces, bike lockers, and showers for residents, employees, and visitors. As described on pages 2-36 through 2-44 of the Final EIR and Appendix B-4 of the Final EIR, while the Original Project did not have any work VMT impact because the square footage of the retail/restaurant space was below the threshold of significance for analysis, and Alternative 8 contains an analysis of the work VMT, the conclusion that Alternative 8 would be consistent with the applicable plans remains the same since Alternative 8's low work VMT would be below the threshold of significance, as described in Appendix B-4.

Additionally, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8 would increase population density in close proximity to the Metro Red (B) Line Hollywood/Vine Station, other regional Metro bus lines, and the LADOT DASH lines. Alternative 8 would also provide for road and pedestrian improvements, including a paseo linking the West Site and East Site and new median improvements along Vine Street, which would enhance pedestrian safety. A signalized mid-block crosswalk is proposed across Argyle Avenue to help facilitate local pedestrian circulation and access by maintaining a path of east-west travel with the existing mid-block crosswalks across Ivar Avenue and Vine Street.

For all these reasons, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would not conflict with programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and, as such, impacts relative to relevant plans and programs would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b):

As described on page V-307 of the Draft EIR and page 3-51 and Appendix B-4 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would have a household VMT of 4.5 per capita and a work VMT of 5.0 per employee compared to the Original Project's household per capita VMT of 4.8 and its exemption from retail VMT analysis. Alternative 8's rates are all below the thresholds of significance proposed for the City's Central Area Planning Commission household VMT of 6.0 and work VMT of 7.6 per employee. Thus, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than significant. However, as Alternative 8's comparative household and work VMT per capita rates are lower than the Original Project's, Alternative 8 impacts with respect to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b) would be less

than the Original Project as to household VMT but greater than the Original Project as to work VMT although still less than significant.

(iii) Design Hazards:

As described on page V-307 of the Draft EIR and Appendix B-4, *Supplemental Transportation Analysis for the Hollywood Center Project Alternative 8,* of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would reduce existing curb cuts from 12 to five, provide new sidewalks around the perimeter of the Project Site, and eliminate driveway crossings on Vine Street. Improvements under Alternative 8 would include a signalized mid-block crosswalk provided across Argyle Avenue to help facilitate local pedestrian circulation and access. Alternative 8 would provide a paseo through the Project Site between Argyle Avenue and Ivar Avenue. Access to the Capitol Records Complex (including both the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building) would continue to be provided via the existing driveway on Yucca Street. Alternative 8 would not require the removal or relocation of existing passenger transit stops and would be designed and configured to avoid potential conflicts with transit services and pedestrian traffic. Thus, Alternative 8 would not substantially increase hazards, vehicle/pedestrian conflict, or preclude City action to fulfill or implement projects associated with these networks. Alternative 8 would contribute to overall walkability through enhancements to the Project Site, streetscape, and crossing of Argyle Avenue, and would not substantially increase geometric hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iv) Emergency Access:

As described on pages V-307 though V-308 of the Draft EIR and Appendix B-4, *Supplemental Transportation Analysis for the Hollywood Center Project Alternative 8,* of the Final EIR, the Project Site is located in an established urban area served by the surrounding roadway network, and multiple routes exist in the area for emergency vehicles and evacuation. Drivers of emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. No policy or procedural changes to an existing risk management plan, emergency response plan, or evacuation plan would be required due to implementation under Alternative 8. All driveways and the internal circulation would be subject to LAFD review to confirm adequate access is provided internally for on-site emergency vehicle access. With review and approval of Project Site access and circulation plans by the LAFD, Alternative 8 would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Additionally, as described in Chapter IV.F, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials,* of the Draft EIR, the streets adjacent to the Project Site are not designated disaster routes. Moreover, Project Design Features TRAF-PDF-2 (Construction Management Plan) and TRAF-PDF-3 (Construction Worker Parking Plan) would ensure that emergency access is not impeded during construction. For all the foregoing reasons, impacts regarding emergency access under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.L-47 through IV.L-49 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, neither Alternative 8 nor the nearby related projects would conflict with applicable programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system nor would they conflict with adjacent street designations and classifications, nor require street widenings. Other related projects in further proximity with the Project Site would

not share adjacent street frontages and, as a result, would not contribute with Alternative 8 to any conflicts with applicable regulations or programs. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system would not be considerable and cumulative impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.L-48 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, according to the LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG), projects that do not demonstrate a project impact applying the VMT thresholds is sufficient to demonstrate a less than significant cumulative impact. Therefore, Alternative 8's cumulative household VMT impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project and Alternative 8's cumulative work VMT impacts would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant.

As explained for the Original Project on page IV.L-48 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, design hazards are generally limited to a project's immediate vicinity. Nonetheless, each related project would be reviewed by the City to ensure compliance with the City's requirements relative to the provision of safe access for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with hazardous design conditions would not be considerable and the cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.L-48 through IV.L-49 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, as to emergency access, related projects would be required to implement design features such as construction management plans to ensure adequate emergency access is maintained in and around the related project sites throughout construction. Similarly, the related projects would be required to comply with applicable policies and regulatory measures regarding emergency access and would also be reviewed by the LAFD to ensure compliance with emergency access requirements. Consequently, Alternative 8's contribution to impacts on emergency access would not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-1 (Transportation Demand Management Program), Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-2 (Construction Traffic Management Plan), and Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-3 (Construction Worker Parking Plan), set forth below and incorporated into Alternative 8, further reduce the less-than-significant transportation impacts of Alternative 8.

TRAF-PDF-1: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. The Applicant will implement a TDM Program aimed at discouraging single-occupancy vehicle trips and encouraging alternative modes of transportation, such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking. The TDM Program will be subject to review and approval by the Los Angeles Department of City Planning and LADOT. The exact measures to be implemented will be determined when the Program is prepared, prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy for the Project. The strategies in the TDM Program will include, but are not necessarily limited to:

<u>Parking</u>

- Unbundle residential parking and price according to market rate

- Unbundle commercial parking coupled with pricing workplace parking and parking cash-out
- Contribute to LADOT Express Park program to upgrade local parking meter technology
- Daily parking discount for Metro Commuters

Transit

- Provide a location on-site at which to purchase Metro passes and display bus information
- Transit subsidies (available to residents and commercial employees) up to 50 percent of the cost of a monthly pass
- Provide parking spaces for monthly lease to non-resident Metro park-and-ride users
- Provide discounted daily parking to non-resident Metro transit pass holders
- Immediately adjacent Metro bus stop upgrades, which could include, but not limited to, street furniture, signage, and/or other transit-related information

Commute Trip Reductions

- Commute trip reduction program:
  - Rideshare (carpool/vanpool) matching and preferential parking
  - Guaranteed ride home (e.g., monthly Uber/Lyft/taxi reimbursement)
  - Encourage alternative work schedules and telecommuting for project residents
  - Business center/work center for residents working at home

Shared Mobility

- On-site car share
- Rideshare matching
- On-site bike share station with subsidized or free membership (residents, employees); on-site guest bike share service (hotel) (if/when public bike share comes to Hollywood)
- Coordination with LADOT Mobility Hub program

Bicycle Infrastructure

- Develop a bicycle amenities plan
- Bicycle parking (indoors and outdoors)
- Bike lockers, showers, and repair station
- Convenient access to on-site bicycle facilities (e.g., wayfinding, etc.)
- Contribution towards City's Bicycle Plan Trust Fund

Site Design

- Integrated pedestrian network within and adjacent to site (e.g., transit-, bike-, pedestrian-friendly)
- External and internal multimodal wayfinding signage

Education & Encouragement

- Transportation information center, kiosks and/or other on-site measures, such as providing a Tenant Welcome Package (i.e., all new residents receive information on available alternative modes and ways to access destinations)
- Tech-enabled mobility: incorporating commute planning, on-demand rideshare matching, shared-ride reservations, real-time traffic/transit information, push notifications about transportation choices, interactive transit screens, etc.

- Marketing and promotions (including digital gamification – participants can log trips for prizes, promotions, discounts for local merchants, incentives, etc.)

Management
- On-site TDM Program coordinator and administrative support
- Conduct user surveys
- Join future Hollywood Transportation Management Organization (TMO)

TRAF-PDF-2: Construction Traffic Management Plan. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the Project, a detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP), including street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes, and a staging plan, will be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval. The CMP will formalize how construction will be carried out and identify specific actions that will be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The CMP will be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site. Construction management meetings with City Staff and other surrounding construction-related project representatives (i.e., construction contractors), whose projects will potentially be under construction at around the same time as the Project, will be conducted bimonthly, or as otherwise determined appropriate by City Staff. This coordination will ensure construction activities of the concurrent related projects and associated hauling activities are managed in collaboration with one another and the Project. The CMP will include, but not be limited to, the following elements as appropriate:

- As traffic lane, parking lane and/or sidewalk closures are anticipated, worksite traffic control plan(s), approved by the City of Los Angeles, will be developed and implemented to route vehicular traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians around any such closures.
- Ensure that access will remain unobstructed for land uses in proximity to the Project Site during project construction.
- Coordinate with the City and emergency service providers to ensure adequate access, including emergency access, is maintained to the Project Site and neighboring businesses and residences. Emergency access points will be marked accordingly in consultation with LAFD, as necessary.
- Provide off-site truck staging in a legal area furnished by the construction truck contractor. Anticipated truck access to the Project Site will be off Ivar Avenue, Vine Street, and Argyle Avenue.
- Schedule deliveries and pick-ups of construction materials during non-peak travel periods to the extent possible and coordinate to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to load or unload for protracted periods.
- As parking lane and/or travel lane closures are anticipated, worksite traffic control plan(s), approved by the City of Los Angeles, should be implemented to route vehicular traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians around any such closures.

TRAF-PDF-3: Construction Worker Parking Plan. The Applicant will prepare a Construction Worker Parking Plan prior to commencement of construction to identify and enforce parking location requirements for construction workers. The Construction Worker Parking Plan will include, but not be limited to, the following elements as appropriate:

- During construction activities when construction worker parking cannot be accommodated on the Project Site, the plan will identify alternate parking location(s) for construction workers and the method of transportation to and from the Project Site (if beyond walking distance) for approval by the City 30 days prior to commencement of construction.
- Construction workers will not be permitted to park on the street.

- All construction contractors will be provided with written information on where their workers and their subcontractors are permitted to park and provide clear consequences to violators for failure to follow these regulations.

(d) Conclusion:

Alternative 8 would not conflict with programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system; would not exceed VMT thresholds; would not create a geometric hazard due to design or incompatible use; and would not result in inadequate emergency access. As such, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative transportation impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, Project-level and cumulative impacts related to transportation would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

13. Tribal Cultural Resources

(a) Impact Summary:

As described on page V-308 of the Draft EIR, the City complied with AB 52 in its consultation and records searches conducted for the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, Paleontological Resources Assessment, and Tribal Cultural Resources Reports, Appendices F-2, G-4, and O of the Draft EIR, respectively. The research indicated no known tribal cultural resources within the Project Site or surrounding area. However, in the event that buried tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction under Alternative 8, the Project Applicant will be required to comply with the City's standard Conditions of Approval for the treatment of inadvertent Tribal cultural resource discoveries. Therefore, as described on pages IV.M-8 through IV.M-9 and V-308 of the Draft EIR, through review of the entire record, including the Tribal Cultural Resources Report contained in Appendix O of the Draft EIR and the correspondence located in Appendix C, *Tribal Correspondence,* of the Final EIR, the City has determined that Alternative 8 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, and, therefore, impacts would be less than significant with compliance with the City's standard Conditions of Approval. As excavation depths would be similar, impacts to tribal cultural resources under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on page IV.M-10 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would not contribute to a cumulative impact on tribal resources since Alternative 8 would have a less-than significant impact and the related projects would be required to engage in AB 52 consultation with relevant tribes and identify any potential tribal resources on that site. Should investigation, similar to what was conducted for the Project Site, disclose no known potential resources on the related project site, the related project would still be subject to the City's standard Conditions of Approval to address any inadvertent discovery. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impact to tribal resources would not be considerable. As such, Alternative 8's cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to tribal resources.

(d) Conclusion:

As there are no known tribal cultural resources on or near the Project Site, project-level and cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

14. Utilities and Service Systems – Wastewater

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Construction:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.1-12 through IV.N.1-13 and IV.N.1-17, and Appendix P-1, *Utility Infrastructure Technical Report: Water, Wastewater and Energy*, of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8's construction would generate a negligible amount of wastewater, and any such generation would be temporary only lasting during construction activities. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and the impact would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Operation:

As described on pages V-308 through V-309 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would generate additional wastewater and increase demand on the existing Hyperion Treatment Conveyance System and Hyperion Treatment Plant. As shown on Table V-14, *Alternative 8 Wastewater Generation During Operation*, which summarizes Alternative 8's approximate wastewater generation, 45 percent of Alternative 8's 903 residential units would be one-bedroom units, 40 percent would be two-bedroom units, and 15 percent would be three-bedroom units, while indoor amenities, spa/health club, retail/restaurant space, and swimming pool areas would be similar to those of the Original Project. As shown in Table V-14, Alternative 8 is estimated to generate an increase of approximately 308,843 gallons per day (gpd), or 0.308 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater compared to the Original Project's increase of 311,680 gpd, or approximately 0.312 mgd. These estimates do not account for reductions in wastewater generation that would occur with implementation of conservation measures. The increase in wastewater generation by Alternative 8 would be within the capacity limits of the conveyance and treatment facilities serving the Project Site. As such, Alternative 8 would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects, and the impact would be less than significant. However, because Alternative 8 would generate a lower volume of wastewater, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.1-19 through IV.N.1-21, and Table IV.N.1-4, *Estimated Cumulative Wastewater Generation,* of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8 which would generate less wastewater, Alternative 8 and the related projects would not generate wastewater in excess of existing or planned capacity of the City's wastewater system. Alternative 8, considered together with the related projects, would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or standards of the applicable regulatory agencies; require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing

facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or result in a determination by the Hyperion Sanitary Sewer System, the wastewater treatment provider that would serve Alternative 8, that it does not have adequate capacity to serve Project and related project demand in addition to its existing commitments. Therefore, Alternative 8's impacts, when considered together with the impacts of the related projects, would not result in a cumulative considerable contribution to a significant impact on the wastewater system, and Alternative 8's cumulative impacts would be less than significant and less than the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to wastewater.

(d) Conclusion:

As there is sufficient capacity without construction of new or expanded facilities, project-level and cumulative impacts with respect to wastewater would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

15. Utilities and Service Systems – Water Supply

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Construction:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.2-23 through IV.N-26 and Appendices P-1, *Utility Infrastructure Technical Report: Water, Wastewater and Energy,* and P-2, *Water Supply Assessment,* of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 construction demand for water would be in the range of 1,000 to 2,000 gpd, much less than the demand for Alternative 8 operation, which would not exceed the capacity and availability of the existing City water system. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and the impact would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Operation:

As described on pages V-310 through V-311 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would increase demand on water supplies and infrastructure over existing conditions. Based on wastewater generation factors shown in Table V-14 of the Draft EIR, residential, commercial, office, and recreational uses provided under Alternative 8 would generate a maximum day water demand of approximately 308,843 gpd, which includes water demand from draining the pools entirely. However, draining the pools would occur very infrequently and on average over the course of a year, pool-related water demand would average less than approximately 500 gpd. Thus, the water demand analysis in the Draft EIR is based on this average pool daily water demand to provide a reasonable assessment of yearly water demand. Additional water would be required for landscaping and indoor parking structure space. As under the Original Project, landscaping would require approximately 2,227 gpd. Parking would increase from approximately 1,521 spaces under the Project to 2,337 spaces under Alternative 8. As such, parking space water demand is expected to increase from 445 gpd under the Original Project by approximately by approximately 54 percent to approximately 683 gpd. Alternative 8's water maximum daily demand is estimated to be 311,753 gpd prior to water conservation. Water conservation measures under the City's

Ordinance No. 184,248, the 2017 Los Angeles Plumbing Code, and the 2017 Los Angeles Green Building Code, and implementation of water conservation efforts and Project Design Feature WS-PDF-1 would result in a savings of approximately 39 percent, excluding swimming pools. Assuming a water demand of 500 gpd for the swimming pool, Alternative 8's average daily water demand would be would typically less than approximately 144,287 gpd (162 acre-feet per year [afy]) compared to the Original Project's water demand of 163,098 gpd (~183 afy), accounting for water conservations and compliance with applicable regulations.

Alternative 8's water demand projections would be within LADWP's 2015 UWMP's projected increases in Citywide water demands, while anticipating multi-dry year water conditions through the planning horizon of 2040. As such, with regulatory compliance to the LAMC and coordination with LADWP, operation of Alternative 8 would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which would cause significant environmental effects. However, because Alternative 8 would result in less average daily water demand compared to the Original Project, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.2-33 through IV.N.2-36 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8 which would generate lower water demand, the City has adequate infrastructure capacity and supply to meet the needs of Alternative 8 and the related projects. Moreover, as with Alternative 8, the related projects would need to obtain a determination from the City that there is sufficient capacity and supplies to meet the related projects' projected demand. The related projects would also be required to comply with all applicable regulations regarding water conservation. Therefore, Alternative 8's impacts, when considered together with the impacts of the related projects, would not result in a cumulative considerable contribution to a significant impact on the water system or water supply, and Alternative 8's cumulative impacts would be less than significant and less than the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Feature WS-PDF-1 (Water Conservation Features), set forth below and incorporated into Alternative 8, would further reduce the less-than-significant water supply impacts of Alternative 8.

WS-PDF-1: Water Conservation Features. The Project will provide the following specific water efficiency features:

- ENERGY STAR Certified Residential Clothes Washers – Front-loading, capacity of 4.5 cubic feet, with Integrated Water Factor of 2.8.
- ENERGY STAR Certified Commercial Clothes Washers – Front-loading, capacity of 4.5 cubic feet, with Integrated Water Factor of 2.8.
- ENERGY STAR Certified Residential Dishwashers – Standard with 3.2 gallons/cycle.
- High-Efficiency Toilets (dual flush) with a flush volume of 0.8 gallons per flush for liquid waste and 1.28 gallons per flush for solid waste. Per Ordinance No. 180,822, Section 125,02, the toilets would have an effective flush volume of 0.96 gallons per flush.
- Install a meter on the pool make-up line so water use can be monitored, and leaks can be identified and repaired.
- Landscaping – Approximately 52 percent of the total proposed landscaping is classified as low water use. Approximately 18 percent of the total proposed landscaping is

classified as very low water use, which is considered drought-tolerant enough to require no irrigation by Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
- Leak Detection System for swimming pools and Jacuzzi.
- Overhead spray (8 percent) and drip irrigation (92 percent) for landscaped areas.
- Pool splash troughs around the perimeter that drain back into the pool.
- Proper Hydro-zoning/Zoned Irrigation.
- Reuse pool backwash water for irrigation.
- Water-Saving Pool Filter.
- Waterless urinals for commercial uses

(d) Conclusion:

As there is adequate infrastructure and supply without the construction of new or expanded facilities, Project-level and cumulative impacts with respect to water supply would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

16. Utilities and Service Systems – Solid Waste

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Construction:

As described on page V-311 of the Draft EIR, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would increase solid waste generation at the Project Site that would need to be landfilled by an estimated 691,269.18 gross tons construction and demolition waste. This amount of waste would represent a small fraction of the available capacity of the County's Azusa Land Reclamation landfill or one of the inert debris engineered fill operations in Los Angeles County. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would generate solid waste that can be accommodated within existing infrastructure capacity. Furthermore, Alternative 8 construction would comply with all regulations and policies regarding solid waste disposal, reduction, and recycling. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction would not result in generation of solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of local infrastructure capacity or otherwise impair attainment of solid waste reduction goals and impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Operation:

As described on pages V-311 through V-312 of the Draft EIR and page 3-51 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8's 903 residential units would generate approximately 11,134 pounds of solid waste per day or approximately 2,032 tons per year (tpy) and Alternative 8's 1,849 employees would generate approximately 19,470 pounds of solid waste per day or approximately 3,553 tpy. After implementation of the City's 65-percent diversion rate, Alternative 8 would generate approximately 1,955 tpy (3.41 tons per day [tpd]) requiring landfill disposal per year compared to the Original Project's 2.96 tpd landfill disposal rate after diversion. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill, the primary recipient of Class III solid waste from the City, has a maximum daily capacity of 12,100 tpd and a disposal rate of 6,765 tpd, indicating a residual daily capacity of 5,335 tpd. Therefore, Alternative 8's addition of 6.27 tdp landfill disposal rate would represent 0.07 percent of Sunshine Canyon's residual daily capacity, assuming diversion. Therefore, Alternative 8's additional solid waste generation would be accommodated by the County's City-certified waste processing facilities. As such, Alternative 8's operation would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Therefore, impacts with respect to solid waste under

Alternative 8 would be less than significant. However, because Alternative 8 would increase solid waste compared to the Original Project, impacts under Alternative 8 would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

(i) Construction:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.3-23 through IV.N.3-25 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 and the related projects would be required to comply with all State and local regulations regarding the disposal, reduction and recycling of solid waste from construction activities including the citywide Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Ordinance and the Waste Hauler Permit Program. Additionally, the County of Los Angeles has concluded that there is adequate capacity in permitted solid waste facilities to serve the County for current and future users through the 15-year period of 2018 through 2033. Therefore, Alternative 8 construction's contribution to cumulative impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Operation:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.3-25 through IV.N.3-27 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 combined with the related projects represent only a fraction of the available capacity; approximately 0.10 percent, well within the existing and planned infrastructure capacity. Accordingly, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. However, due to the greater Project-level contribution of Alternative 8, impacts related to solid waste would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant.

(iii) Consistency with Applicable Regulations:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.N.3-27 through IV.N.3-28 of the Draft EIR, which would be equally applicable to Alternative 8, as with Alternative 8, the related projects will be required to comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste, including those pertaining to waste reduction, recycling and diversion. As a result, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to consistency with applicable regulations would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to wastewater.

(d) Conclusion:

With compliance with applicable regulatory measures and as there is sufficient infrastructure capacity for solid waste generated by Alternative 8 and the related projects, Project-level and cumulative impacts with respect to solid waste would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

17. Energy Conservation and Infrastructure

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.O-20 through IV.O-40 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and pages V-312 through V-313 of the Draft EIR, and page 3-55 to 3-56 of Final EIR, Alternative 8's use of electricity, natural gas, if any, and transportation energy (gasoline and diesel for equipment and vehicles), during construction would be temporary lasting through the duration of construction only and generally limited to construction hours, and would be used in compliance with all applicable federal, State and local regulations relating to fuel efficiency and consistent with LEED Gold Certification level or its equivalent. Alternative 8 would incorporate energy-conservation measures beyond regulatory requirements as specified in Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features) and Project Design Feature WS-PDF-1 (Water Conservation Features). These require USGBC LEED Gold Certification energy performance optimization features, such as reducing building energy cost by a minimum of 11.6 percent for new construction compared to the 2016 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and installing energy efficient appliances.

Alternative 8's proposed residential buildings on the West Site would incorporate LEED Gold Certification, as with the Original Project; however, the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification. Alternative 8 would comply with and exceed existing minimum energy efficiency requirements, such as the Title 24 standards and CALGreen Code, including for building rooftops to be solar-ready so that onsite solar photovoltaic or solar water heating systems could be installed in the future. Alternative 8, would be designed to exceed ASHRAE 90.1-2010 standards by more than 20 percent through the use of efficient heating, ventilation, and HVAC systems and a high-performance building envelope. Indoor air quality would be enhanced through the selection of low-VOC emitting materials, and exhaust systems would be utilized for optimal ventilation in both kitchens and bathrooms. Alternative 8 would be consistent with and not conflict with SCAG's land use type for the area and would encourage alternative transportation and achieve a reduction in VMT resulting in a transportation efficiency level better than the Hollywood neighborhood and City and Statewide average. Based on energy consumption modeling for Alternative 8, natural gas usage in Alternative 8 would be approximately 10 percent higher than the Original Project and electricity usage would be approximately 63 percent higher than the Original Project. Despite the differences in energy consumption which are due to the difference in on-site uses, Alternative 8, would not cause wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during operation, and, as such, construction and operation impacts related to efficient energy consumption would be less than significant. Therefore, as Alternative 8 would comply with the applicable efficient energy consumption regulations, impacts under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Conflict with Plans for Renewal Energy or Energy Efficiency:

As described on page V-313 of the Draft EIR, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would comply with applicable regulations relating to energy efficiency and would not conflict with State or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Its LEED Gold Certification level or its equivalent, combined with Project Design Features GHS-PDF-1 and WS-PDF-1, and its setting within a TPA in furtherance of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS goals for GHG reduction are supportive and not in conflict with all applicable energy plans. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. By exceeding the regulatory standards and compliance with plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original

Project.

(iii) Construction, Expansion or Relocation of Energy Infrastructure:

As described on page V-313 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would utilize energy infrastructure to accommodate respective demand for energy resources. Alternative 8's electricity and natural gas demand is expected to represent a small fraction of LADWP and SoCalGas energy supplies and the service provider's existing infrastructure. Thus, as with the Original Project, planned electricity and natural gas supplies would be sufficient to meet Alternative 8's demand for electricity and natural gas. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not result in an increase in demand for electricity or natural gas services that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure that could result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. As such, impacts under Alternative 8 would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.O-47 through IV.O-55 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, as with Alternative 8, the related projects would be required to comply with all applicable regulations and policies related to energy consumption and efficiency and would also be required to not conflict with or obstruct plans for energy efficiency. Moreover, since growth represented by Alternative 8 and the related projects is within regional and local projections and demand for electricity, natural gas and transportation energy would not exceed infrastructure capacity or supply, these projects are not anticipated to require the construction, expansion or relocation of energy facilities. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative energy impacts would not be considerable and cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Features GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features), and WS-PDF-1 (Water Conservation Features), set forth above under the GHG and water supply sections in these Findings, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would further reduce the less-than-significant water supply impacts of Alternative 8.

