

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING APPEAL REPORT

Case No.:

. . . .

VTT-83510-CN-HCA-1A

City Planning Commission

			CEQA No.:	ENV-2021-6887-CE
Date:	June 23	, 2022	Incidental Case:	N/A
Time:	After 8:	30 a.m.*	Related Case:	CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-
Place:	In conformity with the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 (March 17			WDI-HCA
			Council No.:	13 - Mitch O'Farrell
	2020) ai	nd due to concerns over	Plan Area:	Hollywood
	COVID-	19. the CPC meeting will be	Specific Plan:	None
	conduct	ed entirely telephonically by	Certified NC:	Hollywood United
	Zoom [h	ttps://zoom.us/].	GPLU:	Highway Oriented Commercial; High Density Residential
Public H	earing:	Required	Zone:	C4-1-SN: R4-2
Anneal S	tatus:	Appealable to City Council		- · · · - · · , · · · -
Evpiratio	n Doto			
Expiratio	n Dale.	June 23, 2022	Applicant:	1717 Bronson, LLC
			Representative:	Michael Gonzales, Gonzales Law Group, APC
			Appellant:	Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER)
			Representative:	Amalia Bowely Fuentes, Lozeau Drury, LLP
			Appellant:	Kevin Carmichael, Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles (CREED LA)
			Representative:	Kevin Carmichael, Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo

PROJECT LOCATION: 1715 - 1739 North Bronson Avenue

- **PROPOSED PROJECT:** The proposed project involves the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 24story, 229,015 square-foot residential building with 128 residential dwelling units (including 11 units – 11% of the base density set aside for Very Low Income Households), and a total of 17,778 square feet of open space. The project would provide a total of 134 automobile parking spaces within one (1) subterranean and three (3) above ground level of parking and a total of 89 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 9 short-term bicycle parking spaces. The Lombardi Structures would remain on-site and will not be altered.
- APPEAL An appeal of the Advisory Agency approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. VTT-83510-CN-HCA, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 17.03, for the merger and subdivision of three (3) lots into one (1) master ground lot and five (5) commercial condominiums lots for a high-density residential project containing a maximum of 128 residential dwelling units.

VTT-83510-CN-HCA-1A

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

- 1. **Determine** that, based on the whole of the administrative record, the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15332, Class 32, that there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies, and
- Deny the appeal of the Advisory Agency approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. VTT-83510-CN-HCA, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 17.03, for the merger and subdivision of three (3) lots into one (1) master ground lot and five (5) commercial condominiums lots for a high-density residential project containing a maximum of 128 residential dwelling units;
- 3. Adopt the Findings; and
- 4. **Approve** Vesting Tentative Trat Map No. VTT-83510-CN.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP Director of Planning

Heather Bleemers, Senior City Planner

Kevin Golden

Kevin Golden, City Planner

Michelle Carter, City Planning Associate Michelle.Carter@lacity.org

ADVICE TO PUBLIC: *The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communications may be mailed to the City Planning Commission Secretariat, 200 North Spring Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213-978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent to the week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to this programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request not later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at (213) 978-1300.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Analysis	A-1
Appeal Analysis	A-6
Staff Conclusion and Recommendation	A-11

Maps:

Map 1 - Zoning Map Map 2 - Vicinity Map Map 3 - Radius Map

Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Appeal Application (Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility, SAFER and Kevin Carmichael, Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles, CREED LA)

Exhibit B: Advisory Agency's Determination (Case No. VTT-83510-CN-HCA-1A)

Exhibit C: Vesting Tentative Tract Map

Exhibit D: Categorical Exemption (Case No. ENV-2021-6887-CE)

PROJECT ANALYSIS

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The subject property is comprised of three (3) lots resulting in approximately 38,826 square feet of lot area with a 248-foot frontage along Bronson Avenue and a 148-foot frontage along Carlos Avenue. The subject property is zoned C4-1-SN and R4-2 within the Hollywood Community Plan Area with a Highway Oriented Commercial and High-Density Residential land use designation. The subject site is located within a Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles (ZI-2452), Redevelopment Project Area: Hollywood, Sign District: Hollywood Signage (CRA Area), Sign District: Hollywood Signage (Media District), Freeway Adjacent Advisory Notice for Sensitive Uses, Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area Individual Historic Resources, and a State Enterprise Zone: Los Angeles (ZI-2374). The site is located 0.83 kilometers from the Hollywood Fault. The project is located within a Special Grading Area.

The property is currently vacant on two (2) parcels and the southern parcel is currently improved with the Lombardi House including a two-story residential building and a barn which will remain on the subject property. The residence was originally built as a single-family dwelling between 1904 – 1905. The building was later modified in 1930 and reoriented to face east onto Bronson Avenue and was extensively renovated in 2012. The Lombardi House was previously surveyed four times by the City of Los Angeles, as recent as in 2010 and appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation and appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation. A project that would physically detract, either directly or indirectly, from the integrity and significance of the historical resource such that its eligibility for listing in the National Register, California Register, or as a City Historic Cultural Monument would no longer be maintained, is considered a project that would result in a significant impact on the historical resource. Here, since there are no proposed alternations to the Lombardi House would continue to convey the property's historic significance, the project is not considered a project.

The Vesting Tentative Tract Map is for the merger and subdivision of three (3) parcels into a single parcel with five (5) commercial condominiums.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

Surrounding properties are developed with a mix of residential, commercial retail/restaurant, commercial office, and public facilities uses. To the west, abutting the project site, land uses include the Los Angeles County Superior Courthouse. The project site is bordered to the north by multi-family housing. To the east, across Bronson Avenue, uses include multi-family residential, commercial and the Hollywood 101 Freeway. To the south of the project site, land uses include various commercial uses, including a fast-food restaurant, a gas station, a two-story self-storage facility, and a liquor store.

STREETS AND CIRCULATION

<u>Bronson Avenue</u>, adjoining the property to the east, is a designated Modified A venue III dedicated to a varying width of 60 to 69-feet and is improved with asphalt roadway, curb, gutter, concrete sidewalks, and street trees.

<u>Carlos Avenue</u>, adjoining the property to north, is a Local Street dedicated to a varying width of 48 to 54 feet and is improved with asphalt roadway, curb, gutter, and concrete sidewalks.

RELEVANT CASES

ON-SITE:

<u>Case No. DIR-2014-3609-SPR</u>– On May 12, 2015, the Director of Planning approved Site Plan Review for the development of 89 dwelling units, 75,098 square feet of floor area, 15,269 square feet of open space and common amenities, 131 vehicle parking spaces in a three-level subterranean garage plus one ground level garage, 98 bicycle parking spaces, within a building measuring 92 feet to the top of the parapet.

OFF-SITE:

<u>Case No. VTT-71587-CN</u>– On December 21, 2011, the Advisory Agency approved Vesting Tentative Tract A Map No. 71587 composed of one-lot, located at 5841 and 5845 West Carlton Way for a new maximum 40-unit residential condominium.

Public Hearing

A joint Public Hearing was held with the Deputy Advisory Agency and the Hearing Officer for Case No. CPC-2021-1557-DB-SPR-HCA on March 23, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., via Teleconference.

The hearing was attended by approximately 22 people, including the applicant, the applicant's representative, and members of the public. The applicant's representative presented the project.

Comments were made by Tommy Valvi, in opposition stating that the developers should work with the local workforce.

Omar Galindo, on behalf of UA Plumbers Local 78, stated that the union does not support the project and that the developers should commit to using local workers.

Comments were made by Kevin Carmichael, on behalf of CREED LA opposing the project stating that the project does not qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption and urged the City to continue the project and remand the project to staff to prepare an EIR.

Comments were made by Cory Smith, Deputy Director of Housing Action Coalition, in support of the proposed project.

Comments were made by Derek Sanders, Resident, in support of the proposed project.

Comments were made by Zach on behalf of CREED LA in opposition of the project stating that the project would cause a significant impact to traffic and emergency response.

Comments were made Godfrey on behalf of CREED LA in opposition of the proposed project, stating that the project will have a negative impact on the residents.

Ray, on behalf of a church, stated that the developer should choose to bring in the hard working people of Los Angeles.

Comments were made by Amalia Fuentes of Lozeau | Drury LLP on behalf of SAFER, opposing the project because the project the project is not allowed to utilize a Class 32 Exemption and an EIR needs to be circulated.

Comments were made by Alex Richmond in support of the proposed project because the project would be a development with a mix of units on a vacant site.

George, of SWRRC in support of the project for creating good paying jobs for the community.

Doug Haines, in opposition of the project, stating that the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan limits density increase to 30 percent and the Plan supersedes the State Density Bonus law. Housing incentive units should not be granted in a very high designation such as the project site. The Plan limits the FAR to 4.5 to 1 with an increase to not exceed 6 to 1. Off menu incentives are only allowed for incentives that are not on the menu and side yard reductions should be on menu with a maximum 20 percent reduction. A 24-story building with the notion that they would be no construction impacts is "silly" and the use of a Categorical Exemption is "non-sensical". The project is not near public transit Vine and Western stations are more than a half mile away.

Sean, on behalf of CREED LA in opposition of the project, stated that the project needs to be reconsidered. A 24-story building would have impacts whether or not it is in fill is irrelevant.

Marco Rodriguez, resident opposing the project stated that the project would "stick out like a sore thumb" and would probably contribute to an "insane" amount of traffic on Bronson and Hollywood. "More than 100 units is not a good idea."

Comments were made by Laura, resident, stating that there are no benefits to the immediate community. Current residents won't have a view since all they would see is the building. There would be traffic impacts. There are homeless communities in the area that is not addressed and 11 affordable units of 128 is not significant.

At the close of the public hearing, the Hearing Officer announced the June 23, 2022, tentative date for the City Planning Commission meeting, and encouraged all interested parties to send an email to the assigned Planner in order to receive future notification and determinations on the proposed project.

Public Correspondence

Two (2) correspondence was received from Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) requesting that the City of Los Angeles ("City") send by electronic mail, if possible or U.S. mail notice of any and all actions or hearings related to activities undertaken, authorized, approved, permitted, licensed, or certified by the City; and regarding the CEQA Class 32 (In-fill Development) Categorical Exemption prepared for the proposed Project.

Correspondence dated March 23, 2022, was received from Mitchell M. Tsai Attorneys for Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters stating that "the Southwest Carpenters would like to express their support for this Project. After received clarification and further information about this Project, SWRCC believes that this Project will benefit the environment and the local economy by utilizing a local skilled and trained workforce and will be built utilizing protocols that will protect worker health and safety."

Correspondence dated March 23, 2022, was received from Kevin Carmichael, on behalf of Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles ("CREED LA"), with "comments for consideration by the City of Los Angeles ("City") Department Of City Planning,

Subdivisions and Hearing Officer ("Hearing Officer") on Agenda Item 2 at the March 23, 2022 hearing for the Vesting Tentative Tract Map 1("VTTM") for the Bronson Residential Tower Project ("Project") (VTT-83510-CN-HCA, CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE) proposed by 1717 Bronson LLC ("Applicant"). These comments also address the City's Categorical Exemption Document ("Categorical Exemption" or "CE"), which incorrectly proposes to exempt the Project from environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA")."

Correspondence dated March 23, 2022, was received from Mitchell M. Tsai Attorneys for Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters, requesting "that the Lead Agency provide notice for any and all notices referring or related to the Project issued under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Cal Public Resources Code ("PRC") § 21000 et seq, and the California Planning and Zoning Law ("Planning and Zoning Law"), Cal. Gov't Code §§ 65000–65010. California Public Resources Code Sections 21092.2, and 21167(f) and Government Code Section 65092 require agencies to mail such notices to any person who has filed a written request for them with the clerk of the agency's governing body. The City should require community benefits such as requiring local hire and use of a skilled and trained workforce to build the Project. The City should require the use of workers who have graduated from a Joint Labor Management apprenticeship training program approved by the State of California, or have at least as many hours of on-the job experience in the applicable craft which would be required to graduate from such a state approved apprenticeship training program or who are registered apprentices in an apprenticeship training program approved by the State of California."

Correspondence dated March 20, 2022, was received from Casey Maddren, Citizens for a Better Los Angeles, in opposition of the project stating that; "there are a number of problems with the application as it currently stands, and with the requested entitlements. To briefly state the issues: 1. The project does not qualify for a categorical exemption. City Planning determined that a smaller project previously proposed for the same site required an MND. 2. The number of affordable units proposed does not satisfy the legal requirement for replacement units. There were previously at least 16 RSO units on the site, and possibly as many as 20 RSO units. 3. The City cannot make the findings required to approve a site plan review. 4. The requested 6.74 FAR is not permitted under Hollywood Redevelopment Plan. 5. Because the project is in close proximity to the Hollywood Freeway, the project will expose future residents to well-documented health risks for persons living near high-traffic corridors."

Correspondence dated March 15, 2022, was received from Sheila Sannadan, Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo writing on behalf of Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development ("CREED LA") to request immediate access to any and all public records referring or related to the 1715 N. Bronson Avenue Project (ENV-2021- 6887-CE; VTT-83510-CN-HCA; CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA) ("Project"), proposed by 1717 Bronson LLC and immediate access to all documents referenced in the CEQA Categorical Exemption document for the Project.

Correspondence dated February 21, 2022, was received from The Hollywood United Neighborhood Council (HUNC) stating that "at their regularly scheduled meeting on February 14, 2022 reviewed this project and voted to oppose the project as proposed and the precedence that it sets for the height, placement/siting and density of this of project. HUNC understands the limited impact on our scope of influence over these kinds of projects due to the California State ordinances. With that in mind, we request the project be conditioned as follows: • Due to the safety concerns of the Bronson Avenue and Hollywood Blvd. intersection and specifically, the fact that turning left at Hollywood from Bronson to access the Hollywood Freeway is a major problematic intersection, construction to be managed in such a way that two lanes of Bronson are kept open at all times and that there is no staging of construction equipment on Bronson. • Traffic lanes and

protocols be set up to safely manage bicycle use in and out of and around the project. • Due to environmental concerns regarding air quality and the need for tree canopy over sidewalks and wildlife protection (specifically birds that may interfere with the building windows) that native California vegetation be used throughout the project. • The number of affordable housing units be increased to 16 to offset the 16 affordable housing units that were torn down. The units to be RSO units to replace those taken off due to the exercise of the Ellis Act options by the applicant. • All leases to contain clauses forbidding the use of the apartments as AirBnB's, short term rentals or extended stay."

APPEAL SCOPE

The appeals challenge the entirety of the Advisory Agency's approval of a vesting tentative tract map for the merger and subdivision of three (3) parcels into a single parcel with five (5) commercial condominiums, in conjunction with the proposed new 128-unit residential development on the project site. The appellants contends that the project does not qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption from CEQA because there are significant impacts. As the proposed new development on the property is being reviewed by the City Planning Commission under a separate but related case (Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA), the appellate body for this appeal of the vesting tentative tract map is the City Planning Commission; the decision of the City Planning Commission regarding this appeal is appealable to the City Council.

APPEAL ANALYSIS

On May 5, 2022, the Advisory Agency issued a Determination that approved a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTT-83510-CN-HCA) for the proposed project. On May 11, 2022, an appeal was filed by Amalia Fuentes Maya Barron and Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) appealing the entire decision of the Advisory Agency. Additionally, on May 13, 2022, an appeal was filed by Kevin Carmichael, and Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles (CREED LA) appealing the entire decision of the Advisory Agency.

The following statements have been compiled from the submitted appeals. The appeals in their entirety have been attached herein for reference (Exhibit A).

1. <u>Appeal #1</u>

A. <u>The Categorical Exemption prepared for the Bronson Residential Tower Project</u> (VTT-83510-CN; CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA; ENV-2021-6887-CE) ("Project") fails to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

The Appellant contends that approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTT-83510-CN) was in error because (1) on its face, the Project does not qualify for a Categorical Exemption due to potential air quality and noise impacts and (2) the cumulative impacts and historical resources exceptions apply to the Project. The City must set aside the entitlements, withdraw the CEQA analysis for the Project, and prepare and circulate an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") prior to considering approvals for the Project.

Staff Response

As part of the review and approval process for the proposed project, staff conducted an environmental analysis of the proposed project to determine whether the project qualified for the Class 32 Categorical Exemption. This included a review of the project's potential impacts related to traffic, noise, air quality, hazardous materials and historic resources as prepared by the applicant's environmental consultant. The analysis of these areas of impacts found that the project would have either no impact or a less than significant impact on the environment.

A Noise Data study included in the Class 32 Categorical Exemption Analysis prepared by DKA Planning, dated June 2, 2021, which considered the six (6) closest residential uses to the proposed project, found that the project would not result in any significant construction-related or operational noise impact to any nearby sensitive uses. Additionally, the LAMC contains regulations that would apply to the project's temporary construction activities and long-term operations. Similarly, an Air Quality modeling included in the Class 32 Categorical Exemption Analysis, prepared by DKA Planning, dated May 30, 2021, found that the project would not result in any significant construction-related or operational air quality or greenhouse gas emissions impact to any nearby sensitive uses, or the regional as a whole.

The Appellant contends that the project does not qualify for a Categorical Exemption due to potential cumulative impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(b) states that a categorical exemption is inapplicable "when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant." An agency's determination that a project falls within a categorical exemption includes an implied finding that none of the exceptions identified in the CEQA Guidelines apply. Instead, the burden of proof shifts to the challenging party to produce evidence showing that one of the exceptions applies to take the Project out of the exempt category. (San Francisco Beautiful v. City and County of San Francisco (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1012, 1022-23.) The Appellant has provided a conclusory statement but has not submitted substantial evidence to the record that would contradict the conclusions of the Deputy Advisory Agency's determination that the project qualifies for the Class 32 Categorical Exemption.

A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The Lombardi House is located on the project site which includes a two-story residential building and a barn which will remain on the subject property. The residence was originally built as a single-family dwelling between 1904 – 1905. The building was later modified in 1930 and reoriented to face east onto Bronson Avenue and was extensively renovated in 2012. The Lombardi House was previously surveyed four times by the City of Los Angeles, as recent as in 2010 and appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation and appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation. A project that would physically detract, either directly or indirectly, from the integrity and significance of the historical resource such that its eligibility for listing in the National Register, California Register, or as a City Historic Cultural Monument would no longer be maintained, is considered a project that would result in a significant impact on the historical resource. Here, since there are no proposed alternations to the Lombardi House and all the existing physical elements that characterize the Lombardi House would continue to convey the property's historic significance, the project has no impact on the eligible historic resources.

2. Appeal #2

A. The Advisory Agency's Exemption Determination Was Premature and Unsupported

A CEQA document cannot be approved before the underlying project has been approved. An agency decision to approve a project is not final if it may be reviewed by appealing the decision to a higher administrative body. Accordingly, approval cannot occur until all administrative appeals have been exhausted.

Staff Response

On March 23, 2022, the Deputy Advisory Agency held a joint hearing with the Hearing Officer for Cases No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA and VTT-83510-CN-HCA for the proposed project. At that hearing, the DAA took the case (VTT-83510-CN-HCA) under advisement. Upon completion of the advisement period and acting as an initial decision-maker with the authority to determine the Categorical Exemption, the Advisory Agency issued a letter of determination approving the requested Vesting Tentative Tract Map and determining that the project was exempt from CEQA on May 5, 2022.

The appellant has made arguments that the Class 32 CE should not be approved, because a CEQA document cannot be approved before the underlying project has been approved. However, the Advisory Agency has the authority to determine if the project

is exempt from CEQA based on a review of supporting documents and did so after the completion of the advisement period, and in conjunction with its approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map that will facilitate the project being applied for in case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA. The approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map does not affect the separate review process for the Density Bonus request, and the Density Bonus case does not affect or preclude the granting of a subdivision action which does not effectuate or authorize any physical changes on the property.

B. The Project is Not Exempt From CEQA

The Categorical Exemption document failed to adequately analyze the Project's impacts related to air quality, noise impacts, transportation impacts, and adverse effects on public health and safety, and failed to disclose that the Project has potentially significant impacts, which render exemptions inapplicable. As a result of the unsupported exemption findings, the City also failed to adopt mitigation measures capable of reducing the Project's potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels, leaving major Project impacts significant and unmitigated.

 The City Failed to Analyze the Health Risk Impacts of Project Construction to On-Site Workers and Nearby Sensitive Receptors
 The City failed to complete a quantified health risk analysis ("HRA") which is commonly conducted to determine if a Project's construction hazardous air pollutant ("HAP") emissions would cause a significant health impact. The HRA is based on pollutants other than conventional air quality pollutants; that is, other than ROG, NOx, PM10, PM2.5, CO, and SO2.

Staff Response

The assessment of the project's construction and operational air quality impacts was conducted in accordance with guidance provided by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Project's regional and localized construction and operational emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The OEHHA Risk Assessment Guidelines were developed in order to provide guidance and recommended values to perform an HRA as part of the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act. The Act is "designed to provide information to state and local agencies and to the general public on the extent of airborne emissions." The Guidelines require that the local Air Quality Management District determine which facilities are required to prepare an HRA to determine impacts from the operations of the facilities. SCAQMD established Rule 1401 for regulations as it pertains to the Air Toxic Hot Spots and HRA requirements. Example of uses considered facilities would be: gas stations, dry cleaners, waste water treatment facilities, or other similar uses which emit toxic air contaminants.

In this case, the project proposes to develop 128 residential units and does not propose a use which would be a stationary source for the release of toxic air contaminants. The project does not fall within the criteria of OEHHA or SCAQMD to require that an HRA be prepared. Since the project would not generate pollutant emissions in excess of SCAQMD's significance threshold, the project impacts related to air quality would be less than significant.

2. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Noise Impacts

Our comments detailed that construction noise levels from the Project will result in an increase of between 9.6 dBA and 17.1 dBA at the receptors nearest to the Project site, resulting in a significant impact.

Staff Response

A Noise Data study included in the Class 32 Categorical Exemption Analysis prepared by DKA Planning, dated June 2, 2021, which considered the six (6) closest residential uses to the proposed project, found that the project would not result in any significant construction-related or operational noise impact to any nearby sensitive uses. The LAMC contains regulations that would apply to the project's temporary construction activities and long-term operations. LAMC Section 41.40(a) prohibits construction activities from occurring between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M., Monday through Friday. Subdivision (c) further prohibits construction activities from occurring between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M., Monday through Friday. Subdivision (c) further prohibits construction activities for one any Sunday or national holiday. Additionally, LAMC Section 112.05 of the LAMC establishes noise limits for powered equipment and hand tools operated within 500 feet of residential zones. Moreover, the LAMC notes that these limitations shall not apply where compliance therewith is technically infeasible.

3. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Impacts from Transportation

The Project's contribution to transportation impacts is potentially significant. Additionally, CREED LA proposed feasible mitigation measures that could lessen the Project's impacts. The City failed to address the Project's transportation impacts and they remain significant and unmitigated.

Staff Response

A significant impact may occur if the project conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. On July 30, 2019, pursuant to SB 743 and the recent changes to Section 15064.3 of the State's CEQA Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles adopted vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a criteria in determining transportation impacts under CEQA. The new Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG) provide instructions on preparing transportation assessments for land use proposals and defines the significant impact thresholds. LADOT has established that any project resulting in a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips requires a VMT analysis.

A Transportation Assessment was prepared for the project by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., dated May 2021. The Transportation Assessment was reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) on July 1, 2021. Further, LADOT received a memorandum, dated May 23, 2022, from the consultant, with the proposed project description which included minor revisions to the original project description. LADOT determined that the updated transportation assessment and the changes to the proposed project did not change the findings of the original analysis and all the recommendations in its July 1, 2021, letter remains in effect which determined that the project traffic at any freeway off-ramp will not exceed 25 peak hour trips, and a freeway ramp analysis is not required. Additionally, LADOT also determined that the VMT Analysis report prepared by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., for the project proposes to incorporate the TDM strategy of providing Bike Parking per the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) as a project design feature. With the application of this TDM measure, the proposed

project is projected to have a Household VMT per capita of 4.9 and no Work VMT. LADOT concluded that implementation of the project would result in no significant VMT impact.

4. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Cumulative Impacts

The Project is likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment. Project construction will require the use of heavy equipment and heavy-duty trucks diesel powered. Diesel exhaust contains TACs that would represent a potential hazard to workers on site and to the surrounding community. Additionally, the City failed to properly analyze the Project's contribution to the deterioration of levels of service ("LOS") at nearby intersections. As demonstrated in our comments there is clearly a significant cumulative impact resulting from the Project plus other concurrent projects in the area.