(d) Conclusion:

As the construction and operation of Alternative 8 would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of electricity, natural gas or transportation energy, or in an increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, or transportation fuels that exceed available supply or distribution infrastructure that could result in the construction of new energy facility or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environment effect, or conflict with or obstruct energy efficiency plans, Project-level and cumulative impacts with regard to energy use and infrastructure would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

VI. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION

The EIR determined that, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 has potentially significant environmental impacts in the areas discussed below. Where a mitigation measure would be required, the EIR identified feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially reduce the

environmental impacts in these areas to a level of less than significant. Based on the information and analysis set forth in the EIR, Alternative 8 would not have any significant environmental impacts in these areas as long as all identified feasible mitigation measures are incorporated into Alternative 8. The City, again, ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the full analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR.

1. Air Quality (Cumulative Increase in Criteria Pollution, TACs)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Cumulative Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Nitrogen Oxide):

a. Construction:

As described on page V-282 of the Draft EIR, the construction of Alternative 8 would contribute to local and regional air pollutant emissions during construction (short-term or temporary). Construction of Alternative 8 would result in a potentially significant impact relative to the maximum daily emissions of nitrogen oxide (NO_X) as compared to the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for construction criteria air pollutant emissions in which the region is non-attainment under the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) or the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Therefore, Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 (Construction Equipment) is required to reduce impacts to less than significant.

b. Operation:

As described on page V-283 of the Draft EIR and page 3-48 through 3-49 of the Final EIR, operation of Alternative 8 would contribute to local and regional air pollutant emissions during occupancy (long-term). Alternative 8 would result in a potentially significant impact relative to the maximum daily emissions of NO_X as compared to the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for construction criteria air pollutant emissions in which the region is non-attainment under the CAAQS or NAAQS. Therefore, Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2 (Emergency Generator) is required to reduce impacts to less than significant.

c. Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) (Construction):

As described on page V-284 of the Draft EIR and page 3-49, temporary TAC emissions associated with construction emissions from heavy construction equipment would occur during construction activities but would be of short duration and, therefore, would not result in long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions. Nonetheless, Appendix E of the Draft EIR included a study, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, that demonstrated that with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1 (Construction Equipment Features), Alternative 8 construction would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations, and, therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors related to construction TAC emissions would be less than significant with mitigation.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.B-74 through IV.B-77 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the City has determined, pursuant to SCAQMD guidance that the approach to address the cumulative air quality impacts, the Lead Agency would use the same significance thresholds for project-specific and cumulative impacts. As explained

on page IV.B-74 of the Draft EIR, the City has identified a number of related projects located in the Project Site area that are currently proposed, have not yet been built, or that are currently under construction. Since both the timing and the sequencing of the construction of the related projects are unknown, any quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that assumes multiple, concurrent construction projects would be speculative. For this reason, the SCAQMD recommends using two different methodologies: (1) that project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the project's potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality; or (2) that a project's consistency with the current AQMP be used to determine its potential cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR included an analysis using both methodologies, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8 for all the previously stated reasons. However, only the Project-specific impacts would result in cumulative impacts since, for the reasons described above, Alternative 8 would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of air quality plans, and therefore, Alternative 8's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

As described on pages IV.B-76 through IV.B-77 and V-282 through 285 of the Draft EIR, based on the Project-specific level of emissions, impacts would be potentially significant for construction and operation because regional NO_X emissions would exceed the threshold significance, as shown in tables discussed above. Therefore, Project-specific significant impacts are deemed to be significant cumulative impacts as well, and mitigation measures are required to reduce the impact to less than significant.

As discussed above, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1 and AQ-MM-2, regional emissions from the construction and operation of Alternative 8 would be reduced to below the SCAQMD regional threshold for NO_X. Related projects would also be required under CEQA to incorporate mitigation measures if related project regional or localized emissions exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to regional NO_X construction and operational emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. As a result, cumulative impacts would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1 and AQ-MM-2 and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features) described above in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section of these Findings, will allow Alternative 8 to achieve a LEED Gold Certification level or equivalent, which will reduce emissions from Alternative 8. However, while the residential component of Alternative 8 would achieve LEED Gold Certification, the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification.

(d) Mitigation Measures:

The City finds that Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1 (Construction Equipment Features) and AQ-MM-2 (Emergency Generators), set forth below and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the potentially significant air quality impacts related to cumulative increases in criteria pollutants and exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions of Alternative 8 to less than significant.

AQ-MM-1: **Construction Equipment Features.** The Applicant shall implement the following construction equipment features for equipment operating at the Project Site. These features shall be included in applicable bid documents, and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. Construction features shall include the following:

- The Project shall utilize off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meets or exceeds the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards or equivalent for equipment rated at 50 horsepower (hp) or greater during Project construction where available within the Los Angeles region. Such equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT), which means a CARB-certified Level 3 DPM or equivalent.
- Construction equipment, such as tower cranes, shall utilize electricity from power poles or alternative fuels (i.e., non-diesel) rather than diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators. Pole power shall be made available for use for electric tools, equipment, lighting, etc. If stationary construction equipment, such as diesel- or gasoline-powered generators, must be operated continuously, such equipment shall be located at least 100 feet from sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, childcare centers, hospitals, parks, or similar uses), whenever possible.
- Contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. All construction equipment must be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. The contractor shall keep documentation on-site demonstrating that the equipment has been maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. Tampering with construction equipment to increase horsepower or to defeat emission control devices shall be prohibited.

AQ-MM-2: Emergency Generators. The Project representative shall schedule routine maintenance and testing of the emergency generators installed on the Project Site on different days. Prior to the installation of emergency generators, the Project representative shall supply documentation to the City that emergency generator testing by contractors, service providers, or maintenance crews shall be conducted in accordance with the specified requirements. The Project representative shall maintain records of emergency generator testing, including testing dates, which shall be made available to the City upon request.

(e) Findings:

With respect to cumulative increase of criteria pollutants during construction and operation and exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs during construction, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1), the City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, Alternative 8 which mitigate or avoid the potential significant effects identified in the EIR.

(f) Rationale for Finding

(i) Cumulative Increase of Criteria Pollutants/Violation of Air Quality Standards:

a. Construction:

As described on pages IV.B-38 through IV.B-40 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the Original Project's daily regional criteria pollutant emissions during construction were estimated by assuming a conservative scenario for construction activities (i.e., assuming all construction occurs at the earliest feasible date) and applying the mobile source and fugitive dust emissions factors. Detailed emissions calculations are provided in Appendix E of the Draft EIR. The results of the criteria pollutant calculations were presented in Table IV.B-5 of the Draft EIR

as modified in Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR,* Table IV.B-5, *Estimated Maximum Regional Construction Emissions for Project Under the Overlapping Construction Scenario – West Side First Scenario,* of the Final EIR and in Table IV.B-5A, *Estimated Maximum Regional Construction Emissions for Project Under the Overlapping Construction Scenario – East Side First* of the Final EIR. These calculations are equally applicable to Alternative 8 as explained below. The calculations in Table IV.B-5 and IV.B-5A incorporated compliance with dust control measures required to be implemented during each phase of construction by SCAQMD Rule 403 (Control of Fugitive Dust) and fugitive VOC control measures required to be implemented by architectural coating emission factors based on SCAQMD Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings). As shown in Table IV.B-5 and Table IV.B-5A, construction-related daily emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance only for NO_X while other emissions levels would be below the applicable thresholds of significance.

As described on page V-282 of the Draft EIR and page and page 3-48 of the Final EIR, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8's construction phases have the potential to generate emissions that would exceed SCAQMD air quality standards through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction traffic, fugitive dust emissions, paving operation, and the application of architectural coatings and other building materials. The maximum emissions under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project for construction of the West Site first or construction of the East Site first because emission levels are based on a single day in which maximum construction activity would occur. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1, the regional NOX emissions would be reduced to a level below the SCAQMD regional threshold of 100 pounds per day, as shown in Table IV.B-9, Estimated Maximum Mitigated Regional Construction Emissions for the Project under the Overlapping Construction Scenario – West Site First Scenario (pounds per day) of the Draft EIR as modified on page 3-16 of the Final EIR and shown in Table IV.B-9A, Estimated Maximum Mitigated Regional Construction Emissions for the Project under the Overlapping Construction Scenario – East Site First Scenario, of the Final EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8. Similar to the Original Project, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 which would require the use of diesel-powered construction equipment that meet USEPA Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards; use of pole electricity or alternative energy to power electric tools, equipment, and lighting; maintenance and operation of construction equipment to minimize exhaust emissions; and incorporation of Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features), construction emissions under Alternative 8 would not exceed SCAQMD numerical significance thresholds. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 and Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1, Alternative 8 emissions related to air quality standards would be less than significant. Since Alternative 8's floor area would be the same and expected duration of construction would be similar as under the Original Project, impacts relative to air quality threshold standards under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Operation:

As described on pages IV.B-41 through IV.B-42 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, since the two construction scenarios, overlapping and sequential, would result in two potential operational buildout timeframes for the Original Project, and since mobile source emissions decrease in future years, the operational emissions analysis was prepared for the earlier operational buildout timeframe for the Original Project, the overlapping scenario, since that scenario would result in the maximum operational emissions. In addition, under both construction scenarios, the West Site would be completed first in the year 2024 and operational before completion of the East Site. Therefore, operational emissions for the West Site in year 2024 were also analyzed in the Draft EIR and Appendix E. The operational emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod software to forecast the daily regional criteria pollutant emissions from on-site area

and stationary sources that would occur during long-term Project operations. Detailed emissions calculations are provided in Appendix E of the Draft EIR.

As described on page V-283 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would generate emissions associated with vehicle trips, heating, lighting, other electric and natural gas power requirements, emergency generators, and architectural coatings. Similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would incorporate Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1 (Green Building Features) and would comply with SCAQMD Rule 1113 regarding architectural coatings.

As described on page V-283 of the Draft EIR and page 3-49 of the Final EIR, NOx emissions would be 76 pounds per day for the Original Project which exceeds the daily impact threshold for NOx of 55 pounds per day. At interim buildout conditions and under the overlapping construction scenario with operations of either the West or East Site (whichever is built first) and overlapping construction of the other site, maximum NOx emissions would be 79 pounds per day for the Original Project. For Alternative 8, at interim buildout conditions and under the overlapping construction scenario with operations of either the West or East Site (whichever is built first) and overlapping construction of the other site, maximum NOx emissions would be slightly greater than the Original Project because Alternative 8 results in greater daily vehicle trips as compared to the Original Project. However, the primary contributor to Alternative 8's operational emissions is from emergency generator capacity. Alternative 8 would implement the same Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1 to reduce construction-related emissions and AQ-MM-2 to reduce operational-related emissions as the Project to reduce interim buildout construction and operational NOx emission levels to a less-than-significant level.

As described for the Original Project, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2 (Emergency Generators), the regional NO_X emissions would be reduced to a level below the SCAQMD regional threshold of 55 pounds per day, as shown in Table IV.B-10, *Estimated Maximum Mitigated Regional Operational Emissions for the West Site Buildout and Concurrent East Site Construction in 2024*, and Table IV.B-10A, *Estimated Maximum Mitigated Regional Operational Emissions for the East Site Buildout and Concurrent West Site Construction in 2024*, of the Final EIR, and Table IV.B-10 of the Draft EIR (retitled Table IV.B-10B, *Estimated Maximum Mitigated Regional Operational Emissions for the West Site Buildout 2024 – West Site First Scenario*, on page 3-19 of the Final EIR, and Table IV.B-10C, *Estimated Maximum Mitigated Regional Operational Emissions for the West Site Buildout 2024 – East Site First Scenario,* of the Final EIR. Since Alternative 8 would also implement Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2, Alternative 8's regional NO_X emissions would also be reduced to a level below the 55-pound threshold. By implementing mitigation that restricts the emergency generator testing/maintenance to one emergency generator per day, the emergency generator emissions occurring in a day would be reduced compared to potentially testing multiple generators on the same day, as daily emissions determine the significance of impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2, regional NO_X emissions from operations would be reduced to below the regional threshold for NO_X, and, therefore, impacts related to regional NO_X operational emissions would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. However, because of its increased mobile source emissions, impacts under Alternative 8 with respect to cumulative increases in criteria pollutants and violations of air quality standards would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant with mitigation.

(ii) Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants (Construction):

As described on page V-284 of the Draft EIR and page 3-49 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would

generate localized emissions during construction, which would be similar to the Original Project. Since emissions are calculated for the worst-case scenario as described on pages IV.B-38 through IV.B-40 and IV.B-43 through VI.B-45 of the Draft EIR, and the Original Project and Alternative 8 would have a similar amount of construction activities utilizing the same types of construction equipment and vehicles, a similar scale of development (floor area) and a similar level of construction emissions as under the Original Project, impacts under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project for construction of the West Site first or construction of the East Site first. Thus, the emissions analysis for the construction of the Original Project is equally applicable to Alternative 8 and maximum daily localized construction emissions would be similar to the Original Project.

Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 (Construction Equipment Features) would require utilization of off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meets or exceeds the most stringent and environmentally protective CARB and USEPA Tier 4 off-road emissions standards. The Tier 4 standards would reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions by approximately 81 to 96 percent compared to equipment that meet the Tier 2 off-road emissions standards. As with the Original Project, with implementation of this mitigation measure, Alternative 8 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations and impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

As described on pages IV.B-43 through IV.B-45 of the Draft EIR, the air quality analysis of TACs relied on the guidance manual prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment (OEHHA) in junction with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), for use in implementing the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program pursuant to Health and Safety Code, Section 44360, et seq. Alternative 8 would not be considered a TAC Hot Spot since it would not involve a stationary use which would generate excessive TACs, such as a truck stop or warehouse distribution center. Nonetheless, the Draft EIR analyzed the potential risks from TAC emissions from both construction and operation. As to construction impacts, while there is substantial uncertainty in meaningfully evaluating short term exposures, the Draft EIR did utilized OEHHA and SCAQMD guidance to determine if mitigation measures should be implemented.

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.B-70 through IV.B-71 and Appendix E of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, temporary TAC emissions associated with DPM emissions from heavy construction equipment would occur during construction activities. According to the OEHHA and SCAQMD’s Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis, TACs can create cancer risks to individuals based on a lifetime (i.e., 70-year) of resident exposure duration. Given the temporary construction schedule of approximately 4.5 years under the overlapping construction scenario and approximately 7 years under the sequential scenario, like the Original Project, Alternative 8 would not result in a long-term (i.e., lifetime or 70-year) exposure as a result of construction activities.

Nonetheless, while a quantified construction Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was not required for the Original Project (Draft EIR page IV.B-44), for informational purposes only, a refined quantitative construction HRA was prepared, the details of which are provided in Appendix E of the Draft EIR. The results of the construction HRA for the Original Project, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, show that with incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1, set forth above, construction activities would result in cancer risk below 10 in one million for the maximum impacted residential and worker receptors. The maximum non-cancer impacts for the Project would be below a hazard index of 1.0. The results of this refined AERMOD dispersion modeling provides further substantial evidence that TAC emissions from construction activities would not

expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Thus, although this analysis was provided for informational purposes only, it demonstrates that with incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1, construction activities at the Project Site would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Accordingly, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1, Alternative 8 construction impacts from TACs would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(g) Reference:

For a complete discussion of air quality impacts, please see Section IV.B, *Air Quality,* Appendix E, *Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Technical Documentation,* and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* pages V-281 through V-286 of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications and Corrections to the Draft EIR,* and Appendix E, *Supplemental Project Construction Air Quality Data,* of the Final EIR.

2. Cultural Resources (Historical Resources – Direct Impacts to Hollywood Walk of Fame, Indirect Impacts to Capitol Records Complex, and Archaeological Resources)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Direct Impacts (Hollywood Walk of Fame):

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-54 through IV.C-55 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-286 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 is located immediately adjacent to portions of the Hollywood Walk of Fame, which border the Project Site along Vine Street between Hollywood Boulevard and Yucca Street (on both the west and east sides of the street). Portions of the Hollywood Walk of Fame fronting the Project Site could be affected during construction due to the presence of heavy construction equipment, generally high levels of activity, and the need for sidewalk improvements. Therefore, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8 construction would require implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1 to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

(ii) Indirect Impacts (Capitol Records Complex):

As to the potential physical damage to the on-site historical resources, the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building, after construction of Alternative 8, these resources would remain intact and in their original location. All of their character-defining features would remain unchanged and continue to be viewable and discernible by the public. They will continue to convey their historic significance and maintain their eligibility for listing as a historical resource. The buildings' National Register eligibility, their status as a listed California Register resource, and their designation as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument would not be threatened, and impacts would be less than significant. However, similar to the Original Project, the potential for damage due to construction-related vibration and settlement would be a potentially significant impact, which requires implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4 to reduce Alternative 8's construction impacts to the Capitol Records and Gogerty Buildings to less than significant.

(ii) Archaeological Resources:

As described on page V-287 of the Draft EIR, excavation associated with Alternative 8 would

reach a maximum depth of 64 feet for subterranean parking on the East Site and 60 feet on the West Site. Similar to the Original Project, these excavations would cut into the historic fill layer, as well as previously undisturbed native soils. Such depths have the potential to encounter prehistoric and/or historic archaeological resources. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-3 through CUL-MM-5 would be required to reduce this potential impact to less than significant.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons set for Original Project on pages IV.C-88 through IV.C-92 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, direct construction impacts to Hollywood Walk of Fame and indirect construction impacts to the Capitol Records Complex would be potentially significant as a result of potential damage during construction requiring implement Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-MM-2 for cultural resources and could lead to cumulative impacts as discussed be under the Significant and Unavoidable Impacts Section of these Findings.

With regards to archeological resources, for the reasons set forth for the Original Project on pages IV.C-92 through IV.C-93 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, impacts related to archaeological resources under CEQA are in most cases site-specific because they occur on a project level as a result of a project's ground disturbance activities during construction. Therefore, since Alternative 8 would implement Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-3 through MM-CUL-5 for archaeological resources, Alternative 8 would not have a significant contribution to cumulative impacts on archaeological resources and, as a result, cumulative impacts with mitigation would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with respect to cultural resources.

(d) Mitigation Measures:

The City finds that Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-1 and CUL-MM-2, set forth below, and Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, presented below in the Noise Section of these Findings, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the potentially significant cultural resources impacts to historical resources of Alternative 8 to less than significant, with the exception of the potential temporary construction vibration and settlement effects on certain off-site historical resources, which would remain significant and unavoidable.

CUL-MM-1: Prior to any disturbance to the Hollywood Walk of Fame, a City of Los Angeles designated Historic-Cultural Monument, the Applicant shall contact the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce/Hollywood Historic Trust (Chamber/Trust) directly via letter detailing the location of the Project Site, its potential impact on the Hollywood Walk of Fame, Project timeframe, list of affected stars and surrounding sidewalk area, proposed procedures for removal of stars, where and for how long the stars would be stored, how they would be secured, and other relevant details. The Chamber/Trust would reply via letter with the required procedures related to alterations to the Hollywood Walk of Fame and a list of contractors approved for such work. Additionally, the Chamber/Trust would request a formal in-person meeting between the Applicant, Chamber/Trust officials, and staff from the Office of Historic Resources and Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering to discuss the process in greater depth. Written correspondence to the Chamber/Trust shall be sent to the address that follows: Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, 6255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 150, Hollywood, CA 90028. Accepting that specific details for removal,

storage and, replacement of affected stars and terrazzo shall be determined through coordination with the Chamber/Trust, the following general procedures shall be implemented:

- Photographic and documentary recordation of the location of each Hollywood Walk of Fame star potentially impacted by project construction shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural History;
- Prior to any construction or demolition activities that have the potential to damage the sidewalk along Vine Street, each section of sidewalk containing a star that cannot be reasonably protected in place shall be cut and carefully removed [by a qualified restoration contractor] within its respective bronze-bordered square as specifically directed by Chamber/Trust procedures. Each affected star shall be promptly crated and stored, at a secured off-site location;
- Following completion of Project construction, reinstallation of each affected star at its original documented location shall occur within a newly poured, color-matched terrazzo sidewalk [by a qualified restoration contractor] with work completed to the satisfaction of the Chamber/Trust, the Office of Historic Resources, and the Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering; and
- Excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the Hollywood Walk of Fame and work conducted by the restoration contractor to remove, store, and replace affected areas of the Hollywood Walk of Fame, shall be monitored by a qualified historic preservation consultant meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural History and documented in a monitoring report that shall be provided to the City of Los Angeles, Office of Historic Resources, and the Chamber/Trust.

CUL-MM-2: Excavation and shoring have the potential to damage buildings in close proximity to the Project Site; therefore, the following procedures are required for shoring system design and monitoring of excavation, grading, and shoring activities are proposed:

- Excavation and shoring plans and calculations for temporary shoring walls shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer experienced in the design and construction of shoring systems and hired under the excavation subcontractor. The shoring systems shall be selected and designed in accordance with all current code requirements, industry best practices, and the recommendations of the Project Geotechnical Engineer. Maximum allowable lateral deflections for the Project Site are to be developed by the Project Geotechnical Engineer in consideration of adjacent structures, property, and public rights-of-way. These deflection limits shall be prepared in consideration of protecting adjacent historic resources. The shoring engineer shall produce a shoring design, incorporating tie-backs, soldier piles, walers, etc., that is of sufficient capacity and stiffness to meet or exceed the Project strength and deflection requirements. Calculations shall be prepared by the shoring engineer showing the anticipated lateral deflection of the shoring system and its components and demonstrating that these deflections are within the allowable limits. Where tie-back anchors shall extend across property lines or encroach into the public rights-of-way, appropriate notification and approval procedures shall be followed. The final excavation and shoring plans shall include all appropriate details, material specifications, testing and special inspection requirements and shall be reviewed by the Project Geotechnical Engineer for conformance with the design intent and submitted to LADBS for review and approval during the Grading Permit application submission. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall provide on-site observation during the excavation and shoring work.

- The general contractor shall hire a California Registered Professional Engineer or California Professional Land Surveyor to prepare an Adjacent Structures Construction Monitoring Plan, subject to review and approval by LADBS, prior to initiation of any excavation, grading, or shoring activities to ensure the protection of adjacent historic resources from damage due to settlement during construction and excavation. The Adjacent Structures Construction Monitoring Plan shall be carried out by a California Professional Land Surveyor and establish survey monuments and document and record through any necessary means, including video, photography, survey, etc. the initial positions of adjacent structures, sidewalks, buildings, utilities, facades, cracks, etc. to form a baseline for determining settlement or deformation. Upon installation of soldier piles, survey monuments shall be affixed to the tops of representative piles so that deflection can be measured. The shored excavation and adjacent structures, sidewalks, buildings, utilities, facades, cracks, etc. shall be visually inspected each day. Survey monuments shall be measured at critical stages of dewatering, excavation, shoring, and construction but shall not occur less frequently than once every 30 days. Reports shall be prepared by the California Professional Land Surveyor documenting the movement monitoring results.
- Appropriate parties shall be notified immediately and corrective steps shall be identified and implemented if movement exceeds predetermined thresholds, calculated amounts, or if new cracks, distress, or other damage are observed in adjacent structures, sidewalks, buildings, utilities, façades, etc. In the event that settlement due to excavation or construction activity causes damage requiring repairs to the historic features of adjacent historic buildings, (specifically the Capitol Records Building, the Gogerty Building, Pantages Theatre, Avalon Hollywood, and 6316-24 Yucca Street/Art Deco Building storefront), that work shall be performed in consultation with a qualified preservation consultant and in accordance with the California Historical Building Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, as appropriate.
- Foundation systems are to be designed in accordance with all applicable loading requirements, including seismic, wind, settlement, and hydrostatic loads, as determined by the California Building Code and in accordance with the recommendations provided by the Project Geotechnical Engineer. Foundation systems are anticipated to consist of a cast-in-place concrete mat foundations supported by cast-in-place concrete drilled shaft or auger cast piles. Driven piles shall not be used.

The City finds that Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-3 through CUL-MM-5, set forth below, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the potentially significant cultural archeological resources impacts of Alternative 8 to less than significant.

CUL-MM-3: Prior to issuance of a grading permit and prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the Applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (Qualified Archaeologist) to oversee an archaeological monitor who shall be present during construction excavations, such as demolition, clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, or any other construction excavation activity associated with the Project, including peripheral activities, such as sidewalk replacement, utilities work, and landscaping, which may occur adjacent to the Project Site. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated (younger sediments vs. older sediments), the depth of excavation, and, if found, the abundance and type of archaeological resources encountered. Full-time monitoring may be reduced to part-time

inspections, or ceased entirely, if determined adequate by the Qualified Archaeologist. Prior to commencement of excavation activities, Archaeological Sensitivity Training shall be given for construction personnel. The training session shall be carried out by the Qualified Archaeologist and shall focus on how to identify archaeological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities and the procedures to be followed in such an event.

CUL-MM-4: In the event that historic (e.g., bottles, foundations, refuse dumps/privies, railroads, etc.) or prehistoric (e.g., hearths, burials, stone tools, shell and faunal bone remains, etc.) archaeological resources are unearthed, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A 50-foot buffer within which construction activities shall not be allowed to continue shall be established by the Qualified Archaeologist around the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the Qualified Archaeologist. If a resource is determined by the Qualified Archaeologist to constitute a "historical resource" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or a "unique archaeological resource" pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g), the Qualified Archaeologist shall coordinate with the Applicant and the City to develop a formal treatment plan that would serve to reduce impacts to the resources. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If, in coordination with the City, it is determined that preservation in place is not feasible, appropriate treatment of the resource shall be developed by the Qualified Archaeologist in coordination with the City and may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. Any archaeological material collected shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, they shall be donated to a local school, Tribe, or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

CUL-MM-5: Prior to the release of the grading bond, the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a final report and appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation Site Forms at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, results of the artifact processing, analysis, and research, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register and CEQA. The report and the Site Forms shall be submitted by the Applicant to the City, the South Central Coastal Information Center, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the development and required mitigation measures.

(e) Finding:

With respect to impacts to archeological resources, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1), the City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Alternative 8, which mitigate or avoid the potential significant effects identified in the EIR.

(f) Rationale:

(i) Direct Impacts to the Hollywood Walk of Fame:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-54 through IV.C-55 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-286 through V-287 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 construction would have direct

impacts to the Hollywood Walk of Fame because construction, particularly during sidewalk improvements, would require the temporary removal of the bronze stars and terrazzo sidewalks on adjacent areas of the historic Hollywood Walk of Fame along Vine Street. In accordance with required procedures for alterations to the Hollywood Walk of Fame set forth in the Hollywood Walk of Fame Terrazzo Pavement Installation and Repair Guidelines (Walk of Fame Guidelines), and in coordination with the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce/Hollywood Historic Trust, the City Office of Historic Resources (OHR), and the Department of Public Works, where stars or parts of the sidewalk cannot be protected in place, the locations would be recorded, and the stars crated and stored in an approved secured location.

Once necessary construction work is completed, the stars would be replaced and restored in an appropriate manner in their original location with matching terrazzo. All restoration work within the Hollywood Walk of Fame shall be reviewed and approved by the Bureau of Engineering as required by LAMC Section 62.105 under permit as required by LAMC Section 62.110 in conjunction with the review of the City Cultural Heritage Commission the Hollywood Historic Trust and Hollywood Chamber of Commerce for both removal and reinstallation. Once restored Alternative 8 would have enhanced this historical resource through the removal of existing driveways and street and landscape improvements. Nonetheless, the temporary removal of portions of the Hollywood Walk of Fame would have a temporary adverse effect on the Hollywood Walk of Fame, which would be a significant impact.

However, through compliance with the Walk of Fame Guidelines and with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1, the Hollywood Walk of Fame's eligibility as an Historic-Cultural Monument, and as a historical resource previously determined eligible for the National Register, would be maintained, and the areas restored would represent upgraded conditions for the Hollywood Walk of Fame, and, therefore, Alternative 8's direct impacts to the resource would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Indirect Impacts to the Capitol Records Complex:

a. Capitol Records Building:

As described for the Original Project on page IV.C-60 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-286 though V-287 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, although indirect impacts on the Capitol Records Building associated with the design of new construction and maintaining visual access would be less than significant without mitigation, Alternative 8 could have indirect impacts to the building during construction since construction would include substantial excavation to accommodate the new building's foundation and subterranean parking. As a result, there is potential for construction activities to cause damage to the Capitol Records Building due to vibration or settlement given the building's close proximity to the construction activity. As is common in similar urban development sites, vibration and settlement would be controlled through adherence to design values prescribed by the shoring engineer and geotechnical engineer with the intent to prevent damage to adjacent structures and through monitoring of associated construction activities. Although steps would be taken during construction to help ensure design values are not exceeded, if exceedance were to occur and result in structural damage, such damage would likely be surficial and repairable based on industry practice and knowledge of construction activities in similar settings. Nonetheless, the potential for damage to this historical resource due to construction-related vibration and settlement would be a potentially significant impact.

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-80 through IV.C-83 of the Draft EIR, which is

equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-286 of the draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, the potentially significant impacts caused by vibration and settlement during Alternative 8's construction can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 and Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2. Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, provided below in the Noise Section of these Findings, addresses structural vibration and includes reference to historical, as well as non-historical, buildings that require vibration monitoring. Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2, provided above, sets forth the procedures which will be required for shoring system design and monitoring of excavation, grading and shoring activities. Among other provisions which would protect historical resources on or adjacent to the Project Site, Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2 requires the preparation of an adjacent structures construction monitoring plan prior to any excavation, grading or shoring, daily monitoring and visual inspection, remediation if movement exceeds predetermined thresholds or if new cracks or distress are observed, and repair of damage caused by the construction. With implementation of these mitigation measures, Alternative 8 impacts to the Capitol Records Building historical resource would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Gogerty Building:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-60 through IV.C-61 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-286 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, similar to the Capitol Records Building, although indirect impacts on the Gogerty Building associated with the design of new construction and maintaining visual access would be less than significant without mitigation, the Gogerty Building could potentially suffer indirect damage by vibration or settlement caused by Alternative 8 construction. However, the potentially significant impacts caused by vibration and settlement during Alternative 8 construction can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, and Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2. Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, provided below in the Noise Section of these Findings, addresses structural vibration and includes reference to historical, as well as non-historical, buildings that require vibration monitoring. Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2, provided above, sets forth the procedures which will be required for shoring system design and monitoring of excavation, grading and shoring activities. Among other provisions which would protect historical resources on or adjacent to the Project Site, Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2 requires the preparation of an adjacent structures construction monitoring plan prior to any excavation, grading or shoring, daily monitoring and visual inspection, remediation if movement exceeds predetermined thresholds or if new cracks or distress is observed, and repair of damage caused by the construction. With implementation of these mitigation measures, Alternative 8 impacts to the Gogerty Building historical resource would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Archeological Resources:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-83 through IV.C-85 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on page V-287 of the Draft EIR, the analysis in the Draft EIR is based on review of previous investigations in the vicinity of the Project Site, as well as review of the prehistoric context for the area, which provides an understanding of the potential for encountering prehistoric and historic archaeological resources within the Project Site during Alternative 8's construction. The current development within the Project Site that would be subject to excavation primarily consists of surface parking lots. Archaeological deposits are frequently located beneath parking lots where construction activities would not have likely destroyed any potential subsurface remnant associated with the previous residential dwellings, if any such remnants do exist. Additionally, the geotechnical report prepared for the Project Site indicates

that the Project Site is underlain by 1 to 8 feet of historic fill, which likely represents a historic disturbance layer. Such layers are unlikely to represent imported fill but instead may be the result of historic development and demolition, which could contain historic period archaeological resources. Furthermore, the area is located less than two miles from the natural course of the Los Angeles River near the intersection that joins the Cahuenga Pass with the Los Angeles basin and may have been a focus of prehistoric human habitation. Holocene age Younger Alluvium in the subsurface of the Project Site, beneath artificial fill, indicates that it may contain buried archaeological deposits. Alternative 8 excavation would extend into both the historic fill layer, as well as the native soils beneath which have the potential to contain prehistoric and/or historic archaeological resources, which could qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.C-84 of the Draft EIR, no archaeological resources have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the Project Site. However, this does not preclude the possibility that subsurface archaeological deposits underlie the Project Site. For example, to the south of the Project Site is a historic period archaeological site that contains a foundation, structure pads, privies, a dump, and a trash scatter. Therefore, Alternative 8's grading and excavation may substantially disturb, damage, or degrade previously unknown archaeological resources. As a result, Alternative 8 construction has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, which may result in a potentially significant impact to archaeological resources.

However, as described for the Original Project on page V-287 of the Draft EIR, implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-3, CUL-MM-4, and CUL-MM-5 will be incorporated into Alternative 8 to ensure that construction activities do not cause significant impact to archaeological resources. Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-3 requires, amongst other requirements, the retention of a qualified archaeologist prior to issuance of a grading permit and prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, to oversee an archaeological monitor who shall be required to be present during construction excavations, such as demolition, clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, including peripheral activities, such as sidewalk replacement, utilities work, and landscaping, which may occur adjacent to the Project Site, training of construction personnel focused on how to identify archaeological resources that may be encountered, and the procedures to be followed in such an event. Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-4 and CUL-MM-5 set forth the procedures for handling and reporting of any archaeological resources encountered during Alternative 8 construction. Therefore, the implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant impact to archaeological resources during construction of Alternative 8 to less than significant with mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons set for the Original Project on Page IV.C-92 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, impacts due to potential construction, vibration and temporary alterations to the Hollywood Walk of Fame would be based on the proximity of the related projects to the Project Site and potential overlapping construction schedule of any related projects that could impact the same portions of the Hollywood Walk of Fame and Capitol Records Complex as Alternative 8. reduced to less than significant through Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1. Potential impacts due to structural vibration and settlement on the Capitol Records Building and Gogerty Building would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4. Similar mitigation measures could be imposed on the related projects which would protect the Capitol Records Complex and the mitigation provided would avoid significant impacts on the Capitol Records Building and Gogerty Building. As to Hollywood Walk

of Fame, for the reasons described above, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1 and related project compliance with the Hollywood Walk of Fame Guidelines, impacts on this resource would not be cumulative considerable and cumulative impacts would, therefore, be less than significant with mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Archeological Resources:

For the reasons set forth for the Original Project on pages IV.C-92 through IV.C-93 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, impacts related to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA are in most cases site-specific because they occur on a project level as a result of a project's ground disturbance activities during construction and, as such, are assessed on a project-by-project basis. Since Alternative 8 would be required to implement Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-3 through CUL-MM-5 to reduce impacts to archeological resources to a less-than-significant level and since the related projects would be required to comply with applicable regulations and standard City mitigation measures regarding discovery of archaeological resources, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts related to archaeological resources would not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts on archaeological resources would be less than significant and similar to the Original Project.

(g) Reference:

For a complete discussion of archeological resources, please see Section IV.C, *Cultural Resources,* Chapter V, *Alternatives,* page V-287, and Appendix F, *Cultural Resources Documentations,* of the Draft EIR.

3. Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Paleontological Resources:

As described on pages IV.D-39 through IV.D-41 and page V-289, and Appendix G-4 of the Draft EIR, substantial excavation within the Project Site during construction for subterranean parking, shoring, and ancillary uses, or improvements is planned at depths up to 64 feet bgs on the East Site and 60 feet bgs on the West Site. As such, although excavation depths would be somewhat reduced, Alternative 8, as with the Original Project, could access high sensitivity alluvial sediments with a high potential for fossils. As a result, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8's construction would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource not identified in the analysis conducted for the Project Site and, as such, would result in a potentially significant impact requiring implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-MM-1 through GEO-MM-3 to provide for appropriate treatment and/or preservation of any encountered resources.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on page IV.D-42 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, with regard to paleontological resources, given the site characteristics and mitigation measures to be implemented by Alternative 8, and the fact that related projects which would require excavation would be subject to environmental review and imposition of mitigation measures similar to Alternative 8, Alternative 8's contribution to

cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and Alternative 8's cumulative impacts regarding paleontological resources would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with regard to paleontological resources.

(d) Mitigation Measures:

The City finds that Mitigation Measures GEO-MM-1, GEO-MM-2 and GEO-MM-3, set forth below and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the potentially significant paleontological resources impacts of Alternative 8 to less than significant.

GEO-MM-1: A Qualified Paleontologist meeting the SVP Standards (Qualified Paleontologist) shall be retained prior to the approval of demolition or grading permits. The Qualified Paleontologist shall provide technical and compliance oversight of all work as it relates to paleontological resources, shall attend the Project kick-off meeting and Project progress meetings on a regular basis, and shall report to the Project Site in the event potential paleontological resources are encountered.

GEO-MM-2: The Qualified Paleontologist shall conduct construction worker paleontological resources sensitivity training at the Project kick-off meeting prior to the start of ground disturbing activities (including vegetation removal, pavement removal, etc.). In the event construction crews are phased, additional training shall be conducted for new construction personnel. The training session shall focus on the recognition of the types of paleontological resources that could be encountered within the Project Site and the procedures to be followed if they are found. Documentation shall be retained by the Qualified Paleontologist demonstrating that the appropriate construction personnel attended the training.

GEO-MM-3: Paleontological resources monitoring shall be performed by a qualified paleontological monitor (meeting the standards of the SVP, 2010) under the direction of the Qualified Paleontologist. Paleontological resources monitoring shall be conducted for all ground disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments which have high sensitivity for encountering paleontological resources. Depending on the conditions encountered, full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections or ceased entirely if determined adequate by the Qualified Paleontologist. The Qualified Paleontologist shall spot check the excavation on an intermittent basis and recommend whether the depth of required monitoring needs to be revised based on his/her observations. Monitors shall have the authority to temporarily halt or divert work away from exposed fossils or potential fossils. Monitors shall prepare daily logs detailing the types of activities and soils observed and any discoveries. Any significant fossils collected during Project-related excavations shall be prepared to the point of identification and curated into an accredited repository with retrievable storage. The Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a final monitoring and mitigation report for submittal to the City in order to document the results of the monitoring effort and any discoveries. If there are significant discoveries, fossil locality information and final disposition shall be included with the final report, which shall be submitted to the appropriate repository and the City.

(e) Finding:

With respect to impacts to paleontological resources, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1), the

City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Alternative 8, which mitigate or avoid the potential significant effects identified in the EIR.

(f) Rationale for Finding:

As described on pages IV.D-39 through IV.D-40 and Appendix G-4, *Paleontological Resources Assessment Report*, of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-289 of the Draft EIR, because Alternative 8 is in an urban developed location, there are no unique geologic features and unique geologic features on the Project Site. However, a thorough background research and analysis detailed in Appendix G-4 of the Draft EIR was conducted to determine the possibility of disturbance of paleontological resources during construction. Although the records search resulted in no known localities within the Project Site, a number of vertebrate fossils are known from similar sedimentary deposits in Los Angeles and in nearby areas and discoveries of significant fossil remains as have been discovered in as shallow as 5 to 6 feet bgs at locations near the Project Site. Additionally, the results of the 2015 and 2019 Fault Studies (Appendices G-1 and G-2 of the Draft EIR) indicate the shallowest soils are at least 5,000 years old, which means that they are of an age where they could contain sensitive fossils. Moreover, the depth of excavation during construction for subterranean parking, shoring, and ancillary uses, or improvements would access high sensitivity alluvial sediments with a high potential for fossils to be present in the subsurface. As a result, Alternative 8 construction would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource not identified in the analysis conducted for the Project Site and, as such, would result in a potentially significant impact.

In order to ensure that paleontological resources are not destroyed, Alternative 8 would be required to implement Mitigation Measures GEO-MM-1, GEO-MM-2, and GEO-MM-3. These mitigation measures provide the procedures for protecting paleontological resources that are encountered during construction. In summary, these mitigation measures would: (i) require the retention of a qualified paleontologist prior to approval of demolition or grading permits to provide technical and compliance oversight of all work as it relates to paleontological resources (Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-1); (ii) required the qualified paleontologist to conduct construction worker paleontological resources sensitivity training with focus on the recognition of the types of paleontological resources that could be encountered within the Project Site and the procedures to be followed if they are found (Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-2); and (iii) require paleontological resources monitoring by a qualified paleontological monitor for all ground disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments which have high sensitivity for encountering paleontological resources with the authority to halt or divert work away from exposed fossils or potential fossils, prepare daily logs detailing the types of activities and soils observed and any discoveries. Additionally, any significant fossils collected during excavations are required to be prepared to the point of identification and curated into an accredited repository with retrievable storage and appropriate reports prepared to indicate all work and finds (Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-3). As stated on page V-289 of the Draft EIR, impacts related to paleontological resources during Alternative 8 construction would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the above mitigation measures. As such, Alternative 8 impacts to paleontological resources during construction would be less than significant with mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

As Alternative 8 would have no impacts to paleontological resources during operation since there would be no continuous groundbreaking and excavation activities during operation, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and impacts would be similar to the Original Project.

(g) Reference:

For a complete discussion of impacts related to paleontological resources, please see Section IV.D, *Geology and Soils*, and the Geotechnical Reports and Paleontological Resources Documentation contained in Appendices G-1, *2015 Fault Study,* G-2, *2019 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Evaluation Report,* G-3, *Geotechnical Investigation,* and G-4, *Paleontological Resources Assessment Report,* and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* page V-289 of the Draft EIR.

4. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials and Use of Hazardous Materials within a One-Quarter Mile of a School)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Release of hazardous materials into the environment:

As described on page V-291 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would require excavation for subterranean parking. Such excavation could expose the public or the environment to contaminated soils and soil vapors and could reveal remnant steel structures and/or possibly underground storage tanks (USTs) associated with historic automobile gas and service stations, and, therefore, construction could cause a potential impact from the accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore, Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1 (Soil Management Plan) is required to reduce construction impacts to less than significant.

(ii) Use of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school:

As described on pages V-291 through V-292 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. However, as described on page IV.F-26 of the Draft EIR, while there are no Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) elementary, middle, or high schools located within one-quarter mile of the Project Site, in a dense metropolitan area, such as Los Angeles, day care centers and/or pre-schools are sometimes associated with civic, business, and residential uses in the area and are considered sensitive receptors to hazardous materials or substances. Therefore, Project construction could potentially have a significant impact on an existing or proposed school located within one-quarter mile of the Project. As such, Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1 (Soil Management Plan), which would establish policy and requirements during construction for the disposal of contaminated soils and management of soil vapors or other gases during excavation activities, and Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 (Construction Equipment Features) would be required to reduce the impacts of Alternative 8 to less than significant.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.F-32 through IV.F-33 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 and the related projects are not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or environment because the potentially hazardous materials typically used in such developments are limited to relatively small volumes of commonplace materials. In addition, each of the related projects would be required to comply with its site-specific development standards and applicable hazardous materials handling and transporting regulations and manufacturer's specifications. Moreover, while the Phase I Environmental Impacts Report, Appendix H-1 of the Draft EIR, identified some potentially hazardous conditions within a one-mile of the Project Site due to historic uses of those sites, none of the related projects are located on those identified sites and, thus, would they not contribute to

a cumulative impact. Therefore, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and, Alternative 8's hazards and hazardous materials cumulative impacts would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

(d) Mitigation Measures:

The City finds that Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1 (Soil Management Plan), set forth below, and Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 (Construction Equipment Features), set forth above, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts of Alternative 8, to less than significant.

HAZ-MM-1: Soil Management Plan. The Project Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to prepare a Soils Management Plan (SMP), which shall be submitted to the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) for review and approval prior to the commencement of excavation and grading activities. The SMP shall establish policy and requirements for the management and disposal of soils, as well as for any steel structures, including USTs, should they be encountered, during soil-disturbing activities performed at the Project Site (i.e., excavation, grading, trenching, utility installation or repair, and other human activities) that may disturb potentially contaminated soils. The SMP shall describe specific soil- and UST-handling controls required to comply with federal, state, and local, overseeing agencies; prevent unacceptable exposure to contaminated soils or vapors during construction; and prevent the improper disposal of contaminated soils or steel structures.

(e) Finding:

With respect to the accidental release of hazardous materials and the use of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1), the City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Alternative 8 which mitigate or avoid the potential significant effects identified in the EIR.

(f) Rationale for Finding:

(i) Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials:

As described on pages V-291 of the Draft EIR and for the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.F-24 through IV.F-25 for the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 would require excavation of soil at depths of 64 feet on the East Site and 60 feet on the West Site for subterranean parking. Since soil testing revealed the presence of VOCs in concentrations above applicable environmental screening levels (ESLs), the Draft EIR conservatively concluded that there is the potential for contaminated soils and vapors to occur beneath the Project Site, which could result in a potentially significant impact or hazard to the public or the environment during excavation activities. Furthermore, on the West Site, undocumented remnant steel structures, and possibly USTs, may still be located on the subsurface of the Project Site that were associated with historic on-site automotive-related maintenance and fueling activities. On the East Site, a possible underground steel structure may also be located due to historic uses of the Project Site. To address potential hazards associated

with contaminated soils, soil vapors and remnant steel structures, including possible USTs, Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1 (Soils Management Plan) will be incorporated into the Project which is a soils management plan for the entire Project Site.

As described on page IV.F-26 of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1 would establish policy and requirements for the management and disposal of soils, as well as for any steel structures, including USTs, should they be encountered, during soil-disturbing activities performed at the Project Site (i.e., excavation, grading, trenching, utility installation or repair, and other human activities) that may disturb potentially contaminated soils. The Soils Management Plan would describe specific soil- and UST-handing controls required to comply with federal, State, and local overseeing agencies; prevent unacceptable exposure to contaminated soils or vapors during construction; and prevent the improper disposal of contaminated soils or steel structures. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1, potentially significant impacts to the public or the environment from the release of hazardous materials released during upset and/or accident conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Use of Hazardous Materials within One-Quarter Mile of a School:

As described on pages V-291 through V-292 and for the reasons described for the Project on pages IV.F-26 through IV.F-28 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, no LAUSD elementary, middle, or high schools are located within one-quarter mile of the Project Site with the nearest LAUSD school to the Project Site located 0.29 miles from the Project Site. However, in a dense metropolitan area, such as Los Angeles, day care centers and/or pre-schools are sometimes associated with civic, business, and residential uses in the area and are considered sensitive receptors to hazardous materials or substances. Examples of such schools in the Project Site vicinity include the Hollywood Presbyterian Children's Center Preschool, located 0.2 miles east of the Project Site, and the Montessori Shir-Hashirim Los Angeles school, located 0.25 miles southeast of the Project Site. As with the Original Project, Alternative 8 construction activities would include the use or architectural coatings and the use of diesel-powered construction equipment, which could generate VOCs or diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions. Exposure to DPM may be a health hazard, particularly to children whose lungs are still developing. An analysis of the Project TACs emissions (including VOCs emissions) was conducted as part of the analysis in Section IV.B, *Air Quality*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, which included analysis of the sensitive receptors such as schools. As indicated in Appendix E of the Draft EIR, and discussed above under the air quality findings, Alternative 8 construction-related TACs would be less than significant with use of Tier IV construction equipment required as mitigation in Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 (Construction Equipment Features). In addition, Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1(Soils Management Plan) would establish requirements for the handling, management and disposal of any contaminated soils or structures, which prevent unacceptable exposure to contaminated soils or vapors during construction at any nearby school.

Therefore, as to construction impacts, through compliance with applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations relating to environmental protection and the management of hazardous materials, adherence to manufacturer's instructions for safe handling and disposal of hazardous materials, and implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-MM-1 and AQ-MM-1, potentially significant Project construction impacts regarding hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would be less than significant and would be similar to the Original Project.

(g) Reference:

For a complete discussion of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, please see Section IV.F, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and Appendices H-1, *Phase I Environmental Assessment,* and H-2, *Phase II Environmental Assessment,* and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* pages V-272 through V-314 of the Draft EIR.

VII. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The Final EIR determined that, similar to the Original Project, the environmental impacts of Alternative 8 set forth below are significant and unavoidable.

As to the impacts which are significant and unavoidable, in order to approve Alternative 8 with significant unmitigated impacts, the City is required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is set forth below in Section XII of these Findings. No additional environmental impacts other than those identified below will have a significant effect or result in a substantial or potentially substantial adverse effect on the environment as a result of the construction or operation of Alternative 8. The City finds and determines that:

a) All significant environmental impacts that can be feasibly avoided have been eliminated, or substantially lessened through implementation of the Project Design Features and/or Mitigation Measures; and
b) Based on the Final EIR, the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth below, and other documents and information in the record with respect to the construction and operation of the Project, all remaining unavoidable significant impacts, as set forth in these findings, are overridden by the benefits of Alternative 8 as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the construction and operation of Alternative and implementing actions.

1. Cultural Resources (Off-Site Historical Resources)

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Indirect Impacts:

As to the potential physical damage to nearby historical resource buildings, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8 could also result in potentially significant impacts due to structural vibration at nearby historical resources during construction. As with the Original Project, impacts associated with Alternative 8 to those resources could be reduced to less-than-significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4. However, as with the Original Project, these mitigation measures can only be applied to the Pantages Theatre, Avalon Hollywood, and the building located at 6316-24 Yucca Street/Art Deco Storefront with the consent of their property owners, who may not agree to participate in the implementation, and, therefore, the City has conservatively concluded that indirect impacts to those buildings would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-88 through IV.C-93 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, with implementation of mitigation measures,

cumulative level impacts to historical resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, with the exception of potential temporary construction vibration and settlement effects on certain off-site historical buildings. A significant cumulative impact associated with Alternative 8 and the related projects would occur if the impact would render a historical resource or district as no longer eligible for listing, and Alternative 8's contribution to the impact would be considerable. Only the related projects that are in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site that have the potential to contribute to indirect damage to or changes in the setting of identified historical resources on the Project Site and in the vicinity would have a potential to have a significant cumulative impact which, as identified in the Draft EIR, pages IV.C-88 through IV.C-89, would be Related Project Nos. 1 through 4.

Potentially overlapping construction schedules with Related Project No. 2 could result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to the Pantages Theatre and the Hollywood Walk of Fame. As to the Hollywood Walk of Fame, for the reasons described above under Impacts that Are Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures of these Findings, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1 and related project compliance with the Hollywood Walk of Fame Guidelines, impacts on this resource would not be cumulative considerable and cumulative impacts would, therefore, be less than significant with mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

However, as to the Pantages Theatre, for all the same reasons described above for Alternative 8, while the mitigation provided by Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4 would reduce impacts to less than significant, implementation of these mitigation measures would require the consent of other property owners, who may not agree to participate in the mitigation measure. Therefore, the City has concluded that Alternative 8's construction vibration and settlement cumulative impacts on the Pantages Theatre would remain significant and unavoidable and similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

No specific Project Design Features are proposed with respect to cultural resources.

(d) Mitigation Measures:

The City finds that Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-1 and CUL-MM-2, presented above in the Cultural Resources Section of these Findings and Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, presented below in the Noise Section of these Findings, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the potentially significant cultural resources impacts of Alternative 8 to less than significant; however, as they require consent of other property owners, these mitigation measures may not be able to be implemented and, therefore, potential temporary construction vibration and settlement effects on certain off-site historical resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

(e) Findings:

Regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts to historical resources of Alternative 8, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible additional mitigation measures or the other Project alternatives identified in the EIR.

(f) Rationale for Finding:

(i) Historical Resources:

As stated on pages IV.C-49 through IV.C-50 and Appendix F-1 of the Draft EIR, a project could have a significant effect on a historical resource if the project results in a substantial adverse change which is defined as "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1)). Additionally, the ability of the historical resources to retain their integrity is important since a project that diminishes the integrity of a resource such that the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired is a project that would result in a significant impact on the environment.