Staff Response

A Transportation Assessment was prepared for the project by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., dated May 2021. The Transportation Assessment was reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) on July 1, 2021. Further, LADOT received a memorandum, dated May 23, 2022, from the consultant, with the proposed project description which included minor revisions to the original project description. LADOT determined that the updated transportation assessment and the changes to the proposed project did not change the findings of the original analysis and all the recommendations in its July 1, 2021. Additionally, temporary construction activities on the project site would be addressed by regulatory compliance measures. The project has completed a circulation analysis using a "level of service" screening methodology that indicates that the trips generated by the proposed development will not likely result in adverse circulation conditions at several locations. Access to the project will be provided along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue. LADOT has reviewed this analysis and determined that it adequately discloses operational concerns.

C. The City Improperly Approved the Project Under the Subdivision Map Act

The Subdivision Map Act requires a lead agency to make findings that a proposed subdivision is consistent with the general plan/specific plan and does not have any detrimental environmental or public health effects. The City is unable to make these mandatory findings because the Project has unmitigated, adverse impacts in each of these areas. Moreover, the Categorical Exemption and LOD fail to provide substantial evidence to meet either of these legal standards.

Staff Response

The appellant contends that because they believe "the Project has unmitigated, adverse impacts," the Advisory Agency cannot make the Subdivision Map Act findings. While there is some overlap between the Subdivision Map Act finding and the environmental analysis provided as part of the CEQA environmental review, much of the Map Act findings are unrelated to CEQA, such as consistency with the General Plan, or conflicts with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of. The environmental and public health issues were analyzed in Air Quality, Noise and Traffic reports and provide substantial evidence in support of the City's findings. In contrast, Appellant's argument is conclusory and is not accompanied by evidence. Responses to the appellant's arguments are provided above.

STAFF CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons stated herein, and in the findings of the Advisory Agency, the approved Vesting Tentative Tract Map does comply with the Subdivision Map Act and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed map is consistent with the State's Subdivision Map Act, the General Plan, the Hollywood Community Plan and the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

Therefore, it is recommended that the City Planning Commission deny the appeal, sustain the Determinations made by the Advisory Agency.

MAPS









Exhibit AAppeal Application SAFER and CREED LA



APPLICATIONS:

APPEAL APPLICATION

Instructions and Checklist

Related Code Section: Refer to the City Planning case determination to identify the Zone Code section for the entitlement and the appeal procedure.

Purpose: This application is for the appeal of Department of City Planning determinations authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

A. APPELLATE BODY/CASE INFORMATION

1. APPELLATE BODY

	 Area Planning Commission Zoning Administrator 	City Planning Commission	City Council	Director of Planning		
	Regarding Case Number:					
	Project Address:					
	Final Date to Appeal:					
2.	APPELLANT					
	Appellant Identity: (check all that apply)	RepresentativeApplicant	Property OwnOperator of the	er ie Use/Site		
	Person, other than the A	pplicant, Owner or Operator claim	ning to be aggrieved	I		
	Person affected by the d	etermination made by the Depart	ment of Building a	nd Safety		
	RepresentativeApplicant	OwnerOperator	Aggrieved Pa	arty		
3.	APPELLANT INFORMATION					
	Appellant's Name:					
	Company/Organization:					
	Mailing Address:					
	City:	State:		Zip:		
	Telephone: E-mail:					
	a. Is the appeal being filed on \Box Self \Box Other:	your behalf or on behalf of anothe	er party, organizatio	n or company?		
	b. Is the appeal being filed to	support the original applicant's po	sition? 🛛 Yes	□ No		

4. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

	Representative/Agent name (if applicable):				
	Company:				
	Mailing Address:				
	City:	State:	Zip	:	
	Telephone:	E-mail:			
5.	JUSTIFICATION/REASON F	OR APPEAL			
	a. Is the entire decision, o	r only parts of it being appealed?	Entire	D Part	
	b. Are specific conditions	of approval being appealed?	□ Yes	🗆 No	
	If Yes, list the condition nur	nber(s) here:			
	Attach a separate sheet pro	oviding your reasons for the appeal. Yo	our reason must state:		
	The reason for the a	ppeal 🛛 How you are aggrieve	d by the decision		
	Specifically the point	s at issue I Why you believe the d	lecision-maker erred or	abused their discretion	
6.	3. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true:				
F	Appellant Signature:	Unalis poney tuenles	_ Date: <u>Ma</u>	y 11, 2022	

GENERAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS

B. ALL CASES REQUIRE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS - SEE THE ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC CASE TYPES

1. Appeal Documents

- a. Three (3) sets The following documents are required for <u>each</u> appeal filed (1 original and 2 duplicates) Each case being appealed is required to provide three (3) sets of the listed documents.
 - Appeal Application (form CP-7769)
 - □ Justification/Reason for Appeal
 - Copies of Original Determination Letter

b. Electronic Copy

Provide an electronic copy of your appeal documents on a flash drive (planning staff will upload materials during filing and return the flash drive to you) or a CD (which will remain in the file). The following items must be saved as <u>individual PDFs</u> and labeled accordingly (e.g. "Appeal Form.pdf", "Justification/Reason Statement.pdf", or "Original Determination Letter.pdf" etc.). No file should exceed 9.8 MB in size.

c. Appeal Fee

- □ Original Applicant A fee equal to 85% of the original application fee, provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) to calculate the fee per LAMC Section 19.01B 1.
- Aggrieved Party The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01B 1.

d. Notice Requirement

- □ Mailing List All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC section(s). Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC
- □ Mailing Fee The appeal notice mailing fee is paid by the <u>project applicant</u>, payment is made to the City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC), a copy of the receipt must be submitted as proof of payment.

SPECIFIC CASE TYPES - APPEAL FILING INFORMATION

C. DENSITY BONUS / TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITES (TOC)

1. Density Bonus/TOC

Appeal procedures for Density Bonus/TOC per LAMC Section 12.22.A 25 (g) f.

NOTE:

- Density Bonus/TOC cases, <u>only</u> the *on menu or additional incentives* items can be appealed.
- Appeals of Density Bonus/TOC cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation), and always <u>only</u> appealable to the Citywide Planning Commission.

□ Provide documentation to confirm adjacent owner or tenant status, i.e., a lease agreement, rent receipt, utility bill, property tax bill, ZIMAS, drivers license, bill statement etc.

D. WAIVER OF DEDICATION AND OR IMPROVEMENT

Appeal procedure for Waiver of Dedication or Improvement per LAMC Section 12.37 I.

NOTE:

- Waivers for By-Right Projects, can <u>only</u> be appealed by the owner.
- When a Waiver is on appeal and is part of a master land use application request or subdivider's statement for a project, the applicant may appeal pursuant to the procedures that governs the entitlement.

E. TENTATIVE TRACT/VESTING

1. Tentative Tract/Vesting - Appeal procedure for Tentative Tract / Vesting application per LAMC Section 17.54 A.

NOTE: Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission.

Provide a copy of the written determination letter from Commission.

F. BUILDING AND SAFETY DETERMINATION

1. Appeal of the <u>Department of Building and Safety</u> determination, per LAMC 12.26 K 1, an appellant is considered the Original Applicant and must provide noticing and pay mailing fees.

a. Appeal Fee

Original Applicant - The fee charged shall be in accordance with LAMC Section 19.01B 2, as stated in the Building and Safety determination letter, plus all surcharges. (the fee specified in Table 4-A, Section 98.0403.2 of the City of Los Angeles Building Code)

b. Notice Requirement

- □ Mailing Fee The applicant must pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of receipt as proof of payment.
- 2. Appeal of the <u>Director of City Planning</u> determination per LAMC Section 12.26 K 6, an applicant or any other aggrieved person may file an appeal, and is appealable to the Area Planning Commission or Citywide Planning Commission as noted in the determination.

a. Appeal Fee

□ Original Applicant - The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B 1 a.

b. Notice Requirement

- □ Mailing List The appeal notification requirements per LAMC Section 12.26 K 7 apply.
- □ Mailing Fees The appeal notice mailing fee is made to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC), a copy of receipt must be submitted as proof of payment.

G. NUISANCE ABATEMENT

1. Nuisance Abatement - Appeal procedure for Nuisance Abatement per LAMC Section 12.27.1 C 4

NOTE:

- Nuisance Abatement is only appealable to the City Council.

a. Appeal Fee

Aggrieved Party the fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B 1.

2. Plan Approval/Compliance Review

Appeal procedure for Nuisance Abatement Plan Approval/Compliance Review per LAMC Section 12.27.1 C 4.

a. Appeal Fee

- Compliance Review The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B.
- □ Modification The fee shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B.

NOTES

A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may <u>not</u> file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an <u>individual on behalf of self</u>.

Please note that the appellate body must act on your appeal within a time period specified in the Section(s) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) pertaining to the type of appeal being filed. The Department of City Planning will make its best efforts to have appeals scheduled prior to the appellate body's last day to act in order to provide due process to the appellant. If the appellate body is unable to come to a consensus or is unable to hear and consider the appeal prior to the last day to act, the appeal is automatically deemed denied, and the original decision will stand. The last day to act as defined in the LAMC may only be extended if formally agreed upon by the applicant.

This Section for City Planning Staff Use Only				
Base Fee:	Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner):		Date:	
Receipt No:	Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):		Date:	
Determination authority notified	C	□ Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)		

Justification/Reason for Appeal

Bronson Residential Tower Project

VTT-83510-CN; CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA; ENV-2021-6887-CE

I. REASON FOR THE APPEAL

The Categorical Exemption prepared for the Bronson Residential Tower Project (VTT-83510-CN; CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA; ENV-2021-6887-CE) ("Project") fails to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). Furthermore, the approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTT-83510-CN) was in error because (1) on its face, the Project does not qualify for a Categorical Exemption due to potential air quality and noise impacts and (2) the cumulative impacts and historical resources exceptions apply to the Project. The City must set aside the entitlements, withdraw the CEQA analysis for the Project, and prepare and circulate an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") prior to considering approvals for the Project.

II. SPECIFICALLY THE POINTS AT ISSUE

The specific points at issue are set forth in the attached comment letter dated March 21, 2022. An EIR should be prepared to remedy these issues, and proper CEQA review must be complete *before* the City approves the Project's entitlements. (*Orinda Ass'n. v. Bd. of Supervisors* (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 1145, 1171 ["No agency may approve a project subject to CEQA until the entire CEQA process is completed and the overall project is lawfully approved."].) The VTT approval was therefore premature and otherwise unsupported by substantial evidence.

III. HOW YOU ARE AGGRIEVED BY THE DECISION

Members of appellant Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") live and/or work in the vicinity of the proposed Project. They breathe the air, suffer traffic congestion, and will suffer other environmental impacts of the Project unless it is properly mitigated.

IV. WHY YOU BELIEVE THE DECISION-MAKER ERRED OR ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION

The Advisory Agency approved Vesting Tentative Tract No. VTT-83510-CN and approved a Categorical Exemption for the project pursuant to Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines, despite evidence in the record that the project does not meet the requirements of a Section 15332 exemption. The Project has the potential to cause significant air quality and noise impacts, in addition to falling under the cumulative impacts and historical resources exceptions to Categorical Exemptions. The Department of City Planning should have prepared an EIR and circulated the Draft EIR for public review and comment in accordance with CEQA prior to consideration of approvals for the Project. The City is not permitted to approve the Project's entitlements until proper CEQA review has been completed.



T 510.836.4200 F 510.836.4205 1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150 Oakland, CA 94612 www.lozeaudrury.com Amalia@lozeaudrury.com

Via Email

March 22, 2022

Michelle Carter, City Planning Associate City of Los Angeles 200 N. Spring St., Room 763 Los Angeles, CA 90012 <u>michelle.carter@lacity.org</u> <u>per.planning@lacity.org</u>

Re: Categorical Exemption – Bronson Residential Tower Project ENV-2021-6887-EAF; CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA Hearing Officer Hearing, March 23, 2022

Dear Ms. Carter:

I am writing on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") regarding the Project known as Bronson Residential Tower (ENV-2021-6887-EAF; CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA), including all actions related or referring to the proposed construction of a 24-story residential building with 128 units and four levels of parking, located at 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue, in the City of Los Angeles ("Project"). SAFER objects to staff's determination that the Project is categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental documents under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines ("Infill Exemption").

I. DISCUSSION

CEQA mandates that "the long-term protection of the environment . . . shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions" throughout California. (PRC § 21001(d).) To achieve its objectives of environmental protection, CEQA has a three-tiered structure. (14 CCR § 15002(k); *Committee to Save the Hollywoodland Specific Plan v. City of Los Angeles* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1168, 1185-86 (*"Hollywoodland"*)). First, if a project falls into an exempt category, or it can be seen with certainty that the activity in question will not have a significant effect on the environment, no further agency evaluation is required. *Id.* Second, if there is a possibility the project will have a significant effect on the environment, the agency must perform an initial threshold study. (*Id.*; 14 CCR § 15063(a).) If the study indicates that there is no substantial evidence that the project or

March 22, 2022 Comment re: Bronson Residential Project, CEQA Infill Exemption Hearing Officer Hearing Page 2 of 4

any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment the agency may issue a negative declaration. (*Id.*, 14 CCR §§ 15063(b)(2), 15070.) Finally, if the project will have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report ("EIR") is required. (*Id.*) Here, since the City exempted the Project from CEQA entirely, we are at the first step of the CEQA process.

a. CEQA Exemptions

CEQA identifies certain classes of projects which are exempt from the provisions of CEQA. These are called categorical exemptions. (14 CCR §§ 15300, 15354.) "Exemptions to CEQA are narrowly construed and "[e]xemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language." (*Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish & Game Com.* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 125.)

The determination as to the appropriate scope of a categorical exemption is a question of law subject to independent, or de novo, review. (*San Lorenzo Valley Community Advocates for Responsible Education v. San Lorenzo Valley Unified School Dist.*, (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1356, 1375 ("[Q]uestions of interpretation or application of the requirements of CEQA are matters of law. (Citations.) Thus, for example, interpreting the scope of a CEQA exemption presents 'a question of law, subject to de novo review by this court.' (Citations).")

b. Exceptions to Infill Exemptions

There are several exceptions to the categorical exemptions. (14 CCR § 15300.2.) At least two exceptions are relevant here:

(1) Cumulative Impacts. A project may not be exempted from CEQA review "when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant." (14 CCR § 15300.2(b)).

The City identified 20 related projects that would occur in the vicinity of the Project site around the same time as the Project, but concluded that the Project "would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts resulting from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time." (Bronson Residential Tower Project Categorical Exemption, hereafter "Exemption," p. 50). However, this conclusion is based in part on the City's conclusion that air quality impacts of the individual Project would also be less-than-significant. As discussed below, this conclusion is not supported by substantial evidence, therefore the City's conclusion regarding cumulative impacts is also unsupported. The Project therefore cannot be exempted under CEQA.

(2) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (14 CCR § 15300.2(f)).

March 22, 2022 Comment re: Bronson Residential Project, CEQA Infill Exemption Hearing Officer Hearing Page 3 of 4

The proposed Project will be located directly adjacent to a recognized historical resource, the Lombardi House. Environmental consulting firm Environmental Science Associates ("ESA") prepared a Historic Resources Memo which concluded that the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Lombardi House. (Exemption, Appendix E). However, neither the City's discussion nor the ESA report address the potential indirect physical impacts that the construction of a 24-story building directly adjacent to the Lombardi House may have on that property. The exemption should therefore be withdrawn, and an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") prepared to adequately assess this impact.

c. Limitations on Infill Exemptions

A project may only be exempt under the Infill Exemption where the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality." (14 CCR § 15332(d).) As part of its air quality assessment, the City included an analysis from DKA Planning consultants ("DKA"). (Exemption, Appendix D). The analysis identified six residential buildings within 400 feet of the project as sensitive receptors and used CalEEMod to assess impacts on those receptors. However, DKA did not conduct a Health Risk Assessment ("HRA"), and has therefore failed to give sufficient information with which to determine whether there would be significant air quality effects. Without an HRA, the Infill Exemption is unsupported by substantial evidence and, therefore, in violation of CEQA.

As for its discussion of noise impacts, the exemption document claims that "[o]ther mechanical equipment would be housed within the Project building itself . . . [t]he noise generated by this equipment would likely not be audible from outside of the Project building." (Exemption, p. 37). The City provides no evidence to support this conclusion regarding noise impacts from on-site operational activities, therefore also rendering the conclusion unsupported by substantial evidence. Additionally, the consultants who performed the noise analysis for the Project conducted technical surveys on June 2, 2021. (Exemption, p. 28). It was not until June 15, 2021 that the state of California dropped most of its pandemic restrictions¹, therefore making the June 2 date a skewed baseline off of which to analyze noise impacts.

¹ <u>https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/whats-changing-on-june-15-in-california-coronavirus-pandemic-reopening/2614733/.</u>

March 22, 2022 Comment re: Bronson Residential Project, CEQA Infill Exemption Hearing Officer Hearing Page 4 of 4

II. CONCLUSION

The CEQA Analysis fails to properly analyze and mitigate impacts to air quality, noise, historical resources, and other impacts. The analysis should be withdrawn, an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared, and the draft EIR should be circulated for public review and comment in accordance with CEQA. Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

Amalia Bowley Fuentes Lozeau | Drury LLP



APPLICATIONS:

APPEAL APPLICATION

Instructions and Checklist

Related Code Section: Refer to the City Planning case determination to identify the Zone Code section for the entitlement and the appeal procedure.

Purpose: This application is for the appeal of Department of City Planning determinations authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

A. APPELLATE BODY/CASE INFORMATION

1. APPELLATE BODY

☐ Area Planning Commission ☐ Zoning Administrator	☐ City Planning Commission	City Council	Director of Planning
Regarding Case Number:			
Project Address:			
Final Date to Appeal:			
APPELLANT			
Appellant Identity: (check all that apply)	RepresentativeApplicant	Property OwnOperator of th	er e Use/Site
Person, other than the A	pplicant, Owner or Operator claim	ing to be aggrieved	
□ Person affected by the d	etermination made by the Departr	nent of Building a	nd Safety
RepresentativeApplicant	OwnerOperator	☐ Aggrieved Pa	arty
APPELLANT INFORMATION			
Appellant's Name:			
Company/Organization:			
Mailing Address:			
City:	State:		Zip:
Telephone:	E-mail:		
a. Is the appeal being filed on	your behalf or on behalf of anothe	er party, organization	n or company?
	 Area Planning Commission Zoning Administrator Regarding Case Number: Project Address: Final Date to Appeal: Final Date to Appeal: APPELLANT Appellant Identity: (check all that apply) Person, other than the A Person affected by the deget Representative Applicant APPELLANT INFORMATION Appellant's Name: Company/Organization: Mailing Address: City: Telephone: a. Is the appeal being filed on	Area Planning Commission City Planning Commission Zoning Administrator Regarding Case Number:	Area Planning Commission City Planning Commission City Council Zoning Administrator Regarding Case Number:

4. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

	Representative/Agent name (if applica	ble):		
	Company:			
	Mailing Address:			
	City:	State:	Zi	p:
	Telephone:	E-mail:		
5.	JUSTIFICATION/REASON FOR APPEA	L		
	a. Is the entire decision, or only parts	of it being appealed?	Entire	Part
	b. Are specific conditions of approval	being appealed?	□ Yes	🗆 No
	If Yes, list the condition number(s) her	e:		
	Attach a separate sheet providing you	reasons for the appea	al. Your reason must state	:
	The reason for the appeal	How you are agg	rieved by the decision	
	Specifically the points at issue	Why you believe	the decision-maker erred of	or abused their discretion
6.	APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT	·		
	Appellant Signature:	in this application are o	complete and true: Date: ^{May}	[,] 13, 2022
_	// ···································			

GENERAL APPEAL FILING REQUIREMENTS

B. ALL CASES REQUIRE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS - SEE THE ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC CASE TYPES

1. Appeal Documents

- **a.** Three (3) sets The following documents are required for <u>each</u> appeal filed (1 original and 2 duplicates) Each case being appealed is required to provide three (3) sets of the listed documents.
 - Appeal Application (form CP-7769)
 - □ Justification/Reason for Appeal
 - Copies of Original Determination Letter

b. Electronic Copy

Provide an electronic copy of your appeal documents on a flash drive (planning staff will upload materials during filing and return the flash drive to you) or a CD (which will remain in the file). The following items must be saved as <u>individual PDFs</u> and labeled accordingly (e.g. "Appeal Form.pdf", "Justification/Reason Statement.pdf", or "Original Determination Letter.pdf" etc.). No file should exceed 9.8 MB in size.

c. Appeal Fee

- □ Original Applicant A fee equal to 85% of the original application fee, provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) to calculate the fee per LAMC Section 19.01B 1.
- Aggrieved Party The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01B 1.

d. Notice Requirement

- □ Mailing List All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC section(s). Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC
- □ Mailing Fee The appeal notice mailing fee is paid by the <u>project applicant</u>, payment is made to the City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC), a copy of the receipt must be submitted as proof of payment.

SPECIFIC CASE TYPES - APPEAL FILING INFORMATION

C. DENSITY BONUS / TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITES (TOC)

1. Density Bonus/TOC

Appeal procedures for Density Bonus/TOC per LAMC Section 12.22.A 25 (g) f.

NOTE:

- Density Bonus/TOC cases, only the on menu or additional incentives items can be appealed.
- Appeals of Density Bonus/TOC cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation), and always <u>only</u> appealable to the Citywide Planning Commission.

Provide documentation to confirm adjacent owner or tenant status, i.e., a lease agreement, rent receipt, utility bill, property tax bill, ZIMAS, drivers license, bill statement etc.

D. WAIVER OF DEDICATION AND OR IMPROVEMENT

Appeal procedure for Waiver of Dedication or Improvement per LAMC Section 12.37 I.

NOTE:

- Waivers for By-Right Projects, can <u>only</u> be appealed by the owner.
- When a Waiver is on appeal and is part of a master land use application request or subdivider's statement for a project, the applicant may appeal pursuant to the procedures that governs the entitlement.

E. TENTATIVE TRACT/VESTING

1. Tentative Tract/Vesting - Appeal procedure for Tentative Tract / Vesting application per LAMC Section 17.54 A.

NOTE: Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission.

Provide a copy of the written determination letter from Commission.

F. BUILDING AND SAFETY DETERMINATION

1. Appeal of the <u>Department of Building and Safety</u> determination, per LAMC 12.26 K 1, an appellant is considered the Original Applicant and must provide noticing and pay mailing fees.

a. Appeal Fee

Original Applicant - The fee charged shall be in accordance with LAMC Section 19.01B 2, as stated in the Building and Safety determination letter, plus all surcharges. (the fee specified in Table 4-A, Section 98.0403.2 of the City of Los Angeles Building Code)

b. Notice Requirement

- □ Mailing Fee The applicant must pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of receipt as proof of payment.
- □ 2. Appeal of the *Director of City Planning* determination per LAMC Section 12.26 K 6, an applicant or any other aggrieved person may file an appeal, and is appealable to the Area Planning Commission or Citywide Planning Commission as noted in the determination.

a. Appeal Fee

□ Original Applicant - The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B 1 a.

b. Notice Requirement

- □ Mailing List The appeal notification requirements per LAMC Section 12.26 K 7 apply.
- □ Mailing Fees The appeal notice mailing fee is made to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC), a copy of receipt must be submitted as proof of payment.

G. NUISANCE ABATEMENT

1. Nuisance Abatement - Appeal procedure for Nuisance Abatement per LAMC Section 12.27.1 C 4

NOTE:

- Nuisance Abatement is only appealable to the City Council.

a. Appeal Fee

Aggrieved Party the fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B 1.

2. Plan Approval/Compliance Review

Appeal procedure for Nuisance Abatement Plan Approval/Compliance Review per LAMC Section 12.27.1 C 4.

a. Appeal Fee

- Compliance Review The fee charged shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B.
- □ Modification The fee shall be in accordance with the LAMC Section 19.01 B.

NOTES

A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may <u>not</u> file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an <u>individual on behalf of self</u>.