To ascertain whether there would be a significant impact on historical resources on and near the Project Site, the Draft EIR relied on the Historical Resources Technical Report, which included a review of the existing properties within the Project Site and within a 0.25-mile of the Project Site. Research of the Project Site's development included a review of historic building permits for improvements to the property, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, historic photographs, aerial photos, and local histories. The California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) for Los Angeles County, Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Resources Inventory Forms, and SurveyLA Eligibility findings were consulted to identify any previous evaluations of Project Site and potential historic resources within a 0.25-mile radius of the property. Also consulted was the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Historic Resources Survey: Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area, published in 2010. In addition, field examinations were conducted to review and confirm previous findings and to identify previously unevaluated properties that were potentially eligible as historical resources within the area where potential direct or indirect impacts could occur.

a. Indirect Impacts:

1) Pantages Theatre:

As discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.C-64 through IV.C-66 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, the Pantages Theatre, which is a district contributor to the Hollywood Boulevard District, is located immediately adjacent to the East Site. The Pantages Theatre property is separated from the East Site along portions of its western side lot line by a shared 20-foot-wide public alley. This alley provides both a physical and visual separation between the Project Site and the Pantages Theatre. Along other portions of the western side lot-line and northern rear lot line, the two sites abut directly. Although there would be limited areas where Alternative 8 would be in close proximity, nearly all of the aspects of integrity for the Pantages Theatre would be retained and remain intact. Close-up views of the front façade of the Pantages Theatre would not be affected by Alternative 8, although more distant views of the front façade would feature Alternative 8 as a backdrop to the Pantages Theatre. However, the Pantages Theatre's location, design, materials, and workmanship would remain completely intact. The Pantages Theatre's feeling and association as a historical theatre would not change, and the building would retain its visual prominence upon the street. The only views of the Pantages Theatre that would be obscured by Alternative 8 include a view of the building's rear and west elevations. However, the rear and west elevations of the Pantages Theatre are the building's least significant elevations as they are not articulated architecturally. While these views would be blocked from a distance, they would still be viewable from the alley (see Figure IV.C-2, *Rear Elevation of the Pantages Theatre*, of the Draft EIR) and along Vine Street. In addition, whether blocked from a distance or still accessible from the alley and Vine Street, they are not

the primary views that help the building convey its significance. The only aspect of the Pantages Theatre's integrity that would be affected by Alternative 8 is its setting. However, although the setting for the Pantages Theatre would somewhat change because of its new relationship to its surroundings in that Alternative 8, which is much larger in scale, would now form a backdrop to the Pantages Theatre, this change in the setting and the partial alteration of visual access to the non-articulated rear and west elevations would not be considered significant in light of other large construction projects in the Project vicinity that has been occurring since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed.

Nonetheless, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-65 and IV.C-83 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and pages V-286 through V-287 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, because construction at the Project Site would include substantial foundation work and the construction of subterranean parking, there is potential for these activities to cause damage to the Pantages Theatre through vibration or settlement due to the building's close proximity to the Project Site. Similar to the potential damage to the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building, while vibration and settlement would be controlled through adherence to design values prescribed by the shoring engineer and geotechnical engineer with the intent to prevent damage to adjacent structures and through monitoring of associated construction activities, the potential for damage to the Pantages Theatre due to construction-related vibration and settlement is considered a significant impact. If Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4 could be implemented, these measures would reduce this significant impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, provided below in the Noise Section of these Findings, addresses structural vibration and includes reference to historical, as well as non-historical, buildings that require vibration monitoring. Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2, provided above, sets forth the procedures which will be required for shoring system design and monitoring of excavation, grading and shoring activities. Among other provisions, which would protect historical resources on or adjacent to the Project Site, Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2 requires the preparation of an adjacent structures construction monitoring plan prior to any excavation, grading or shoring, daily monitoring and visual inspection, remediation if movement exceeds predetermined thresholds or if new cracks or distress is observed, and repair of damage caused by the construction. However, because implementation of these mitigation measures requires the consent of the property owner, which may not be given, the City has concluded that potential indirect impacts from construction related vibrations and settlement would be a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative 8 and would be similar to the Original Project.

2) Avalon Hollywood:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-66 through IV.C-69 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, the West Site of the Project Site is bordered by the Avalon Hollywood Building which is the closest building that is a contributor to the Hollywood Boulevard District. New construction on the West Site would be set back 17.5 feet from the north property line of the Avalon Hollywood and 15 feet from Vine Street north of the Avalon Hollywood to maintain the prominence of the Avalon Hollywood façade on Vine Street. Because of the strong physical and visual separation of the Project Site to the north of the Avalon Hollywood, as well as the setback of Alternative 8 from Vine Street, nearly all of the aspects of integrity for the Avalon Hollywood would be retained and remain intact and primary views of the building's primary façade would not be affected. Its location, design, materials, and workmanship would remain completely intact as Alternative 8 would not physically touch the resource and its feeling and association would remain intact as the front façade is the most architecturally

articulated of all of the building's elevations and the elevation that most conveys the building's feeling and association a historical theater. The only view of the Avalon Hollywood that would be partially obscured by Alternative 8 is a far-distant view of the building's north (side) elevation; however, the north (side) elevation of the Avalon Hollywood is not a particularly significant one, as it is fairly unarticulated architecturally and very utilitarian. Therefore, the building would retain its integrity in terms of both feeling and association. The only aspect of the Avalon Hollywood's integrity that would be affected by Alternative 8 is its setting. However, as with the Pantages Theatre, Avalon Hollywood's larger setting has been characterized by the juxtaposition of varying building heights since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed.

Nonetheless, as discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.C-68 and IV.C-83 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on pages V-286 through V-287 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, and as described above for the Pantages Theatre, there is potential for construction activities to cause damage to the Hollywood Avalon through vibration or settlement due to the building's close proximity to the Project Site. Similar to the potential damage to the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building, while vibration and settlement would be controlled through adherence to design values prescribed by the shoring engineer and geotechnical engineer and implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4, would reduce this significant impact to less than significant. However, because implementation of these mitigation measures requires the consent of the property owner, which may not be given, the City has concluded that potential indirect impacts from construction related vibrations and settlement would be a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative 8 and would be similar to the Original Project.

3) Art Deco Commercial Building/6316-6324 Yucca Street:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.C-69 through IV.C-70 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and Appendix B-2 of the Final EIR, the Art Deco Commercial Building (6316-24 Yucca Street) historic significance is conveyed through its largely intact storefronts and distinctive Art Deco detailing. New construction proposed for the West Site, which would be located south and east of the commercial building at 6316-6324 Yucca Street, would not block important street views of the building from Yucca Street. Due to its modest size and street-facing orientation, the historic significance of the commercial building at 6316-6324 Yucca Street is primarily experienced on an intimate scale, either by pedestrians or passing motorists. The increased density constructed to the south and west would not obscure the building's important Yucca Street façade, which would remain unobstructed from view after implementation of Alternative 8. Moreover, the large surface parking areas to the west and south do not represent setting features that are character-defining or important to the building's historic significance.

Nonetheless, as discussed for the Original Project on pages IV.C-69 and IV.C-83 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and on pages V-286 through V-287 of the Draft EIR, and Appendix B of the Final EIR, and as discussed above for the Pantages Theatre, there is potential for construction activities to cause damage to the Art Deco Building through vibration or settlement due to the building's close proximity to the Project Site. Similar to the potential damage to the Capitol Records Building and the Gogerty Building, while vibration and settlement would be controlled through adherence to design values prescribed by the shoring engineer and geotechnical engineer and implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-MM-2 and NOI-MM-4 would reduce this significant impact to less than significant. However, because implementation of these mitigation measures requires the consent of the property owner, which may not be given, the City has concluded that potential indirect impacts from construction related vibrations and

settlement would be a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative 8 and would be similar to the Original Project.

(g) Reference:

For a complete discussion of impacts related to cultural resources, please see Section IV.C, *Cultural Resources*, and Appendices F-1, *Historical Resources Technical Report,* and F-2, *Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Report,* and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* pages V-272 through V-314 of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR,* and Appendix B-2, *Supplemental Historical Resources Analysis,* of the Final EIR.

2. Noise

(a) Impact Summary:

(i) Noise (Construction):

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-38 through IV.I-43 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and pages V-297 through V-298 of the Draft EIR, and pages 3-50 through 3-51 of the Final EIR, even though Alternative 8 would comply with regulatory requirements regarding noise, calculating the maximum potential noise level with overlapping construction of the East and West Sites and assuming that all equipment was operating simultaneously and located at construction areas nearest to the affect sensitive receptor, on-site construction noise would exceed significance threshold levels and, therefore, would be significant. Mitigation could lessen this significant impact but would not reduce it to a less-than-significant level, and, therefore, Alternative 8 on-site construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable and, due to similar construction duration, would be similar to the Original Project.
Also, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-43 through IV.I-46 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page 298 of the Draft EIR, and page 2-94 of the Final EIR, off-site construction noise caused by construction trucks, including haul trucks and trucks delivering building materials, supplies and concrete, would generate noise levels exceeding significance thresholds and, therefore, would be significant. Mitigation measures could lessen this significant impact but would not reduce it to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, Alternative 8 off-site construction noise levels would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Vibration and Human Annoyance:

a. Construction:

As described on pages V-299 through V-300 of the Draft EIR, as with the Original Project, construction ground borne vibration and human annoyance impacts would be significant to nearby historical structures and sensitive receptors. Therefore, vibration impacts pursuant to the significance criteria for building damage would be significant. As with the Original Project, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Construction Vibration) and compliance with LAMC Section 91.3307.1, vibration impacts associated with Alternative 8 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels for the Capitol Records and Gogerty Buildings. However, similar to the Original Project, because consent of off-site property owners, who may not agree, would be required to implement the vibration mitigation for potential structural damage to their off-site structures, the City has concluded that structural vibration impacts would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

Regarding human annoyance, as with the Original Project, the estimated vibration levels due to maximum construction activity at the West Site under Alternative 8 would exceed the significance threshold for human annoyance at vibration sensitive receptors near the Project Site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 under Alternative 8, as with the Original Project, may lessen but would not reduce all human annoyance impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures under Alternative 8 would reduce the temporary vibration impacts from on-site construction associated with human annoyance at the vibration-sensitive receptors 3, 5, 6, and 8 through 13. As with the Original Project, construction vibration levels would be significant and unavoidable under Alternative 8, and, as Alternative 8 would result in a similar duration of construction activity, impacts related to construction vibration would be similar to the Original Project.

(b) Cumulative Impacts:

(i) Construction:

a. Noise:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-88 through IV.I-90 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the potential for cumulative construction noise impacts from on-site construction activities to occur is based on the distance between Alternative 8 and each of the related projects. Noise from construction activities would normally affect the areas immediately adjacent to each of the construction sites, specifically areas that are less than 500 feet from a construction site. Therefore, of the 150 related projects, six of the related projects have the potential to create construction noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors should their construction schedule overlap with the construction of Alternative 8. As to off-site construction noise, while the scheduling and timing of construction truck trips are not known, five of the six related projects would use the same haul routes which, assuming an overlap in construction schedules, could result in increased roadway noise. As such, should one or more of these related projects' construction schedules overlap with Alternative 8, Alternative 8's cumulative on-site and off-site construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Groundbourne Vibrations and Human Annoyance:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on page IV.I-90 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, due to rapid attenuation characteristics of groundborne vibration, only related projects located adjacent to the same sensitive receptors would result in cumulatively considerable vibration impacts. The only related project located adjacent to the same receptor as Alternative 8 and has not yet been constructed is Related Project No. 2. Should construction of Alternative 8 and Related Project No. 2 overlap, there is the potential for cumulative vibration impacts to the Pantages Theatre to the south of the Project Site. As discussed above, construction of Alternative 8 would result in significant vibration impacts related to structural damage and human annoyance at this receptor. Therefore, vibration impacts in association with Related Project No. 2 would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts due to construction vibration would be significant. Because consent of off-site property owners, who may not agree, would be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4, the City has concluded that cumulative vibration impacts on the Pantages Theatre would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

(c) Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Features NOI-PDF-1 (Impact Pile Driving and Blasting Prohibitions) and NOI-PDF-2 (Construction Power Sources), set forth below, and Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-1 (TDM Program aimed at discouraging single-occupancy vehicle trips), set forth above in the Transportation Section of these Findings, and incorporated into Alternative 8, would reduce the significant and unavoidable construction noise, groundborne vibration and human annoyance impacts of Alternative 8, although not to a less-than-significant level.

NOI-PDF-1: **Impact Pile Driving and Blasting Prohibitions.** The Project will not use or allow impact pile drivers and will not require or allow blasting during construction activities.

NOI-PDF-2: Construction Power Sources. Electricity from power poles, where power poles are available, and/or solar-powered generators rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators will be used during construction. If diesel- or gasoline-powered generators are used, such equipment will be located at least 100 feet away from off-site sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, childcare centers, hospitals, parks, or similar uses), whenever possible, and flexible sound control curtains will be placed around the equipment when in use.

(d) Mitigation Measures:

The City finds that Mitigation Measures NOI-MM-1 (Setback Distances and Boundary Noise Current), NOI-MM-2 (Equipment Noise Shielding, Mufflers, and Stationary Curtains), NOI-MM-3 (Construction Liaison), and NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring), set forth below and incorporated into Alternative 8 would reduce the significant and unavoidable construction noise and groundborne vibration and human annoyance impacts of Alternative 8, although not to a less-than-significant level.

NOI-MM-1: **Setback Distances and Boundary Noise Curtains.** Noise and vibration construction equipment whose specific location on the Project Site may be flexible (e.g., compressors and generators) shall be located away from the nearest off-site sensitive land uses (at least 100 feet away), or natural and/or manmade barriers (e.g., intervening construction trailers) shall be used to screen propagation of noise from such equipment towards these land uses. Even with natural and/or manmade barriers, in no case shall fixed stationary equipment, stockpiling of construction materials, equipment warm-up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas be within 40 feet from the property line of off-site historic buildings. If manmade barriers are to be used, the contractor shall be required to use temporary construction noise barriers, such as sound deadening blankets or curtains, with a height up to 20 feet above ground that shall achieve a performance standard of a minimum 12-dBA insertion loss along the Project Site's boundary where significantly impacted noise-sensitive land uses are within 500 feet of the Project Site. The temporary construction noise barriers shall be installed on or around the Project Site perimeter and/or along soldier piles that shall be drilled and cast in place during shoring activities. Open access points or gates leading to street frontages, including along Ivar Avenue, Vine Street, and Argyle Avenue, shall be permissible to allow for adequate and safe worker, vehicle, and equipment access to the construction area. The temporary construction noise barriers installed on or around the soldier piles shall remain in-place during ground disturbance activities until exterior vertical building construction commences, when the use of on-site noise-generating heavy-duty construction equipment is prevalent.

NOI-MM-2: **Equipment Noise Shielding, Mufflers, and Stationary Curtains.** The Project contractor shall use power construction equipment with factory-installed noise shielding and

muffling devices. In addition, no impact pile driving shall be utilized; augured, or drilled piles are permitted. Flexible sound control curtains that achieve a performance standard of a minimum 12-dBA insertion loss with appropriate open access points or gates to allow for adequate and safe worker, vehicle, and equipment access shall be placed around all drilling apparatuses, drill rigs, stationary concrete pumps, stationary generators, and jackhammers when in use.

NOI-MM-3: **Construction Liaison.** A construction liaison shall be provided to inform the nearby receptors 1, 3, and 5 through 13 when peak noise and vibration activities are scheduled to occur. Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction at the Project Site, notification shall be provided to these receptor properties that discloses the construction schedule, including the various types of activities and equipment that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period. The construction liaison shall coordinate with the owner/operator of the Pantages Theatre to minimize disruptions to performances during the performance times starting at 8:00 p.m., Tuesday through Saturday, and 2:00 p.m. on Saturday afternoon from Project construction noise and vibration near the Pantages Theater.

NOI-MM-4: Vibration Monitoring. The Applicant shall perform structural vibration monitoring during Project construction as follows:

a) Prior to start of construction, the Applicant shall retain the services of a licensed building inspector or structural engineer, or other qualified professional as approved by the City, to visit the following buildings, which are located either on-site or immediately adjacent to the Project Site, to inspect and document (video and/or photographic) the apparent physical condition of the building's readily-visible features. This includes both historic buildings and non-historic buildings in proximity to the Project Site. For the historic buildings listed below, inspection and documentation shall also be carried out by and in coordination with a qualified preservation consultant. The non-historic buildings are as follows:
    - AMDA Vine Building
    - Argyle House
    - Single-story commercial building at 1718 N. Vine Street (if this building has been issued demolition permits or has already been demolished as part of Related Project No. 2, the provisions of this mitigation measure do not apply to this structure)

    The historic buildings are as follows:
    - Capitol Records Building (on-site)
    - Gogerty Building (on-site)
    - Pantages Theatre (off-site)
    - Avalon Hollywood (off-site)
    - 6316-24 Yucca Street/Art Deco Building Storefront (off-site)

b) The Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified acoustical engineer and/or structural engineer to develop and implement a vibration monitoring program during the site demolition and grading/excavation, capable of documenting the construction-related ground vibration levels at the buildings listed above. The vibration monitoring systems shall be placed at receptor building façades closest to Project construction activity or placed at a representative location if a receptor building façade is not accessible and shall continuously measure (in vertical and horizontal directions) and store the peak particle velocity (PPV) in inch/second. The systems shall also be programmed for two preset velocity levels: a warning level of 0.09 inch/second (PPV) for the off-site historic structures, 0.15 inch/second (PPV) for the single-story commercial building at 1718 N. Vine Street (not required if this building has been issued demolition permits or has already been demolished as part of Related Project No. 2), 0.25 inch/second (PPV) for the AMDA Vine Building, and 0.45 inch/second (PPV) for the Capitol Records Building, Gogerty Building,

and the Argyle House and a regulatory level of 0.12 inch/second (PPV) for the off-site historic structures, 0.2 inch/second (PPV) for the single-story commercial building at 1718 N. Vine Street (not required if this building has been issued demolition permits or has already been demolished as part of Related Project No. 2), 0.30 inch/second (PPV) for the AMDA Vine Building, and 0.50 inch/second (PPV) for the Capitol Records Building, Gogerty Building, and the Argyle House. In cases where a receptor building façade is not accessible, the two preset velocity levels shall be programmed at equivalent levels based on distance and soil characteristics that affect vibration transmission over that distance. The systems shall also provide real-time alert when the vibration levels exceed the two preset levels. The noise and vibration monitoring program shall include a description of the monitoring equipment specifications, calibration certificates, exact monitoring locations (which shall be coordinated with the property owners for the buildings listed in "a." above), and protocols for data collection, reporting, alerting, maintenance and calibration, and unplanned outage. Selected monitoring systems shall be capable of unmanned operation during periods of on-site Project construction activity, with internal storage and remote data download. Systems shall be capable of measuring the inch/second PPV in all three axes (vertical and two horizontal) simultaneously. The monitoring program shall specify the protocols for threshold exceedance, including, but not be limited to, which personnel are designated to receive alerts, how the alerts shall be sent (text message, email, etc.), and how the vibration event shall be documented and reported. The program shall include regular reporting no less frequently than weekly.

c) The vibration monitoring program shall be submitted, for review and approval to the Department of Building and Safety, prior to initiating any construction activities.
d) In the event the warning level (i.e., 0.09, 0.15, 0.25, and 0.45 inch/second [PPV], or equivalent levels) is triggered, the contractor shall identify the source of vibration generation and provide feasible steps to reduce the vibration level, including but not limited to staggering concurrent vibration-generating construction activities (if doing so would not pose a safety risk to personnel or damage risk to buildings or facilities) and utilizing lower vibratory techniques.
e) In the event the regulatory level (i.e., 0.12, 0.20, 0.30, and 0.50 inch/second [PPV], or equivalent levels) is triggered, the contractor shall identify the source of vibration generation and implement feasible steps identified in Item "d" above to reduce the vibration level from construction activities to avoid or minimize damage from construction activities in the vicinity of the building. The contractor shall visually inspect the building for any damage. Results of the inspection must be logged.
f) In the event damage occurs to the historic features of historic buildings due to construction vibration, such features/materials shall be repaired in consultation with a qualified preservation consultant, and, if warranted, in a manner that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

(e) Findings:

(i) Construction Noise:

Regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts from on-site and off-site construction noise of Alternative 8, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible additional mitigation measures or the other Project alternatives identified in the EIR.

(ii) Construction Groundbourne Vibrations and Human

Annoyance:

Regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts from construction groundbourne vibrations to structures and human annoyance of Alternative 8, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible additional mitigation measures or the other Project alternatives identified in the EIR.

(iii) Cumulative Construction Noise:

Regarding the cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts from construction noise of Alternative 8, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible additional mitigation measures or the other Project alternatives identified in the EIR.

(iv) Cumulative Construction Groundbourne Vibration and Human Annoyance:

Regarding the cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts from construction groundbourne vibrations and human annoyance of Alternative 8, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible additional mitigation measures or the other Project alternatives identified in the EIR.

(f) Rationale for Findings:

(i) Construction Noise:

a. On-Site Construction Noise:

As described on page IV.I-33 and Appendix K-1 of the Draft EIR and using the methodology, as described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-38 through IV.I-43 of the Draft EIR, construction noise impacts were calculated for the noise generated by construction equipment taking into consideration such factors as type of equipment, the location of the equipment, the timing and duration of the noise-generating construction activities, and the relative distance to noise-sensitive receptors. Construction activities would generally include demolition, site grading and excavation for the subterranean parking garage, and building construction. Each phase of construction would involve the use of various types of construction equipment and would, therefore, have its own distinct noise characteristics. Noise from construction equipment would generate both steady-state and episodic noise that could be heard within and adjacent to the Project Site. Moreover, construction noise levels fluctuate throughout a given workday as construction equipment move from one location to another within a construction site. When construction equipment would be in use further away from a sensitive receptor location, construction noise levels would be lower than the calculated values provided in the Draft EIR, which assumes construction equipment would be in use nearest to a sensitive receptor location. Exposure to fluctuating construction noise levels that would at times be lower than the noise levels shown in the analysis below would not rise to the level that would result in hearing loss or adverse health impacts.

Individual pieces of construction equipment that would be used for construction produce maximum noise levels of 74 dBA to 90 dBA at a reference distance of 50 feet from the noise source, as shown in Table IV.I-7, *Construction Equipment Noise Reference Levels and Usage Factors*, of the Draft EIR. The construction equipment noise levels at 50 feet distance (Referenced Maximum Noise Levels) are based on the FHWA RCNM User's Guide, which is a technical report containing actual measured noise data for construction equipment. These maximum noise levels would occur when equipment is operating under full power conditions (i.e., the equipment engine at maximum speed). However, equipment used on construction sites often operates under less than full power conditions or part power. Therefore, to more accurately characterize construction-period noise levels, the average (hourly L_{eq}) noise level associated with each construction phase was calculated based on the quantity, type, and usage factors for each type of equipment that would be used during each construction phase. These noise levels are typically associated with multiple pieces of equipment operating simultaneously.

Table IV.I-8, *Construction Noise Levels – West Site (Sequential Construction Scenario)* and Table IV.I-9, *Construction Noise Levels – East Site (Sequential Construction Scenario)* of the Draft EIR, provided the estimated construction noise levels under the sequential construction scenario at the off-site noise-sensitive receptors for construction activities at the West Site and East Site, respectively, for the Original Project. To present a conservative impact analysis, the estimated noise levels were calculated with all pieces of construction equipment assumed to operate simultaneously and located at construction areas nearest to the affected receptors. In addition, the analysis accounts for overlapping construction phases that would occur on each of the individual sites (i.e., the West Site and the East Site) to provide maximum construction noise levels from on-site construction activities on each site. As shown in these tables, the estimated West Site construction noise levels would exceed the significance threshold at receptors 1, 3, and 6 through 13 while the estimated East Site construction noise levels would exceed the significance threshold at receptors 1, 3, and 5 through 13. Therefore, the noise impacts at both the West Site and East Site would be potentially significant.

Table IV.I-10, *Construction Noise Levels – Overlapping Construction Scenario – West Site First*, and Table IV.I-10A, *Construction Noise Levels – Overlapping Construction Scenario – East Site First*, of the Final EIR, for the Original Project, of the Final EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, provide the estimated noise levels due to overlapping construction activities between the West Site and East Site and shows that the estimated noise levels due to overlapping construction activities between the West Site and East Site would exceed the significance threshold at receptors 1, 3, and 5 through 13, and, therefore, construction noise impacts under the overlapping construction scenario also would be potentially significant for construction of the West Site first or construction of the East Site first.