Please note that the appellate body must act on your appeal within a time period specified in the Section(s) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) pertaining to the type of appeal being filed. The Department of City Planning will make its best efforts to have appeals scheduled prior to the appellate body's last day to act in order to provide due process to the appellant. If the appellate body is unable to come to a consensus or is unable to hear and consider the appeal prior to the last day to act, the appeal is automatically deemed denied, and the original decision will stand. The last day to act as defined in the LAMC may only be extended if formally agreed upon by the applicant.

This Section for City Planning Staff Use Only				
Base Fee: Reviewed & Accepted B		Accepted by (DSC Planner):	Date:	
Receipt No:	Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):		Date:	
Determination authority notified		Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)		

ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO

KEVIN T. CARMICHAEL CHRISTINA M. CARO THOMAS A. ENSLOW KELILAH D. FEDERMAN RICHARD M. FRANCO ANDREW J. GRAF TANYA A. GULESSERIAN DARIEN K. KEY RACHAEL E. KOSS AIDAN P. MARSHALL TARA C. RENGIFO MICHAEL R. SEVILLE

Of Counsel MARC D. JOSEPH DANIEL L. CARDOZO

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

520 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 350 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4721

TEL: (916) 444-6201 FAX: (916) 444-6209 kcarmichael@adamsbroadwell.com

May 13, 2022

SO. SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000 SO. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

TEL: (650) 589-1660 FAX: (650) 589-5062

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

City of Los Angeles City Planning Commission Samantha Millman, President c/o, Cecilia Lamas, Commission Executive Assistant Los Angeles City Hall 200 N. Spring Street, Suite 525 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Email: <u>cpc@lacity.org</u> Online Portal: <u>https://plncts.lacity.org/oas</u>

VIA EMAIL

Michelle Carter, Planner (michelle.carter@lacity.org)

Re: <u>Appeal of Advisory Agency Approval of the CEQA Categorical</u> <u>Exemption and Vesting Tentative Tract Map for Bronson</u> <u>Residential Tower Project (VTT-83510-CN-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE; Related Case: CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA)</u>

Dear President Millman, Commissioners, and Ms. Carter:

On behalf of the Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles ("CREED LA"), we submit this appeal of the City of Los Angeles Deputy Advisory Agency's ("Advisory Agency") approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") and certification of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") ¹ Class 32 Categorical Exemption ("Categorical Exemption") for the Bronson Residential Tower Project Case No. VTT-83510-CN-HCA, CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE ("Project"), proposed by 1717 Bronson LLC ("Applicant").²

² City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, <u>https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/-MjQ5OTYx0</u>.

¹ Pub. Resources Code ("PRC") §§ 21000 et seq.; 14 Cal. Code Regs. ("CCR" or "CEQA Guidelines") §§ 15000 et seq.

L6058-004acp

May 13, 2022 Page 2

On March 23, 2022, CREED LA submitted comments to the Hearing Officer to address the City's Categorical Exemption Document³ ("Categorical Exemption") which incorrectly proposes to exempt the Project from environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Our March 23, 2022 comments are attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

The Project's VTTM and Categorical Exemption were considered by the Advisory Agency on behalf of the City Planning Commission ("CPC") at the March 23, 2022 joint meeting of the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer.⁴ Following the hearing, the Advisory Agency took the Project under advisement.

On May 5, 2022, the Advisory Agency issued a Letter of Determination⁵ ("LOD") adopting the Categorical Exemption, approving the Vesting Tentative Tract Map for the Project and making related findings under CEQA and the Subdivision Map Act. The LOD indicates that the appeal period for the determination ends on May 16, 2022.

This letter supplements CREED LA's Appeal Application, filed concurrently herewith. In accordance with City requirements, this appeal is accompanied by an appeal filing fee of \$158. This appeal is based on each of the reasons set forth herein and in the attached and referenced exhibits.

For the reasons discussed our March 23 comments and herein, we urge the Planning Commission to find that the Project does not comply with CEQA or the Subdivision Map Act, and does not qualify for the Categorical Exemption approved by the City. CREED LA respectfully requests that the City Planning Commission ("CPC") remand the Project to Staff to prepare a legally adequate environmental impact report ("EIR") to fully disclose and mitigate the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts.

³ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Categorical Exemption, Bronson Residential Tower Project, Case Number: ENV-2021-6887-EAF (February 2022).

⁴ City of Los Angeles, Notice of Public Hearing, 1715-1739 North Bronson Avenue (March 23, 2022) <u>https://planning.lacity.org/dcpapi/meetings/document/71659</u>

⁵ City of Los Angeles, Letter of Determination, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83510-CN 1715 - 1739 North Bronson Avenue Hollywood Community Plan Related Case: CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDIHCA (May 5, 2022) <u>https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/document/MjE4NTA0/1823a-02c-5d95-4003-95c4-258347c32f18/pdd</u>

May 13, 2022 Page 3

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

CREED LA is an unincorporated association of individuals and labor organizations that may be adversely affected by the potential public and worker health and safety hazards, and the environmental and public service impacts of the Project. The coalition includes the Sheet Metal Workers Local 105, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 11, Southern California Pipe Trades District Council 16, and District Council of Iron Workers of the State of California, along with their members, their families, and other individuals who live and work in the City of Los Angeles.

Individual members of CREED LA and its member organizations, including John Ferruccio, Jorge L. Aceves, John P. Bustos, Gerry Kennon and Chris S. Macias live, work, recreate and raise their families in the City of Los Angeles and surrounding communities. Accordingly, they would be directly affected by the Project's environmental and health and safety impacts. Individual members may also work on the Project itself. They will be first in line to be exposed to any health and safety hazards that exist onsite.

In addition, CREED LA has an interest in enforcing environmental laws that encourage sustainable development and ensure a safe working environment for its members. Environmentally detrimental projects can jeopardize future jobs by making it more difficult and more expensive for business and industry to expand in the region, and by making the area less desirable for new businesses and new residents. Indeed, continued environmental degradation can, and has, caused construction moratoriums and other restrictions on growth that, in turn, reduce future employment opportunities.

II. REASONS FOR APPEAL

CREED LA hereby appeals all actions taken by the Advisory Agency and described in the LOD dated May 5, 2022. The reasons for this appeal are set forth in the attached comments and exhibits, including CREED LA's March 23, 2022 comment letter to the Advisory Agency, as well as the comments of air quality experts James Clark, Ph.D., acoustics expert Derek Watry and transportation expert Daniel Smith.⁶ Reasons include violations of CEQA, local land use codes, and of the Subdivision Map Act. We incorporate by reference all comments included in

⁶ Attached as Exhibit 1. L6058-004acp

May 13, 2022 Page 4

the expert letters, as well as our earlier comments to the Advisory Agency, which are in the City's record of proceedings for the Project.

The LOD states that the Advisory Agency determined that the Project is exempt from CEQA and adopted the Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA, despite the fact that the City has not approved the Project's remaining entitlements. It would be premature and improper for the City to adopt the Categorical Exemption for the Project at this time because the Project has not been fully approved. The remaining entitlements required for the Project are part of the Project, and must be considered and acted upon before the City can make a final CEQA determination for the Project.

Additionally, our attached comments conclude that the Project's construction air quality impacts, operational air quality impacts, construction noise impacts and transportation impacts were not analyzed, in violation of CEQA. As a result, the City failed to accurately disclose the severity of these impacts and failed to mitigate them by relying on an inapplicable CEQA exemption to approve the Project.

Finally, the City improperly approved the VTTM for the Project notwithstanding the Project's significant air quality, noise, transportation and cumulative effects, which should have precluded the City from making the findings required under the Subdivision Map Act to approve the VTTM.⁷

A. The Advisory Agency's Exemption Determination Was Premature and Unsupported

It is well-settled that a CEQA document cannot be approved before the underlying project has been approved.⁸ An agency decision to approve a project is not final if it may be reviewed by appealing the decision to a higher administrative body.⁹ Accordingly, approval cannot occur until all administrative appeals have

⁷ Gov Code §§66473.5, 66474(a), (b), (e), (f), (g).

⁸ See, e.g., County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 931, 963; Coalition for an Equitable Westlake/Macarthur Park v. City of Los Angeles (2020) 47 Cal.App.5th 368, 379; Stockton Citizens for Sensible Planning v. City of Stockton, 48 Cal. 4th 481, 489; Coalition for Clean Air v. City of Visalia (2012) 209 Cal.App.4th 408, 418-25.

⁹ Alta Loma School Dist. V. San Bernardino County Comm. On Sch. Dist. Reorganization (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 542 (CEQA action against county committee challenging school reorganization plan was premature because final decision to approve plan and decide CEQA issues must be made by State Bd. Of Equalization).
been exhausted.¹⁰ This is consistent with CEQA's requirement that a lead agency consider the "whole of an action."¹¹ This includes all phases of a project that are reasonably foreseeable.¹² As the courts have held, "[t]he purpose of CEQA is to inform the public of plans, so that the public can help guide decision makers about environmental choices. It is not the purpose of CEQA to foment prophylactic litigation."¹³

The Advisory Agency circumvented these basic CEQA requirements by approving the VTTM and making factual findings that the Project is exempt from CEQA before the CPC considered the Project's remaining entitlements. The Advisory Agency conducted a single hearing for the Project on March 23, 2022, at which it considered all of the Project's entitlements, including the VTTM. Following the hearing, the Agency made a recommendation to the CPC to approve the Project's principal entitlements, including: a density bonus pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(c)(1); Site Plan Review pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05; an onmenu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(8); an off-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(3); a waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1); a waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1); a maximum required parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A); and a waiver of dedications and improvements (WDIs) pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I.¹⁴ The City has scheduled these entitlements to be heard by the CPC on June 23, 2022.

Rather than make a recommendation on the VTTM, the Advisory Agency approved the VTTM (subject to the appeal provisions of the LAMC), and made specific findings of fact that the Project is exempt from CEQA under the Class 32 Infill Exemption and that the "proposed project and potential impacts were analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines."¹⁵ Because the Project's remaining entitlements are yet to be

¹⁰ See Sea and Sage Audubon Society, Inc. v. Planning Comm'n of City of Anaheim (1983) 34 Cal.3d 412.

 ¹¹ 14 CCR § 15378; Habitat & Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th
 1277, 1297.
 ¹² Id.

¹³ Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1997) 63 Cal.App.4th 227, 242.

¹⁴ CE, p. 1.

¹⁵ LOD, p. 12. L6058-004acp

considered by the CPC on June 23, 2022, the Advisory Agency's Categorical Exemption findings were premature and piecemealed, as the whole of the action was not before it and the VTTM is subject to administrative appeal to higher decision making bodies within the City.

The CPC should vacate the Advisory Agency's premature CEQA findings related to the VTTM and the Project.

B. The Project is Not Exempt From CEQA

As discussed in our prior comments, the City's findings that the Project is categorically exempt fail to comply with CEQA. To date, the City has failed to address or resolve the issues CREED LA raised in its March 23, 2022 comments. The Categorical Exemption document failed to adequately analyze the Project's impacts related to air quality, noise impacts, transportation impacts, and adverse effects on public health and safety, and failed to disclose that the Project has potentially significant impacts, which render exemptions inapplicable. As a result of the unsupported exemption findings, the City also failed to adopt mitigation measures capable of reducing the Project's potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels, leaving major Project impacts significant and unmitigated. As a result of these ongoing impacts, the Project is not exempt from CEQA and the City cannot make the findings required under State and City laws to issue the Project's land use entitlements.

Furthermore, categorical exemptions necessarily include an implied finding that the project has no significant effect on the environment. Public agencies utilizing such exemptions must support their determination with substantial evidence.¹⁶ The City lacks substantial evidence to support a conclusion that the Project meets the Class 32 exemption requirements and is not subject to any exceptions to categorical exemptions. Rather, the record shows that the Project is likely to result in potentially significant impacts that were not disclosed or analyzed by the City before it concluded that the Project is exempt from CEQA review. An EIR is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts.

¹⁶ PRC § 21168.5. L6058-004acp

1. The City Failed to Analyze the Health Risk Impacts of Project Construction to On-Site Workers and Nearby Sensitive Receptors

We previously provided comments detailing that the City failed to complete a quantified health risk analysis ("HRA") which is commonly conducted to determine if a Project's construction hazardous air pollutant ("HAP") emissions would cause a significant health impact.¹⁷ The HRA is based on pollutants other than conventional air quality pollutants; that is, other than ROG, NOx, PM10, PM2.5, CO, and SO₂.

Construction equipment emits diesel particulate matter ("DPM"), which is a HAP and a potent carcinogen.¹⁸ Construction workers and nearby residents and sensitive receptors will be exposed to DPM emissions during Project construction.

In addition to failing to measure the impacts to nearby residents and construction workers, the City failed to quantify the health risks to the future residents of the Project due to the Project's proximity to the 101 Freeway. An EIR must be prepared which adequately links the Project's air quality effects to human health consequences.¹⁹

2. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Noise Impacts

We previously provided substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project has potentially significant noise impacts and that the Categorical Exemption document failed to support is construction noise reference levels with substantial

¹⁸ Cal/EPA OEHHA and American Lung Association of California, Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust; <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/calenviroscreen/indicators/diesel4-02.pdf</u>. See also OEHHA, Appendix A: Hot Spots Unit Risk and Cancer Potency Values, p. 1 (DPM unit risk = 3 E-4); <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/CPFs042909.pdf</u> and OEHHA, Diesel Exhaust Particulate; <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/chemicals/diesel-exhaust-particulate#:~:text=Cancer</u> <u>%20Potency%20Information&text=Listed%20as%20Particulate%20Emissions%20from,(ug%2Fm3)%</u>

¹⁷ Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment, February 2015; may be requested at <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>.

<u>2D1.</u>

¹⁹ Sierra Club v. County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 519; Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 134 Cal.App.4th 1184, *1220* ("After reading the EIRs, the public would have no idea of the health consequences that result when more pollutants are added to a nonattainment basin. On remand, the health impacts resulting from the adverse air quality impacts must be identified and analyzed in the new EIRs."). L6058-004acp

evidence. Our comments detailed that construction noise levels from the Project will result in an increase of between 9.6 dBA and 17.1 dBA at the receptors nearest to the Project site, resulting in a significant impact.

This issue renders the Project inapplicable for a CEQA exemption, remains unresolved, and the Project's construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors remain unmitigated, in violation of CEQA.

3. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Impacts from Transportation

We previously provided substantial evidence showing that the Project's contribution to transportation impacts is potentially significant. Additionally, CREED LA proposed feasible mitigation measures that could lessen the Project's impacts. The City failed to address the Project's transportation impacts and they remain significant and unmitigated.

4. The Project May Result in Significant, Unmitigated Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in our previous comments, the Project is likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment.²⁰ Project construction will require the use of heavy equipment and heavy-duty trucks diesel powered. Diesel exhaust contains TACs that would represent a potential hazard to workers on site and to the surrounding community.²¹

Additionally, the City failed to properly analyze the Project's contribution to the deterioration of levels of service ("LOS") at nearby intersections. As demonstrated in our comments there is clearly a significant cumulative impact resulting from the Project plus other concurrent projects in the area.

The Project's cumulative air quality and transportation impacts constitute an exception to a Class 32 Categorical Exemption under CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2(b). The City must prepare an EIR to evaluate the Project's cumulative transportation impacts.

²⁰ CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

²¹ Clark Comments, p. 4.

L6058-004acp

C. The City Improperly Approved the Project Under the Subdivision Map Act

The Subdivision Map Act requires a lead agency to make findings that a proposed subdivision is consistent with the general plan/specific plan, and does not have any detrimental environmental or public health effects. The City is unable to make these mandatory findings because the Project has unmitigated, adverse impacts in each of these areas. Moreover, the Categorical Exemption and LOD fail to provide substantial evidence to meet either of these legal standards.

As discussed in our previous comments, the Project will conflict with the City's adopted Mobility Plan which is an element of the City's General Plan. Additionally, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project will result in significant impacts related to air quality, public health, noise, and transportation that the City has not analyzed or mitigated. The threats to public health posed by the Project cannot be ignored and necessarily contravene the findings required to approve the Project under the Map Act.

The City must prepare an EIR that analyzes the Projects potentially significant impacts and implement mitigation to address those impacts before it is able to make the findings required under the Map Act.

III. CONCLUSION

CREED LA respectfully requests that the City set a hearing on this appeal, and that the Planning Commission uphold this appeal and vacate the Advisory Agency's CEQA and Subdivision Map Act findings, as well as its adoption of the Categorical Exemption and the Vesting Tentative Tract Map.

Sincerely,

Kevin Carmichael

Attachment

KTC:acp

L6058-004acp

EXHIBIT 1

ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

520 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 350 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4721

TEL: (916) 444-6201 FAX: (916) 444-6209 kcarmichael@adamsbroadwell.com

March 23, 2022

KEVIN T. CARMICHAEL CHRISTINA M. CARO THOMAS A. ENSLOW KELILAH D. FEDERMAN ANDREW J. GRAF TANYA A. GULESSERIAN KENDRA D. HARTMANN* DARIEN K. KEY RACHAEL E. KOSS AIDAN P. MARSHALL TARA C. RENGIFO MICHAEL R. SEVILLE

Of Counsel MARC D. JOSEPH DANIEL L. CARDOZO

*Not admitted in California. Licensed in Colorado.

SO. SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000 SO. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

TEL: (650) 589-1660 FAX: (650) 589-5062

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Deputy Advisory Agency, and Hearing Officer c/o Michelle Carter, City Planning Associate City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 200 North Spring Street, Room 763 Los Angeles, CA 90012 **Email**: <u>michelle.carter@lacity.org</u>

Re: Agenda Item No. 2: Bronson Residential Tower Project (VTT-83510-CN-HCA, CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE)

Dear Hearing Officer and Ms. Carter:

On behalf of Coalition for Responsible Equitable Economic Development Los Angeles ("CREED LA"), we hereby submit comments for consideration by the City of Los Angeles ("City") Department Of City Planning, Subdivisions and Hearing Officer ("Hearing Officer") on Agenda Item 2 at the March 23, 2022 hearing for the Vesting Tentative Tract Map ¹("VTTM") for the Bronson Residential Tower Project ("Project") (VTT-83510-CN-HCA, CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA, ENV-2021-6887-CE) proposed by 1717 Bronson LLC ("Applicant").² These comments also address the City's Categorical Exemption Document³ ("Categorical Exemption" or "CE"), which incorrectly proposes to exempt the Project from environmental review

¹ City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Staff Report, VTT-83510-CN (March 23, 2022) available at <u>https://planning.lacity.org/plndoc/Staff Reports/2022/03-23-</u> 2022/Final VTT 83510 CN HCA Staff Report.pdf

² City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning,

https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/caseid/MjQ5OTYx0.

³ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Categorical Exemption, Bronson Residential Tower Project, Case Number: ENV-2021-6887-EAF (February 2022). L-6058-003j

pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").⁴ The Project's VTTM and Categorical Exemption will be considered by the Hearing Officer on behalf of the City Planning Commission ("CPC") at the March 23, 2022 joint meeting of the Deputy Advisory Agency and Hearing Officer.⁵

The Project proposes to construct a 24-story, 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, three levels of above-ground parking, and one subterranean parking level. Of the 128 dwelling units, 11 units would be set aside for Very Low Income Households. The Project would also include 17,778 square feet of open space and 134 vehicle parking spaces.⁶ The 0.86-acre Project Site is located at 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue at the southwest corner of Carlos Avenue and Bronson Avenue in the Hollywood Community Plan area of the City. The Assessor Parcel Numbers ("APNs") for the Project Site are 5545-003-014, 5545-003-023, and 5545-003-029.

The Project Site is bordered on the north by Carlos Avenue, on the south by a restaurant, on the west by a Los Angeles County Superior Court building and associated parking, and to the east by Bronson Avenue. Land uses in the greater Project Site area include US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the north; Hollywood Boulevard and commercial uses to the south; commercial uses to the west; and the US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the east. The northern portion of the Project Site is currently vacant but was previously developed with four residential units. The northern portion is used as surface parking. The southern portion of the Project Site is developed with a two-story residential building and a barn known as the Lombardi Structures. There are 22 trees on the Project Site and 8 street trees located in the public right of-way ("ROW") along Bronson Street.⁷

Regional access to the Project Site is provided by the US 101 Freeway located just to the east of the Project Site. The Project Site is zoned R4-2 (Multiple Dwelling Zone, Height District 2) and C4-1-SN (Commercial Zone, Height District 1, Sign

⁴ Pub. Resources Code ("PRC") §§ 21000 et seq.; 14 Cal. Code Regs. ("CCR" or "CEQA Guidelines") §§ 15000 et seq.

⁵ City of Los Angeles, Notice of Public Hearing, 1715-1739 North Bronson Avenue (March 23, 2022) <u>https://planning.lacity.org/dcpapi/meetings/document/71659</u>

⁶ CE, p. 1.

⁷ CE, p. 2.

L6058-003j

District), with General Plan land use designations of High Density Residential and Highway Oriented Commercial. The Project Site is also located within the boundaries of the following:

- ZI-2452 Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles
- ZI-2374 State Enterprise Zone: Los Angeles
- ZI-2488 Redevelopment Project Area: Hollywood
- ZI-2330 Sign District: Hollywood Signage (CRA Area)
- ZI-2331 Sign District: Hollywood Signage (Media District)
- ZI-2433 Revised Hollywood Community Plan Injunction
- ZI-2427 Freeway Adjacent Advisory Notice for Sensitive Uses
- ZI-2492 Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area Individual Historic Resources
- ZI-2424 Mitigation Measures for Certain Residential Densities Near Freeway⁸

The Project site is within a "disadvantaged community," meaning the community is "disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative public health effects, exposure or environmental degradation" and the community contains "concentrations of people that are of low income, high unemployment, low levels of home ownership, high rent burden, or low levels of educational attainment."⁹ Construction and operation of the Project would further exacerbate the already disproportionate environmental impacts to the neighboring community.

The Project requires the following approvals from the City:

- A 35 percent ministerial density bonus pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(c)(1) to permit a maximum residential density of 133 dwelling units (4 existing dwelling units and 128 new dwelling units) with 11 dwelling units (11 percent of the base density) reserved for Very Low Income Households;
- 2) A Site Plan Review pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05 a development project resulting in an increase of 50 or more dwelling units;
- 3) An On-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(8) to allow an averaging of floor area, density, open space, and parking over the Project Site;

⁸ CE, p. 3.

⁹ Health and Safety Code § 39711(a). L6058-003j

- 4) An Off-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(3) to allow a maximum floor area of 234,745 square feet or a corresponding floor area ratio of 6.74:1 averaged across the site in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 in the C4-1-SN zoned portion of the Project Site and 6:1 in the R4-2 zoned portion of the site;
- 5) A Waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) to reduce the side yard along Bronson Avenue and eliminate the side yard along the west side of the property in lieu of the otherwise required 16-foot side yards at both locations;
- 6) A Waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) to allow reduced building separation of 13 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 54 feet per LAMC Section 12.21 C.2;
- 7) A maximum required parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A);
- 8) A Vesting Tentative Tract Map for merger and condominium purposes pursuant to LAMC Section 17.06 A; and
- 9) A Waiver of dedications and improvements (WDIs) pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I to waive a nine-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the property's entire eastern lot line (along Bronson Avenue) and a four-foot dedication and improvement requirement along Carlos Avenue.¹⁰

Our review of the proposed VTTM Findings, Categorical Exemption and accompanying technical reports demonstrates that the Project will result in potentially significant environmental impacts that the City failed to disclose or mitigate, and as such, does not qualify for a Class 32 exemption or any other CEQA exemption. As described below an in the attached expert reports, the proposed Project will result in significant impacts relating to air quality, noise, and transportation and may not be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. The Project thus fails to meet the facial requirements to qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption.

Furthermore, categorical exemptions necessarily include an implied finding that the project has no significant effect on the environment. Public agencies utilizing such exemptions must support their determination with substantial evidence.¹¹ The Categorical Exemption lacks substantial evidence to support a conclusion that the Project meets the Class 32 exemption requirements and is not

¹⁰ CE, p. 1.

¹¹ PRC § 21168.5. L6058-003j

subject to any exceptions to categorical exemptions. Rather, the record shows that the Project is likely to result in potentially significant impacts that were not disclosed or analyzed by the City before it concluded that the Project is exempt from CEQA review. An environmental impact report ("EIR") is required to analyze and mitigate these impacts.