As described on pages V-297 through V-298 of the Draft EIR and pages 3-50 through 3-51 of the Final EIR, Alternative 8 would require excavation for subterranean parking that would reach depths of 64 feet on the East Site and 60 feet on the West Site. Similar to the Original Project, maximum construction activities under Alternative 8 during most phases would increase noise levels at several sensitive receptor locations in the area. Because the maximum amount of construction equipment operating simultaneously within the Project Site would be constrained by the size of the property, the maximum construction noise levels under Alternative 8 would be similar to the Original Project. Based on a conservative impact analysis, in which noise levels were calculated with all pieces of construction equipment operating simultaneously and located at the construction area nearest to the affected receptors, construction noise levels would exceed the applicable noise significance thresholds at several nearby noise sensitive receptors. Therefore, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8 would implement Mitigation Measures NOI-

MM-1 (Setback Distances and Boundary Noise Curtains), NOI-MM-2 (Equipment Noise Shielding, Mufflers, and Stationary Curtains), and NOI-MM-3 (Construction Liaison) to reduce construction noise impacts at off-site noise sensitive receptors to the extent technically feasible. However, as with the Original Project, with implementation of technically feasible mitigation, construction noise impacts at noise-sensitive receptors 1, 3, and 5 through 13 (eleven sites) would still exceed the significance threshold under Alternative 8 for construction of the West Site first or construction of the East Site first. Therefore, construction noise impacts associated with on-site noise sources would remain temporarily significant and unavoidable for Alternative 8 and would be similar to the Original Project.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.I-75 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the noise analysis also considered additional methods to reduce noise impacts. However, given the logarithmic nature of sound and the decibel scale, reducing the types and numbers of construction equipment by a few pieces of equipment would not result in a substantial reduction in noise levels since, for example, 3-dBA reduction in noise requires a halving of the sound energy. Thus, there would be little benefit in terms of the construction noise levels by requiring a reduction in the types and numbers of construction equipment by only a few pieces of equipment. Given that a 3-dBA reduction in noise would require a halving of the construction sound energy, it would not be feasible to construct Alternative 8 by substantially reducing the types and number of construction equipment used by half or more without severely impacting the ability to build Alternative 8 within a reasonable schedule and the ability to safely and adequately construct the proposed buildings and facilities without access to the full range of the needed equipment. As such, with implementation of technical feasible mitigation, construction noise impacts at noise-sensitive receptors 1, 3, and 5 through 13 would still exceed the significance threshold. Therefore, construction noise impacts associated with on-site noise sources would remain temporarily significant and unavoidable. While construction noise impacts would be temporarily significant and unavoidable, construction noise levels fluctuate throughout a given workday as construction equipment move from one location to another within a project site. When construction equipment would be in use further away from a sensitive receptor location, construction noise levels would be lower than the calculated values provided in the EIR analysis, which assumes construction equipment would be in use nearest to a sensitive receptor location. Nonetheless, as with the Original Project, Alternative 8 construction noise levels associated with on-site noise sources would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Off-Site Construction Noise Impacts:

As stated for the Original Project on page IV.I-34 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, off-site noise is related to roadway noise caused by construction trucks. Roadway noise impacts were evaluated using the FHWA TNM based on the roadway traffic volume data provided in Exhibit N-1, *Transportation Assessment,* of the Draft EIR. This method allows for the definition of roadway configurations, barrier information (if any), and receiver locations. Roadway noise attributable to development was calculated and compared to baseline noise levels that would occur without Original Project construction.

As shown for the Original Project in Table IV.I-11, *Estimate of Off-Site Construction Traffic Noise Levels*, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, construction trips would not generate significant impacts at all but one roadway segment. As described on page V-298 of the Draft EIR and page 3-54 of the Final EIR, since the type and duration of construction, and thereby the number of construction trips, would be similar to the Original Project, traffic noise levels of 5.4 dBA L_{eq} greater than existing traffic noise levels along Yucca Street between Argyle Avenue and

N. Gower Street would be generated by Alternative 8. Sensitive land uses along this roadway segment include residential, hotel, and religious uses, such as residential uses on the north and south sides of Yucca Street, Kimpton Everly Hotel, Hollywood Hills Suites, and Saint Stephen's Episcopal Church. Since 5.4 dBA L_{eq} is above the significance threshold of 5-dBA L_{eq} along this roadway segment, off-site construction traffic noise impacts would be potentially significant for this segment but would not exceed the 5-dBA L_{eq} threshold compared to existing traffic noise levels along any of the other studied roadway segments.

Alternative 8 would implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan (Project Design Feature TRF-PDF-2) that would include street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes and a staging plan, and would be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval. However, concrete trucks and worker vehicles would not be subject to the City-approved haul route and these trucks and vehicles would travel from a variety of locations, which may include travel along Yucca Street between Argyle Avenue and N. Gower Street. Since there are no feasible mitigation measures to impose restriction for concrete trucks and worker vehicles from travel along this roadway segment, impacts would be temporarily significant and unavoidable. However, trucks and vehicles driving past a sensitive receptor location would also generate very short-term (i.e., several seconds) fluctuating noise levels as a truck and/or vehicle passes the location. Exposure to fluctuating construction noise levels that would at times be lower than the noise levels shown in the analysis in the Draft EIR would not rise to the level that would result in hearing loss, and the significant construction noise increase on a project-specific basis would not be expected to result in adverse health impacts. Nonetheless, off-site construction noise would exceed the significant threshold at the Yucca Street between Argyle Avenue and No. Gower Street roadway segment, and, therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

(ii) Construction Vibration and Human Annoyance:

a. Structural Damage:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-77 through IV.I-80 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, construction activities can generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures and the type of construction equipment used. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The effect on buildings located in the vicinity of the construction site often varies, depending on soil type, ground strata, and construction characteristics of the receptor buildings. With regard to potential building damage, construction would generate groundborne construction vibration forces during building demolition and site excavation/grading activities when heavy construction equipment, such as large bulldozers, drill rigs, and loaded trucks, would be used. The FTA has published standard vibration velocities levels for various construction equipment operations. Table IV.I-16, *Construction Equipment Vibration Levels*, of the Draft EIR, presented the typical vibration levels at a reference distance of 25 feet for construction equipment anticipated to be used during construction for the Original Project. Vibration impacts with regard to structures were evaluated at the nearest off-site buildings to the Project Site (north, south, east, and west) and the on-site Capitol Records Complex.

As indicated in Table IV.I-17, *Construction Vibration Impacts – Building Damage*, of the Draft EIR as revised on page 3-41 of the Final EIR, which provides the estimated vibration levels at the nearest off-site structures (including adjacent historic structures) to the Project Site for the Original Project, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, the estimated vibration velocity levels from all construction equipment would be below the building damage significance criteria at off-site

building structures west and east of the West Site and East Site construction areas. The estimated vibration levels at the buildings adjacent to the north and south of the West Site and East Site construction areas would be up to 3.379 inch/second peak particle velocity (PPV), which would exceed the 0.50 inch/second PPV significance threshold (FTA Category I, Reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber building) at the Argyle House at the southwest corner of Yucca Street/Argyle Avenue, the 0.30 inch/second PPV significance threshold for Category II (FTA Category II, Engineered concrete and masonry) at the AMDA Vine and the 0.12 inch/second PPV significance threshold for Category IV (FTA Category IV, Buildings extremely susceptible to building damage) at the Avalon Hollywood and the Pantages Theatre. The estimated vibration levels from construction activities at both the West Site and East Site would also exceed the significance threshold of 0.50 inch/second PPV significance threshold (FTA Category I, Reinforced-concrete, steel or timber) at the Capitol Records Building and Gogerty Building. The estimated vibration levels from construction activities at both the West Site and East Site would exceed the significance threshold, as applicable to adjacent historic buildings, of 0.12 inch/second PPV significance threshold (FTA Category IV, Buildings extremely susceptible to building damage) at the Art Deco Building Storefront on the West Site and the Pantages Theatre and Avalon Hollywood on the East Site. The estimated vibration levels from construction activities at the East Site would exceed the significance threshold of 0.20 inch/second PPV significance threshold (FTA Category III, Non-engineered timber and masonry buildings) at the single-story commercial building at 1718 N. Vine Street located south of the East Site.

Therefore, as described on page V-299 of the Draft EIR, the estimated vibration velocity levels from all construction equipment (maximum construction conditions) under Alternative 8 would be below the building damage significance criteria at off-site building structures west and east of the West Site and East Site construction areas. However, as with the Original Project, the estimated construction vibration levels under Alternative 8 would exceed the significance threshold at the Avalon Hollywood, the Pantages Theatre, the Yucca Street Art Deco Building Storefront, the AMDA Vine building, the Argyle House, the Commercial Building at 1718 Vine Street, the Capitol Records Building, and the Gogerty Building.

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-86 through IV.I-47 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, page V-299 of the Draft EIR and pages 3-42 through 3-45 of the Final EIR, Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 sets forth the vibration monitoring requirements to ensure that vibration levels remain below the threshold of significance. This mitigation measure specifies warning levels prior to damage and the process for monitoring, warnings, reduction of vibrations, and inspection of damage as well as the requirement to repair any damage in a manner that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for historical resources. As described for the Original Project on page IV.I-86 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-299 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 and compliance with LAMC Section 91.3307.1 regarding protection of adjoining property, structural groundborne vibration impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels for the Capitol Records Building and Gogerty Building. However, while implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 would provide the same or similar protections to the other buildings subject to potential structural damage from vibration which would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels, because Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 requires the consent of other property owners, who may not agree, the City has concluded that Alternative 8's structural vibration impacts on the AMDA Vine Building, the Argyle House at southwest corner of Yucca Street and Argyle Avenue, the Pantages Theatre, Avalon Hollywood, Art Deco Building (6320 Yucca), and the single-story commercial building at 1718 N. Vine Street (except if this building has already been demolished as part of Related Project No. 2) would be significant and unavoidable because it cannot be assured that all components of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 can be implemented and would be

similar to the Original Project.

b. Human Annoyance:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-33 and IV.I-36 and Appendices K-1 and K-2 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-300 of the Draft EIR, and page 3-45 of the Final EIR, human annoyance from groundborne vibration impacts due to the construction activities were evaluated by identifying the construction equipment which would be potential vibration sources, estimating the vibration levels at the potentially affected receptor, and comparing the construction activities to the applicable vibration significance thresholds. Vibration levels were calculated based on the FTA published standard vibration velocities for various construction equipment operations. The vibration velocities were calculated based on a point source with standard distance propagation conditions, pursuant to FTA procedures. Pursuant to Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-1 (Impact Pile Driving and Blasting Prohibitions), construction of Alternative 8 would not use impact pile driving methods, and as such, impact pile driving vibration was not included in the analysis. However, the analysis included use of augured or drilled piles, which are less vibration-intensive than impact pile driving. Based on FTA guidelines, construction vibration impacts associated with human annoyance would be significant if the following were to occur (applicable to frequent events; 70 or more vibration events per day): (i) Project construction activities cause groundborne vibration levels to exceed 65 VdB at buildings where vibration would interfere with interior operations; (ii) 72 VdB at off-site sensitive uses, including residential uses and where people normally sleep; and (iii) construction activities cause groundborne vibration levels to exceed 75 VdB at off-site institutional uses.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.I-81 and Table IV.I-18, *Construction Vibration Impacts – Human Annoyance (West Site)*, and Table IV.I-19, *Construction Vibration Impacts – Human Annoyance (East Site)* of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the estimated vibration levels due to construction equipment at off-site vibration receptors would exceed the thresholds of significance at some sensitive receptors. As shown in Table IV.I-18, the estimated vibration levels due to on-site construction equipment at the West Site would exceed the significance threshold for human annoyance at receptors 6 and 11 through 13, and, as shown in Table IV.I-19, the estimated vibration levels due to construction equipment at the East Site would exceed the vibration significance threshold for human annoyance at receptors 3, 5, and 8 through 11. Therefore, the on-site vibration impacts pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance during construction of the Project would be potentially significant.

As described for the Original Project on page IV.I-86 through IV.I-87 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, even with the Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-1, prohibiting the use of pile drivers, vibration impacts regarding human annoyance at the nearby noise sensitive receptors would exceed the significance thresholds (72 VdB at residential uses and 75 VdB at institutional uses) at some nearby receptors potential mitigation measure to reduce vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance would be the installation of a wave barrier, which is typically a trench or a thin wall made of sheet piles installed in the ground (essentially a subterranean sound barrier to reduce noise). However, this measure, which is normally used for long-term operational impacts, is not a feasible mitigation measure because wave barriers must be very deep and long to be effective. In addition, constructing a wave barrier to reduce the Project's construction-related vibration impacts would, in and of itself, generate groundborne vibration from the excavation equipment. Therefore, there are no feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the temporary vibration impacts from on-site construction associated with human annoyance at the vibration-sensitive receptors 3, 5, 6, and 8 through 13.

Accordingly, as described on pages V-299 through V-300 of the Draft EIR, the estimated vibration levels due to maximum construction activity at the West Site under Alternative 8 would exceed the significance threshold for human annoyance at vibration sensitive receptors near the Project Site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 may lessen but would not reduce all human annoyance impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, as with the Original Project, no feasible mitigation measures under Alternative 8 would reduce the temporary vibration impacts from on-site construction associated with human annoyance at the vibration-sensitive receptors 3, 5, 6, and 8 through 13 and Alternative 8 construction vibration levels would be significant and unavoidable. As Alternative 8 would result in a similar duration of construction activity, impacts related to construction vibration would be similar to the Original Project.

(iii) Construction Cumulative Impacts:

a. On-Site Construction Noise:

For the reasons described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-88 through IV.I-90 of the Draft EIR, which are equally applicable to Alternative 8, the potential for cumulative construction noise impacts from on-site construction activities to occur is based on the distance between Alternative 8 and each of the related projects. Noise from construction activities would normally affect the areas immediately adjacent to each of the construction sites, specifically areas that are less than 500 feet from a construction site. Of the 150 related projects, 10 are within 1000 feet of the Project Site (i.e., Related Project Nos. 1 through 10). Of those 10 related projects, four have already been constructed and, therefore, would not have a cumulative construction impact with the Project. As such, six of the related projects (Related Project Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10) have the potential to create construction noise impacts to the 13 nearby sensitive receptors should their construction schedule overlap with the construction of Alternative 8. The potential for overlapping construction schedules would be speculative at this time for all but Related Project No. 2 which has submitted its potential construction schedule to the City and has made the preliminary determination that that its construction noise impacts would be cumulatively considerable after mitigation if nearby related projects, including the Original Project, were to be constructed concurrently. Nonetheless, as described for the Original Project on page IV.I-119 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, given the significant construction noise impacts on receptors 1, 3 and 5 through 13, if construction of one or more of the related projects were to overlap with Alternative 8 construction, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative construction noise would be cumulatively considerable and would represent a significant cumulative impact similar to the Original Project.

Mitigation Measures NOI-MM-1 (Setback Distances and Boundary Noise Curtains) and NOI-MM-2 (Equipment Noise Shielding, Mufflers, and Stationary Curtains) would reduce Alternative 8's on-site construction noise impacts at the off-site noise sensitive receptors, to the extent technically feasible. However, as explained above, while measures to reduce the types and numbers of construction equipment were considered, the level of reduction needed to reduce the impact to less than significant was not feasible to permit Alternative 8 to be built safely and adequately within a reasonable schedule. Thus, even if the related projects utilized similar mitigation measures, the cumulative impacts to receptors 1, 3 and 5 through 13 would be significant. Accordingly, given the significant construction noise impacts on receptors 1, 3, and 5 through 13, if construction of one or more of these related projects were to overlap with Alternative 8 construction, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative construction noise would be cumulatively considerable, and on-site cumulative noise impacts from Alternative 8 construction would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

b. Off-Site Construction Noise:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-89 through IV.I-90 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, if construction of related projects would overlap with Alternative 8 construction and construction trucks would utilize the same roadway network as Alternative 8, cumulative off-site construction noise level increases could occur in the Project area. The exact construction scheduling and timing of construction truck trips for the identified related projects are not known. Therefore, a quantitative analysis assuming a construction overlap and/or a combined on-road construction noise level would be entirely speculative. However, five of the nearby related projects would use the same haul routes as Alternative 8, which, assuming an overlap in construction schedules, could result in increased roadway noise. Thus, based on a qualitative assessment, and to present a worst-case analysis, the Draft EIR analysis assumed that construction truck trips from these related projects could result in overlapping construction schedules. When combined with construction truck trips from related projects, it is possible that the combined increases in noise levels from Alternative 8 and related projects construction truck trips would exceed the significance threshold at some roadway segments, including along Yucca Street between Argyle Avenue and Gower Street, where Alternative 8 truck trips alone would result in significant increase in noise. Similar to Alternative 8, each project applicant would be required to prepare and submit to LADOT for approval a construction management plan that would be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction and other projects in the vicinity of the development site which could be used to reduce conflicts in schedules. Nonetheless, should Alternative 8's construction overlap with related project construction, Alternative 8's contribution to cumulative construction noise would be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, Alternative 8's off-site construction noise impacts would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact along common travel routes and would be similar to the Original Project.

(iv) Construction Groundborne Vibration and Human Annoyance:

As described for the Original Project on pages IV.I-90 of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, due to rapid attenuation characteristics of groundborne vibration, only related projects located adjacent to the same sensitive receptors would result in cumulatively considerable vibration impacts. The only related projects that are located adjacent to the same receptor as Alternative 8 are Related Project No. 1 and Related Project No. 2. However, Related Project No. 1 is already built, and, therefore, it would not contribute to cumulative vibration impacts. Should construction of Alternative 8 and Related Project No. 2 overlap, there is the potential for cumulative vibration impacts to the Pantages Theatre to the south of the Project Site. As discussed above, while Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring), which sets forth monitoring and repair requirements, would reduce impacts to less than significant, because Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 requires the consent of other property owners, who may not agree, all the components of this mitigation measure may not be able to be implemented for the Pantages Theatre. Therefore, vibration impacts in association with Related Project No. 2 would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts due to construction vibration would be significant and unavoidable and would be similar to the Original Project.

(g) Reference:

For a complete discussion of impacts related to noise and vibrations, please see Section IV.I, *Noise*, and Appendices K-1, *Construction Noise & Vibration Impact Study,* and K-2, *Off-Site Construction, and On-Site and Off-Site Operational Noise Technical Appendix,* and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* pages V-272 through V-314 of the Draft EIR and Chapter 3, *Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR*, of the Final EIR.

VIII. ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a range of reasonable alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. An EIR must identify ways to substantially reduce or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1). Accordingly, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to a project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially reducing any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. The alternative analysis included in the Draft EIR, therefore, identified a reasonable range of project alternatives focused on avoiding or substantially reducing the Project's significant impacts.

A. Summary of Findings

Based upon the following analysis, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(g)(2), that no feasible alternative or additional mitigation measures will substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project, reduce the significant unavoidable impacts of the Original Project to a level that is less than significant, or avoid any significant effect that the Original Project would have on the environment. Nonetheless, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Sections 21002-21002.1 and 21004 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15002(a), 15002(h), and 15021(a), that Alternative 8 is a feasible and acceptable alternative in that it meets all of the Project Objectives with similar impacts to the Original Project, as summarized below. While certain Alternative 8 impacts would be greater than the less-than-significant impacts of the Original Project, all of these impacts would still be less than significant (with or without mitigation), similar to the Original Project. Moreover, Alternative 8 would result in less impacts than the Original Project with regards to GHG, Public Services (Parks and Libraries), Transportation (household VMT), and Utilities (Water and Wastewater). As such, pursuant to the aforementioned CEQA regulations, the City may choose to adopt a modified version of the Original Project, or an alternative studied in the Draft EIR (including Alternative 8), instead of the Original Project, to satisfy the City's environmental concerns (*Sierra Club v. City of Orange* (2008) 163 Cal.4th 523, 533 (2008). Additionally, Alternative 8 meets the City's broader policy concerns with providing increased employment opportunities and office uses within a TPA in the Hollywood area. (S*outh of Market Community Action Network v. City and County of San Francisco* (2019) 33 Cal.App.5th 321).

B. Project Objectives

An important consideration in the analysis of alternatives to the Project is the degree to which such alternatives would achieve the objectives of the Project. Chapter II, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR set forth the Project Objectives defined by the Applicant and the Lead Agency. The underlying purpose of the Project is to create a mixed-use development in the Hollywood community that provides residents, employees, and visitors with an active open space area and to create a design that contributes to the unique landmarks of the Capitol Records Complex and legacy of the Hollywood area. The specific objectives are:

1. Redevelop the Project Site, with a mixed-use development that protects the architectural and historical heritage of the Capitol Records Complex and activates Hollywood Boulevard, Vine Street, and surrounding streets through connected, publicly available landscaped

open space, including a paseo with shopping, seating, open air dining, and art installations, and plazas accommodating performances and community focused events.

2. Create a hub of activity surrounding the Capitol Records Complex and the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street, by activating the eastern end of Hollywood Boulevard and the terminus of the Hollywood Walk of Fame, to increase engagement with the Capitol Records Complex.

3. Develop architecturally distinct buildings that are compatible with the Capitol Records Complex through a design that responds to the Capitol Records Building's modernist architectural character, and preserve views of the Capitol Records Building.

4. Maintain prominent views of the Capitol Records Building by providing building setbacks, visual buffers, open space between the Project's new buildings and the Capitol Records Complex, and safe public viewing areas from the proposed paseo and plazas, to maximize view corridors and continue showcasing its distinctive architectural design.

5. Promote local, regional, and state land use and mobility objectives and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by maximizing infill development within an existing Regional Center near jobs, retail, and entertainment in proximity to transit and transportation infrastructure that encourages pedestrian activity.

6. Provide affordable senior housing with outdoor spaces in proximity to public transportation, allowing an age-specific demographic to continue to live in their residence of preference while maintaining access to services and goods.

7. Cluster jobs and housing near transit by locating a high-density, mixed-use development within a Transit Priority Area.

8. Support the growth of the City's economic base through the introduction of an economically viable project which creates a significant number of construction and permanent jobs.

9. Activate the Hollywood area with commercial opportunities that could serve local employees, generate local tax revenues, and provide new permanent jobs and housing for residents in support of local business.

10. Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-Gold equivalent building.

C. Alternatives Analyzed

1. No Project/No Build Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

The No Project/No Build Alternative (Alternative 1) assumes that no new development would occur within the Project Site. The portion of the Project Site that would have been occupied by the Original Project would continue to operate as paved surface parking lots and a small storage building (West Site) and the Capitol Records Complex (East Site).

(ii) Impact Summary:

As Alternative 1 assumes that no new development would occur on the Project Site, the on-site uses would continue to operate similar to existing conditions. As such, this Alternative would not have the beneficial impact of improvements related to water quality standards or drainage patterns or transportation related to design hazards as the Original Project.

Moreover, as Alternative 1 would not include a development program, it would not contribute to growth and development within the Hollywood Community or develop senior housing or promote local, regional, and State land use and mobility objectives and reduce VMT by maximizing infill development within an existing Regional Center near jobs, retail, and entertainment in proximity to transit and transportation infrastructure that encourages pedestrian activity, and, therefore, it would not achieve any of the Project Objectives.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible the No Project/No Build Alternative (Alternative 1) described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 1 would generally reduce the Original Project's environmental impacts due to lack of any construction, and, therefore, is environmentally superior to the Original Project, it would not improve existing conditions related to drainage from the Project Site or curb cuts along Vine Street. Moreover, Alternative 1 would not meet the Original Project's underlying purpose or primary objectives to develop the Project Site with a transit-oriented development that includes residential uses, affordable senior housing, Project- and community-serving commercial uses, and publicly accessible and private open space and amenities. In addition, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project Objectives.

(v) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

2. Development Under Existing Zoning Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

The Development Under Existing Zoning Alternative (Alternative 2) would conform to the Project Site's existing zoning designation. The development of Alternative 2 with a mix of residential, retail, and restaurant uses would be similar to the Project, although residential uses would be proportionally reduced to reflect the reduction in the Project's FAR from 6.994:1[2] to 3:1, except

[2] The Draft EIR, the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer Notice of Public Hearing, and the VTT Staff Report identified a 6.973:1 FAR, as it was assumed that the Applicant's requested sidewalk and alley mergers would be approved and, thus, were included as part of the lot area when calculating the total FAR. However, the Deputy Advisory Agency only partially approved the requested mergers which results in a

for a small section in the northwest corner of the West Site, which would be developed to an FAR of 2:1. Alternative 2 would be developed with a total of 30,176 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, which is the same as the floor area of retail and restaurant uses provided by the Original Project. Alternative 2 would include approximately 36,141 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which would form a paseo through the Original Project Site. No performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site. Alternative 2 would provide a total of 384 market-rate residential units and no senior affordable units.

As shown in Figure V-1, *Building Massing for Alternative 2*, of the Draft EIR, Alternative 2's residential component would be provided within two high-rise buildings, one each on the East Site and West Site, respectively. Each building would provide 192 market-rate residential units. The East Building would be 18 stories and the West Building would be 14 stories. A three-level subterranean parking structure containing 300 spaces would be provided on the East Site, and a two-level subterranean parking structure containing 193 parking spaces would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 493 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in accordance with LAMC requirements. The total floor area for Alternative 2 would be approximately 480,516 square feet, which would result in an FAR of 2.96:1, and represent an approximately 62.7-percent reduction in the Original Project's total floor area.

The components of Alternative 2 are compared to those of the Original Project in Table V-2, *Comparison of Alternative 2 to the Project,* of the Draft EIR.

(ii) Impact Summary:

Alternative 2 would reduce but not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts related to cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts. However, because of the reduced scale of development, the duration of construction-related impacts would be less than under the Original Project.

As described on pages V-28 through V-68 of the Draft EIR, overall, because of reduced building size, occupancy, and vehicle trips, Alternative 2 would incrementally reduce or be similar to the Project's less-than-significant, or less-than-significant with mitigation, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 2 described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 2 would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant and less-

---

slight change in the FAR calculation to 6.994:1. It should be noted that the square footage of the proposed uses remains the same.

than-significant with mitigation impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to cultural resources and construction noise and vibration to nearby impacted structures.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 2's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Moreover, Alternative 2 would not meet, or meet to a lesser degree, several of the Project Objectives. Although Alternative 2 would provide for mixed-use development, it would not maximize infill development, cluster jobs and housing near transit, create jobs in both construction and operation, or activate the Hollywood area to the same extent as under the Original Project. In addition, Alternative 2 would reduce the Original Project's setback between the Capitol Records Building and the East Building and would comparatively constrain views of the Capitol Records Building compared to the Original Project. As such, it would not meet the following objectives to the same extent as under the Original Project and is, thus, only partially consistent with Project Objectives 4 through 8.

(v) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

3. Reduced Maximum Height Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

Development under the Reduced Maximum Height Alternative (Alternative 3) would limit maximum building heights to 23 stories on the East Site and 22 stories on the West Site. Alternative 3 would incorporate 30,176 square feet of retail and restaurant uses distributed over the East and West Sites. Alternative 3 would provide both market-rate and senior affordable housing as under the Project but at a reduced number to reflect the incremental reduction in floor area. Alternative 3 would provide 349 market-rate units and 53 senior affordable units on the East Site and 478 market-rate units and 72 senior affordable units on the West Site, for a total of 827 market-rate units and 125 senior affordable units.