Finally, even if the Project qualified for a categorical exemption, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project has potentially significant environmental impacts related to air quality, construction noise and transportation. These impacts render any categorical exemption inapplicable.¹²

We prepared these comments with the assistance of air quality and hazards expert James Clark, Ph.D, noise expert Derek Watry, and transportation impacts expert Daniel Smith. Dr. Clark's, Mr. Watry's and Mr. Smith's technical comments and curriculum vitae are attached hereto as Exhibits A, B and C respectively.^{13 14 15} Dr. Clark concludes that the Project's proximity to a major freeway put the future residents at risk of potentially significant health risk impacts. Additionally, Dr. Clark concludes that the City failed to consider the cumulative air quality impacts of the Project. Mr. Watry found that the Project's construction noise impacts are far more severe than estimated by the City. Finally, Mr. Smith found that the Project will result in significant transportation impacts that were not considered by the City. The City failed to accurately disclose the severity of these impacts and fails to mitigate them by relying on an inapplicable CEQA exemption to approve the Project.

For the reasons discussed herein, we urge the Hearing Officer to find that the Project does not qualify for the Class 32 exemption proposed by the City, and remand the Project to Staff to prepare a legally adequate EIR to fully disclose and mitigate the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts.

¹⁵ **Exhibit C**, Daniel Smith, Bronson Residential Tower Project (Case #: 2021-6887-EAF) (March 22, 2022) ("Smith Comments").

 $^{^{12}}$ 14 CCR § 15300.2 (b), (c).

¹³ **Exhibit A,** James Clark, Comments On Categorical Exemption For Bronson Residential Tower Project Case No. ENV-2021-6887-EAF (March 22, 2022) ("Clark Comments").

¹⁴ **Exhibit B**, Derek Watry, Bronson Residential Tower Project Los Angeles, California, Review and Comment on Categorical Exemption Noise Analysis (March 21, 2022) ("Watry Comments")

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

CREED LA is an unincorporated association of individuals and labor organizations that may be adversely affected by the potential public and worker health and safety hazards, and the environmental and public service impacts of the Project. The coalition includes the Sheet Metal Workers Local 105, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 11, Southern California Pipe Trades District Council 16, and District Council of Iron Workers of the State of California, along with their members, their families, and other individuals who live and work in the City of Los Angeles.

Individual members of CREED LA and its member organizations, including John Ferruccio, Jorge L. Aceves, John P. Bustos, Gerry Kennon and Chris S. Macias live, work, recreate and raise their families in the City of Los Angeles and surrounding communities. Accordingly, they would be directly affected by the Project's environmental and health and safety impacts. Individual members may also work on the Project itself. They will be first in line to be exposed to any health and safety hazards that exist onsite.

In addition, CREED LA has an interest in enforcing environmental laws that encourage sustainable development and ensure a safe working environment for its members. Environmentally detrimental projects can jeopardize future jobs by making it more difficult and more expensive for business and industry to expand in the region, and by making the area less desirable for new businesses and new residents. Indeed, continued environmental degradation can, and has, caused construction moratoriums and other restrictions on growth that, in turn, reduce future employment opportunities.

II. THE PROPOSED EXEMPTION DETERMINATION FAILS TO COMPLY WITH CEQA'S PURPOSE AND GOALS

CEQA requires that an agency analyze the potential environmental impacts of its proposed actions in an EIR except in certain limited circumstances.¹⁶ The EIR is the very heart of CEQA.¹⁷ "The foremost principle in interpreting CEQA is that

¹⁶ See, e.g., PRC § 21100.

 $^{^{17}}$ Dunn-Edwards v. BAAQMD (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 644, 652. L6058-003j

the Legislature intended the act to be read so as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language."¹⁸

CEQA has two primary purposes. First, CEQA is designed to inform decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of a project.¹⁹ "Its purpose is to inform the public and its responsible officials of the environmental consequences of their decisions before they are made. Thus, the EIR 'protects not only the environment but also informed self-government."²⁰ The EIR has been described as "an environmental 'alarm bell' whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return."²¹

Second, CEQA requires public agencies to avoid or reduce environmental damage when "feasible" by requiring "environmentally superior" alternatives and all feasible mitigation measures.²² The EIR serves to provide agencies and the public with information about the environmental impacts of a proposed project and to "identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced."²³ If the project will have a significant effect on the environment, the agency may approve the project only if it finds that it has "eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment are "acceptable due to overriding concerns."²⁴

Under CEQA, mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements or other legally binding instruments.²⁵ A CEQA lead agency is precluded from making the required CEQA findings to approve a project unless the record shows that all uncertainties regarding the mitigation of impacts have been resolved. For this reason, an agency may not rely on mitigation measures of

²¹ Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Bd. of Port Comm'rs. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1354 ("Berkeley Jets"); County of Inyo v. Yorty (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 795, 810.

²⁵ CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(2).

 ¹⁸ Communities. for a Better Env. v. Cal. Res. Agency (2002) 103 Cal. App.4th 98, 109 ("CBE v. CRA").
 ¹⁹ 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15002(a)(1).

²⁰ Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553, 564.

 $^{^{22}}$ 14 CCR $\$ 15002(a)(2) and (3); see also Berkeley Jets, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1354; Citizens of Goleta Valley, 52 Cal.3d at p. 564.

²³ 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15002(a)(2).

²⁴ PRC § 21081; 14 CCR § 15092(b)(2)(A) & (B).

L6058-003j

uncertain efficacy or feasibility.²⁶ This approach helps "ensure the integrity of the process of decision by precluding stubborn problems or serious criticism from being swept under the rug."²⁷

CEQA identifies certain classes of projects which are exempt from the provisions of CEQA, called categorical exemptions.²⁸ Categorical exemptions apply to certain narrow classes of activities that generally do not have a significant effect on the environment.²⁹ Public agencies utilizing such exemptions must support their determination with substantial evidence.³⁰ CEQA exemptions are narrowly construed and "[e]xemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language."³¹ Erroneous reliance by a lead agency on a categorical exemption constitutes a prejudicial abuse of discretion and a violation of CEQA.³² "[I]f the court perceives there was substantial evidence that the project might have an adverse impact, but the agency failed to secure preparation of an EIR, the agency's action must be set aside because the agency abused its discretion by failing to follow the law."³³

CEQA also contains several exceptions to categorical exemptions. In particular, a categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment, including (1) when "the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant."³⁴ An agency may not rely on a categorical exemption if to do so would require the imposition of mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant effects.³⁵

²⁹ PRC § 21084(a); 14 CCR §§ 15300, 15354.

²⁶ *Kings County Farm Bureau v. County of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 727-28 (a groundwater purchase agreement found to be inadequate mitigation because there was no record evidence that replacement water was available).

²⁷ Concerned Citizens of Costa Mesa, Inc. v. 32nd Dist. Agricultural Assn. (1986) 42 Cal.3d 929, 935.

²⁸ PRC § 21084(a); 14 CCR §§ 15300, 15354.

³⁰ PRC § 21168.5.

³¹ Mountain Lion Found. v. Fish & Game Com. (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 125; McQueen, 2 Cal.App.3d at 1148.

³² Azusa, 52 Cal.App.4th at 1192.

³³ Dunn-Edwards Corp. v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 644, 656).

³⁴ 14 CCR § 15300.2(b).

³⁵ Salmon Pro. & Watershed Network v. County of Marin ("SPAWN") (2004) 125 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1198-1201.

L6058-003j

The Project's Categorical Exemption and its appendices fail to comply with CEQA's basic informational requirements, fail to disclose that the Project may result in significant effects relating to air quality, health risk, transportation, and construction noise. The City failed to require any mitigation measures to mitigate these potentially significant impacts. Ultimately, the City lacks substantial evidence to support its findings that a categorical exemption from CEQA review applies, and must instead prepare an EIR to fully disclose and mitigate the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts.

"[A]n agency may not apply a categorical exemption without considering evidence in its files of potentially significant effects, regardless of whether that evidence comes from its own investigation, the proponent's submissions, a project opponent, or some other source... if those files contain 'substantial evidence' of a mere 'fair argument' that the project will have significant environmental effects, the agency may not apply a categorical exemption."³⁶ Here, the City has applied a Class 32 Categorical exemption without fully analyzing the potentially significant effects of the Project. The record shows, and these comments detail, that there is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the Project will have significant environmental effects. An EIR must be prepared to adequately analyze and mitigate all potentially significant impacts and all significant environmental effects associated with the Project's cumulative impacts.

III. THE PROJECT DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CLASS 32 CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION FOR INFILL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

CEQA is "an integral part of any public agency's decision making process."³⁷ It was enacted to require public agencies and decisionmakers to document and consider the environmental implications of their actions before formal decisions are made.³⁸ CEQA requires an agency to conduct adequate environmental review prior to taking any discretionary action that may significantly affect the environment, unless an exemption applies.³⁹ Categorical exemptions apply to classes of projects that are determined to be exempt because they do not have a significant effect on the environment.⁴⁰ "Thus an agency's finding that a particular proposed project

³⁶ Id.

³⁷ PRC § 21006.

³⁸ Id., §§ 21000, 21001.

³⁹ PRC § 21100(a); see also CEQA Guidelines § 15004(a).

⁴⁰ Muzzy Ranch Co. v. Solano County Airport Land Use Com. (2007) 41 Cal.4th 372, 380. L6058-003j

comes within one of the exempt classes necessarily includes an implied finding that the project has no significant effect on the environment."⁴¹ "It follows that where there is any reasonable possibility that a project or activity may have a significant effect on the environment, an exemption would be improper."⁴²

CEQA exemptions must be narrowly construed and are not to be expanded beyond the scope of their plain language.⁴³ They should not be construed so broadly as to include classes of projects that do not normally satisfy the requirements for a categorical exemption.⁴⁴

To qualify for a categorical exemption, a lead agency must provide "substantial evidence to support [its] finding that the Project will not have a significant effect."⁴⁵ "Substantial evidence" means enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. Whether a fair argument can be made that the project may have a significant effect on the environment is to be determined by examining the whole record before the lead agency.⁴⁶ If a court locates substantial evidence in the record to support the agency's conclusion, the agency's decision will be upheld.⁴⁷ If, however, the record lacks substantial evidence, as here, a reviewing court will not uphold an exemption determination.

Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines provides an exemption from CEQA for projects characterized as in-fill development meeting the conditions:

(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.

⁴¹ Davidon Homes v. City of San Jose (1997) 54 Cal.App.4th 106, 115.

 ⁴² Azusa Land Reclamation Co. v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 1165,
 1191 ("Azusa Land Reclamation"), quoting Wildlife Alive v. Chickering (1976) 18 Cal.3d 190, 205–206.

⁴³ Castaic Lake Water Agency v. City of Santa Clarita (1995) 41 Cal.App.4th 1257.

⁴⁴ Azusa Land Reclamation (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 1165, 1192.

⁴⁵ Banker's Hill, Hillcrest, Park West Community Preservation Group v. City of San Diego (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 249, 269.

⁴⁶ 14 CCR § 15384.

 $^{^{47}}$ Bankers Hill Hillcrest, 139 Cal.App.4th at 269. L6058-003j

- (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
- (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
- (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

The Class 32 Exemption is facially inapplicable to the Project due to, at a minimum, significant impacts to traffic, air quality, and noise.

A. An Exemption is Inapplicable Because the Project is Not Consistent with the General Plan Designation and all Applicable General Plan Policies

The Project is inconsistent with local plans and policies, which renders the Class 32 exemption inapplicable and constitutes a significant impact under CEQA.⁴⁸ The Applicant in this case has asked for waivers from the City's Mobility Plan requirements with respect to the street right-of-way requirements of the Mobility Plan. Right-of-way requirements, including neighborhood connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle access, and access to key corridors within "mobility-enhanced networks" are fundamental elements of the Mobility Plan.⁴⁹ By waiving right-of-way requirements of the Mobility Plan without mitigation, the Project would be patently inconsistent with the basic priorities of the Plan. Neither the Staff Report nor the Categorical Exemption provide any compelling need to waive the Plan's mobility requirements. As a result, the City lacks substantial evidence to support a finding that the Project is in compliance with the Mobility Plan. Rather, the Project is necessarily inconsistent with the Mobility Plan, which is an element of the City's General Plan.⁵⁰

The City cannot approve this Project under a Class 32 exemption and must prepare an EIR to evaluate and mitigate the Project's impacts relative to the proposed non-compliance with the Mobility Plan.

⁴⁸ Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 783-4, 32
Cal.Rptr.3d 177; see also, County of El Dorado v. Dept. of Transp. (2005) 133 Cal.App.4th 1376.
⁴⁹ CE, pp. 13-14.

⁵⁰ City of Los Angeles, Mobility, <u>https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/initiatives-policies/mobility</u> (Accessed March 22, 2022). L6058-003j

B. An Exemption is Inapplicable Because the Project May Result in Significant Effects Related to Air Quality and Health Risk Impacts

The Categorical Exemption fails to analyze and mitigate significant health risk impacts to construction workers, nearby sensitive receptors or future residents of the Project based on the Project's proximity to U.S. Route 101.

i. The City Failed to Assess the Project's Health Risk Impacts

The City lacks substantial evidence to support its reliance on an exemption because the City failed to analyze the health risk impacts of Project construction to on-site workers or nearby sensitive receptors. The Findings provide that the nearest sensitive receptors are the multi-family residential uses located approximately 80 feet to the west of the Project Site.⁵¹ CEQA requires lead agencies to disclose the health risks posed by hazardous air pollutants released during construction on sensitive receptors. Construction workers and nearby residents are sensitive receptors at the greatest risk of exposure due to their close proximity to the Project's TAC emissions during Project construction.

CEQA requires that a project's health risks "must be 'clearly identified' and the discussion must include 'relevant specifics' about the environmental changes attributable to the Project and their associated health outcomes."⁵² Courts have held that an environmental review document must disclose a project's potential health risks to a degree of specificity that would allow the public to make the correlation between the project's impacts and adverse effects to human health.⁵³ Instructively, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's ("OEHHA") risk assessment guidelines recommend a formal health risk analysis ("HRA") for short-term construction exposures lasting longer than 2 months and exposures from projects lasting more than 6 months should be evaluated for the duration of the project.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments, February 2015 (OEHHA 2015), Section 8.2.10: Cancer Risk Evaluation of Short Term Projects, pp. 8-17/18; L6058-003j

⁵¹ Findings, p. 55.

⁵² Sierra Club v. County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 518–522; Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 1184.

⁵³ Id.

The construction of this Project will last for 24 months.⁵⁵ The nearest sensitive receptors are the multi-family residential uses located approximately 80 feet (~25 meters) to the west of the Project Site, in addition to Project construction workers.⁵⁶ CEQA requires that the health risk from each of these construction phases on these receptors be quantified and disclosed. And under the OEHHA risk assessment guidelines, which are used throughout California for assessing health risks under CEQA, the Project should be subject to a quantified HRA.

Project construction would produce diesel exhaust which has been linked to a range of serious health problems including an increase in respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death. Fine DPM is deposited deep in the lungs in the smallest airways and can result in increased respiratory symptoms and disease; decreased lung function, particularly in children and individuals with asthma; alterations in lung tissue and respiratory tract defense mechanisms; and premature death. Exposure to DPM increases the risk of lung cancer. It also causes non-cancer effects including chronic bronchitis, inflammation of lung tissue, thickening of the alveolar walls, immunological allergic reactions, and airway constriction. DPM is a TAC that is recognized by state and federal agencies as causing severe health risk.

Dr. Clark states that criteria pollutants such as ozone and particulate matter associated with project construction can lead to a host of respiratory impacts and diminishment of quality of life.⁵⁷ Dr. Clark further states that construction may cause nearby sensitive receptors to be subjected to exposure of TACs emitted from Project construction, including DPM.⁵⁸ Dr. Clark concludes that this may constitute a significant health risk impact to the surrounding community.

https://oehha.ca.gov/air/crnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0.

⁵⁵ CE, p. 40.

⁵⁶ Clark Comments, p. 7.

⁵⁷ Clark Comments, p. 7.

⁵⁸ Clark Comments, p. 8.

L6058-003j

A quantified HRA is commonly conducted to determine if a Project's construction hazardous air pollutant ("HAP") emissions would cause a significant health impact.⁵⁹ The HRA is based on pollutants other than conventional air quality pollutants; that is, other than ROG, NOx, PM10, PM2.5, CO, and SO₂.

Construction equipment emits DPM, which is a HAP and a potent carcinogen.⁶⁰ Construction workers and nearby residents and sensitive receptors will be exposed to DPM emissions during construction. An EIR must be prepared which adequately links the Project's air quality effects to human health consequences.⁶¹

ii. The City Failed to Conduct an HRA to Quantify Potential Health Risk Impacts to Future Residents from the Nearby Freeway

In addition to failing to measure the impacts to nearby residents and construction workers, the City failed to quantify the health risks to the future residents of the Project. Pursuant to City Zoning Information File No. 2424, the City requires health risk assessments to be conducted for all residential projects located within 500 feet of the 101 Freeway that take advantage of any of the increased residential densities provided by the Hollywood Community Plan (i.e. a project that builds more units on a parcel than currently permitted under the existing plan).⁶² ZI-2424 specifies that mitigation measures shall be required at the project level as necessary to reduce health risk (for indoor and outdoor uses) to an

⁶⁰ Cal/EPA OEHHA and American Lung Association of California, Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust; <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/calenviroscreen/indicators/diesel4-02.pdf</u>. See also OEHHA, Appendix A: Hot Spots Unit Risk and Cancer Potency Values, p. 1 (DPM unit risk = 3 E-4); <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/CPFs042909.pdf</u> and OEHHA, Diesel Exhaust Particulate; <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/chemicals/diesel-exhaust-particulate#:~:text=Cancer</u> <u>%20Potency%20Information&text=Listed%20as%20Particulate%20Emissions%20from,(ug%2Fm3)%</u>

⁵⁹ Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment, February 2015; may be requested at <u>https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf</u>.

<u>2D1.</u>

⁶¹ Sierra Club v. County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 519; Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 134 Cal.App.4th 1184, 1220 ("After reading the EIRs, the public would have no idea of the health consequences that result when more pollutants are added to a nonattainment basin. On remand, the health impacts resulting from the adverse air quality impacts must be identified and analyzed in the new EIRs.").

⁶² City Of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Zoning Information File, ZI No. 2424 ("ZI-2424"), Mitigation Measures For Certain Freeway Adjacent Residential Densities In Hollywood (August 6, 2012) available at <u>http://zimas.lacity.org/documents/zoneinfo/zi2424.pdf</u> L6058-003j

acceptable level below SCAQMD's adopted thresholds.⁶³ The City recognizes that ZI-2424 applies to this Project⁶⁴ yet failed to perform an HRA to measure the effects of the freeway on the Project's future residents. This is a violation of City's land use mandates as well as CEQA, and demonstrates that the City lacks substantial evidence to support an exemption determination.

The City routinely performs HRAs for Projects that are in close proximity to freeways. For example, there are two projects within 0.25 miles of the Project Site, 6220 Yucca Street Project⁶⁵ and 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project⁶⁶, for which the City performed health risk analyses of freeway emissions on the projects.

The two nearby projects estimated emissions starting in 2018 for the Hollywood Boulevard Project and 2024 for Yucca Project.⁶⁷ Each of the projects is located approximately 80 meters away from the freeway.⁶⁸ The Bronson Towers Project site is located within 25 meters of the Hollywood Freeway, much closer to the Freeway than the other projects and therefore far more likely to result in significant health impacts.⁶⁹ As Dr. Clark explains in his comments, based on the distance of the Project Site, the calculated DPM and associated HAPs will be 1.5 times higher than the concentrations modeled at Hollywood Boulevard and Yucca Street Project sites. Despite the clear requirement to perform an HRA the City failed to analyze the health risk to future residents posed by the nearby freeway. This error must be corrected and addressed in an EIR for the Project.

iii. The Project Will Result in Significant Air Quality and Public Health Impacts to Future Residents

Dr. Clark found that the Project will result in a significant impact due to its proximity to the freeway. Using inputs from the HRAs for the Yucca and Hollywood

⁶³ ZI-2424, p. 1.

⁶⁴ CE, p. 3.

⁶⁵ City of Los Angeles, 6220 West Yucca Street Mixed Use Project Health Risk Assessment for Freeway Adjacent Projects ("Yucca HRA") (April 2020) available at

https://planning.lacity.org/eir/6220Yucca/deir/Appendices/Apx%20C-2%20-%20Freeway%20HRA.pdf ⁶⁶ City of Los Angeles, 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project, Health Risk Assessment Technical Report ("Hollywood HRA") (October 201) available at

https://planning.lacity.org/eir/5750HollywoodBlvd/Technical Appendices/Appendix E-HRA Technical Report.pdf

⁶⁷ Clark Comments, p. 7.

⁶⁸ Clark Comments, p. 7.

⁶⁹ Clerk Comments, p. 7.

L6058-003j

Boulevard projects, Dr. Clark was able to estimate the Project's health risk impacts to future residents and found a significant undisclosed and unmitigated impact.

The primary source of particulate matter from freeways is diesel particulate exhaust. Diesel exhaust contains nearly 40 toxic substances, including TACs and may pose a serious public health risk for residents in the vicinity of the Project. TACs are airborne substances that are capable of causing short-term (acute) and/or long-term (chronic or carcinogenic, i.e., cancer causing) adverse human health effects (i.e., injury or illness). TACs include both organic and inorganic chemical substances. The current California list of TACs includes approximately 200 compounds, including particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines.

Using the outputs from the Yucca Project analyses, the concentrations of TACs at 25 meters from the freeway, which is the distance of the Project Site to the freeway, were calculated for each year of exposure using the weight fractions outlined in the air quality and risk analysis.⁷⁰ Based on his analysis, Dr. Clark determined that the risk from exposure to the chemicals of concern is 11.95 in 1,000,000 which exceeds the CEQA threshold of significance of 10 in 1,000,000.⁷¹

Based on Dr. Clarks analysis, the Project will result in a significant health risk to the future residents. The Class 32 Exemption is facially inapplicable to the Project due to significant impacts to air quality as demonstrated by Dr. Clark. The City must prepare an EIR which adequately analyzes and mitigates the Project's health risk impacts.

C. An Exemption is Inapplicable Because the Project May Result in Significant Traffic and Transportation Impacts

The City failed to adequately analyze impacts to traffic and transportation created by the Project. There is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the Project may result in a significant impact to traffic and transportation. The Project would add 491 new average daily trips.⁷² As described above, the trips generated by the Project will result in the deterioration of the LOS at nearby intersections.

⁷⁰ Clark Comments, p. 8.

⁷¹ Clark Comments, p. 8

⁷² Los Angeles Department of City Planning, DCP Application form, (Filed June 8, 2021) p. 2 of 8. L6058-003j

In addition to the LOS deterioration at the intersections of Hollywood Boulevard and Bronson Avenue, and the intersection of Bronson Avenue with Franklin Avenue, Mr. Smith states that the queuing analysis performed for the project shows that traffic from concurrent relevant projects and the Project itself will result in queue lengths of 28.7 vehicles or 717 feet in the left turn lane from Hollywood Boulevard westbound to Bronson Avenue Southbound.⁷³ Mr. Smith explains that a queue of this length completely overflows the left turn storage lane, blocking a westbound through lane on Hollywood Boulevard, extends through the intersection with the southbound 101 ramps, through the intersection with the northbound 101 ramps, through the intersection with N. Van Ness Avenue and well east on the block toward Taft Avenue.⁷⁴ The Project's contribution to the significant transportation impacts is potentially significant, but largely ignored by the Categorical Exemption. Queue lengths of this magnitude could result in follow on effects such as backing up traffic onto U.S. Route 101 or impeding the movement of emergency vehicles.⁷⁵

Mr. Smith proposes potential mitigation that the City should consider to reduce this impact, such as prohibiting left turns from Hollywood Boulevard to northbound and southbound N. Bronson Avenue, making the N. Bronson connections to Hollywood Boulevard right turn in and right turn out movements only and similar alterations at the intersection of N. Bronson with Franklin.⁷⁶ Mr. Smith concludes that these feasible mitigation measures would help to alleviate the expected significant impacts from the Project.

The Class 32 Exemption is facially inapplicable to the Project due to significant impacts to traffic as demonstrated by Mr. Smith. The City must prepare an EIR which adequately analyzes and mitigates the Project's impacts associated with traffic and transportation.

D. An Exemption is Inapplicable Because the Project May Result in Significant Construction Noise Impacts

There is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that construction of the Project may result in a significant impact to noise. The Project's construction

⁷³ Smith Comments, p. 3.

⁷⁴ Smith Comments, p. 3.

⁷⁵ Smith Comments, p. 3.

⁷⁶ Smith Comments, p. 5.

L6058-003j

noise impact analysis is based on unsubstantiated construction noise reference levels, by using the information available in the record, Mr. Watry found that the reference levels assumed in the Categorical Exemption are 7 to 11 dB too low. By correcting the reference levels and cleaning up the analysis, Mr. Watry found that Project construction will result in noise increases that exceed the 5dB threshold of significance.

First, Mr. Watry observed that the noise analysis accompanying the Categorical Exemption makes the unsubstantiated assumption that the sound pressure level of equipment on site would be 75 dBA.⁷⁷ The noise study does not substantiate this assumption, which as Mr. Watry explains is fatal to the study's results since this reference is used to calculate all of the Project's construction noise impacts.⁷⁸ Mr. Watry states that the construction noise level plots were generated using a program called SoundPLAN which takes as its input sound power level per unit area.⁷⁹ The Categorical Exemption uses the assumed sound pressure level of 75 dBA from construction equipment to arrive at a sound power level input 109.7 dBA at 15.24 meters.⁸⁰

To calculate a more accurate sound power level, Mr. Watry looked to the Air Quality analysis documentation for the Categorical Exemption which includes a detailed list of construction equipment by construction phase which can be used to validate the noise model.⁸¹ Using the information in the record, Mr. Watry calculated the noise levels for the first three phases of Project construction by applying the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") Roadway Noise Construction Model methodology and data.⁸² By using data for the construction equipment that will be on site, Mr. Watry found that the noise reference levels at the site would be 7 to 11 dB higher than the reference level assumed in the CE.⁸³ The following Figure 1 shows the substantiated noise reference levels at 15.24 meters for the first three phases of the Project:

⁷⁷ Watry Comments, p. 3.

⁷⁸ Watry Comments, p. 2.

⁷⁹ Watry Comments, p. 3.

⁸⁰ Watry Comments, p. 3.

⁸¹ Watry Comments, p. 3.

⁸² Watry Comments, p. 4.

⁸³ Watry Comments, p. 4.

L6058-003j

Demolition						
		RCNM R	ef Values @			
	Equipment	Lmax	Util%	No.	Distance	Leq
	Conc Saw	89.6	20%	1	50 ft	82.6
	Tractor	84.0	40%	1	50 ft	80.0
	Backhoe	77.6	40%	1	50 ft	73.6
	Dozer	81.7	40%	1	50 ft	11.1
	Total					85.6
						\smile
Grading						
		RCNM R	RCNM Ref Values @ 50 ft			
	Equipment	Lmax	Util%	No.	Distance	Leq
	Conc Saw	89.6	20%	1	50 ft	82.6
	Tractor	84.0	40%	1	50 ft	80.0
	Backhoe	77.6	40%	1	50 ft	73.6
	Dozer	81.7	40%	1	50 ft	11.1
	Total					85.6
						\smile
Bldg Const	ruction					
_		RCNM R	RCNM Ref Values @ 50 ft			
	Equipment	Lmax	Util%	No.	Distance	Leq
	Crane	81.0	16%	1	50 ft	73.0
	Forklift (Man Lift)	75.0	20%	2	50 ft	71.0
	Tractor	84.0	40%	1	50 ft	80.0
	Backhoe	77.6	40%	1	50 ft	13.0
	Total					81.9

Figure 1 Noise Level Calculations Using FHWA Methodology

Using the values above, Mr. Watry was able to calculate the average hourly noise levels at the noise-sensitive receptors close to the Project. Mr. Watry's analysis shows that the Project's construction noise levels are significantly higher than the estimates made in the CE's noise analysis as shown in Table 1 below:⁸⁴

Address	Description	Distance	Construction Phase			
			Demo	Grading	Bldg Erection	
1717 N Bronson	Lombardi House	$85~{ m ft}$	81.0	81.0	77.3	
1720 N Bronson	Residences	160 ft	75.5	75.5	71.8	
5919 Carlos	Residences	208 ft	73.2	73.2	69.6	
5940 Carlos	Hollywood Silvercrest Apts	260 ft	71.3	71.3	67.6	

Table 1: Average Hourly Noise Levels at Nearest Noise Sensitive Receptors

The Categorical Exemption correctly states that "[b]ecause the Project's construction phase would occur for more than three months, the applicable City threshold of significance for the Project's construction noise impacts is an increase of 5 dBA over existing ambient noise levels."⁸⁵

Mr. Watry explains that the Categorical Exemption established the existing ambient noise levels by taking measurements at four locations in the area around the project site.⁸⁶ Using the ambient noise measurement information from the CE, Mr. Watry applied the updated construction noise levels and found that the Project will result in an increase of between 9.6 dBA and 17.1 dBA at the receptors nearest to the Project site, resulting in a significant impact.⁸⁷ The results of Mr. Watry's calculations are included in Table 2 below.

⁸⁵ CE, p. 34.

⁸⁶ Watry Comments, p. 7.

⁸⁷ Watry Comments, p. 7.

L6058-003j

Receptor	Maximum	Existing	New		
	Construction	Ambient	Ambient	Increase	Significant
	Noise Level	Noise Level	Noise Level	(dBA Leq)	Impact?
	(dBA Leq)	(dBA Leq)	(dBA Leq)		
1717	91.0	62.7	01 1	174	Vaa
Bronson	81.0	65.7	01.1	17.4	ies
1720	75 5	62 7	75 9	19.1	Voo
Bronson	75.5	05.7	75.8	12.1	Tes
5919 Carlos	73.2	62.2	73.5	11.3	Yes
5940 Carlos	71.3	62.2	71.8	9.6	Yes
88					

 Table 1
 Assessment of Construction Noise Levels at Off-Site Receptors

Mr. Watry's calculations demonstrate that the Project's noise levels will exceed the significance threshold, resulting in a significant impact. The Project's significant construction noise impacts must be analyzed and mitigated in an EIR for the Project.

E. The Project's Significant Cumulative Impacts Result in an Exception to the Categorical Exemption

A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment, including (1) when "the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant."⁸⁹ As explained below, the Project's air quality and transportation impacts result in significant cumulative impacts preventing the City from relying on a categorical exemption.

i. The Project's Cumulative Air Quality Impacts Result in an Exception to the Categorical Exemption

The Project will cause significant cumulative impacts triggering an exception to categorical exemptions under CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(b). The US EPA found that the Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment for lead, and

⁸⁸ Watry Comments, p. 7.

⁸⁹ 14 CCR § 15300.2(b).

L6058-003j

serious nonattainment for particulate matter ("PM") PM2.5.⁹⁰ The California Air Resources Board determined the South Coast Air Basin, the air basin encompassing the Project, is in nonattainment for ozone (O3), and PM10, and PM2.5.⁹¹ Thus, a cumulative incremental increase in any of these pollutants may result in significant cumulative air quality impacts. The Project is likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment.⁹² As Dr. Clark notes in his comments, the Project construction will require the use of heavy equipment and heavy-duty trucks diesel powered. Diesel exhaust contains TACs that would represent a potential hazard to workers on site and to the surrounding community.⁹³

Diesel exhaust has been linked to a range of serious health problems including an increase in respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death.⁹⁴ Fine DPM is deposited deep in the lungs in the smallest airways and can result in increased respiratory symptoms and disease; decreased lung function, particularly in children and individuals with asthma; alterations in lung tissue and respiratory tract defense mechanisms; and premature death.⁹⁵ Exposure to DPM increases the risk of lung cancer. It also causes non-cancer effects including chronic bronchitis, inflammation of lung tissue, thickening of the alveolar walls, immunological allergic reactions, and airway constriction.⁹⁶ DPM is a TAC that is recognized by state and federal agencies as causing severe health risk because it contains toxic materials, unlike $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} .⁹⁷

⁹⁰ United States Environmental Protection Agency, Current Nonattainment Counties for All Criteria Pollutants (October 31, 2021) <u>https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html</u>.

⁹¹ MND, p. 68 - 69.

⁹² CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

⁹³ Clark Comments, p. 4.

⁹⁴ Clark Comments, pp. 4-6;

⁹⁵ Clark Comments, p. 6; California Air Resources Board, Initial Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking, Proposed Identification of Diesel Exhaust as a Toxic Air Contaminant, Staff Report, June 1998.

⁹⁶ Clark Comments, p. 6; Findings of the Scientific Review Panel on The Report on Diesel Exhaust as adopted at the Panel's April 22, 1998 Meeting.

⁹⁷ Clark Comments, p. 6; Health & Safety Code § 39655(a) (defining "toxic air contaminant" as air pollutants "which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. A substance that is listed as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to subsection (b) of Section 112 of the federal act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7412 (b)) is a toxic air contaminant.") L6058-003j

The Project's cumulative air quality impacts constitute an exception to a Class 32 Categorical Exemption under CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2(b). The City must prepare an EIR to evaluate the Project's cumulative air quality impacts.

ii. The Project's Cumulative Transportation Impacts Result in an Exception to the Categorical Exemption

Operation of the Project will result significant cumulative transportation impacts triggering an exception to the categorical exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(b). Mr. Smith explains in his comments the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard with Bronson Avenue deteriorates from an AM peak 32.0 seconds delay⁹⁸/Level of Service ("LOS") C and PM peak 57.8 seconds delay/LOS E in the existing condition without the Project to an AM peak 206.8 seconds delay/LOS F and PM peak 201.1 seconds delay/LOS F in the cumulative (2024) with Project condition.⁹⁹ The transportation analysis in the record shows that over 3 years, during the AM peak, the intersection deteriorates from an acceptable LOS C to a condition about 2.5 times worse than the threshold of unacceptable and dysfunctional, LOS F.¹⁰⁰ Additionally, the PM peak deteriorates from a marginally functional LOS E to a condition about 2.5 times worse than the threshold of unacceptable and dysfunctional, LOS F.¹⁰¹ Additionally, Mr. Smith notes that the analysis of the intersection of Bronson Avenue with Franklin Avenue shows similar though less severe deterioration.¹⁰²

The Categorical Exemption contains no discussion about the severity of this deterioration or what plans the City has to correct or offset it.¹⁰³ Despite the fact that the Project only contributes to a small portion of the deterioration of LOS at these intersections, there is clearly a significant cumulative impact resulting from the Project plus other concurrent projects in the area.

The Project's cumulative transportation impacts constitute an exception to a Class 32 Categorical Exemption under CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2(b). The City must prepare an EIR to evaluate the Project's cumulative transportation impacts.

⁹⁸ Average intersection delay per vehicle.

⁹⁹ Smith Comments, p. 2.

¹⁰⁰ Smith Comments, p. 2.

¹⁰¹ Smith Comments, p. 2.

¹⁰² Smith Comments, p. 2.

¹⁰³ Smith Comments, p. 2.

L6058-003j

IV. THE CITY CANNOT APPROVE THE PROJECT UNDER THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT

The Subdivision Map Act requires a lead agency to make findings that a proposed subdivision is consistent with the general plan/specific plan, and does not have any detrimental environmental or public health effects.¹⁰⁴ The City is unable to make these mandatory findings because the Project has unmitigated, adverse impacts in each of these areas. Moreover, the Categorical Exemption and Staff Report fail to provide substantial evidence to meet either of these legal standards.

As demonstrated above, the Project will conflict with the City's adopted Mobility Plan which is an element of the City's General Plan.¹⁰⁵ Additionally, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the Project will result in significant impacts related to air quality, public health, noise, and transportation that the City has not analyzed or mitigated. The threats to public health posed by the Project cannot be ignored and necessarily contravene the findings required to approve the Project under the Map Act.

The City must prepare an EIR that analyzes the Projects potentially significant impacts and implement mitigation to address those impacts before it is able to make the findings required under the Map Act.

V. CONCLUSION

There is substantial evidence demonstrating that Project may result in potentially significant adverse impacts that were not identified by the City, and thus have not been adequately analyzed or mitigated. The City also lacks substantial evidence to support the findings required to approve the Project in reliance on a Categorical Exemption from CEQA.

 $^{^{104}}$ Gov Code \S 66473.5, 66474(a), (b), (e), (f), (g).

¹⁰⁵ City of Los Angeles, Mobility, <u>https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/initiatives-policies/mobility</u> (Accessed March 22, 2022). L6058-003j

We urge the Hearing Officer to deny this Project and fulfill its responsibilities under CEQA by remanding the Project to staff to prepare a legally adequate EIR to address the potentially significant impacts described in this comment letter and the attached expert letters. The City cannot allow the Project to move forward with any subsequent approvals until it prepares an EIR that resolves these issues and complies with CEQA's requirements.

Thank you for your attention to these comments. Please include them in the record of proceedings on the Project.

Sincerely,

Kein Canidnul

Kevin Carmichael

KTC:ljl

EXHIBIT A



Clark & Associates Environmental Consulting, Inc.

OFFICE 12405 Venice Blvd Suite 331 Los Angeles, CA 90066

PHONE 310-907-6165

FAX 310-398-7626

EMAIL jclark.assoc@gmail.com March 23, 2022

Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo 520 Capitol Mall, Suite 350 Sacramento, CA 95814

Attn: Mr. Kevin T. Carmichael

Subject: Comments On Categorical Exemption For Bronson Residential Tower Project Case No. ENV-2021-6887-EAF

Dear Mr. Carmichael:

At the request of Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo (ABJC), Clark and Associates (Clark) has reviewed materials related to the 2022 City of Los Angeles Categorical Exemption (CE) of the above referenced project.

Clark's review of the materials in no way constitutes a validation of the conclusions or materials contained within the plan. If we do not comment on a specific item this does not constitute acceptance of the item.

Project Description:

According to the City of Los Angeles's CE, Project includes the construction use and maintenance of a 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, three levels of above-ground parking, and one subterranean parking level. Of the 128 dwelling units, 11 units would be set aside for Very Low Income Households. The Lombardi Structures would remain in place and would not be altered by the Project. The proposed building would be 24 stories, reaching a maximum height of 275 feet. The Project would include 17,778 square feet of open space. The Project would provide 134 vehicle parking spaces and 9 short-term bicycle parking spaces. The 22 non-protected trees on the Project Site would be removed and replaced in

accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. The Project would require 10,000 cubic yards of soil to be disposed of at a regional dump location.

The 0.86-acre Project Site is located at 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue at the southwest corner of Carlos Avenue and Bronson Avenue in the Hollywood Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles (City). The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) for the Project Site are 5545-003-014, 5545-003-023, and 5545-003-029. The Project Site is bordered on the north by Carlos Avenue, on the south by a restaurant, on the west by a Los Angeles County Superior Court building and associated parking, and to the east by Bronson Avenue. Land uses in the greater Project Site area include US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the north; Hollywood Boulevard and commercial uses to the south; commercial uses to the west; and the US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the south but was previously developed with four residential units. The northern portion is used as surface parking. The southern portion of the Project Site is developed with a two-story residential building and a barn (Lombardi Structures).and residential amenity spaces throughout the project.

The City is claiming that the Project is categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental documents under Class 32 in Section 15332, Article 19, Chapter 3, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Class 32 is intended to promote infill development within urbanized areas. The class consists of environmentally benign in-fill projects that are consistent with local general plan and zoning requirements. Class 32 is not intended to be applied to projects that would result in any significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality effects.

The conclusion from the City that there will not be significant air quality impacts is not supported by the facts of the Project. There are substantial impacts that are not addressed in the City's analysis that must be addressed in an environmental impact report (EIR).

Specific Comments:

1. The Project Analysis Fails To Assess The Cumulative Impacts Of The Project On The Already Heavily Impacted Portion Of Los Angeles.

The proposed project analysis describes the impacts of the expansion of the project but does not attempt to assess the cumulative impacts of the Bronson Towers Project. The analysis performed is inadequate for assessing the cumulative impacts which must be addressed in an environmental impact report. Using the Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA's) California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool Version 4.0 (CalEnviroScreen) it is possible to assess the existing concerns for the census tract in which the project is located.



The location of the proposed project is in a census tract located within the top 14 percent for Pollution Burden according to the CalEnviroScreen 4.0. According to the CalEnviroScreen analysis, the census tract for the Project location, census tract 6037191000, has a higher pollution burden than 86% of the census tracts in California.

Based on the existing toxic diesel particulate matter (DPM) emission sources, which include existing industrial uses and vehicular traffic along State Route 101 (the Hollywood Freeway) places the census tract in the top 1% in California being impacted by DPM. The community is therefore considered a disadvantaged community. Increasing the number of DPM sources within the community

via the construction of the project will increase the Pollution Burden on the community even more placing a greater health burden on the community.



The introduction of a large residential facility next to the Hollywood Freeway will expose all of the residents to a substantial health risk for DPM, fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and greenhouse gases (GHGs). When the health impacts from the Proposed Project are added to those existing impacts, residents living in the communities surrounding the Proposed Project will possibly face an even greater exposure to air pollution and bear a disproportionate burden of increasing health risks. Thus, cumulative impacts from projects in communities with existing health risk sources should be evaluated and disclosed.

No cumulative impact analysis was performed for the sensitive receptors identified in the CE. The City should revise its analysis and present it in an EIR.
2. The City Has Failed To Assess The Health Impacts On The Project From The Hollywood Freeway. Specifically, the CE Ignores The Substantial Impacts Of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) On The Residents Of The Project

The City has failed to conduct a numerical health risk analysis (HRA) for Project. The CE states that, for the purposes of "the Project would not produce VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ emissions in excess of SCAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore, the cumulative air quality impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant."¹ This statement clearly fails to consider the impact of emissions from the adjacent Hollywood Freeway on the residents of the Project.

When assessing pollution concentrations upon sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD has developed LSTs that are based on the number of pounds of emissions per day that can be generated by a project that would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts.² For the Criteria Pollutants assessed under CEQA, this is correct. For toxic air contaminants (TACs), there are no LSTs, nor levels of significance based on the pounds per day. Instead, the determination of a significance threshold is based on a *quantitative risk analysis* that requires the City to perform a multistep, quantitative health risk analysis.

TACs, including diesel particulate matter (DPM)³, contribute to a host of respiratory impacts and may lead to the development of various cancers. Failing to quantify those impacts places the community at risk for unwanted adverse health impacts. *Even brief exposures to the TACs could lead to the development of adverse health impacts over the life of an individual.*

Diesel exhaust contains nearly 40 toxic substances, including TACs and may pose a serious public health risk for residents in the vicinity of the facility. TACs are airborne substances that are capable of causing short-term (acute) and/or long-term (chronic or carcinogenic, i.e., cancer causing) adverse human health effects (i.e., injury or illness). TACs include both organic and inorganic

¹ City of Los Angeles. 2022. Categorical Exemption. Pg 50.

² City of Los Angeles. 2021. DEIR of 8th, Grand, and Hope Project. Pg IV.A-58

³ Because DPM is a TAC, it is a different air pollutant than criteria particulate matter (PM) emissions such as PM10, PM2.5, and fugitive dust. DPM exposure causes acute health effects that are different from the effects of exposure to PM alone.

chemical substances. The current California list of TACs includes approximately 200 compounds, including particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines.

Diesel exhaust has been linked to a range of serious health problems including an increase in respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death.^{4,5,6} Fine DPM is deposited deep in the lungs in the smallest airways and can result in increased respiratory symptoms and disease; decreased lung function, particularly in children and individuals with asthma; alterations in lung tissue and respiratory tract defense mechanisms; and premature death.⁷ Exposure to DPM increases the risk of lung cancer. It also causes non-cancer effects including chronic bronchitis, inflammation of lung tissue, thickening of the alveolar walls, immunological allergic reactions, and airway constriction.⁸ DPM is a TAC that is recognized by state and federal agencies as causing severe health risk because it contains toxic materials, unlike PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀.⁹

The inherent toxicity of the TACs requires the City to first quantify the concentration released into the environment at each of the sensitive receptor locations through air dispersion modeling, calculate the dose of each TAC at that location, and quantify the cancer risk and hazard index for each of the chemicals of concern. Following that analysis, then the City can make a determination of the relative significance of the emissions.

There are several sensitive receptors in the direct vicinity of the Project site, including residences located near the Project site. The two closest residential/sensitive receptors to the Project Site are

⁴ California Air Resources Board, Initial Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking, Proposed Identification of Diesel Exhaust as a Toxic Air Contaminant, Staff Report, June 1998; see also California Air Resources Board, Overview: Diesel Exhaust & Health, <u>https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health#:~:text=Diesel%20Particulate%20Matter%20and%20Health&text=In%201998%2C%20CARB%20identified%20DPM,and%20other%20adverse%20health%20effects.</u>

⁵ U.S. EPA, Health Assessment Document for Diesel Engine Exhaust, Report EPA/600/8-90/057F, May 2002.

⁶ Environmental Defense Fund, Cleaner Diesel Handbook, Bring Cleaner Fuel and Diesel Retrofits into Your Neighborhood, April 2005; <u>http://www.edf.org/documents/4941_cleanerdieselhandbook.pdf</u>, accessed July 5, 2020.

⁷ California Air Resources Board, Initial Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking, Proposed Identification of Diesel Exhaust as a Toxic Air Contaminant, Staff Report, June 1998.

⁸ Findings of the Scientific Review Panel on The Report on Diesel Exhaust as adopted at the Panel's April 22, 1998 Meeting.

⁹ Health & Safety Code § 39655(a) (defining "toxic air contaminant" as air pollutants "which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. A substance that is listed as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to subsection (b) of Section 112 of the federal act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7412 (b)) is a toxic air contaminant.")

located next door to the Project Site. These receptors are less than 80 feet or 25 meters away from the Project Site location.

These receptors would be exposed to TACs released during Project construction and operation, including DPM. No effort is made in the CE to quantify the potential health impacts from DPM generated by construction activities, operational activities from the Project on these sensitive receptors, or the continuous emissions from the Hollywood Freeway. The City's failure to perform such an analysis is clearly a major flaw in the CE and may be placing the residents of the adjacent structures at risk from the construction and operational phases of the Project.

3. Dispersion Modeling From Nearby Developments Clearly Shows That The Emissions From The Hollywood Freeway Will Create A Risk In Excess Of 10 In 1,000,000 At The Project Site

Two projects within a 1/3rd and 1/4 mile of the Project Site, 6220 Yucca Street Project and 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project, performed health risk analyses of the freeway emissions. Each estimated emissions forward starting in 2018 for the Hollywood Boulevard Project and 2024 for Yucca Project. Each of the projects is located approximately 80 meters away from the freeway. The Bronson Tower Project site is located within 25 meters of the Hollywood Freeway. Based on the distance of the Project Site, the calculated DPM and associated HAPs will be 1.5 to 5 times (based on the difference seen using the χ/Q method outlined in the SCAQMD Risk Assessment Tool for Rule 1401 and 212, Version 8.1) higher than the concentration modeled at Hollywood Boulevard and Yucca Street Project sites.

Using the emissions from the Yucca Project, it is possible to estimate the emissions that will reach the Bronson Towers Project site and calculate the risk for residents of the Project. According to the Yucca Project report, vehicle traffic and speed data was obtained from the Caltrans PeMS database for the US Route 101 mainline. Vehicle traffic data for on-and off-ramps were obtained from Caltrans PeMS as well as from traffic count data from Caltrans Traffic Census Program. On- and off-ramp vehicle speeds were set at 15 miles per hour, which provides for a conservative (i.e., health protective) analysis since emissions factors are relatively high at this speed. Vehicle traffic data was obtained for the segments of the US Route 101 mainline and US Route 101 on- and off-ramps within 0.25 mile of the site. Hourly traffic data was also obtained to account for temporal variation of traffic flow. An

annual traffic growth rate of one percent was applied to account for future traffic flow. Emission factors were obtained from the CARB EMFAC2017 emissions model. EMFAC was run for 2024 through 2050 to identify the average total organic gases (TOG) emission factors from light-duty automobiles, and TOG and diesel particulate matter (DPM) emission factors from heavy-duty diesel trucks typical of the US Route 101 over the lifetime of the project's operations. Vehicle emission factors were calculated assuming exposure duration of 30 years. Vehicle emissions were then calculated for each year from 2024 (the earliest year of project buildout and occupancy) through 2050 based on average traffic flow and vehicle speed along the study segment.