As shown in Figure V-4, *Building Massing for Alternative 3*, of the Draft EIR, this Alternative's residential component would be provided within four buildings, two each on the East Site and West Site, respectively. The East Building would be 23 stories, the West Building would be 22 stories, the East Senior Building would be eight stories and the West Senior Building would be 11 stories. Alternative 3 would be developed with a total of 35,664 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which would form a paseo through the East Site and a plaza accessible from Vine Street on the West Site. No performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site. The total new floor area for Alternative 3 would be approximately 1,097,466 square feet, which would result in an FAR of 6.031:1, and represent an approximate 14.7-percent reduction in the Original Project's floor area. A five-level subterranean parking structure containing 684 spaces would be provided on the East Site, and a five-level subterranean parking structure containing 699 parking spaces would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 1,383 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in

accordance with LAMC requirements. Alternative 3 would result in shorter buildings with broader footprints and would, thus, reduce the Original Project's building setbacks.

The components of Alternative 3 were compared to those of the Original Project in Table V-4, *Comparison of Alternative 3 to the Project,* of the Draft EIR.

(ii) Impact Summary:

As with the Original Project, Alternative 3 would have significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts. However, because of the reduced scale of development, the duration of construction-related impacts would be less than under the Original Project.

As described on pages V-75 through V-109 of the Draft EIR, overall, because of reduced building size, occupancy, and vehicle trips, Alternative 3 would incrementally reduce or be similar to the Original Project's less than significant, or less than significant with mitigation, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 3 described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 3 would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant, and less-than-significant with mitigation, impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to cultural resources, and construction noise and vibration.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 3's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Moreover, Alternative 3, would not meet, or meet to a lesser degree, several of the Project Objectives. Alternative 3 would maintain views of the Capitol Records Building through building setbacks from Vine Street and the open paseo, running between Ivar Avenue and Argyle Avenue. However, because of reductions in the setback between the Capitol Records Building and the East Building, it would constrain closer views compared to the Original Project.

Alternative 3, would incorporate senior affordable residential units, and it would also be constructed to meet LEED-Gold equivalent standards. As such, it would be fully consistent with Project Objectives1, 2, and 5 through 10.

Although Alternative 3 would provide for mixed use development and achieve Project Objectives,

because of reduced setbacks between the Capitol Records Building and the East Building, and its rectangular buildings, it would not meet the following objectives to the same extent as under the Original Project and, thus, would be only partially consistent with the Project Objectives 3 and 4.

(v) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

4. Office, Hotel and Commercial Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

The Office, Hotel and Commercial Alternative (Alternative 4) would incorporate retail and restaurant floor area, as under the Original Project. Approximately 17,485 square feet of retail and restaurant uses would be provided on the East Site, and approximately 12,692 square feet of retail and restaurant uses would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 30,176 square feet of retail and restaurant uses. Alternative 4 would also include the development of a 324-room hotel on the East Site and a 603,060-square-foot office building on the West Site. Unlike the Original Project, Alternative 4 would not provide any residential uses.

As shown in Figure V-7, *Building Massing for Alternative 4*, of the Draft EIR, the hotel and office components under Alternative 4 would be provided within two high-rise buildings, one each on the East Site and West Site, respectively. The hotel building on the East Site would be 12 stories, and the office building on the West Site would be 20 stories. Alternative 4 would be developed with a total of 32,657 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which would form a paseo through the East Site and a plaza accessible from Vine Street on the West Site. No performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site. The total new floor area for Alternative 4 would be approximately 789,967 square feet, which would result in an FAR of 4.501:1 and represent an approximate 38.6-percent reduction in the Original Project's floor area. A five-level subterranean parking structure containing 624 spaces would be provided on the East Site, and a five-level subterranean parking structure containing 837 parking spaces would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 1,461 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in accordance with LAMC requirements. Figure V-8, *Alternative 4 Ground Floor Plan*, illustrated the uses and open space at the ground level, and Figure V-9, *Alternative 4 Building Footprints*, illustrated the location of proposed buildings relative to the proposed ground level uses.

The components of Alternative 4 were compared to those of the Project in Table V-6, *Comparison of Alternative 4 to the Project*, of the Draft EIR.

(ii) Impact Summary:

As with the Original Project, Alternative 4 would have significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts. However, because of the reduced scale of development, the duration of construction-related impacts would be less than under the Original Project.

As described on pages V-116 through V-151 of the Draft EIR, with the exception of some air quality impacts and population and housing and some pubic services impacts due to increased mobile source emissions, increased vehicle trips, reduced housing, and increased occupancy,

where impacts would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant, overall, because of reduced scale of development and duration of construction, Alternative 3 either would incrementally reduce, or be similar to, the Original Project's less-than-significant, less-than-significant with mitigation impacts, or would have greater than but still less-than-significant impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 4 described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 4 either would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant and less-than-significant with mitigation impacts, or would have some greater than but still less-than-significant impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to cultural resources, and construction noise and vibration.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 4's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured, and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Moreover, Alternative 4 would not meet one of the Original Project objectives and would meet other Project Objectives to a lesser extent than the Original Project. As described above, Alternative 4 would consist of a hotel building and office building, each containing retail and restaurant uses at ground level without any residential uses. Alternative 4 would represent an approximate 38.6 percent reduction in the Original Project's total floor area. Alternative 4 would also be constructed to meet LEED-Gold equivalent standards, would provide commercial uses and would provide publicly accessible open space. As such, it would be fully consistent with Project Objectives 5, 8 and 10.

Although Alternative 4 would provide for an all commercial development, it would not activate the Hollywood area to the same extent as under the Original Project. Also, because Alternative 4 would not include a residential component, it would not meet the full intention of the Original Project to provide mixed-uses. Therefore, it would not meet the following objectives to the same extent as under the Original Project and, thus, would be only partially consistent with Project Objectives 1 through 4, 6, 7 and 9.

(vi) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

5. Proposed Community Plan Update Compliant Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

The Proposed Community Plan Update Compliant Alternative (Alternative 5) would be developed with a floor area of 4.5:1 and incorporate retail and restaurant floor area, as under the Original Project. Approximately 17,485 square feet of retail and restaurant uses would be provided on the East Site, and approximately 12,691 square feet of retail and restaurant uses would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 30,176 square feet of retail and restaurant uses. Alternative 5 would provide both market-rate and senior affordable housing, as under the Original Project, but at a reduced rate compared to the Original Project to reflect an incremental reduction in floor area. Alternative 5 would provide 303 market-rate units and 46 senior affordable units on the East Site; and 280 market-rate units and 43 senior affordable units on the West Site, for a total of 583 market-rate units and 89 senior affordable units.

As shown in Figure V-10, *Building Massing for Alternative 5*, of the Draft EIR, Alternative 5's residential components would be provided within four buildings, two each on the East and West Sites. The East Building would be 29 stories, the West Building would be 20 stories, the East Senior Building, located along Argyle Avenue, would be seven stories, and the West Senior Building, which would be located in the northwestern corner of the Project Site would be 7 stories. Alternative 5 would be developed with a total of 36,551 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which would form a paseo through the East Site and a plaza accessible from Vine Street on the West Site. No performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site. The total new floor area for Alternative 5 would be approximately 789,921 square feet, which would represent an approximate 38.7-percent reduction in floor area compared to the Project. A four-level subterranean parking structure containing 438 spaces would be provided on the East Site; and a three-level subterranean parking structure containing 308 parking spaces would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 746 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in accordance with LAMC requirements.

The components of Alternative 5 were compared to those of the Project in Table V-8, *Comparison of Alternative 5 to the Project*, of the Draft EIR.

(ii) Impact Summary:

As with the Original Project, Alternative 5 would have significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts. However, because of the reduced scale of development, the duration of construction-related impacts would be less than under the Original Project.

As described on pages V-158 through V-192 of the Draft EIR, overall, because of reduced building size, occupancy, and vehicle trips, Alternative 5 would incrementally reduce or be similar to the Original Project's less-than-significant, or less-than-significant with mitigation, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social,

technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 5 described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 5 would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant and less-than-significant with mitigation impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to cultural resources, and construction noise and vibration.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 5's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured, and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Moreover, Alternative 5 would not meet several of the Project Objectives. Alternative 5 would maintain views of the Capitol Records Building through building setbacks and the open paseo running between Ivar Avenue and Argyle Avenue. It would incorporate senior affordable residential units, and it would also be constructed to meet LEED-Gold equivalent standards. As such, it would be fully consistent with Original Project Objectives 3, 6, 7 and 10.

Although Alternative 5 would provide for mixed-use development, because of its substantially reduced scale, it would not rise to the same landmark status as under the Original Project or create a similar hub of activity, maximize infill development or reduce VMT, cluster jobs and housing near transit, or activate the Hollywood area to the same extent as under the Project. In addition, Alternative 5 would reduce the Original Project's setback between the Capitol Records Building and the East Building (reducing the width of the view corridor) and would comparatively constrain views of the Capitol Records Building compared to the Original Project. Therefore, it would not meet the following objectives to the same extent as under the Original Project and, thus, would only partially be consistent with Project Objectives 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9.

(vi) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

6. Above-Grade Parking Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

The Above-Grade Parking Alternative (Alternative 6) would provide the same amount of retail/restaurant square footage (30,176 square feet) and the same total number of residential units (1,005 units), including the same number of market-rate (872) and senior affordable units (133) as the Original Project. Also consistent with the Original Project, Alternative 6 would include 423 market-rate units and 65 senior affordable units on the East Site; and 449 market-rate units and 68 senior affordable units on the West Site. Alternative 6, however, would have a total floor area of 1,286,634 square feet and a 6.972:1 FAR, or 516 square feet less than the Project and

just below the Original Project's 6.994:1 FAR.[3]

As shown in Figure V-13, *Building Massing for Alternative 6*, residential components of Alternative 6 would be provided within four buildings, two each on the East and West Sites, with retail and restaurant uses incorporated into the ground level, similar to the Original Project. Because of the above-grade parking, Alternative 6 would be higher than the Original Project. The 46-story East Building would reach a height of 545 feet at the top of the 46th story and 595 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The East Senior Building would be located above the East Site parking podium. The East Senior Building would reach a height of 240 feet at the top of the 21st story and 260 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The ground floor of the 11-level parking podium beneath the East Senior Building would include parking and a lobby for the East Senior Building. Levels 2-11 would be parking only, and Levels 12-21 would include the senior affordable units. The parking podium would extend to and connect with the East Building, providing parking on Levels 2-11 beneath the amenity deck. The amenity deck would be located on the 12th level of the East Site parking podium and would be available to Project Site residents. The amenity deck would include similar recreational and open space features as the Original Project. The 35-story West Building would reach a height of 429 feet at the top of the 35th story and 469 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The West Senior Building would be located above the West Site parking podium. The West Senior Building would reach a height of 179 feet at the top of the 15th story and 198.5 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The ground floor of the five-level parking podium beneath the West Senior Building would include commercial space, parking and a lobby for the West Senior Building. Levels 2-5 beneath the West Senior Building would be parking only, and Levels 6-15 would include the senior affordable units. The parking podium would extend to and connect with the West Building, providing parking on Levels 1-4 beneath the amenity deck. The amenity deck would be located on the 5th level of the West Site parking podium and would be available to Project Site residents. The amenity deck would include similar recreational and open space features as the Original Project.

While the proposed mix of uses would remain the same as the Original Project, the configuration of the ground floor commercial uses and residential lobbies for the Senior Buildings would be reconfigured in order to accommodate the parking podiums. The four commercial spaces would be located on the ground floor along: Vine Street in the East Building; Vine Street in the West Building; and Yucca Street and Ivar Avenue in the West Senior Building. Alternative 6 would be developed with a total of 24,541 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, as compared to 33,922 square feet of publicly accessible open space under the Original Project. A paseo extending between Vine Street and Ivar Avenue would be provided on the West Site; however, because of the parking podium on the East Site, the paseo would not extend to Argyle Avenue. As such, the open space plaza on the East Site would only be accessible from Vine Street. In addition, no performance stage would be located within the paseo off of Vine Street on the East Site as the East Building footprint would preclude this feature from occurring.

The components of Alternative 6 were compared to those of the Original Project in Table V-8, *Comparison of Alternative 6 to the Project*, of the Draft EIR.

---

[3] The Draft EIR, the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer Notice of Public Hearing, and the VTT Staff Report identified a 6.973:1 FAR, as it was assumed that the Applicant's requested sidewalk and alley mergers would be approved and, thus, were included as part of the lot area when calculating the total FAR. However, the Deputy Advisory Agency only partially approved the requested mergers which results in a slight change in the FAR calculation to 6.994:1. It should be noted that the square footage of the proposed uses remains the same.

(ii) Impact Summary:

As with the Original Project, Alternative 6 would have significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts. However, since Alternative 6 would eliminate the Original Project's excavation and hauling phase necessary for the development of the subterranean garages, it would reduce the duration of construction activities and therefore lessen the vibration impact on historical resources.

As described on pages V-200 through V-229 of the Draft EIR, overall, with the exception of aesthetic less-than-significant impacts due to greater view blockage due to the parking podiums, and consistency with transportation plans due to decreased pedestrian access and connectivity through the Project Site where impacts would be greater than the Original Project but still less than significant, Alternative 6 would incrementally reduce or be similar to the Original Project's less-than-significant, or less-than-significant with mitigation, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 6 described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 6 would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant and less-than-significant with mitigation impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to cultural resources, and construction noise and vibration.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 6's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured, and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Moreover, Alternative 6 would not meet several of the Project Objectives. As described above, Alternative 6 would provide the same mix of residential and retail uses as under the Original Project. The building design would also be similar, except that the Senior Buildings would be constructed above parking podiums. The taller buildings would rise to 46 stories on the East Site and 35 stories on the West Site as under the Original Project. Alternative 6 would include 24,541 square feet of publicly accessible open space; however, the paseo leading from Ivar Avenue would be blocked by a parking podium along Argyle Avenue, which would block views of the Capitol Records Building from the east.

As Alternative 6 would be similar to the Original Project, it would fully meet Project Objectives 2, and 5 through 10.

However, Alternative 6 would block more views of the Capitol Records Building, reduce the setback between the Capitol Records Building and the East Building, and provide less public open space than the Original Project. Therefore, it would only be partially consistent with Project Objectives 1, 3 and 4.

(v) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

7. Primarily Office Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

The Primarily Office Alternative (Alternative 7) would consist of only commercial uses. Alternative 7 would incorporate retail and restaurant floor area as under the Original Project. Approximately 17,485 square feet of retail and restaurant uses would be provided on the East Site, and approximately 14,083 square feet of retail and restaurant uses would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 31,568 square feet of retail and restaurant uses. Alternative 7 would also include the development of 537,280 square feet of office uses on the East Site (East Office Building) and 525,872 square feet of office uses on the West Site (West Office Building), for a total of 1,063,152 square feet of office floor area. Unlike the Original Project, Alternative 7 would not provide for the development of any residential uses.

As shown in Figure V-16, *Building Massing for Alternative 7*, of the Draft EIR the retail and office components of this Alternative would be provided in two buildings, one each on the East Site and the West Site. The East Office Building would be 29 stories and the West Office Building would be 27 stories. Alternative 7 would be developed with a total of 24,900 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level. A paseo extending between Vine Street and Ivar Avenue would be provided on the West Site; however, because of a proposed parking structure along Argyle Avenue, the open space plaza on the East Site would only be accessible from Vine Street. The total new floor area for Alternative 7 would be approximately 1,094,720 square feet, which would result in an FAR of 6.017:1. A three-level subterranean parking structure and four-level parking podium, collectively containing 1,645 spaces, would be provided on the East Site, and a four-level subterranean parking structure and five-level parking podium, collectively containing 1,100 parking spaces, would be provided on the West Site, for a total of 2,745 parking spaces. Vehicle and bicycle parking would be provided in accordance with LAMC requirements. The components of Alternative 7 were compared to those of the Original Project in Table V-11, *Comparison of Alternative 7 to the Project*, of the Draft EIR.

(ii) Impact Summary:

As with the Original Project, Alternative 7 would have significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts. However, because of the reduced scale of development and duration of construction, impacts would be less than under the Original Project.

As described on pages V-236 through V-270 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 7 impacts would be greater but still less than significant compared to the Original Project with respect to aesthetics (scenic vistas), some air quality impacts, GHG emissions, response emergency times, population and housing, and consistency with some transportation plans due to some blocked views of the Capitol Records Building, the lack of housing, increased mobile source emissions, and increased

vehicle trips. However, overall, because of reduced scale of development and duration of construction, Alternative 7 would incrementally reduce or be similar to the Original Project's less-than-significant, or less-than-significant with mitigation, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI of these findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 7 described in the Draft EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

Although Alternative 7 would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant and less-than-significant with mitigation impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable impacts pertaining to cultural resources, and construction noise and vibration.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 7's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured, and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Moreover, Alternative 7 would not meet several of the Project Objectives. Alternative 7 would concentrate commercial development within the TPA, generate a high employment base, and be constructed in accordance with LEED-Gold equivalent standards. Therefore, Alternative 7 would fully meet Project Objectives 5, 8, and 10.

Alternative 7 would be comprised of a mix of commercial uses, which include office, retail, and restaurant uses. In the absence of a residential component, Alternative 7 would not create the same range or mix of uses anticipated under the Original Project. In addition, Alternative 7 would require an above-grade parking structure because of the office component's high parking requirements. The parking structure would block the paseo at Argyle Avenue, which would, in turn, block views of the Capitol Records Building from Argyle Avenue and the east. It would also reduce the Original Project's publicly accessible open space. As such, it would be only partially consistent with Project Objectives 1 through 4, 6, 7 and 9.

(v) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR.

8. Office, Residential and Commercial Alternative

(i) Description of Alternative:

As stated in these Findings, the Office, Residential and Commercial Alternative (Alternative 8)

would provide a mix of office, residential and commercial uses, with a total of 386,347 square feet of office uses and 27,140 square feet of commercial (i.e., restaurant and retail) uses distributed between the West and East Sites; and a total of 770 market-rate residential units and 133 senior affordable units, for a total of 903 residential units. Alternative 8 would include approximately 33,105 square feet of publicly accessible open space at the ground level, which includes a paseo through the East and West Sites, connecting Argyle Avenue to Ivar Avenue. The total new floor area for Alternative 8 would be 1,287,100 square feet, with an FAR of 6.994:1,[4] the same as under the Original Project, although the total overall floor area for Alternative 8 would be 50 square feet less than the Original Project.

As shown in Figure V-19, *Building Massing for Alternative 8,* of the Draft EIR, the West Site would be developed with two residential structures. The West Building, along Vine Street, would be 48 stories and reach a height of 545 feet at the top of the 48th story and 595 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The West Senior Building, at the southeast corner of Yucca Street and Ivar Avenue, would be 13 stories and reach a height of 169 feet at the top of the 13th story and 209 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The East Site would be developed with the East Office Building containing 386,347 square feet of office uses. The building would be 17 stories and reach a height of 317 feet at the top of the 17th story and 367 feet at the top of the bulkhead. The commercial uses would be distributed between the East and West Sites, with a commercial space located at the ground floor on the corner of Yucca Street and Ivar Avenue and along Vine Street in the West Site, and along Argyle Avenue in the East Site. Under Alternative 8, a four-level subterranean parking structure containing a total of 1,134 spaces would be provided on the West Site; and a four-level subterranean parking structure containing 1,103 parking spaces would be provided on the East Site, for a total of 2,237 parking spaces.

Under Alternative 8, the proposed residential buildings on the West Site would incorporate LEED Gold Certification, as with the Original Project, and the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification which is a performance-based system for measuring, certifying, and monitoring features of the built environment that impact human health and wellbeing, through air, water, nourishment, light, fitness, and comfort. Example LEED Platinum sustainability features of include the following: 40-percent reduction in water consumption; Low-flow bathroom fixtures; Stormwater collection and reuse; Improved daylighting on office floors to maximize the reach of natural light into the floor plates; Energy optimization through high-performance design; Enhanced commissioning to ensure building systems are achieving their desired efficiency; Self-sustaining green vegetative roofs to decrease storm water runoff, reduce heat island effect and increase biodiversity; Use of regional materials to reduce the need to transport building materials; Recycling room and building-wide trash and recycling; Bicycle program, including bicycle storage, bicycle repair and valet, bicycle share; Use of recycled content, material reuse, and low-emitting materials; Green power purchasing program; On-site transit information; Enhanced refrigerant management to offset global warming potential; Implementation of green cleaning throughout the Project; and ParkSmart certified parking garage, with electric charging stations, car share, ride share, and green cleaning. Although the listed items are the same as under the LEED Gold Certification (see Section O, *Energy Conservation and Infrastructure*, of the Draft EIR), LEED Platinum requires

[4] The Draft EIR, the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer Notice of Public Hearing, and the VTT Staff Report identified a 6.973:1 FAR, as it was assumed that the Applicant's requested sidewalk and alley mergers would be approved and, thus, were included as part of the lot area when calculating the total FAR. However, the Deputy Advisory Agency only partially approved the requested mergers which results in a slight change in the FAR calculation to 6.994:1. It should be noted that the square footage of the proposed uses remains the same.

more points of compliance with options offered under the LEED Certification program and, therefore, is held to a higher conservation standard than under LEED Gold.

The WELL Gold Certification program for Alternative 8 focuses on features that contribute to the health and well-being of occupants and visitors. The combination of the LEED Platinum and WELL Gold Certifications would create a building with exceptional sustainability benefits. Example WELL Gold Certification features include: enhanced ventilation in all floors, with 30 percent more fresh air than comparable buildings; fresh air systems, with advanced air filtration with 95-percent efficiency; rigorous air and water quality testing providing high quality fresh air and high quality water; office common amenities will provide healthy food and beverage options; state-of-the-art fitness center that includes fitness equipment and programming; and showering facilities for those that bike to work and/or use the fitness center.

The components of Alternative 8 were compared to those of the Original Project in Table V-13, *Comparison of Alternative 8 to the Project*, of the Draft EIR.

(ii) Impact Summary:

As with the Original Project, Alternative 8 would have significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration impacts.

As described on pages V-279 through V-313 of the Draft EIR, Appendices B-1, *Alternative 8 Plans, Renderings and Visual Simulations*, B-2, *Alternative 8 Supplemental Historical Analysis*, B-3, *Alternative 8 Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis,* and B-4, *Supplemental Transportation Analysis* of the Final EIR, due to increased mobile source emissions, vehicle trips, and occupancy, Alternative 8 would have a greater, but still less-than-significant impact compared to the Original Project with respect to the following impacts related to air quality (cumulative increase of criteria pollutants, localized emissions, and CO), GHG emissions, public services (police, fire and schools), and solid waste. However, all these increased impacts would still be less-than-significant and overall, Alternative 8 would incrementally reduce or be similar to the Project's less-than-significant, or less-than-significant with mitigation, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, archaeological resources and human remains, geology and soils, paleontological resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise, odor, population, housing and employment, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, public utilities, and energy.

(iii) Finding:

The City finds that Alternative 8 would be a feasible alternative that, while not reducing or avoiding the Original Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, meets all of the Project Objectives and would advance the City's broader policy interests of increasing office uses and employee population within a TPA in the Hollywood Center area of the Hollywood Community Plan to a greater extent than the Original Project. Therefore, as with the Original Project, as to Alternative 8's significant and unavoidable cultural resources (historic architectural resources) and construction noise and vibration and human annoyance Project-level and cumulative impacts, the City finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible additional mitigation measures or the other Original Project alternatives identified in the EIR.

(iv) Rationale for Finding:

a) No impact:

As described on pages V-279 through V-281 of the Draft EIR and summarized in these Findings, similar to the Original Project, Alternative 8 would have no impact with regard aesthetics because, in addition to the reasons set forth in those pages, pursuant to PRC Section 21099(d)(1)) and ZI File No. 2452, Alternative 8 qualifies as a mixed-use or employment center project in a designated TPA site and infill area and, therefore, the EIR is not required to evaluate physical aesthetic impacts pertaining to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and light and glare and impacts would not constitute CEQA environmental impacts.

Since Alternative 8 would be located on the same Project Site as the Original Project, for all of the reasons set forth in the Initial Study, Appendix A-2 of the Draft EIR, and summarized above in Section V.A of these Findings Alternative 8 would also have no impact associated with agricultural and forest resources; biological resources; landslides; septic systems; flooding; habitat conservation plans; mineral resources; airstrips or airport proximity or plans; population of housing displacement; and, air traffic patterns.

b) Less than significant impacts:

As described on pages V-280 through V-314 of the Draft EIR, and summarized in these Findings, Alternative 8 would have a similar, greater but still less-than-significant, or reduced less-than-significant impact associated with aesthetics (regulations governing scenic quality), air quality (other than cumulative increase of criteria pollutants and TAC emissions during construction), human remains, geology and soils (other than paleontological resources), GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials (other than accidental release and use of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school), hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise (operation noise, vibrations and human annoyance), public services, transportation, tribal resources, utilities and service systems – water, wastewater and solid waste, and energy conservation and infrastructure. Alternative 8's similar or reduced less-than-significant impacts without mitigation in these areas are due to this Alternative's development being similar to the Project other than the office building component. The greater than, but still less-than-significant, without mitigation impacts of Alternative 8 generally are due to increased mobile source emissions, slightly higher use of gas, increased vehicle trips and higher occupancy resulting from the office use. Nonetheless, all these impacts would still be below the applicable thresholds of significance for air quality emissions, GHG emissions and VMT.

c) Less than significant impacts with mitigation:

As described on pages V-280 through V-314 of the Draft EIR and Appendices B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4 of the Final EIR, and as summarized in these Findings, with incorporation of the Project Design Features and mitigation measures listed in Section VI of these Findings, Alternative 8 would have a similar, greater but still less-than-significant, or reduced less-than-significant impact associated with air quality (cumulative increase of criteria pollutants, TACs); archaeological resources; paleontological resources; and hazards and hazardous materials (accidental release and use of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school).

d) Significant and unavoidable impacts:

Although Alternative 8 would reduce certain of the Original Project's less-than-significant and less-than-significant with mitigation impacts, it would not eliminate its significant and unavoidable

impacts pertaining to cultural resources, and construction noise and vibration.