The primary source of particulate matter from freeways is diesel particulate exhaust. Diesel exhaust contains nearly 40 toxic substances, including toxic air contaminants (TACs) and may pose a serious public health risk for residents in the vicinity of the facility. TACs are airborne substances that are capable of causing short-term (acute) and/or long-term (chronic or carcinogenic, i.e., cancer causing) adverse human health effects (i.e., injury or illness). TACs include both organic and inorganic chemical substances. The current California list of TACs includes approximately 200 compounds, including particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines. Diesel exhaust has been linked to a range of serious health problems including an increase in respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death.^{10,11,12} Fine DPM is deposited deep in the lungs in the smallest airways and can result in increased respiratory symptoms and disease; decreased lung function, particularly in children and individuals with asthma; alterations in lung tissue and respiratory tract defense mechanisms; and premature death.¹³ Exposure to DPM increases the risk of lung cancer. It also causes non-cancer effects including chronic bronchitis, inflammation of lung tissue, thickening of the alveolar walls,

¹⁰ California Air Resources Board, Initial Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking, Proposed Identification of Diesel Exhaust as a Toxic Air Contaminant, Staff Report, June 1998; see also California Air Resources Board, Overview: Diesel Exhaust & Health, <u>https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health#:~:text=Diesel%20Particulate%20Matter%20and%20Health&text=In%201998%2C%20CARB%20identified%20DPM,and%20other%20adverse%20health%20effects.</u>

¹¹ U.S. EPA, Health Assessment Document for Diesel Engine Exhaust, Report EPA/600/8-90/057F, May 2002.

¹² Environmental Defense Fund, Cleaner Diesel Handbook, Bring Cleaner Fuel and Diesel Retrofits into Your Neighborhood, April 2005; <u>http://www.edf.org/documents/4941_cleanerdieselhandbook.pdf</u>, accessed July 5, 2020.

¹³ California Air Resources Board, Initial Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking, Proposed Identification of Diesel Exhaust as a Toxic Air Contaminant, Staff Report, June 1998.

immunological allergic reactions, and airway constriction.¹⁴ DPM is a TAC that is recognized by state and federal agencies as causing severe health risk because it contains toxic materials, unlike $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} .¹⁵

Using the outputs from the Yucca Project analyses, the concentrations at 25 meters from the freeway (location on the Project Site) were calculated for each year of exposure using the weight fractions outlined in the air quality and risk analysis.

Year	DPM	Acetaldehyde	Benzene	1,3-butadiene	Formaldehyde	Naphthalene	Ethylbenzene
	ug/m ³						
2023	1.42E-02	1.19E-03	6.44E-04	1.14E-04	2.49E-03	2.14E-05	6.44E-03
2024	1.41E-02	1.18E-03	6.42E-04	1.13E-04	2.49E-03	2.13E-05	6.42E-03
2025	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2026	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2027	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2028	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2029	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2030	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2031	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2032	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2033	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2034	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2035	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2036	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2037	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2038	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2039	1.32E-02	1.10E-03	5.99E-04	1.06E-04	2.32E-03	1.99E-05	5.99E-03
2040	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2041	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2042	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2043	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2044	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2045	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2046	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2047	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03

¹⁴ Findings of the Scientific Review Panel on The Report on Diesel Exhaust as adopted at the Panel's April 22, 1998 Meeting.

¹⁵ Health & Safety Code § 39655(a) (defining "toxic air contaminant" as air pollutants "which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. A substance that is listed as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to subsection (b) of Section 112 of the federal act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7412 (b)) is a toxic air contaminant.")

Year	DPM	Acetaldehyde	Benzene	1,3-butadiene	Formaldehyde	Naphthalene	Ethylbenzene
	ug/m ³						
2048	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2049	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2050	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2051	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2052	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
2053	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.02E-04	1.06E-04	2.33E-03	2.00E-05	6.02E-03
Average	1.33E-02	1.11E-03	6.03E-04	1.06E-04	2.34E-03	2.00E-05	6.03E-03

Using the CARB's HARP 2 Standalone Risk Assessment tool health risks from exposure to the chemicals of concern were calculated for residents of the site. In Exhibit B to this letter the outputs from the model are shown.

1	HARP2 - Risk Assessment Standalone Tool (dated 15065)								
	File	Help							
1	Enter Pol	lutant Cond	centrations Sel	ect Risk	Scenario & Calcu	late Risk View Risk	Results		
1	Cancer	Chronic	8-hour Acute						
	Load	File G	roup Risk By	View	Export				
		INDEX	GRP1	GRP2	POLID	POLABBREV	CONC	RISK_SUM	SCENARIO
		1			9901	DieselExhPM	1.3300e-02	1.1761e-05	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
č		2			75070	Acetaldehyde	1.1100e-03	8.9230e-09	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
		3			107028	Acrolein	1.9800e-05	0.0000e+00	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
		4			71432	Benzene	6.0200e-04	4.8393e-08	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
		5			106990	1,3-Butadiene	1.0600e-04	5.1126e-08	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
		6			50000	Formaldehyde	2.3400e-03	3.9502e-08	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
		7			91203	Naphthalene	2.0000e-05	1.9293e-09	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm
		8			91203	Naphthalene	0.0000e+00	0.0000e+00	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDem
	•	9			100414	Ethyl Benzene	6.0200e-03	4.2102e-08	30YrCancerHighEnd_InhSoilDerm

The risk from exposure to the chemicals of concern exceed 10 in 1,000,000 the CEQA threshold of significance.

Chemical of Concern	Health Risk (per million)
DPM	11.761
Acetaldehyde	0.008923
Benzene	0.048393
1,3-Butadiene	0.051126
Formaldehyde	0.039502
Naphthalene	0.0019293
Ethylbenzene	0.042102
Total Risk	11.9529753

The City must address this issue by performing a detailed health risk analysis which includes dispersion modeling of the contaminants from the sources in an environmental impact report.

Conclusion

The facts identified and referenced in this comment letter lead me to reasonably conclude that the Project could result in significant unmitigated impacts if the CE is approved. The City must reevaluate the significant impacts identified in this letter by requiring the preparation of a revised draft environmental impact report.

Sincerely,

2 Mar

EXHIBIT A

 \mathbf{CV}



Clark & Associates Environmental Consulting, Inc

Office 12405 Venice Blvd. Suite 331 Los Angeles, CA 90066

Phone 310-907-6165

Fax 310-398-7626

Email jclark.assoc@gmail.com

James J. J. Clark, Ph.D.

Principal Toxicologist Toxicology/Exposure Assessment Modeling Risk Assessment/Analysis/Dispersion Modeling

Education:

- Ph.D., Environmental Health Science, University of California, 1995
- M.S., Environmental Health Science, University of California, 1993
- B.S., Biophysical and Biochemical Sciences, University of Houston, 1987

Professional Experience:

Dr. Clark is a well-recognized toxicologist, air modeler, and health scientist. He has 30 years of experience in researching the effects of environmental contaminants on human health including environmental fate and transport modeling (SCREEN3, AEROMOD, ISCST3, Johnson-Ettinger Vapor Intrusion Modeling, RESRAD, GENII); exposure assessment modeling (partitioning of contaminants in the environment as well as PBPK modeling); conducting and managing human health risk assessments for regulatory compliance and risk-based clean-up levels; and toxicological and medical literature research.

SELECTED AIR MODELING RESEARCH/PROJECTS

Client(s) - Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a historical dose reconstruction for community members from an active 700 acre petroleum refinery in Los Angeles. The analysis included a multi-year dispersion model was performed in general accordance with the methods outlined by the U.S. EPA and the SCAQMD for assessing the health impacts in Torrance, California. The results of the analysis are being used as the basis for injunctive relief for the communities surrounding the refinery.

Client(s) – Multiple

Indoor Air Evaluations, California: Performed multiple indoor air screening evaluations and risk characterizations consistent with California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal/EPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) methodologies. Characterizations included the use of DTSC's modified Johnson & Ettinger Model and USEPA models, as well as the attenuation factor model currently advocated by Cal/EPA's Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).

Client - Adams, Broadwell, Joseph Cardozo, P.C.

Dr. Clark has performed numerous air quality analyses and risk assessments of criteria pollutants, air toxins, and particulate matter emissions for sites undergoing evaluation via the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. The analyses include the evaluation of Initial Study (IS) and Environmental Impacts Reports (EIR) for each project to determine the significance of air quality, green house gas (GHG), and hazardous waste components of the projects. The analyses were compiled as comment letters for submittal to oversight agencies.

Client – Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a comprehensive evaluation of criteria pollutants, air toxins, and particulate matter emissions from a carbon black production facility to determine the impacts on the surrounding communities. The results of the dispersion model were used to estimate acute and chronic exposure concentrations to multiple contaminants and were be incorporated into a comprehensive risk evaluation.

Client – Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a comprehensive evaluation of air toxins and particulate matter emissions from a railroad tie manufacturing facility to determine the impacts on the surrounding communities. The results of the dispersion model have been used to estimate acute and chronic exposure concentrations to multiple contaminants and have been incorporated into a comprehensive risk evaluation.

PUBLIC HEALTH/TOXICOLOGY

Client: Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a historical dose reconstruction for community members from radiologically impacted material (RIM) releases from an adjacent landfill. The analysis was performed in general accordance with the methods outlined by the Agency for Toxic Substances Control (ATSDR) for assessing radiation doses from historical source areas in North St. Louis County, Missouri.

Client: City of Santa Clarita, Santa Clarita, California

Dr. Clark managed the oversight of the characterization, remediation and development activities of a former 1,000 acre munitions manufacturing facility for the City of Santa

Clarita. The site is impacted with a number of contaminants including perchlorate, unexploded ordinance, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The site is currently under a number of regulatory consent orders, including an Immanent and Substantial Endangerment Order. Dr. Clark assisted the impacted municipality with the development of remediation strategies, interaction with the responsible parties and stakeholders, as well as interfacing with the regulatory agency responsible for oversight of the site cleanup.

Client: Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a historical dose reconstruction for community members exposed to radioactive waste released into the environment from legacy storage facilities. The releases resulted in impacts to soils, sediments, surface waters, and groundwater in the vicinity of the sites. The analysis was performed in general accordance with the methods outlined by the Agency for Toxic Substances Control (ATSDR) for assessing radiation doses from historical source areas in the community.

Client: Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a dose assessment of an individual occupationally exposed to metals and silica from fly ash who later developed cancer. A review of the individual's medical and occupational history was performed to prepare opinions regarding his exposure and later development of cancer.

Client: Brayton Purcell, Novato, California

Dr. Clark performed a toxicological assessment of residents exposed to methyl-tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) from leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs) adjacent to the subject property. The symptomology of residents and guests of the subject property were evaluated against the known outcomes in published literature to exposure to MTBE. The study found that residents had been exposed to MTBE in their drinking water; that concentrations of MTBE detected at the site were above regulatory guidelines; and, that the symptoms and outcomes expressed by residents and guests were consistent with symptoms and outcomes documented in published literature.

Client: Confidential

Dr. Clark performed a toxicological assessment of an individual occupationally exposed to hexavalent chromium who later developed cancer. A review of the individual's medical and occupational history was performed to prepare opinions regarding her exposure and later development of cancer.

Client: Covanta Energy, Westwood, California

Evaluated health risk from metals in biosolids applied as soil amendment on agricultural lands. The biosolids were created at a forest waste cogeneration facility using 96% whole tree wood chips and 4 percent green waste. Mass loading calculations were used to estimate Cr(VI) concentrations in agricultural soils based on a maximum loading rate of 40 tons of biomass per acre of agricultural soil. The results of the study were used by the Regulatory agency to determine that the application of biosolids did not constitute a health risk to workers applying the biosolids or to residences near the agricultural lands.

Client: Kaiser Venture Incorporated, Fontana, California

Prepared PBPK assessment of lead risk of receptors at a 1,100-acre former steel mill. This evaluation was used as the basis for granting closure of the site by lead regulatory agency.

RISK ASSESSMENTS/REMEDIAL INVESTIGATIONS

Kaiser Ventures Incorporated, Fontana, California

Prepared health risk assessment of semi-volatile organic chemicals and metals for a fiftyyear old wastewater treatment facility used at a 1,100-acre former steel mill. This evaluation was used as the basis for granting closure of the site by lead regulatory agency.

ANR Freight - Los Angeles, California

Prepared a comprehensive Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) of petroleum hydrocarbon and metal contamination of a former freight depot. This evaluation was as the basis for reaching closure of the site with lead regulatory agency.

Kaiser Ventures Incorporated, Fontana, California

Prepared comprehensive health risk assessment of semi-volatile organic chemicals and metals for 23-acre parcel of a 1,100-acre former steel mill. The health risk assessment was used to determine clean up goals and as the basis for granting closure of the site by lead regulatory agency. Air dispersion modeling using ISCST3 was performed to determine downwind exposure point concentrations at sensitive receptors within a 1 kilometer radius of the site. The results of the health risk assessment were presented at a public meeting sponsored by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) in the community potentially affected by the site.

Unocal Corporation - Los Angeles, California

Prepared comprehensive assessment of petroleum hydrocarbons and metals for a former petroleum service station located next to sensitive population center (elementary school). The assessment used a probabilistic approach to estimate risks to the community and was used as the basis for granting closure of the site by lead regulatory agency.

Client: Confidential, Los Angeles, California

Managed oversight of remedial investigation most contaminated heavy metal site in California. Lead concentrations in soil excess of 68,000,000 parts per billion (ppb) have been measured at the site. This State Superfund Site was a former hard chrome plating operation that operated for approximately 40-years.

Client: Confidential, San Francisco, California

Coordinator of regional monitoring program to determine background concentrations of metals in air. Acted as liaison with SCAQMD and CARB to perform co-location sampling and comparison of accepted regulatory method with ASTM methodology.

Client: Confidential, San Francisco, California

Analyzed historical air monitoring data for South Coast Air Basin in Southern California and potential health risks related to ambient concentrations of carcinogenic metals and volatile organic compounds. Identified and reviewed the available literature and calculated risks from toxins in South Coast Air Basin.

IT Corporation, North Carolina

Prepared comprehensive evaluation of potential exposure of workers to air-borne VOCs at hazardous waste storage facility under SUPERFUND cleanup decree. Assessment used in developing health based clean-up levels.

Professional Associations

American Public Health Association (APHA) Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) American Chemical Society (ACS) International Society of Environmental Forensics (ISEF) Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC)

Publications and Presentations:

Books and Book Chapters

- Sullivan, P., J.J. J. Clark, F.J. Agardy, and P.E. Rosenfeld. (2007). Synthetic Toxins In The Food, Water and Air of American Cities. Elsevier, Inc. Burlington, MA.
- Sullivan, P. and J.J. J. Clark. 2006. Choosing Safer Foods, A Guide To Minimizing Synthetic Chemicals In Your Diet. Elsevier, Inc. Burlington, MA.
- Sullivan, P., Agardy, F.J., and J.J.J. Clark. 2005. The Environmental Science of Drinking Water. Elsevier, Inc. Burlington, MA.
- Sullivan, P.J., Agardy, F.J., Clark, J.J.J. 2002. America's Threatened Drinking Water: Hazards and Solutions. Trafford Publishing, Victoria B.C.
- **Clark, J.J.J.** 2001. "TBA: Chemical Properties, Production & Use, Fate and Transport, Toxicology, Detection in Groundwater, and Regulatory Standards" in *Oxygenates in the Environment*. Art Diaz, Ed.. Oxford University Press: New York.
- **Clark, J.J.J.** 2000. "Toxicology of Perchlorate" in *Perchlorate in the Environment*. Edward Urbansky, Ed. Kluwer/Plenum: New York.
- **Clark, J.J.J.** 1995. Probabilistic Forecasting of Volatile Organic Compound Concentrations At The Soil Surface From Contaminated Groundwater. UMI.
- Baker, J.; Clark, J.J.J.; Stanford, J.T. 1994. Ex Situ Remediation of Diesel Contaminated Railroad Sand by Soil Washing. Principles and Practices for Diesel Contaminated Soils, Volume III. P.T. Kostecki, E.J. Calabrese, and C.P.L. Barkan, eds. Amherst Scientific Publishers, Amherst, MA. pp 89-96.

Journal and Proceeding Articles

- Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and Rosenfeld, P.E. (2008) A Statistical Analysis Of Attic Dust And Blood Lipid Concentrations Of Tetrachloro-p-Dibenzodioxin (TCDD) Toxicity Equialency Quotients (TEQ) In Two Populations Near Wood Treatment Facilities. Organohalogen Compounds, Volume 70 (2008) page 002254.
- Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and Rosenfeld, P.E. (2008) Methods For CollectSamples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In AtticDust: A Review. Organohalogen Compounds, Volume 70 (2008) page 000527
- Hensley A.R., Scott, A., Rosenfeld P.E., Clark, J.J.J. (2007). "Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility." *Environmental Research.* 105:194-199.
- Rosenfeld, P.E., Clark, J. J., Hensley, A.R., and Suffet, I.H. 2007. "The Use Of An Odor Wheel Classification For The Evaluation of Human Health Risk Criteria For Compost Facilities" Water Science & Technology. 55(5): 345-357.
- Hensley A.R., Scott, A., Rosenfeld P.E., Clark, J.J.J. 2006. "Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility." The 26th International Symposium on Halogenated Persistent Organic Pollutants –

DIOXIN2006, August 21 – 25, 2006. Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

- Rosenfeld, P.E., Clark, J. J. and Suffet, I.H. 2005. "The Value Of An Odor Quality Classification Scheme For Compost Facility Evaluations" The U.S. Composting Council's 13th Annual Conference January 23 - 26, 2005, Crowne Plaza Riverwalk, San Antonio, TX.
- Rosenfeld, P.E., Clark, J. J. and Suffet, I.H. 2004. "The Value Of An Odor Quality Classification Scheme For Urban Odor" WEFTEC 2004. 77th Annual Technical Exhibition & Conference October 2 - 6, 2004, Ernest N. Morial Convention Center, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Clark, J.J.J. 2003. "Manufacturing, Use, Regulation, and Occurrence of a Known Endocrine Disrupting Chemical (EDC), 2,4-Dichlorophnoxyacetic Acid (2,4-D) in California Drinking Water Supplies." National Groundwater Association Southwest Focus Conference: Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants. Minneapolis, MN. March 20, 2003.
- Rosenfeld, P. and J.J.J. Clark. 2003. "Understanding Historical Use, Chemical Properties, Toxicity, and Regulatory Guidance" National Groundwater Association Southwest Focus Conference: Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants. Phoenix, AZ. February 21, 2003.
- Clark, J.J.J., Brown A. 1999. Perchlorate Contamination: Fate in the Environment and Treatment Options. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation, Fifth International Symposium. San Diego, CA, April, 1999.
- Clark, J.J.J. 1998. Health Effects of Perchlorate and the New Reference Dose (RfD). Proceedings From the Groundwater Resource Association Seventh Annual Meeting, Walnut Creek, CA, October 23, 1998.
- Browne, T., Clark, J.J.J. 1998. Treatment Options For Perchlorate In Drinking Water. Proceedings From the Groundwater Resource Association Seventh Annual Meeting, Walnut Creek, CA, October 23, 1998.
- Clark, J.J.J., Brown, A., Rodriguez, R. 1998. The Public Health Implications of MtBE and Perchlorate in Water: Risk Management Decisions for Water Purveyors. Proceedings of the National Ground Water Association, Anaheim, CA, June 3-4, 1998.
- Clark J.J.J., Brown, A., Ulrey, A. 1997. Impacts of Perchlorate On Drinking Water In The Western United States. U.S. EPA Symposium on Biological and Chemical Reduction of Chlorate and Perchlorate, Cincinnati, OH, December 5, 1997.
- Clark, J.J.J.; Corbett, G.E.; Kerger, B.D.; Finley, B.L.; Paustenbach, D.J. 1996. Dermal Uptake of Hexavalent Chromium In Human Volunteers: Measures of Systemic Uptake From Immersion in Water At 22 PPM. Toxicologist. 30(1):14.

- Dodge, D.G.; Clark, J.J.J.; Kerger, B.D.; Richter, R.O.; Finley, B.L.; Paustenbach, D.J. 1996. Assessment of Airborne Hexavalent Chromium In The Home Following Use of Contaminated Tapwater. Toxicologist. 30(1):117-118.
- Paulo, M.T.; Gong, H., Jr.; Clark, J.J.J. (1992). Effects of Pretreatment with Ipratroprium Bromide in COPD Patients Exposed to Ozone. American Review of Respiratory Disease. 145(4):A96.
- Harber, P.H.; Gong, H., Jr.; Lachenbruch, A.; Clark, J.; Hsu, P. (1992). Respiratory Pattern Effect of Acute Sulfur Dioxide Exposure in Asthmatics. American Review of Respiratory Disease. 145(4):A88.
- McManus, M.S.; Gong, H., Jr.; Clements, P.; Clark, J.J.J. (1991). Respiratory Response of Patients With Interstitial Lung Disease To Inhaled Ozone. American Review of Respiratory Disease. 143(4):A91.
- Gong, H., Jr.; Simmons, M.S.; McManus, M.S.; Tashkin, D.P.; Clark, V.A.; Detels, R.; Clark, J.J. (1990). Relationship Between Responses to Chronic Oxidant and Acute Ozone Exposures in Residents of Los Angeles County. American Review of Respiratory Disease. 141(4):A70.
- Tierney, D.F. and J.J.J. Clark. (1990). Lung Polyamine Content Can Be Increased By Spermidine Infusions Into Hyperoxic Rats. American Review of Respiratory Disease. 139(4):A41.

EXHIBIT B

HARP2 OUTPUT

*HARP -	HRACalc v2	21081 3/21/2	2022 5:43:40) PM - Cancer	[.] Risk - Inp	ut File: C:\Users\jclar\OneDrive\	Desktop\Cla	rk and Asso	ciates\Proje	ect 157 - A	BJC - Bronsc	on Towers\/	AERMOD\av	e conc 30 y	earHRAInput.hra
INDEX	GRP1	GRP2	POLID	POLABBRE C	CONC	RISK_SUM SCENARIO DETAILS	INH_RISK	SOIL_RISK	DERMAL_F	MMILK_R	WATER_RI	FISH_RISK	CROP_RISk	BEEF_RISK	
	1		9901	DieselExhF	0.00819	7.09E-06 30YrCance *	7.09E-06	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	

 INDEX
 GRP1
 GRP2
 POLID
 POLABBRE CONC
 RISK_SUM SCENARIO DETAILS
 DAIRY_RIS PIG_RISK
 CHICKEN_I EGG_RISK
 IST_DRIVE PASTURE_FISH_CON(WATER_CONC

 1
 9901 DieselExhF
 0.00819
 7.09E-06
 30YrCance *
 0.00E+00
 0.00E+00

EXHIBIT B



CALIFORNIA WASHINGTON NEW YORK

WI #22-005.08

21 March 2022

Kevin T. Carmichael, Esq. Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo 520 Capitol Mall, Suite 350 Sacramento, California 95814

Subject:Bronson Residential Tower ProjectLos Angeles, CaliforniaReview and Comment on Categorical Exemption Noise Analysis

Dear Mr. Carmichael,

As requested, we have reviewed the information and noise impact analyses in the following documents:

Categorical Exemption: Bronson Residential Tower Project ("CatEx") Hollywood Community Plan Area, Los Angeles, California Case Number: ENV-2021-6887-EAF February 2022

This letter reports our comments on the noise analysis in the subject document.

Wilson Ihrig, Acoustical Consultants, has practiced exclusively in the field of acoustics since 1966. During our 56 years of operation, we have prepared hundreds of noise studies for Environmental Impact Reports and Statements. We have one of the largest technical laboratories in the acoustical consulting industry. We also utilize industry-standard acoustical programs such as Environmental Noise Model (ENM), Traffic Noise Model (TNM), Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), SoundPLAN, and CADNA. In short, we are well qualified to prepare environmental noise studies and review studies prepared by others.

Adverse Effects of Noise¹

Although the health effects of noise are not taken as seriously in the United States as they are in other countries, they are real and, in many parts of the country, pervasive.

¹ More information on these and other adverse effects of noise may be found in *Guidelines for Community Noise*, eds B Berglund, T Lindvall, and D Schwela, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1999. (https://www.who.int/docstore/peh/noise/Comnoise-1.pdf)



Noise-Induced Hearing Loss. If a person is repeatedly exposed to loud noises, he or she may experience noise-induced hearing impairment or loss. In the United States, both the Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) promote standards and regulations to protect the hearing of people exposed to high levels of industrial noise.

Speech Interference. Another common problem associated with noise is speech interference. In addition to the obvious issues that may arise from misunderstandings, speech interference also leads to problems with concentration fatigue, irritation, decreased working capacity, and automatic stress reactions. For complete speech intelligibility, the sound level of the speech should be 15 to 18 dBA higher than the background noise. Typical indoor speech levels are 45 to 50 dBA at 1 meter, so any noise above 30 dBA begins to interfere with speech intelligibility. The common reaction to higher background noise levels is to raise one's voice. If this is required persistently for long periods of time, stress reactions and irritation will likely result. The problems and irritation that are associated with speech disturbance have become more pronounced during the COVID-19 pandemic because many people find themselves and the people they live with trying to work and learn simultaneously in spaces that were not designed for speech privacy.

Sleep Disturbance. Noise can disturb sleep by making it more difficult to fall asleep, by waking someone after they are asleep, or by altering their sleep stage, e.g., reducing the amount of rapid eye movement (REM) sleep. Noise exposure for people who are sleeping has also been linked to increased blood pressure, increased heart rate, increase in body movements, and other physiological effects. Not surprisingly, people whose sleep is disturbed by noise often experience secondary effects such as increased fatigue, depressed mood, and decreased work performance.

Cardiovascular and Physiological Effects. Human's bodily reactions to noise are rooted in the "fight or flight" response that evolved when many noises signaled imminent danger. These include increased blood pressure, elevated heart rate, and vasoconstriction. Prolonged exposure to acute noises can result in permanent effects such as hypertension and heart disease.

Impaired Cognitive Performance. Studies have established that noise exposure impairs people's abilities to perform complex tasks (tasks that require attention to detail or analytical processes) and it makes reading, paying attention, solving problems, and memorizing more difficult. This is why there are standards for classroom background noise levels and why offices and libraries are designed to provide quiet work environments. While sheltering-in-place during the COVID-19 pandemic, many people are finding working and learning more difficult because their home environment is not as quiet as their office or school was.

Comments on Construction Noise Level Calculations

As far as I can tell, the CatEx noise analysis utterly fails to substantively calculate noise levels based on equipment that will foreseeably be used for the construction. Rather, it appears to simply assume, without substantiation, a reference noise level for construction and then proceed to generate complex sound level plots based upon the assumed reference level.

Although the text of the CatEx states, "when considering . . . the use of multiple pieces of powered equipment (i.e., rubber-tired dozers and tractor/loader/backhoe) simultaneously", no reference sound levels for such equipment is apparent in the CatEx. The construction noise levels plots were



generated using a computer program which takes as its input sound <u>power</u> level per unit area (Lw/unit). The CatEx uses 109.7 dBA:

	Nois	e emissions of	industry sou	rces
Source name	Size m/m²	Reference	Lev Day dB(A)	vel Night dB(A)
Construction Site	1918 m ²	Lw/unit	109.7	-

[CatEx, Appendix C]

.

But the 109.7 dBA Lw/unit appears to have been calculated using an assumed sound <u>pressure</u> level of 75 dBA (Lp) at 15.24m (50ft):

Reference		15.24	meter
Sound Pressure Level (Lp)	(75.0	dBA
Sound Power Level (Lw)		109.7	dB

[CatEx, Appendix C]

I see no substantiation for this assumed reference noise level. However, the Air Quality analysis documentation does include a detailed list of equipment by phase:

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1
Grading	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1
Building Construction	Cranes	1
Building Construction	Forklifts	2
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	1
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2

[CatEx, Appendix D]



Using this information and the ubiquitously-used Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Noise Construction Model methodology and data, one may calculate noise levels for the first three phases of construction.^{2,3} The values circled in red in Figure 1 are the hourly average noise levels for all of the equipment listed all operating at a distance of 50 ft. As can be seen, these levels are 7 to 11 dB higher than assumed by the CatEx noise analysis reference level of 75 dBA.

Using the simple noise model I have put together, one may calculate the following average hourly noise levels at the indicated noise-sensitive receptors (Table 1). The distances used for the calculations are those from the center of the project site to the nearest façade of the building. Not surprisingly, these levels are much higher than the estimates made for the CatEx noise analysis.

Demolition						
		RCNM	Ref Values	@ 50 ft		
	Equipment	Lmax	Util%	No.	Distance	Leq
	Conc Saw	89.6	20%	1	50 ft	82.6
	Tractor	84.0	40%	1	50 ft	80.0
	Backhoe	77.6	40%	1	50 ft	73.6
	Dozer	81.7	40%	1	50 ft	77.7
	Total					85.6
						\sim
Grading						
Cruaing		RCNM	Ref Values	@ 50 ft		
	Equipment	Lmax	Util%	No.	Distance	Leq
	Conc Saw	89.6	20%	1	50 ft	82.6
	Tractor	84.0	40%	1	50 ft	80.0
	Backhoe	77.6	40%	1	50 ft	73.6
	Dozer	81.7	40%	1	50 ft	77.7
	Total					85.6
Blda Constr	ruction					
		RCNM	Ref Values	@ 50 ft		
	Equipment	Lmax	Util%	No.	Distance	Leq
	Crane	81.0	16%	1	50 ft	73.0
	Forklift (Man Lift)	75.0	20%	2	50 ft	71.0
	Tractor	84.0	40%	1	50 ft	80.0
	Backhoe	77.6	40%	1	50 ft	75.6
	Total					81.9

Figure 1 Noise Level Calculations Using FHWA Methodology

² Federal Highway Administration, *FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide*, FHWA-HEP-05-054, DOT-VNTSC-FHWA-05-01, January 2006.

³ Although tractors, loaders, and backhoes may produce similar amounts of air pollution, they do not produce similar noise levels. Since the three are lumped together in the air quality analysis, I have assumed one tractor (the loudest of the three) and one backhoe (the quietest of the three) for my noise calculations.



			Construction Phase				
Address	Description	Distance	Demo	Grading	Bldg		
			Demo	Grauing	Erection		
1717 N Bronson	Lombardi House	85 ft	81.0	81.0	77.3		
1720 N Bronson	Residences	160 ft	75.5	75.5	71.8		
5919 Carlos	Residences	208 ft	73.2	73.2	69.6		
5940 Carlos	Hollywood Silvercrest Apts	260 ft	71.3	71.3	67.6		

Table 1 Average Hourly Noise Levels at Nearest Noise Sensitive Receptors

Comments on Construction Noise Impact Assessment

The CatEx correctly states that

[b]ecause the Project's construction phase would occur for more than three months, the applicable City threshold of significance for the Project's construction noise impacts is an increase of 5 dBA over existing ambient noise levels. [CatEx at p. 34]

To establish the existing ambient noise levels, measurements were made at four locations in the area around the project site. These are documented in Appendix C of the CatEx. Also located in Appendix C are the construction noise calculations and assessment, the latter of which necessarily refers to the ambient measurements. However, the ambient noise levels seem to have been mis-transcribed for the assessment portion. For example, Noise Monitoring Location #1 is clearly in front of Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments located at 5940 Carlos Avenue, and the measured sound level is 62.2 dB(A):





#1 6/2/2021

Name		\$018_BU050019_02062021
Start Time		6/2/2021 10:11:43 AM
Stop Time		6/2/2021 10:26:
Device Name		BU050019
Model Type		SoundPro DL
Device Firmware R	ev	R.13H
Comments		
Summary D	ata Panel	
Description	Meter	tains De
		63.2.49

However, in the assessment table, the existing Leq is shown as 67.1:

Receptor	Existing Leq
Banana Bungalow Hollywood Hostel	65.7
Residences - 1661-1673 Bronson Ave.	63.7
Residences -1720 Bronson Ave.	62.2
Hallmart Apartments - 1810 Bronson Ave.	65.7
Residences - 5855 Carlton Wy	63.7
Residences - 5919 Carlos Ave.	67.1
Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments - 5940 Carlos Ave.	67.1

A review of the other ambient measurement information reveals that 67.1 dBA Leq was actually the level at Noise Monitoring Location #4, in front of the building at 5855 Carlton.

I have appended the ambient noise measurement information from the CatEx to this letter, and I shall be using the levels indicated therein as the basis for my assessment. Given the proximity of the four measurement locations to U.S. 101 and the four reported noise levels, this makes more sense than what was done in the CatEx, i.e., distances farther from the highway should have lower noise levels.



Table 2 recreates the form of the assessment table in the CatEx, but uses the values I have calculated for construction noise and what I believe are the correctly allocated values for the existing ambient.⁴ The construction noise levels will exceed the existing ambient levels at the four nearest noise-sensitive receivers by 10 to 17 dBA, well over the 5 dBA significance threshold. Therefore, unmitigated construction noise should be identified as a significant impact.

Receptor	Maximum Construction Noise Level (dBA Leq)	Existing Ambient Noise Level (dBA Leq)	New Ambient Noise Level (dBA Leq)	Increase (dBA Leq)	Significant Impact?
1717 Bronson	81.0	63.7	81.1	17.4	Yes
1720 Bronson	75.5	63.7	75.8	12.1	Yes
5919 Carlos	73.2	62.2	73.5	11.3	Yes
5940 Carlos	71.3	62.2	71.8	9.6	Yes

Table 2 Assessment of Construction Noise Levels at Off-Site Receptors

Comments about Potential Noise Mitigation

Because the CatEx failed to identify the significant noise impact that will be caused by construction noise, it does not contemplate any noise mitigation for it. It is very common for project proponents to include "use of mufflers will be required" as a construction mitigation measure and then declare the noise impact as less-than-significant. However, the data in the FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model were collected in the 1990s and 2000s when muffler use was ubiquitous. Therefore, no additional noise mitigation from mufflers may be expected.

⁴ The assessment in the CatEx is presented on page 35, CatEx Table 14. My Table 2 does not include the fartheraway receptors but it <u>does</u> include the Lombardi House which is described on its website as "Perfect for long stays or group celebrations, this elegant historic home offers four newly renovated guest suites . . . Our accommodations are modern, spacious, and bright and can comfortably sleep up to 28 guests." [https://www.lombardihouse.com/history/#about-panel]. Interestingly, the CatEx construction noise calculation sheets do include the Lombardi House on the initial "Receiver list", but do not include it in the final analysis results perhaps because the CatEx's own noise analysis – erroneous as it is – indicates that the noise level increase there would be greater than 5 dBA, a significant noise impact. [CatEx, Appendix C]





The only realistic way to reduce noise levels at the neighboring receptors is to construct a tall, temporary noise control barrier on the sides of the project area nearest those receptors. Figure 2 indicates where it ought to be deployed, and Figure 3 shows such a barrier. In order to shield the upper floors of the neighboring buildings, the barrier would need be on the order of 15 to 20 feet tall.



Figure 2 Extent of Noise Barrier



Figure 3 Tall Construction Noise Barrier

Conclusions

- 1. The CatEx construction noise analysis appears to be based on an unsubstantiated noise reference level. Information in the Air Quality analysis enables industry-standard noise calculations which indicate that the assumed reference level is 7 to 11 dB too low.
- 2. The CatEx mixes up the measured ambient noise levels. When the levels are used at the proper location and the industry-standard construction noise calculations are used for the assessment, the increase is seen to be 10 to 17 dB, well over the 5 dB threshold of significance.
- 3. Because the primary noise source from construction is the exhaust noise from dieselpowered equipment, and because the exhaust stack outlets are typically 7 to 8 feet above the ground, a tall, temporary construction noise barrier is the only realistic means of reducing the construction noise levels. The noise calculations already account for mufflers, so no additional noise attenuation should be expected by requiring them, though they should be required.
 - • • •



Please contact me if you have any question about this review of the noise analysis in the Bronson *Residential Tower Project* Categorical Exemption noise analysis.

Very truly yours,

WILSON IHRIG Derek L. Watry Principal

Principal

2022-03-21 - bronson tower - noise - d watry.docx



DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

AMBIENT NOISE MEASUREMENTS

From CatEx, Appendix C





DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

Figure 1 Noise Monitoring Locations

#1 6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S018_BIJ050019_02062021_122422
Start Time	6/2/2021 10:11:43 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 10:26:
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	<u>Meter</u>	Value	Description	Meter	<u>Value</u>
Leq	1	62.2 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	C
Response	2	FAST			

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
58:	0.00	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.29	0.26	0.22	0.26	0.29	0.30	2.05
59:	0.34	0.38	0.48	0.67	0.73	0.63	0.76	0.82	0.93	0.73	6.46
60:	1.00	0.90	1.25	1.24	1.51	2.07	2.15	2.32	2.63	3.56	18.64
61:	4.07	3.67	3.68	2.12	3.41	3.14	3.47	3.39	2.74	2.99	32.68
62:	2.76	2.75	2.60	3.10	2.59	2.42	1.89	1.77	1.79	1.29	22.97
63:	1.41	1.44	1.38	1.25	0.94	0.80	0.87	0.90	0.65	0.50	10.14
64:	0.56	0.52	0.28	0.15	0.26	0.23	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.19	2.68
65:	0.15	0.15	0.08	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.08	0.17	1.31
66:	0.12	0.16	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.16	0.86
67:	0.16	0.10	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.94
68:	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.14	0.80
69:	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.24
70:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.09
71:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.10

#2 6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S019_BIJ050019_02062021_122423
Start Time	6/2/2021 10:35:11 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 10:50:11 AM
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	<u>Meter</u>	Value	Description	Meter	Value
Leq	1	65.7 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	С
Response	2	FAST			

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
62:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.10	0.13	0.43	0.29	0.37	1.39
63:	0.27	0.21	0.33	0.53	0.53	0.67	0.95	1.28	2.42	2.34	9.54
64:	2.34	2.61	3.11	2.14	3.69	3.30	3.16	3.13	3.38	3.83	30.68
65:	3.66	3.49	3.38	3.18	2.85	3.02	2.81	2.61	2.37	2.50	29.85
66:	2.23	2.19	2.03	2.03	1.77	1.46	1.71	1.56	1.62	1.39	17.99
67:	0.97	0.92	0.93	0.50	0.61	0.49	0.26	0.22	0.28	0.31	5.50
68:	0.31	0.17	0.27	0.14	0.13	0.21	0.18	0.12	0.12	0.15	1.79
69:	0.08	0.04	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.94
70:	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.20	0.14	0.08	0.09	1.34
71:	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.68
72:	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.23
73:	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06

#3 6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S020_BIJ050019_02062021_122423
Start Time	6/2/2021 10:59:27 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 11:14:27 AM
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	<u>Meter</u>	Value	Description	Meter	Value
Leq	1	63.7 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	C
Response	2	FAST			

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
49:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.17	0.02	0.13	0.40
50:	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.13	0.03	0.03	0.71
51:	0.22	0.35	0.18	0.24	0.35	0.52	0.36	0.59	0.84	0.67	4.32
52:	0.64	0.62	0.58	0.40	0.85	1.01	0.91	0.85	0.84	0.89	7.59
53:	0.84	0.59	0.52	0.60	0.79	0.55	0.66	0.63	0.73	0.73	6.64
54:	0.81	0.90	0.91	0.86	0.92	0.88	0.90	0.73	0.81	0.78	8.49
55:	0.78	0.82	0.90	0.48	0.51	0.55	0.64	0.82	0.82	0.76	7.06
56:	0.94	0.78	0.74	0.76	0.58	0.67	0.62	0.59	0.57	0.63	6.88
57:	0.58	0.48	0.52	0.51	0.63	0.64	0.56	0.63	0.57	0.48	5.59
58:	0.52	0.52	0.53	0.44	0.55	0.59	0.66	0.56	0.54	0.58	5.49
59:	0.81	0.77	0.63	0.51	0.49	0.46	0.49	0.52	0.55	0.51	5.74
60:	0.64	0.64	0.57	0.51	0.58	0.50	0.46	0.53	0.51	0.56	5.51
61:	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.38	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.45	0.43	0.52	4.74
62:	0.52	0.52	0.50	0.51	0.61	0.53	0.66	0.48	0.44	0.42	5.18

#4

6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S021_BIJ050019_02062021_122424
Start Time	6/2/2021 11:21:10 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 11:36:10 AM
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	Meter	Value	Description	Meter	Value
Leq	1	(67.1 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	C
Response	2	FAST			

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
62:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.20
63:	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.32	0.36	0.44	0.77	2.79
64:	0.67	0.77	0.91	0.73	0.90	0.86	0.87	0.96	0.93	1.07	8.68
65:	0.92	1.07	1.12	1.50	1.75	2.04	1.97	1.99	2.15	2.34	16.85
66:	2.30	2.34	2.12	2.65	2.73	2.77	2.95	3.24	3.22	3.02	27.32
67:	3.57	3.45	3.44	2.38	2.82	2.20	1.90	1.76	1.72	1.65	24.89
68:	1.49	1.20	1.13	1.18	1.45	1.26	0.96	0.93	0.79	0.74	11.14
69:	0.75	0.69	0.65	0.56	0.67	0.47	0.37	0.33	0.40	0.34	5.24
70:	0.26	0.24	0.19	0.11	0.12	0.14	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.10	1.42
71:	0.14	0.15	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.73
72:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.25
73:	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.23
74:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08
75:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.07



DEREK L. WATRY

Principal

Since joining Wilson Ihrig in 1992, Derek has gained experienced in many areas of practice including environmental, construction, forensic, architectural, and industrial. For all of these, he has conducted extensive field measurements, established acceptability criteria, and calculated future noise and vibration levels. In the many of these areas, he has prepared CEQA and NEPA noise technical studies and EIR/EIS sections. Derek has a thorough understanding of the technical, public relations, and political aspects of environmental noise and vibration compliance work. He has helped resolve complex community noise issues, and he has also served as an expert witness in numerous legal matters.

Education

- M.S. Mechanical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley
- B.S. Mechanical Engineering, University of California, San Diego
- M.B.A. Saint Mary's College of California

Project Experience

12th Street Reconstruction, Oakland, CA

Responsible for construction noise control plan from pile driving after City received complaints from nearby neighbors. Attendance required at community meetings.

525 Golden Gate Avenue Demolition, San Francisco, CA

Noise and vibration monitoring and consultation during demolition of a multi-story office building next to Federal, State, and Municipal Court buildings for the SFDPW.

911 Emergency Communications Center, San Francisco, CA

Technical assistance on issues relating to the demolition and construction work including vibration monitoring, developing specification and reviewing/recommending appropriate methods and equipment for demolition of Old Emergency Center for the SFDPW.

Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Grayson Creek Sewer, Pleasant Hill, CA

Evaluation of vibration levels due to construction of new sewer line in hard soil.

City of Atascadero, Review of Walmart EIR Noise Analysis, Atascadero, CA

Review and Critique of EIR Noise Analysis for the Del Rio Road Commercial Area Specific Plan.

City of Fremont, Ongoing Environmental Services On-Call Contract, Fremont, CA

Work tasks primarily focus on noise insulation and vibration control design compliance for new residential projects and peer review other consultant's projects.

City of Fremont, Patterson Ranch EIR, Fremont, CA

Conducted noise and vibration portion of the EIR.

City of King City, Silva Ranch Annexation EIR, King City, CA

Conducted the noise portion of the EIR and assessed the suitability of the project areas for the intended development. Work included a reconnaissance of existing noise sources and receptors in and around the project areas, and long-term noise measurements at key locations.



Conoco Phillips Community Study and Expert Witness, Rodeo, CA

Investigated low frequency noise from exhaust stacks and provided expert witness services representing Conoco Phillips. Evaluated effectiveness of noise controls implemented by the refinery.

Golden Gate Park Concourse Underground Garage, San Francisco, CA

Noise and vibration testing during underground garage construction to monitor for residences and an old sandstone statue during pile driving for the City of San Francisco.

Laguna Honda Hospital, Clarendon Hall Demolition, San Francisco, CA

Project manager for performed vibration monitoring during demolition of an older wing of the Laguna Honda Hospital.

Loch Lomond Marina EIR, San Rafael, CA

Examined traffic noise impacts on existing residences for the City of San Rafael. Provided the project with acoustical analyses and reports to satisfy the requirements of Title 24.

Mare Island Dredge and Material Disposal, Vallejo, CA

EIR/EIS analysis of noise from planned dredged material off-loading operations for the City of Vallejo.

Napa Creek Vibration Monitoring Review, CA

Initially brought in to peer review construction vibration services provided by another firm, but eventually was tapped for its expertise to develop a vibration monitoring plan for construction activities near historic buildings and long-term construction vibration monitoring.

San Francisco DPW, Environmental Services On-Call, CA

Noise and vibration monitoring for such tasks as: Northshore Main Improvement project, and design noise mitigation for SOMA West Skate Park.

San Francisco PUC, Islais Creek Clean Water Program, San Francisco, CA

Community noise and vibration monitoring during construction, including several stages of pile driving. Coordination of noise and ground vibration measurements during pile driving and other construction activity to determine compliance with noise ordinance. Coordination with Department of Public Works to provide a vibration seminar for inspectors and interaction with Construction Management team and nearby businesses to resolve noise and vibration issues.

San Francisco PUC, Richmond Transport Tunnel Clean Water Program, San Francisco, CA

Environmental compliance monitoring of vibration during soft tunnel mining and boring, cut-andcover trenching for sewer lines, hard rock tunnel blasting and site remediation. Work involved long-term monitoring of general construction activity, special investigations of groundborne vibration from pumps and bus generated ground vibration, and interaction with the public (homeowners).

Santa Clara VTA, Capitol Expressway Light Rail (CELR) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Update EIS, CA Reviewed previous BRT analysis and provide memo to support EIS.


Shell Oil Refinery, Martinez, CA

Identified source of community noise complaints from tonal noise due to refinery equipment and operations. Developed noise control recommendations. Conducted round-the-clock noise measurements at nearby residence and near to the property line of the refinery and correlated results. Conducted an exhaustive noise survey of the noisier pieces of equipment throughout the refinery to identify and characterize the dominant noise sources that were located anywhere from a quarter to three-quarters of a mile away. Provided a list of actions to mitigate noise from the noisiest pieces of refinery equipment. Assisted the refinery in the selection of long-term noise monitoring equipment to be situated on the refinery grounds so that a record of the current noise environment will be documented, and future noise complaints can be addressed more efficiently.

Tyco Electronics Corporation, Annual Noise Compliance Study, Menlo Park, CA

Conducted annual noise compliance monitoring. Provided letter critiquing the regulatory requirements and recommending improvements.

University of California, San Francisco Mission Bay Campus Vibration Study, CA

Conducted measurements and analysis of ground vibration across site due to heavy traffic on Third Street. Analysis included assessment of pavement surface condition and propensity of local soil structure.

EXHIBIT C



March 22, 2022

Mr. Kevin Carmichael Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo 520 Capitol Mall, Suite 350 Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Bronson Residential Tower Project (Case #: 2021-6887-EAF) P22008

Dear Mr. Carmichael:

Per your request, I reviewed the Categorical Exemption documentation (the "CE") for the Bronson Residential Tower Project (the "Project") in the City of Los Angeles (the "City"). My review is with respect to transportation and circulation considerations.

My qualifications to perform this review include registration as a Civil and Traffic Engineer in California, over 50 years professional consulting practice in these fields and both preparation and review of the traffic and transportation components of numerous environmental documents prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). My professional resume is attached hereto.

The Project Is Non-Conformant with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan

The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan requires right-of-way dedication and improvements of 9-feet along the Project's Bronson Avenue frontage and 4-feet along its Carlos Avenue frontage. The Project applicant is requesting waiver of these Plan-required dedications and improvements. The notion is that if the City were to approve these waivers to the Mobility Plan requirements, the Project would be in conformance with the Mobility Plan. However, this notion that the City could grant the Project major exceptions to the Mobility Plan requirements and still find the Project consistent with the Mobility Plan is completely incongruous. The City could waive the non-conformity of the Project with respect to the street right-of-way requirements of the Mobility Plan although, excepting the applicants obvious desire to maximize the footprint of the proposed development, no compelling reasons for doing so have been

presented. But it cannot do so while processing the environmental review of the Project as an Infill Section 15332 Categorical Exemption.