As with the Original Project, Alternative 8's significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction vibration impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 (Vibration Monitoring). However, since this mitigation measure can only be implemented with the consent of the property owners of the impacted structures, implementation cannot be assured, and, therefore, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

As described above, Alternative 8 would be an in-fill, mixed-use, office, commercial and office development in a TPA. Alternative 8 would provide 33,105 square feet of publicly accessible open space, would have approximately the same floor area and FAR as the Original Project, and would allow for broad setbacks between the East Office Building and the Capitol Records Building, as under the Original Project. Because of its density of uses, design, open paseo, and building standards, and lower household VMT per capita (4.5) and work VMT per employee (4.7), Alternative 8 would substantially meet all of the Project Objectives.

Accordingly, as Alternative 8 does not create any additional impacts or require any additional mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels, would substantially meet all the Project Objectives, and more fully meets the City's broader policy considerations by providing office uses and increased employment within a TPA than under the Original Project, Alternative 8 would be a feasible and preferable alternative to the Original Project.

(v) Reference:

Refer to Section V, *Alternatives*, and Appendix N-1, *Transportation Analysis,* of the Draft EIR Appendices B-1, *Alternative 8 Plans, Renderings and Visual Simulations*, B-2, *Alternative 8 Supplemental Historical Analysis*, B-3, *Alternative 8 Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis,* and bB-4, *Supplemental Transportation Analysis*, of the Final EIR.

D. Alternatives Rejected as Infeasible

As set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be used to eliminate an alternative from detailed consideration are the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives to the Project that were considered and rejected as infeasible include the following:

1. Alternative Off-Site Location

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(f)(2), in addition to considering whether an alternative site would avoid or substantially lessen impacts, various factors may be considered when addressing the feasibility of an alternative site. Factors considered may include general suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.
An off-site location would not meet the primary Project Objective to redevelop a Project Site that is located in immediate proximity to the Capitol Records Complex and the Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street intersection, into a mixed-use development that activates these and surrounding streets through the provision of publicly accessible open space. In accordance with Metro's

initiatives to spur transit-oriented development around its stations, the Metro Red (B) Line Hollywood/Vine Station has become a prime target for community regeneration.

Also, as discussed in Chapter III, *General Description of the Environmental Setting*, of the Draft EIR, approximately 150 related projects are proposed for the Project Study Area, many of which are located within proximity to the Metro Red (B) Line Hollywood/Vine Station. Considering the development pressure within the TPA, available building sites of a size to accommodate the scale and density of the Original Project are scarce. It is not anticipated that the Applicant would be able to find an equivalent-sized building site that is not the subject of another building project in proximity to the Metro Red (B) Line Hollywood/Vine Station or that is not near any of Hollywood's historic buildings.

In addition, the Applicant does not have ownership or control of any other suitable site in the Hollywood area, and their current investment is specifically in the Project Site. Therefore, the flexibility to develop a similar project on the same or similar scale at another location in proximity to public transit is not feasible. Moreover, any projects in nearby locations would have the same issues as the Original Project related to the significant and unavoidable impacts due to the density of development and the prevalence of historical resources in and around the Project Site.

A number of the Project's Objectives regarding consideration of the Capitol Records Complex as it relates to the design of the Original Project and the Project Site would also not be met should the Original Project be constructed at a different location. Thus, an off-site location alternative would not meaningfully change the impacts of the Original Project, and a feasible alternate location for the Original Project has not been identified. Accordingly, an off-site alternative was not carried forward for further analysis.

2. Alternative On-Site Uses

An alternative substantially devoted to another use, such as all office on both sites without retail or restaurant space, was considered as an alternative to the proposed mixed-use development. However, this category of alternative would not fulfill the majority of Project Objectives which generally seek a high-density, mixed-used development consistent with the uses and density envisioned for the Regional Center and Hollywood Center designations of the Project Site and vicinity, including the provision of new housing to help meet market demand within the City. Further, an all office with no retail/restaurant use was not considered because the retail/restaurant use would be fundamental to reducing trips and VMT by the office workers. Other uses, such as low-density residential uses or industrial uses were not considered to be appropriate to the character of the Project Site and surrounding community. Accordingly, these types of on-site alternatives were not carried forward for further analysis.

E. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a project shall identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines also state that should it be determined that the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR shall identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the remaining alternatives. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to "avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" of the Project.

Of the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative,

would be considered the environmentally superior because it would not involve new development and assumes on-site uses would continue to operate similar to existing conditions. Although Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project Objectives, it would avoid all of the Original Project's, and Alternative 8's, significant impacts, including the significant and unavoidable cultural resources, construction noise and vibration impacts. However, because the No Project/No Build alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative, identification of another environmentally superior alternative is required by the CEQA Guidelines.

As shown in Table V-15, *Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives and the Project,* Alternative 2, the Development under Existing Zoning Alternative, would reduce the most impacts, the majority of which are less-than-significant impacts. As this Alternative would consist of a lower scale of development with respect to total floor area and residential units compared to the Original Project, it would particularly reduce the Original Project's less-than-significant impacts related to public services and utilities where the magnitude of impacts are associated with population increases.

However, as Alternatives 2 would require site clearance, excavation, and foundation development, as would all the proposed build alternatives, Alternative 2 would exceed threshold standards for noise and vibration. Accordingly, temporary noise and vibration impacts during certain phases of construction under the Original Project and all the build alternatives cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels because of the proximity of off-site noise and vibration sensitive uses. However, because of its smaller size, construction-related impacts would be of shorter duration.

In conclusion, although Alternative 2 would not meet all the Project Objectives or meet them to a lesser extent, because Alternative 2 would result in the most reduction of impacts compared to the Original Project, it is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

IX. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an EIR should evaluate any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should Alternative 8 be implemented. The types and level of development associated with Alternative 8 would consume limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during construction of Alternative 8 and would continue throughout its operational lifetime.

Alternative 8 development would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the Project Site. Alternative 8 construction would require the consumption of resources that are non-replenishable or may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include the following construction supplies: certain types of lumber and other forest products; aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt, such as sand, gravel and stone; metals, such as steel, copper, and lead; petrochemical construction materials such as plastics; and water. Furthermore, non-renewable fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment, as well as the transportation of goods and people to and from the Project Site.

Alternative 8 operation would continue to expend non-renewable resources that are currently consumed within the City. These include energy resources, such as electricity and natural gas, petroleum-based fuels required for vehicle-trips, fossil fuels, and water. Fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source associated with both construction and ongoing operation of

Alternative 8, and the existing, finite supplies of these natural resources would be incrementally reduced.

At the same time, through the intensification of development within the TPA, a SCAG-designated High Quality Transit Area (HQTA), Alternative 8 would support a land use pattern that would reduce reliance on private automobiles, VMT, and the consumption of non-renewable resources when considered in a larger context. Most notably, Alternative 8 would provide high density housing and office and retail/restaurant uses along a mixed-use corridor containing commercial, restaurant, office, and entertainment activities, and in close proximity regional transportation systems, such as the Metro Red (B) Line station and numerous regional and local Metro bus lines and LADOT DASH bus lines. These factors would contribute to a land use pattern that is considered to reduce the consumption of non-renewable resources.

Furthermore, Alternative 8 would include design features and be subject to building regulations that would reduce the demands for energy resources needed to support Alternative 8 operation. Alternative 8 would comply with the Los Angeles Green Building Code and 2019 CALGreen Code and achieve the equivalent of the USGBC LEED Gold level for the housing component and LEED Platinum Level for the office building component. The Project Site would be readily accessible by several public transit options, a TDM Program would be implemented to reduce Alternative 8's single occupant vehicle trips and increase the trips arriving via alternative modes of transportation (e.g., walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool, and transit). Additionally, Alternative 8 would provide on-site short- and long-term bicycle parking on both the West and East Sites, located in consideration of the roadway network.

Alternative 8 would incorporate water conservation and rainwater management strategies, such as high efficiency water fixtures, greywater and rainwater capture systems, green roofs on the Senior Building and residential amenity decks, and water-permeable paving. As part of a hybrid strategy to mitigate urban heat island effects, Alternative 8 would not include any uncovered at-grade parking. Alternative 8 would also utilize light-colored, reflective paving materials, and roof and grade-level vegetation. All selected plant and tree species would be drought tolerant.

As indicated in Section IV.E, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would result in a less-than-significant GHG impacts. In addition, Alternative 8 would be consistent with the State's Assembly Bill (AB) 32 GHG reduction target and would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations to reduce GHG emissions. Alternative 8 would achieve several objectives of the City's Framework Element L.A. Green New Deal, the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and the AQMP for establishing a regional land use pattern that promotes sustainability. Continued use of nonrenewable resources would be on a relatively small scale and consistent with regional and local growth forecasts in the area, as well as State and local goals for reductions in the consumption of such resources.

Furthermore, Alternative 8 would not affect access to existing resources or interfere with the production or delivery of such resources. The Project Site contains no energy resources that would be precluded from future use through Alternative 8 implementation. Alternative 8's irreversible changes to the environment related to the consumption of nonrenewable resources would not be significant.

X. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed

project could induce growth. As discussed in Chapter I, *Introduction*, of the Draft EIR, and as presented in Appendix C (Senate Bill 375 Memorandum), of the Draft EIR, which apply equally to Alternative 8, Alternative 8 qualifies for CEQA streamlining per SB 375 and Public Resources Code Section 21159.28 which specifically states that the EIR shall not be required to discuss "growth inducing impacts" (Public Resources Code Section 21159.28(a)). Nonetheless, the Draft EIR included an assessment of growth-inducing impacts is provided for informational purposes. Alternative 8 would provide housing for 2,186 new residents and generate 1,849 new employees. Although Alternative 8 would also generate construction jobs, as described for the Original Project in Section IV.J, *Population and Housing*, of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, and page V-300 of the Draft EIR, for the reasons described herein, it is not likely that construction workers would relocate their households as a consequence of temporary construction employment at the Project Site. As described in Section IV.L, *Transportation*, Section IV.N.1, *Wastewater*, Section IV.N.2, *Wate*r, and Section IV.N.3, *Solid Waste*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, there is adequate infrastructure to serve Alternative 8, and no significant impacts due to expanded infrastructure would occur.

As described in Section IV.J, *Population and Housing*, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8's increase in population, housing, and employment would continue an infill growth pattern that is encouraged locally in the City's plans and regionally by SCAG policies, would be well within the projected growth forecasts for the City and region, and would align with infill development priorities within TPAs consistent with State, regional, and local policies. As such, the potential for physical impacts on the environment due to unplanned population, housing, and employment growth would be less than significant.

As described in Section IV.L, *Transportation*, Section IV.N.1, *Wastewater*, Section IV.N.2, *Water*, and Section IV.N.3, *Solid Waste*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would not have indirect effects on growth through such mechanisms as the extension of roads and infrastructure; the only off-site infrastructure improvements would consist of tie-ins to the existing utility main-lines already serving the Project Site area. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not require the construction of off-site infrastructure that would induce growth and development in new areas. In addition, as described in Section IV.K.1, *Fire Protection*; Section IV.K.2, *Police Protection*; Section IV.K.3, *Schools*; Section IV.K.4, *Parks and Recreation*; and, Section IV.K.5, *Libraries*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would not tax existing community service facilities such that construction of new facilities would be required that would impact the environment. Therefore, Alternative 8 would not directly or indirectly induce growth other than that already anticipated.

Alternative 8's contribution to growth would also not be cumulatively considerable. As evaluated in Section IV.J, *Population and Housing*, of the Draft EIR, which is equally applicable to Alternative 8, related projects also represent infill development that would be served by available infrastructure and would result in growth falling within projected growth forecasts for the City and the region.

XI. ENERGY CONSERVATION

As described in Section IV.O, *Energy,* and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, Alternative 8 would include Project Design Features designed to improve energy efficiency as set forth in these Findings regarding GHG emissions and water conservation measures. Additionally, the Original Project's land use characteristics as described in Section IV. B, *Air Quality*, Section IV.E, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, which apply equally to Alternative 8, show that the proposed uses represent an infill development within an existing

urbanized area that would concentrate new residential, office and neighborhood-serving commercial retail and restaurant uses within a TPA. Thus, Alternative 8's location would result in reduced vehicle trips and VMT compared to a standard project of similar size and land uses without close access to off-site destinations and public transit stops.

Moreover, as described on pages V-273 and V-277 of the Draft EIR, for the proposed residential buildings on the West Site, Alternative 8 would incorporate LEED Gold Certification, while the proposed office building would combine LEED Platinum (the highest level of LEED Certification) and WELL Gold Certification. Examples of the LEED Platinum sustainability features include the following: (i) 40-percent reduction in water consumption; (ii) low-flow bathroom fixtures; (iii) storm water collection and reuse; (iv) improved daylighting on office floors to maximize the reach of natural light into the floor plates; (v) energy optimization through high-performance design; (vi) enhanced commissioning to ensure building systems are achieving their desired efficiency; (vii) self-sustaining green vegetative roofs to decrease storm water runoff, reduce heat island effect and increase biodiversity; (viii) use of regional materials to reduce the need to transport building materials; (ix) recycling room and building-wide trash and recycling; (x) bicycle program, including bicycle storage, bicycle repair and valet, bicycle share; (xi) use of recycled content, material reuse, and low-emitting materials; (xii) green power purchasing program; (xiii) on-site transit information; (xiv) enhanced refrigerant management to offset global warming potential; (xv) implementation of green cleaning throughout the Project; and (xvi) parkSmart certified parking garage, with electric charging stations, car share, ride share, and green cleaning.

Although the listed items are the same as under the LEED Gold Certification (see Section O, *Energy Conservation and Infrastructure*, of the Draft EIR), LEED Platinum requires more points of compliance with options offered under the LEED Certification program and, therefore, is held to a higher conservation standard than under LEED Gold. The WELL Gold Certification program for Alternative 8 focuses on features that contribute to the health and well-being of occupants and visitors. The combination of the LEED Platinum and WELL Gold Certifications would create a building with exceptional sustainability benefits. Example WELL Gold Certification features include: (i) enhanced ventilation in all floors, with 30 percent more fresh air than comparable buildings; (ii) fresh air systems, with advanced air filtration with 95-percent efficiency; (iii) rigorous air and water quality testing providing high quality fresh air and high quality water; (iv) office common amenities that will provide healthy food and beverage options; (v) state-of-the-art fitness center that includes fitness equipment and programming; and (vi) showering facilities for those that bike to work and/or use the fitness center. As discussed in these Finding under Energy Conservation and Infrastructure, above, Alternative 8 would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during Alternative 8 construction or operation, conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, or require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

XII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The EIR identifies unavoidable significant impacts that would result from implementation of Alternative 8. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when a decision of a public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts that are identified in the EIR, but are not at least substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or eliminated, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. The State CEQA Guidelines

require, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b), that the decision-maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects have been identified in the EIR that cannot be substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or be eliminated. These findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on the documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR and all technical appendices attached thereto.

Based on the analysis for the Original Project provided in Section IV, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, and Chapter V, *Alternatives,* of the Draft EIR, which apply equally to Alternative 8, construction and implementation of Alternative 8 would result in significant impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated with respect to: (1) cultural resources: Project-level and cumulative structural vibration impacts during construction to off-site historic architectural resources; and (2) noise and vibration: i) construction noise – Project-level and cumulative noise impacts to off-site noise sensitive receptors from on-site construction activities and off-site vehicle and truck travel; and ii) construction vibration – Project-level and cumulative structural vibration impacts to adjacent off-site buildings, and human annoyance vibration impacts to adjacent sensitive receptors.

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of Alternative 8. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible the alternatives to Alternative 8 discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of Alternative 8 against Alternative 8's significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that each of Alternative 8's benefits, as listed below, outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts relating to cultural resources and construction noise and construction vibration and human annoyance.

The below stated reasons summarize the benefits, goals and objectives of Alternative 8, and provide the detailed rationale for the benefits of Alternative 8. These overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic, and environmental benefits for Alternative 8 justify adoption of Alternative 8 and certification of the completed EIR. Each of the listed Alternative 8 benefits set forth in this Statement of Overriding Considerations provides a separate and independent ground for the City's decision to approve Alternative 8 despite Alternative 8's identified significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Each of the following overriding considerations separately and independently (i) outweighs the adverse environmental impacts of Alternative 8, and (ii) justifies adoption of Alternative 8 and certification of the completed EIR. In particular, achieving the underlying purpose for Alternative 8 would be sufficient to override the significant environmental impacts of Alternative 8.

- Housing: Alternative 8 will develop up to 903 needed new residential units, including 133 senior affordable units for Very-Low Income households, that will directly meet existing housing demand in Hollywood and the City as a whole and help address the current Citywide housing shortage.
- Affordable Senior Housing: Alternative 8 would provide 133 senior affordable senior units for Very-Low Income households with outdoor spaces in proximity to public transportation, allowing an age-specific demographic to continue to live in their residence of preference while maintaining access to services and goods. Additionally, the Legislature has acknowledged that there is a statewide housing crisis due to the lack of housing in general, as well as a lack of affordable housing, and that local governments, including the City, must do their part to address this crisis. (See Gov. Code, Sections 65009 (a)(1), and 65589.5 (a).) Alternative 8 would help the City in its efforts to address the statewide housing crisis.

- Office Uses: Alternative 8 would provide 386,347 square feet of office uses and 27,140 square feet of restaurant and retail space, which would help balance the jobs housing needs for the City and support the Hollywood Center Community Plan's goals for the Hollywood Center area, where the Project Site is located, which seeks to make this part of Hollywood a commercial center for Hollywood and surrounding communities. Moreover, the Alternative 8 office component would respond to the public correspondence received from City Council Office District 13 identifying the community's desire and need for additional office space in the Hollywood neighborhood. Thus, Alternative 8 proposes a greater balance of jobs producing uses while providing housing, including the same number of senior affordable units as the Original Project.
- Support of Multiple State, Regional and City Planning, Sustainability and Energy Consumption Goals:
    - Reduction of Sprawl and Reliance on Single Passenger Vehicles: Alternative 8 would locate high-density residential development at an urban infill location that is in close proximity to jobs-rich centers and add jobs in close proximity to housing. Both Alternative 8 residents and employees would be located within walking distance to public transit, retail and restaurants, and entertainment venues. Alternative 8 would, thereby, contribute to a land use pattern that would reduce reliance on private automobiles and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and GHG emissions.
    - Reduce Energy Consumption: The new development associated with Alternative 8 will promote the City's sustainability goals by achieving the equivalent of the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold Certification and LEED Platinum Certification levels, which combined with applicable regulatory requires, would reduce Alternative 8's GHG emissions by approximately 22 to 25 percent (depending on the construction buildout scenario). Pursuant to Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1, the key features of this Project Design Feature will be:
        1. Alternative 8 will incorporate heat island reduction strategies for 50 percent of the Project Site hardscapes or provide 100 percent structured parking and incorporate heat island reduction strategies for the Project roof areas.
        2. Alternative 8 will promote alternatives to conventionally fueled automobiles by designating a minimum of 8 percent of on-site non-residential parking for carpool and/or alternative-fueled vehicles and shall pre-wire, or install conduit and panel capacity for a minimum of 30 percent of the Code-required parking spaces, with 10 percent of the Code-required spaces further improved with electric vehicle charging stations.
        3. Alternative 8 will optimize building energy performance with a 20 percent reduction from the LEED Version 4 (v4) baseline consistent with LEED requirements (equivalent to approximately 11.6 percent reduction from the 2016 Title 24 standards).113,114,115
        4. Alternative 8 will reduce water consumption by 40 percent for indoor water and 100 percent for outdoor water from the LEED v4 usage baseline. The reductions would be achieved through potential strategies such as the installation of water efficient fixtures that exceed applicable standards and water efficient landscaping.

  - Additional Reductions of GHG Emissions: As an Environmental Leadership Development Project (ELDP) certified by the Governor on April 27, 2018, under the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act, the Project Applicant has entered into a binding agreement with the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning to ensure that Alternative 8 would remain GHG neutral during construction and operation, including GHG emissions from employee transportation.
- Preservation of Historical Resources: Alternative 8 would preserve the Capitol Records and Gogerty Buildings (Capitol Records Complex) and develop architecturally distinct buildings that are compatible with the Capitol Records Complex through a design that responds to the Capitol Records Building's modernist architectural character and preserves views of the Capitol Records Building.
- Enhancement of Hollywood: Alternative 8 would include 27,140 square feet of retail and restaurant uses that will further promote pedestrian activity, promote walkability, and enliven the Hollywood area with 24/7 activity.
- Enhancement of the Hollywood Walk of Fame: Alternative 8 would enhance the Hollywood Walk of Fame by removing five existing driveways along Vine Street and making street and landscaping improvements. Removal of the curb cuts would allow the continuation of the terrazzo sidewalk, thereby improving and restoring the continuity of the Hollywood Walk of Fame as a continuous element oriented towards pedestrians by reducing vehicle conflict with pedestrian activity at the existing driveway junctures.
- Enhancement of Pedestrian Activities: Alternative 8 would provide approximately 386,347 square feet of office uses and 27,140 square feet of restaurant and retail uses which would provide commercial uses within walking distance for existing and future residents, employees, and visitors, to further activate pedestrian activity at the Project Site and reduce vehicle trips.
- Provision of Open Space and Social and Cultural Amenities: Alternative 8 would provide approximately 33,105 square feet of publicly accessible open space comprised of cultural and social amenities, such as paseo linkages, plazas, and enhanced and activated street fronts and would incorporate a public art program in conjunction with landscape and open space design.
- Job Creation: Alternative 8 will generate 1,665 new office jobs and 186 net new long-term retail and restaurant jobs onsite and a peak of 7,452 construction jobs.
- Fiscal Benefits: Alternative 8 will provide direct fiscal benefits to the City in the form of sales tax revenues from the Project's restaurant and retail uses.

XIII. GENERAL FINDINGS

1. The City, acting through the Department of City Planning, is the "Lead Agency" for the project evaluated in the EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2018051002). The City finds that the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR for the Project, that the Draft EIR which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.
2. The EIR evaluated the following potential project and cumulative environmental impacts: Aesthetics (for informational purposes), Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils (including paleontology), Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Transportation, Tribal Cultural

Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, Energy Conservation, Alternatives, and other CEQA considerations. Additionally, the EIR considered, in separate sections, Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes and Growth Inducing Impacts. The significant environmental impacts of the Original Project, Alternative 8 and the other alternatives were identified in the EIR.

3. The City finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of Alternative 8. The public review periods provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review periods and responds to comments made during the public review periods.
4. Textual refinements and errata were compiled and presented to the decision-makers for review and consideration. The City staff has made every effort to notify the decision-makers and the interested public/agencies of each textual change in the various documents associated with project review. These textual refinements arose for a variety of reasons. First, it is inevitable that draft documents would contain errors and would require clarifications and corrections. Second, textual clarifications were necessitated to describe refinements suggested as part of the public participation process.
5. The Department of City Planning evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Department of City Planning prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The Department of City Planning reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the EIR.
6. The Final EIR documents changes to the Draft EIR. Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, and the administrative record, as well as the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines regarding recirculation of Draft EIRs, the City finds that there is no new significant impact, substantial increase in the severity of a previously disclosed impact, significant new information in the record of proceedings or other criteria under CEQA that would require additional recirculation of the Draft EIR, or that would require preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. Specifically, the City finds that:
    a. The Responses to Comments contained in the Final EIR fully considered and responded to comments claiming that the Original Project, and by implication the Alternatives including Alternative 8, would have significant impacts or more severe impacts not disclosed in the Draft EIR and include substantial evidence that none of these comments provided substantial evidence that the Original Project or any of the Alternatives including Alternative 8 would result in changed circumstances, significant new information, considerably different mitigation measures, or new or more severe significant impacts than were discussed in the Draft EIR.
    b. The City has thoroughly reviewed the public comments received regarding the project and the Final EIR as it relates to the Original Project and the Alternatives including Alternative 8 to determine whether under the requirements of CEQA, any of the public comments provide substantial

evidence that would require recirculation of the EIR prior to its adoption and has determined that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

c. None of the information submitted after publication of the Final EIR, including testimony at the public hearings on the Original Project and the Alternatives including Alternative 8, constitutes significant new information or otherwise requires preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. The City does not find this information and testimony to be credible evidence of a significant impact, a substantial increase in the severity of an impact disclosed in the Final EIR, or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative not included in the Final EIR.

7. The mitigation measures identified for Alternative 8 were included in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. As revised, the final mitigation measures for Alternative 8 are described in the MMP. Each of the mitigation measures identified in the MMP is incorporated into Alternative 8. The City finds that the impacts of Alternative 8 have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the MMP.
8. CEQA requires the Lead Agency approving a project to adopt an MMP or the changes to the project, which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the EIR as certified by the City and revised in the MMP as adopted by the City serve that function. The MMP includes all of the Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features adopted by the City in connection with the approval of Alternative 8 and has been designed to ensure compliance with such measures during implementation of Alternative 8. In accordance with CEQA, the MMP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts the MMP.
9. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth herein as conditions of approval for Alternative 8.
10. The custodian of the documents or other materials, which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City decision is based, is the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning.
11. The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.
12. The City is certifying an EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the EIR as comprising Alternative 8.
13. The EIR is a project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of Alternative 8. A project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decisions regarding the project by the City and the other regulatory jurisdictions.

FINDINGS OF FACT (SUBDIVISION MAP ACT)

In connection with the approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 82152 the Advisory Agency of the City of Los Angeles, pursuant to Sections 66473.1, 66474.60, .61 and .63 of the State of California Government Code (the Subdivision Map Act), makes the prescribed findings as follows:

(a) THE PROPOSED MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

Section 66411 of the Subdivision Map Act (Map Act) establishes that local agencies regulate and control the design of subdivisions. Chapter 2, Article I, of the Map Act establishes the general provisions for tentative, final, and parcel maps. The subdivision, and merger, of land is regulated pursuant to Article 7 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The LAMC implements the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, through zoning regulations, including Specific Plans. The zoning regulations contained within the LAMC regulate, but are not limited to, the maximum permitted density, height, parking, and the subdivision of land.

The VTTM for Alternative 8 includes the merger and re-subdivision of the Project Site into three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots for a total of 16 lots; the merger of a portion of an alley to add 1,003 square feet to the Project Site; the merger of portions along the sidewalk of Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and both sides of Vine Street to add 4,873 square feet to the Project Site, and dedicating five-foot wide sidewalk easements over the said sidewalk for a mixed-use development.

The subdivision of land is regulated pursuant to Article 7 of the LAMC. Pursuant to LAMC Section 17.05 C, tract maps are to be designed in conformance with the tract map regulations to ensure compliance with the various elements of the General Plan, including the Zoning Code. Additionally, the maps are to be designed in conformance with the Street Standards established pursuant to LAMC Section 17.05 B. The Project Site is located within the Hollywood Community Plan, which designates the Project Site with a Regional Center Commercial land use designation, with corresponding zones of C2, C4, P, PB, RAS3 and RAS4. The Project Site is zoned C4-2D-SN, which is consistent with the land use designation. The C4 Zone allows for a wide variety of land uses, including retail stores, theaters, hotels, broadcasting studios, parking buildings, parks, and playgrounds and permits any land use permitted in the R4 Zone, including multiple residential uses. Height District 2 allows a 6:1 FAR, with no height limit in conjunction with the C4 Zone. However, the Project Site is subject to “D” Limitations, pursuant to Ordinance No. 165,659, which restricts lots with Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) 5546-004-006, 5546-004-020, 5546-004-021, 5546-004-029, 5546-030-028, 5546-030-031through 5546-030-034 to a 3:1 FAR; and the corner lot on the southeast corner of Yucca Street and Ivar Street, with APN 5546-004-032, to a 2:1 FAR. The “SN” indicates that the Project Site is located in the HSSUD, which establishes signage regulations in addition to and/or which supersede those of the LAMC.

Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.18, any lot in the C4 Zone, provided that such lot is located within an area designated as Regional Center Commercial within the adopted Community Plan, is permitted to develop at the R5 density, or one dwelling unit for every 200 square feet of lot area. In conjunction with the proposed mergers associated with the proposed VTTM for Alternative 8, the lot area of the Project Site is 200,371 square feet,

which permits a maximum density of 1,002 dwelling units[5]. Alternative 8 proposes a total of 903 dwelling units, including 770 market-rate units and 133 affordable senior units. Contingent upon the approval of the Density Bonus Compliance Review, in conjunction with request On- and Off-Menu incentives and Waiver of Development Standards, Alternative 8 would be permitted a maximum 7:1 FAR in exchange for setting aside at least 11 percent for Very Low Income households. Therefore, the proposed merger and re-subdivision of the Project Site into three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots for a total of 16 lots; the merger of a portion of an alley to add 1,003 square feet to the Project Site; the merger of portions along the sidewalk of Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and both sides of Vine Street to add 4,873 square feet to the Project Site, and dedicating five-foot wide sidewalk easements over the said sidewalk for a mixed-use development would therefore be consistent with these regulation.

Pursuant to LAMC Section 17.06 B, a VTTM must be prepared by or under the direction of a licensed land surveyor or registered civil engineer. It is required to contain information regarding the boundaries of the Project Site, as well as the abutting public rights-of-way, hillside contours for hillside properties, location of existing buildings, existing and proposed dedication, and improvements of the tract map. The VTTM indicates the map number, notes, legal description, contact information for the owner, applicant, and engineer, as well as other pertinent information as required by LAMC Section 17.06 B. Therefore, the proposed map demonstrates compliance with LAMC Sections 17.05 C and 17.06 B and is consistent with the applicable General Plan.

(b) THE DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION ARE CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

For purposes of a subdivision, design and improvement is defined by Section 66418 and 66419 of the Subdivision Map Act and LAMC Section 17.02. Section 66418 of the Subdivision Map Act defines the term “design” as follows: “Design” means: (1) street alignments, grades and widths; (2) drainage and sanitary facilities and utilities, including alignments and grades thereof; (3) location and size of all required easements and rights-of-way; (4) fire roads and firebreaks; (5) lot size and configuration; (6) traffic access; (7) grading; (8) land to be dedicated for park or recreational purposes; and (9) such other specific physical requirements in the plan and configuration of the entire subdivision as may be necessary to ensure consistency with, or implementation of, the general plan or any applicable specific plan. Further, Section 66427 of the Subdivision Map Act expressly states that the “Design and location of buildings are not part of the map review process for condominium, community apartment or stock cooperative projects.”

LAMC Section 17.05 enumerates the design standards for a tract map and requires that each map be designed in conformance with the Street Design Standards and in conformance with the General Plan. LAMC Section 17.05 C, further establishes that density calculations include the areas for residential use and areas designated for public uses, except for land set aside for street purposes (“net area”). LAMC Section 17.06 B and 17.15 list the map requirements for a tentative tract map and vesting tentative tract map. The design and layout of the VTTM is consistent with the design standards established by the Subdivision Map Act and Division of Land Regulations of the LAMC.

---

[5] Pursuant to AB 2501, base density calculations that result in a fractional unit shall be rounded up to the next whole number for projects utilizing LAMC Section 12.22 A.25 (Affordable Housing Incentives – Density Bonus).

As indicated in Finding (a), LAMC Section 17.05 C requires that the tract map be designed in conformance with the zoning regulations of the Project Site. The Project Site is zoned C4-2D-SN, with an underlying land use designation of Regional Center Commercial. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.18, any lot in the C4 Zone, provided that such lot is located within an area designated as Regional Center Commercial within the adopted Community Plan, is permitted to develop at the R5 density, or one dwelling unit for every 200 square feet of lot area. In conjunction with the proposed mergers associated with the proposed VTTM for Alternative 8, the lot area of the Project Site is 200,371 square feet, which permits a maximum density of 1,002 dwelling units[6]. Alternative 8 proposes a total of 903 dwelling units, including 770 market-rate units and 133 affordable senior units. Contingent upon the approval of the Density Bonus Compliance Review, in conjunction with request On- and Off-Menu incentives and Waiver of Development Standards, Alternative 8 would be permitted a maximum 7:1 FAR in exchange for setting aside at least 11 percent for Very Low Income households.

As the VTTM for Alternative 8 includes the merger and re-subdivision of the Project Site into three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots for a total of 16 lots; the merger of a portion of an alley to add 1,003 square feet to the Project Site; the merger of portions along the sidewalk of Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and both sides of Vine Street to add 4,873 square feet to the Project Site, and dedication of five-foot wide sidewalk easements over the said sidewalk for a mixed-use development, the VTTMs are consistent with the density permitted by the Zone.

The VTTM was distributed to and reviewed by the various City agencies of the Subdivision Committee, including, but not limited to, the Bureau of Engineering, Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division and Zoning Division, Department of Water and Power, Bureau of Sanitation, Bureau of Street Lighting, Department of Recreation and Parks, that have the authority to make dedication, and/or improvement recommendations. Several public agencies found the subdivision design satisfactory, with imposed improvement requirements and/or conditions of approval. Specifically, the Bureau of Engineering reviewed the VTTM for compliance with the Street Design Standards and has recommended dedication and/or improvements to the public right-of-way along Ivar Avenue, Argyle Avenue, Yucca Street, and Vine Street, and the alley adjoining the Project Site, consistent with the standards of the Mobility Element and Hollywood Walk of Fame Specifications. The Bureau of Engineering also specified that, if Planning Department and the Department of Transportation determine that the merger would not be in conflict with the Community Plan and would not impact traffic circulation, then these proposed merger requests can be granted. In addition, the Bureau of Engineering has recommended the construction of the necessary on-site mainline sewers and all necessary street improvements will be made to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 2010. The Bureau of Sanitation reviewed the sewer/storm drain lines serving the subject tract, determined that sewers are available and have been inspected and deemed adequate in accommodating Alternative 8's sewerage needs. The Department of Building and Safety – Grading Division reviewed the site grading and deemed it appropriate. The Department of Water and Power (LADWP) determined that all required water mains have been installed and that the VTTM can be supplied with water from the municipal system subject to the LADWP's Water System Rules and upon payment of regular service connection charges. The Bureau of Street Lighting

[6] Pursuant to AB 2501, base density calculations that result in a fractional unit shall be rounded up to the next whole number for projects utilizing LAMC Section 12.22 A.25 (Affordable Housing Incentives – Density Bonus).

determined that street lighting improvements shall include the relocation and upgrade streetlights along Ivar Avenue, Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and Vine Street. All Conditions of Approval for the design and improvement of the subdivision are required to be performed prior to the recordation of the tentative map, building permit, grading permit, or certificate of occupancy.

Therefore, as conditioned and upon approval of the entitlement requests, the design and improvements of the proposed subdivision are consistent with the applicable General Plan.

(c) THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT.

The Project Site spans portions of two City blocks, comprised of 10 parcels totaling 4.46 acres in size prior to the approved mergers, and 4.60 acres in size with the approved mergers, and is generally bounded by Yucca Street to the north, Ivar Avenue to the west, Argyle Avenue to the east, adjacent development and Hollywood Boulevard to the south, and is bifurcated by Vine Street. The portion of the Project Site located between Ivar Avenue and Vine Street is identified as the West Site and the portion located between Vine Street and Argyle Avenue is identified as the East Site.

The West Site is currently developed with an approximately 1,237-square-foot, single-story building that is currently used for storage of sets and props associated with AMDA performing arts school and a surface parking lot with a parking attendant kiosk, and is enclosed by iron fencing and secured by a lockable gate. The East Site is currently developed with the Capitol Records Complex, which includes the 13-story Capitol Records Building and ancillary studio recording uses and the two-story Gogerty Building, all of which total approximately 114,303 square feet of existing floor area, and surface parking lots with controlled gated access.

Under Alternative 8, the existing building on the West Site would be demolished, the Capitol Records Complex would be preserved, and the remainder of the Project Site would be redeveloped with up to 903 residential units, comprised of 770 market-rate and 133 senior affordable units, up to 385,943 square feet of office uses, and up to 26,874 square-feet of retail/restaurant space, within three new mixed-use buildings (West Building, West Senior Building and East Office Building). The new buildings would range in height from 13 to 49 stories and comprise approximately 1,287,150 square feet of new floor area. Parking would be provided within a five-level subterranean parking garage with one level of enclosed at-grade parking on the West Site, and a seven-level subterranean parking garage on the East Site. Overall, the Alternative 8 would contain approximately 1,401,403 square feet (including the Capital Records Complex), for a maximum FAR of 7:1. The VTTM for Alternative 8 is for merger of 16 existing lots and the subsequent re-subdivision of a 4.613-acre site into three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots for a total of 16 lots; the merger of a portion of an alley to add 1,0033 square feet to the Project Site; the merger of portions along the sidewalk of Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and both sides of Vine Street to add 4,873 square feet to the Project Site, dedicating five-foot wide sidewalk easements over said sidewalk merger areas; an associated haul route for the export of 542,300 cubic yards of soil; and the removal of 16 street trees.

The Project Site slopes down from northwest corner of the West Side to the northeast corner of the East Site with a grade change of approximately 21 feet. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area and is not located in a Methane Zone, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, Flood Zone, Landslide, Liquefaction, Methane or Tsunami Inundation Zone

and is not subject to the Specific Plan for the Management of Flood Hazards (floodways, floodplains, mud prone areas, coastal high-hazard and flood-related erosion hazard areas). The Project Site is not located within a designated hillside area but is located within a BOE Special Grading Area. The Project Site is not identified as having hazardous waste or past remediation, and the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Reports completed for the Project Site found that development of the Project Site would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The Project Site is located within 0.5 miles of the Hollywood Fault, and is within the Alquist-Priolo Zone, but not within a Preliminary Fault Rupture Study Area. As the Project Site lies within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, issuance of a development permit requires a geologic fault rupture investigation that demonstrates a proposed building site is not threatened by surface displacement from the fault. As indicated in the 2015 and 2019 Fault Studies prepared for the Project Site, there are no active faults beneath the Project Site. The Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division has reviewed the Geology/Soils Report prepared by Feffer Geological Consulting, dated September 23, 2019, and issued a Soils Report Approval Letter, dated October 15, 2019, determining that the report is acceptable, provided that, prior to the issuance of grading/building permits, a design-level geotechnical/soils report shall be submitted to the Grading Division to provide recommendations specific to the proposed development. The Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division has also reviewed the Addendum Reports for Alternative 8, prepared by Feffer Geological Consulting, dated July 6, 2020 for Alternative 8 and issued a Geology Report Review Letter, dated September 9, 2020, confirming that the Alternative does not alter the geologic and geotechnical issues addressed in the previous reports, and references an Inter-Departmental Correspondence by Department of Building and Safety and the Department of City Planning, dated August 7, 2020, which states that , the developer shall be required to excavate another exploratory trench to demonstrate, or rule out, the presence of an active fault in the southerly part of the Project Site. These requirements have been imposed as a Condition of Approval of the VTTM.

In addition, the environmental analysis conducted found that the VTTM and development of Alternative 8 would not result in any significant impacts in terms of geological or seismic impacts, hazards and hazardous materials, and fire safety. Finally, prior to the issuance of any permits, Alternative 8 would be required to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Building and Safety and the Fire Department. Therefore, based on the above and as conditioned, the Project Site will be physically suitable for the proposed type of development.

(d) THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT.

The General Plan identifies, through its Community and Specific Plans, geographic locations where planned and anticipated densities are permitted. Zoning applied to subject sites throughout the City are allocated based on the type of land use, physical suitability, and population growth that is expected to occur. The adopted Hollywood Community Plan designates the Project Site for Regional Center Commercial land uses corresponding to the C4-2D-SN (Commercial Zone, Height District 2D, Hollywood Signage Supplemental Use District [HSSUD]) Zone. The C4 Zone allows for a wide variety of land uses, including retail stores, theaters, hotels, broadcasting studios, parking buildings, parks, and playgrounds and permits any land use permitted in the R4 Zone, including multiple residential uses.

Height District 2 allows a 6:1 FAR, with no height limit in conjunction with the C4 Zone. However, the Project Site is subject to "D" Limitations, pursuant to Ordinance No. 165,659, which restricts lots with Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 5546-004-006, 5546-004-020, 5546-004-021, 5546-004-029, 5546-030-028, 5546-030-031 through 5546-030-034 to a 3:1 FAR; and the corner lot on the southeast corner of Yucca Street and Ivar Street, with APN 5546-004-032, to a 2:1 FAR. The "SN" indicates that the Project Site is located in the HSSUD, which establishes signage regulations in addition to and/or which supersede those of the LAMC.

Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.18, any lot in the C4 Zone, provided that such lot is located within an area designated as Regional Center Commercial within the adopted Community Plan, is permitted to develop at the R5 density, or one dwelling unit for every 200 square feet of lot area. In conjunction with the proposed mergers associated with the VTTM for Alternative 8, the lot area of the Project Site is 200,371 square feet, which permits a base density of 1,002 dwelling units[7].

Alternative 8 proposes a total of 903 dwelling units, including 770 market-rate units and 133 affordable senior units. Contingent upon the approval of the Density Bonus Compliance Review, where, in conjunction with On- and Off-Menu incentives and Waiver of Development Standards, the Project would be permitted a maximum 7:1 FAR in exchange for setting aside at least 11 percent for Very Low Income households.

The Project Site spans portions of two City blocks, comprised of 10 parcels totaling 4.46 acres in size acres in size prior to the approved mergers, and 4.60 acres in size with the approved mergers. The Project Site is generally bounded by Yucca Street to the north, Ivar Avenue to the west, Argyle Avenue to the east, adjacent development and Hollywood Boulevard to the south, and is bifurcated by Vine Street. The Project vicinity is characterized by a commercial, tourist and entertainment-related commercial uses, offices, hotels, and low- to high-density residential developments that vary in building style and period of construction. The sidewalk along Vine Street adjacent to the Project Site contains a portion of the Hollywood Walk of Fame, a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument, and street trees. Surrounding properties are within the C4-2D-SN, [T][Q]C4-2D-SN, and (T)(Q)C4-2D-SN Zones. To the north of the Project Site is the US-101 Hollywood Freeway, Hollywood Boulevard, a variety of hotel, retail, and restaurant uses to the south, and a mix of commercial and residential uses to the east and west.

The floor area, density, and massing for Alternative 8 is appropriately scaled and situated given the size of the Project Site and uses in the surrounding area, which is characterized by commercial, tourist and entertainment-related commercial uses, offices, hotels, and low- to high-density residential developments that vary in building style and period of construction. The subject site is a relatively flat, infill lot in a developed urban area with adequate infrastructure. Furthermore, the area is easily accessible via improved streets, highways, and transit systems; and would be supported by adequate infrastructure, including utility demand and public services, to support the development at the proposed density, as is evidenced from the EIR analysis conducted for Alternative 8. The EIR analysis conducted for Alternative 8 also found that the VTTM and development of Alternative 8 establishes that the physical characteristics of the site and the proposed density of

[7] Pursuant to AB 2501, base density calculations that result in a fractional unit shall be rounded up to the next whole number for projects utilizing LAMC Section 12.22 A.25 (Affordable Housing Incentives – Density Bonus).

development are generally consistent with existing development and urban character of the surrounding community. Therefore, the Project Site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.

(e) THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR SUBSTANTIALLY AND AVOIDABLY INJURE FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

The Project proposes an infill development within an area designated for high density residential and commercial uses within the Hollywood Community Plan area in the City of Los Angeles. The Tract Map subdivision design includes the creation of three (3) ground lots and 13 airspace lots for a total of 16 lots; the merger of a portion of an alley to add 1,003 square feet to the Project Site; the merger of portions along the sidewalk of Yucca Street, Argyle Avenue, and both sides of Vine Street to add 4,873 square feet to the Project Site.

The proposed improvements include a mixed-use development within three buildings. The subdivision design and improvements are consistent with the existing urban development of the area. The Project Site is currently developed with three (3) commercial buildings and associate surface parking lots, and includes 48 trees, which includes 16 street trees. None of the existing trees are protected species. Existing landscaping within the Project Site is limited and does not contain any natural open spaces, act as a wildlife corridor, contain riparian habitat, wetland habitat, migratory corridors, conflict with the Protected Tree Ordinance, conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan, nor possess any areas of significant biological resource value. As described, there are no native or protected trees located within the Project Site or on the street sidewalk parkway. Further, the vicinity is characterized by commercial, tourist and entertainment-related commercial uses, offices, hotels, and low- to high-density residential developments that vary in building style and period of construction. The Project Site, as described in the EIR, is urbanized and built-out, and does not contain riparian or other sensitive natural community and does not provide a natural habitat for either fish or wildlife. No water bodies or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act exist on the Project Site.

Finally, the EIR identifies no potential adverse impacts on fish or wildlife resources. Therefore, the design of the subdivision would not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish, wildlife, or their habitat.

(f) THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SERIOUS PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEMS.

The proposed subdivision and subsequent improvements are subject to the provisions of the LAMC (e.g., the Fire Code, Planning and Zoning Code, Health and Safety Code) and the Building Code. Other health and safety related requirements as mandated by law would apply where applicable to ensure the public health and welfare (e.g., asbestos abatement, seismic safety, flood hazard management).

Alternative 8 is not located over a hazardous materials site, flood hazard area and is not located on unsuitable soil conditions. Alternative 8 would not place any occupants or residents near a hazardous materials site or involve the use or transport of hazardous materials or substances. The Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Reports completed found that development of the Project Site would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident

conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Furthermore, the development of Alternative 8 does not propose substantial alteration to the existing topography. Regarding seismic safety, with adherence to State and City building requirements, along with the recommendation from the LADBS Grading Division Soils Report Approval Letter, dated October 15, 2019, which requires that prior to the issuance of grading/building permits, a design-level geotechnical/soils report shall be submitted to the Grading Division to provide recommendations specific to the proposed development. The Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division has also reviewed the Addendum Reports for Alternative 8, prepared by Feffer Geological Consulting, dated July 6, 2020 for Alternative 8 and issued a Geology Report Review Letter, dated September 9, 2020, confirming that the Alternative does not alter the geologic and geotechnical issues addressed in the previous reports, and references an Inter-Departmental Correspondence by Department of Building and Safety and the Department of City Planning, dated August 7, 2020, which states that the developer shall be required to excavate another exploratory trench to demonstrate, or rule out, the presence of an active fault in the southerly part of the Project Site. These requirements have been imposed as a Condition of Approval of the VTTM.

The EIR fully analyzed the impacts of both construction and operation of Alternative 8 on the existing public utility and sewer systems and determined that impacts are less than significant. In addition, the development is required to be connected to the City's sanitary sewer system, where the sewage will be directed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which has been upgraded to meet Statewide ocean discharge standards. Therefore, the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems.

(g) THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS ACQUIRED BY THE PUBLIC AT LARGE FOR ACCESS THROUGH OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION.

There are no recorded instruments identifying easements encumbering the Project Site for the purpose of providing public access. The Project Site is surrounded by public streets and private properties that adjoin improved public streets and sidewalks designed and improved for the specific purpose of providing public access throughout the area. It should be noted that the VTTM for Alternative 8 includes dedicating five-foot-wide sidewalk easements over said sidewalk merger areas for public use. The Project Site does not adjoin or provide access to a public resource, natural habitat, public park, or any officially recognized public recreation area. Any public access required for roads and utilities would be acquired by the City prior to recordation of the proposed VTTM. Therefore, the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements would not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.

(h) THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION WILL PROVIDE, TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE, FOR FUTURE PASSIVE OR NATURAL HEATING OR COOLING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE SUBDIVISION. (REF. SECTION 66473.1)

In assessing the feasibility of passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the proposed subdivision design, the Project Applicant has prepared and submitted materials which consider the local climate, contours, configuration of the parcel(s) to be subdivided and other design and improvement requirements.

Providing for passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities will not result in reducing allowable densities or the percentage of a lot which may be occupied by a building or structure under applicable planning and zoning in effect at the time the tentative map was filed.

The topography of the site has been considered in the maximization of passive or natural heating and cooling opportunities. In addition, prior to obtaining a building permit, the subdivider shall consider building construction techniques, such as overhanging eaves, location of windows, insulation, exhaust fans; planting of trees for shade purposes and the height of the buildings on the site in relation to adjacent development.

These findings shall apply to both the tentative and final maps for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 82152.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Advisory Agency

William Lamborn
City Planner
Deputy Advisory Agency
WL:LI:MZ:MN

Note: If you wish to file an appeal, it must be filed within 10 calendar days from the decision date as noted in this letter. Such appeal must be submitted on Master Appeal Form No. CP-7769.

COVID-19 INTERIM APPEAL FILING PROCEDURES: Consistent with Mayor Eric Garcetti's "Safer At Home" directives to help slow the spread of COVID-19, the Department of City Planning is implementing new procedures for the filing of appeals for non-applicants that eliminate or minimize in-person interaction. There are three options for filing appeals, including an online option at https://planning.lacity.org/development-services/appeal-application-online, as well as two additional options described in the Interim Appeal Filing Procedures attached to this Letter of Determination.

For reference, the Department's Development Services Centers are located at:

Figueroa Plaza
201 North Figueroa Street, 4th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 482-7077

Marvin Braude
San Fernando Valley Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 251
Van Nuys, CA 91401
(818) 374-5050

West Los Angeles Development Services Center
1828 Sawtelle Boulevard, 2nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 231-2598

Forms are also available on-line at https://planning.lacity.org/development-services/forms

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

If you have any questions, please call Development Services Center staff at (213) 482-7077, (818) 374-5050, or (310) 231-2598.

COVID-19 UPDATE
Interim Appeal Filing Procedures

March 27, 2020

LOS ANGELES CITY PLANNING

Consistent with Mayor Eric Garcetti's "Safer At Home" directives to help slow the spread of COVID-19, the Department of City Planning is implementing new procedures for the filing of appeals for non-applicants that eliminate or minimize in-person interaction. There are two options for filing appeals, which are effective immediately and described below.

OPTION 1: EMAIL PLUS US MAIL

This is a two-step process including pre-clearance by email of the appeal application followed by application and payment submittal via US Mail.

STEP 1:

Email **planning.figcounter@lacity.org** with the subject line: "**Request to File Appeal**." In the email body provide:

- The case number
- Appellant contact information (name, email, telephone number)

Include as individual attachments to the email:

- Copy of Signed Appeal Application
- Justification
- Letter of Determination

City Planning staff will contact the appellant to confirm whether the appeal is complete and meets the applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The appellant will then be instructed to move forward with Step 2.

STEP 2:

Send appeal application via US Mail, postmarked no later than the last day of the appeal period. The package shall include:

- Original Appeal Application (wet signatures),
- Copy of email correspondence with City Planning staff (from Step 1)
- Appeal fee, check payable to the City of Los Angeles ($109.47 for an aggrieved party, not the Project Applicant.)

Mail the appeal application to:
Department City Planning - Metro DSC
201 N. Figueroa St., 4th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

City Planning staff will email and mail the appellant with a receipt for payment. Note: only the original application, email, and check need to be sent via US Mail. This ensures a standard envelope with standard postage is sufficient, and no trip to the Post Office is necessary. Steps 1 and 2 must both be completed. An email alone is not sufficient to satisfy appeal requirements.

OPTION 2: DROP OFF AT DSC

An appellant may continue to submit an appeal application and payment at any of the three Development Services Center (DSC) locations. City Planning established drop off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop off appeal applications and payment. **Drop off areas are monitored in secure locations outside the three DSCs (Metro/Downtown, Van Nuys, and West Los Angeles) and are available during regular business hours.**

City Planning staff will follow up with the appellant via email and phone to:

- Confirm that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable provisions of the LAMC
- Provide a receipt for payment