Conventional Traffic Delay/Level of Service Analysis Fails To Highlight Key Information

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation's *Transportation Assessment Guidelines* require certain conventional transportation analyses not necessarily required by CEQA that provide additional information to decision-makers related to the City's exercise of discretionary authority to make findings that may help correct for transportation deficiencies so that a project must enhance the built environment and that it not further degrade the surrounding neighborhood; that it not further degrade the public health, welfare, and safety; and that a project must substantially conform to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan. The CE documentation Appendix B includes such analyses that the City terms non-CEQA matters. However, the Appendix B narrative focuses on the minor intersections analyzed that are, at least theoretically, not delay and level-of-service ("LOS") challenged and fails to discuss the findings at the two (of only four) intersections analyzed that are seriously problematic in terms of delay and LOS.

What the computational results summarized in Appendix B, Tables 13 and 14 show is that the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard with Bronson Avenue deteriorates from an AM peak 32.0 seconds delay¹/LOS C and PM peak 57.8 seconds delay/LOS E in the existing condition without the Project to an AM peak 206.8 seconds delay/LOS F and PM peak 201.1 seconds delay/LOS F in the cumulative (2024) with Project condition. What this means is that, over a period of just 3 years, in the AM peak the intersection deteriorates from a very acceptable LOS C to a condition about 2.5 times worse than the threshold of unacceptable and dysfunctional LOS F. In the PM peak the deterioration is from a marginally functional LOS E to a condition about 2.5 times worse than the threshold of unacceptable and dysfunctional LOS F. The report contains no discussion about the seriousness of this deterioration, what plans the City might have to correct it or what other measures the City might consider to offset it. To be fair, the Project is responsible for only a small share of the deterioration. Most of it results from ambient traffic growth and related concurrent development projects. However, the severity of deteriorative change should at least pose the question of the appropriateness of further development intensification in this immediate area. We also note that the analysis of the intersection of Bronson Avenue with Franklin Avenue shows similar though less severe deterioration.

The Description of the Queueing Analysis Involves More Abject Failure to Alert Decision-makers to the Severity of Problems in the Project Area

¹ Average intersection delay per vehicle.

The Transportation Assessment did perform a queuing analysis. However, its narrative description of it is comprised of 4 sentences totaling 6 lines of text that describe the methodology and direct the reader to computation sheets in Subappendix E of Appendix B where the actual results are buried. There are no tabular summaries of the queuing analysis results. An interested party must consider each of 32 computation sheets. locate the line among each of 42 cryptically described lines on each sheet that describes the number of gueued vehicles at the 95th percentile queue level, identify the number of queued vehicles in each of up to 12 columns on each sheet representing each turning movement, multiply the number of gueued vehicles, multiply the number of gueued vehicles in each column by 25 feet and compare that gueue length to physical features on a scale aerial photo such as turn storage length, spacing to upstream intersections and major parking area access/egress points. As an example of the challenge for a decision-maker or a non-transportation professional among the public who wants to understand what the queue analysis shows, we reproduce one of the 32 computation sheets involved with the line indicating the number of queued vehicles in the 95'th percentile queue circled. If the preparers wanted to claim they had performed a queue analysis but wanted to obscure the results from decision-makers and the public, they couldn't have done a better job.

Here is an example of what the queuing analysis that was performed actually shows. In the existing condition in the PM peak hour, the 95th percentile left turn queue from Hollywood Boulevard westbound to Bronson Avenue Southbound is 9.2 vehicles or 230 feet. The left turn pocket servicing this movement is only about 185 feet including entry taper. This means the left turn queue occasionally obstructs one of the westbound through lanes on Hollywood Boulevard and, although it extends into the limits of the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard with the southbound 101 ramps, it should not interfere with movements to or from those ramps. So the existing condition is not the most desirable situation, but not a disaster.

Now we consider the 2024 cumulative condition with ambient traffic growth, the traffic from concurrent relevant projects and the subject Project itself. According to the computation sheets, the projected 95th percentile queue length on the westbound to southbound left is 28.7 vehicles or 717 feet. This means the queue completely overflows the left turn storage lane, blocking a westbound through lane on Hollywood Boulevard, extends through the intersection with the southbound 101 ramps, through the intersection with the northbound 101 ramps, through the intersection with the northbound 101 ramps, through the discipline or lack of discipline among drivers in respecting the CLEAR zones at the intersections it extends through, the queue may seriously interfere with operations at those intersections.

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary 4: Bronson Ave & Hollywood BI

	≯		7	1	+	*	1	Ť	r	5	÷.	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations	3	1.		3	4 %		5	î,			4	and an a state of the
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	141	1096	67	172	953	102	81	356	357	96	202	57
Future Volume (veh/h)	141	1096	67	172	953	102	81	356	357	96	202	57
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	C. C	1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	153	1191	73	187	1036	111	88	387	388	104	220	62
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	151	731	45	80	1356	145	321	400	401	60	111	23
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	490	1744	107	439	3238	347	1097	857	859	20	239	49
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	153	0	1264	187	568	579	88	0	775	386	0	(
Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln	490	0	1851	439	1777	1808	1097	0	1716	308	0	(
Q Serve(q s), s	13.1	0.0	37.7	0.0	24.6	24.6	0.0	0.0	39.5	2.5	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g c), s	37.7	0.0	37.7	37.7	24.6	24.6	9.8	0.0	39.5	42.0	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.19	1.00		0.50	0.27		0.16
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	151	0	775	80	744	757	321	0	801	195	0	(
V/C Ratio(X)	1.01	0.00	1.63	2.34	0.76	0.76	0.27	0.00	0.97	1.98	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c a), veh/h	151	0	775	80	744	757	321	0	801	195	0	(
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	41.9	0.0	26.2	45.0	22.3	22.4	15.4	0.0	23.3	22.7	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	76.3	0.0	289.4	638.9	7.3	7.2	2.1	0.0	24.9	460.7	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	00	0.0	0.0	00	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	10.8	0.0	120.6	28.7	16.7	17.0	2.3	0.0	27.7	48.0	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	118.3	0.0	315.6	683.9	29.6	29.6	17.5	0.0	48.2	483.4	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	А	F	F	С	С	В	А	D	F	А	ŀ
Approach Vol, veh/h	12100	1417			1334			863			386	
Approach Delay, s/veh		294.3			121.3			45.1			483.4	
Approach LOS		F			F			D			F	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8	1. A. A. A.			
Pho Duration (G+V+Po)		128		17.2		128		47.2		-		the second second
Change Deried (V+De) a		42.0		*52		51		*52		CAPESON S		
Max Green Setting (Greek)		37.7		* 12		37.7	and the states	* 12		the state	Substant a	
Max O Clear Time (a c+11) c		30.7		44.0		39.7		41.5				
Green Ext Time (p_c+1), s	1. 225	0.0		0.0	12011	0.0		0.3				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			201.1									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

FP PM 10:24 am 02/16/2021 GTC Synchro 11 Report Page 4

Queues of this extended nature constitute accident hazards for the general public and can delay emergency service response. Also, even though the Project itself

> TRAFFIC • TRANSPORTATION • MANAGEMENT 5311 Lowry Road, Union City, CA 94587 tel: 510.489.9477 fax: 510.489.9478

does not add more than 25 peak hour trips to the 101 off ramps, if the driving public does not respect the CLEAR zones at the off ramp intersections (as often happens when queues are excessive) queues on the off ramps may extend onto the freeway mainline, an extremely hazardous situation. These hazards and the potential interference with emergency service response are CEQA matters that have not been addressed in the CE documentation.

The Transportation analysis not only failed to coherently describe the queue and LOS conditions that create the disruptive and hazardous queues that have CEQA and non-CEQA consequences, it fails to describe any potential improvements that would reduce or eliminate the adverse effects of those significant consequences. Some, but not all of the potential remedies include, but are not limited to prohibiting left turns from Hollywood Boulevard to northbound and southbound N. Bronson Avenue, making the N. Bronson connections to Hollyood Boulevard right turn in and right turn out movements only and similar alterations at the intersection of N. Bronson with Franklin. The Public and the TA are deficient in failing to address these and similar measures (such as maintaining the Mobility Plan right-of-way dedication requirements in order to ultimately develop a multi-lane approach to the intersection of N. Bronson and Hollywood Boulevard that would mitigate these safety and operations impacts.

Conclusion

Given the above, the CE document is inadequate and inappropriate.

Sincerely,

Smith Engineering & Management A California Corporation

Smith



Daniel T. Smith Jr., P.E. President

SMITH ENGINEERING & MANAGEMENT

9

DANIEL T. SMITH, Jr. President

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Science, Engineering and Applied Science, Yale University, 1967 Master of Science, Transportation Planning, University of California, Berkeley, 1968

PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION

California No. 21913 (Civil) California No. 938 (Traffic) Nevada No. 7969 (Civil) Washington No. 29337 (Civil) Arizona No. 22131 (Civil)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Smith Engineering & Management, 1993 to present. President. DKS Associates, 1979 to 1993. Founder, Vice President, Principal Transportation Engineer. De Leuw, Cather & Company, 1968 to 1979. Senior Transportation Planner. Personal specialties and project experience include:

Litigation Consulting. Provides consultation, investigations and expert witness testimony in highway design, transit design and traffic engineering matters including condemnations involving transportation access issues; traffic accidents involving highway design or traffic engineering factors; land use and development matters involving access and transportation impacts; parking and other traffic and transportation matters.

Urban Corridor Studies/Alternatives Analysis. Principal-in-charge for State Route (SR) 102 Feasibility Study, a 35-mle freeway alignment study north of Sacramento. Consultant on I-280 Interstate Transfer Concept Program, San Francisco, an AA/EIS for completion of I-280, demolition of Embarcadero freeway, substitute light rail and commuter rail projects. Principal-in-charge, SR 238 corridor freeway/expressway design/environmental study, Hayward (Calif.) Project manager, Sacramento Northeast Area multi-modal transportation corridor study. Transportation planner for I-80N West Terminal Study, and Harbor Drive Traffic Study, Portland, Oregon. Project manager for design of suface segment of Woodward Corridor LRT, Detroit, Michigan. Directed staff on I-80 National Strategic Corridor Study (Sacramento-San Francisco), US 101-Sonoma freeway operations study, SR 92 freeway operations study, Tasman Corridor LRT AA/EIS, Fremont-Warm Springs BART extension plan/EIR, SRs 70/99 freeway ilternatives study, and Richmond Parkway (SR 93) design study.

Area Transportation Plans. Principal-in charge for transportation element of City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework, shaping nations largest city two decades into 21st century. Project manager for the transportation element of 300-acre Mission Bay development in downtown San Francisco. Mission Bay involves 7 million gsf office/commercial space, 8,500 dwelling units, and community facilities. Transportation features include relocation of commuter rail station; extension of MUNI-Metro LRT; a multi-modal terminal for LRT, commuter rail and local bus; removal of a quarter mile elevated freeway; replacement by new ramps and a bouleward; an internal roadway network overcoming constraints imposed by an internal tidal basin; freeway structures and rail facilities; and concept plans for 20,000 structured parking spaces. Principal-in-charge for circulation plan to accommodate 9 million gsf of office/commercial growth in downtown Bellevue (Wash). Principal-in-charge for 64 acre, 2 million gsf multi-use complex for FMC adjacent to San Jose International Airport. Project manager for transportation element of Sacramento Capitol Area Plan for the state governmental complex, and for Downtown Sacramento Redevelopment Plan. Project manager for Napa (Calif) General Plan Circulation Element and Downtown Riverfront Redevelopment Plan, on parking program for downtown Walnut Creek, on downtown transportation plan for San Mateo and redevelopment plan for downtown Mountain View (Calif), for traffic circulation and safety plans for California cities of Davis, Pleasant Hill and Hayward, and for Salem, Oregon.

TRAFFIC CLEANER OF LATER AND ANALYSIS FOR THE

5911 Juney Proof, Unios Cher, CA 94967 (11):5104899477 (11):5704899978

Transportation Centers. Project manager for Daly City Intermodal Study which developed a \$7 million surface bus terminal, traffic access, parking and pedestrian circulation improvements at the Daly City BART station plus development of functional plans for a new BART station at Colma. Project manager for design of multi-modal terminal (commuter rail, light rail, bus) at Mission Bay, San Francisco. In Santa Clarita Long Range Transit Development Program, responsible for plan to relocate system's existing timed-transfer hub and development of three satellite transfer hubs. Performed airport ground transportation system evaluations for San Francisco International, Oakland International, Sea-Tac International, Oakland International, Los Angeles International, and San Diego Lindberg.

Campus Transportation. Campus transportation planning assignments for UC Davis, UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz and UC San Francisco Medical Center campuses; San Francisco State University; University of San Francisco; and the University of Alaska and others. Also developed master plans for institutional campuses including medical centers, headquarters complexes and research & development facilities.

Special Event Facilities. Evaluations and design studies for football/baseball stadiums, indoor sports arenas, horse and motor racing facilities, theme parks, fairgrounds and convention centers, ski complexes and destination resorts throughout western United States.

Parking. Parking programs and facilities for large area plans and individual sites including downtowns, special event facilities, university and institutional campuses and other large site developments; numerous parking feasibility and operations studies for parking structures and surface facilities; also, resident preferential parking.
 Transportation System Management & Traffic Restraint. Project manager on FHWA program to develop techniques and guidelines for neighborhood street traffic limitation. Project manager for Berkeley, (Calif.), Neighborhood Traffic Study, pioneered application of traffic restraint techniques in the U.S. Developed residential traffic plans for Menlo Park, Santa Monica, Santa Cruz, Mill Valley, Oakland, Palo Alto, Piedmont, San Mateo County, Pasadena, Santa Ana and others. Participated in development of photo/radar speed enforcement device and experimented with speed humps. Co-author of Institute of Transportation Engineers reference publication on neighborhood traffic control.

Bicycle Facilities. Project manager to develop an FHWA manual for bicycle facility design and planning, on bikeway plans for Del Mar, (Calif.), the UC Davis and the City of Davis. Consultant to bikeway plans for Eugene, Oregon, Washington, D.C., Buffalo, New York, and Skokie, Illinois. Consultant to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for development of hydraulically efficient, bicycle safe drainage inlets. Consultant on FHWA research on effective retrofits of undercrossing and overcrossing structures for bicyclists, pedestrians, and handicapped.

MEMBERSHIPS

Institute of Transportation Engineers Transportation Research Board PUBLICATIONS AND AWARDS

Residential Street Design and Traffic Control, with W. Homburger et al. Prentice Hall, 1989.

Co-recipient, Progressive Architecture Citation, *Mission Bay Master Plan*, with I.M. Pei WRT Associated, 1984. *Residential Traffic Management, State of the Art Report*, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1979. *Improving The Residential Street Environment*, with Donald Appleyard et al., U.S. Department of Transportation,

1979. Stantonie Concentration Decidential Neighborhood d'Artifica Control Internetional Source cine on Traffic Control

Strategic Concepts in Residential Neighborhood Traffic Control, International Symposium on Traffic Control Systems, Berkeley, California, 1979.

Planning and Design of Bicycle Facilities: Pitfalls and New Directions, Transportation Research Board, Research Record 570, 1976.

Co-recipient, Progressive Architecture Award, *Livable Urban Streets, San Francisco Bay Area and London*, with Donald Appleyard, 1979.

Exhibit B Advisory Agency's Determination (Case No. VTT-83510-CN-HCA)

DEPARTMENT OF **CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE (213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN PRESIDENT

> CAROLINE CHOE VICE-PRESIDENT

HELEN CAMPBELL JENNA HORNSTOCK HELEN LEUNG YVETTE LOPEZ-LEDESMA KAREN MACK DANA M. PERLMAN RENEE DAKE WILSON





ERIC GARCETTI MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES 200 N. Spring Street, Room 525 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801 (213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP DIRECTOR

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN DEPUTY DIRECTO

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Decision Date: May 5, 2022

Appeal Period Ends: May 16, 2022

1717 Bronson LLC (A) 1550 N El Centro Ave #1701 Los Angeles, CA 90028

Lombardi AM, LLC and Lombardi JM, LLC (O) 1425 Cahuenga Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90028

Michael Gonzales (R) Gonzales Law Group, APC 800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 860 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83510-CN 1715 - 1739 North Bronson Avenue Hollywood Community Plan Related Case: CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA Zone: C4-1-SN; R4-2 D. M.: 148-5A191 C. D.: 13 – Mitch O'Farrell CEQA: ENV-2021-6887-CE Legal Description: FR Lot 6; Brokaw Tract

In accordance with provisions of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 17.03 and 17.15, the Advisory Agency approves Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83510-CN (map date-stamped October 28, 2021) located at 1715 - 1739 North Bronson Avenue, for the merger and subdivision of three (3) lots into one (1) master ground lot and five (5) commercial condominiums lots for a high-density residential project containing a maximum of 128 residential dwelling units in the Hollywood Community Plan. This unit density is based on the C4-1-SN and R4-2 Zones. (The subdivider is hereby advised that the LAMC may not permit his 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.) For an appointment with the Development Services Center call (213) 482-7077, (310) 231-2598 or (818) 374-5050. The Advisory Agency's consideration of the request is subject to the following conditions:

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 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

Any questions regarding these conditions should be directed to Quyen Phan of the Land Development Section, located at 201 North Figueroa Street, Suite 290, or by calling (213) 808-8604.

- 1. That a 9-foot wide strip of land be dedicated along Bronson Avenue adjoining the tract to complete a 39-foot wide half right-of-way in accordance with Modified Avenue III standards of LA Mobility Plan.
- 2. That a 4-foot wide strip of land be dedicated along Carlos Avenue adjoining the tract to complete a 30-foot wide half right-of-way in accordance with Local Street standards of LA Mobility Plan.
- 3. That a 20-foot radius property line return or a 15-foot by 15-foot corner cut be dedicated at the intersection of Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue.
- 4. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, GRADING DIVISION

Grading Division approvals are conducted at 221 North Figueroa Street, 12th Floor. The approval of this Tract Map shall not be construed as having been based upon geological investigation such as will authorize the issuance of building permits on the subject property. Such permits will be issued only at such time as the Department of Building and Safety has received such topographic maps and geological reports as it deems necessary to justify the issuance of such building permits.

- 5. The applicant shall comply with any requirements with the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division for recordation of the final map and issuance of any permit.
- 6. That Per Sec. 17.56 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, each approved Tract Map recorded with the County Recorder shall contain the following statement; "The approval of this Tract Map shall not be construed as having been based upon geological investigation such as will authorize the issuance of building permits on the subject property. Such permits will be issued only at such time as the Department of Building and Safety has received such topographic maps and geological reports as it deems necessary to justify the issuance of such building permits."

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, ZONING DIVISION

An appointment is required for the issuance of a clearance letter from the Department of Building and Safety. The applicant is asked to contact Eric Wong at (213) 482-6876 to schedule an appointment.

- 7. 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.
- 8. Obtain permits for the relocation of the existing Barn structure on the site. Provide copy of the relocation permit and signed inspection cards to show completion of the relocation work.
- 9. Required parking spaces are required to remain for the remaining structure on the site. Show location of all parking spaces and access driveways. Provide copies of permits and final inspection cards, for any new garages or carports.

- 10. Provide a copy of CPC case CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA. Show compliance with all the conditions/requirements of the CPC case as applicable.
- 11. The submitted plot plan is not complete. Provide a plot plan drawn to scale that accurately dimensions all: lot areas, building sizes and required yards on the site. Indicate the type of construction for all buildings on the site.
- 12. Show all street dedication(s) as required by Bureau of Engineering and provide net lot area after all dedication. "Area" requirements shall be re-checked as per net lot area after street dedication. Front and side yard requirements shall be required to comply with current code as measured from new property lines after dedication(s).
- 13. Show zone boundaries on the Map. No required yard or other open space around a building shall be located in a more restrictive zone than that of the property on which such building is located. Revise the Map to show compliance with the above requirement or obtain approval from the Department of City Planning.
- 14. The submitted Map does not comply with the side yard(s) (16 ft) and maximum density (400 square feet of lot area/dwelling unit) requirement of the R4-2 Zone. Revise the Map to show compliance with the above requirement(s) or obtain approval from the Department of City Planning.

Notes:

The submitted Map may not comply with the number of parking spaces required by Section 12.21 A.4(a) based on number of habitable rooms in each unit. If there are insufficient numbers of parking spaces, obtain approval from the Department of City Planning.

The submitted Map may not comply with the number of guest parking spaces required by the Advisory Agency.

The existing or 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.

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

If you have any questions or comments regarding this information please feel free to contact Park Fees Staff at, (213) 202-2682 or rap.parkfees@lacity.org, at your convenience.

15. That the Park Fee paid to the Department of Recreation and Parks be calculated as a Subdivision (Quimby in-lieu) fee.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

16. That the project be subject to any recommendations from the Department of Transportation.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

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 email <u>lafdhydrants@lacity.org</u>. You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

- 17. Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.
- 18. 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).
- 19. 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.
- 20. 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.
- 21. The entrance or exit of all ground dwelling units shall not be more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.
- 22. No building or 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.
- The Fire Department may require additional vehicular access where buildings exceed 28 feet in height.
 2014 CITY OF LOS ANGELES FIRE CODE, SECTION 503.1.4 (EXCEPTION)
 - 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.
 - This policy does not apply to single-family dwellings or to non-residential buildings.

- PAGE 5
- 24. 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 150ft horizontal travel distance from the edge of the public street, private street or Fire Lane. This stairwell shall extend onto the roof.
- 25. Entrance to the main lobby shall be located off the address side of the building.
- 26. Any required Fire Annunciator panel or Fire Control Room shall be located within a 20ft visual line of sight of the main entrance stairwell or to the satisfaction of the Fire Department.
- 27. 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.
- 28. The Fire Department may require additional roof access via parapet access roof ladders where buildings exceed 28 feet in height, and when overhead wires or other obstructions block aerial ladder access.
- 29. Emergency responder radio coverage in new buildings. 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.
- 30. 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.
- 31. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER

32. Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) for compliance with LADWP's Water System Rules and requirements. 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 Condition No. S-1(c).)

BUREAU OF STREET LIGHTING

33. If new street light(s) are required, then prior to the recordation of the final map or issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C of O), street lighting improvement plans shall be submitted for review and the owner shall provide a good faith effort via a ballot process for the formation or annexation of the property within the boundary of the development into a Street Lighting Maintenance Assessment District.

BUREAU OF SANITATION

34. Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Collection Systems Division for compliance with its sewer system review and requirements. 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).)

URBAN FORESTRY

Removal or planting of any tree in the public right-of-way requires approval of the Board of Public Works. Contact Urban Forestry Division at: (213) 847-3077 for permit information. CEQA document must address parkway tree removals.

- 35. Street Trees:
 - a. Project shall preserve all healthy mature street trees whenever possible. All feasible alternatives in project design should be considered and implemented to retain healthy mature street trees. A permit is required for the removal of any street tree and shall be replaced 2: 1 as approved by the Board of Public Works and Urban Forestry Division.
 - b. Plant street trees at all feasible planting locations within dedicated streets as directed and required by the Bureau of Street Services, Urban Forestry Division. All tree plantings shall be installed to current tree planting standards when the City has previously been paid for tree plantings. The sub divider or contractor shall notify the Urban Forestry Division at: (213) 847- 3077 upon completion of construction for tree planting direction and instructions.
 - Note: Removal of street trees requires approval from the Board of Public Works.
 - All projects must have environmental (CEQA) documents that appropriately address any removal and replacement of street trees. Contact Urban Forestry Division at: (213) 847-3077 for tree removal permit information.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY

36. To assure that cable television facilities will be installed in the same manner as other required improvements, please email <u>ita.cabletvclearance@lacity.org</u> 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 3 people in case the applicant/owner has any additional questions.

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING-SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

- 37. <u>Prior to the recordation of the final map</u>, 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. A Certificate of Occupancy (temporary or final) for the building(s) in Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83510-CN shall not be issued until after the final map has been recorded.
 - b. Limit the proposed development to a maximum of one (1) master ground lot and to subdivide the site int a maximum of five (5) commercial condominium units for a high-density urban residential project containing a maximum of 128 new residential dwelling units, including 11 units set aside for Very Low Income Households and retaining the four (4) existing dwelling units on-site.
 - c. Parking shall be provided in accordance with the LAMC and CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA.

- d. That a solar access report shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency prior to obtaining a grading permit.
- e. 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.
- f. Recycling bins shall be provided at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable material.
- 38. <u>Prior to the issuance of the building permit or the recordation of the final map</u>, a copy of the approval for Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency. In the event that Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA is not approved, the subdivider shall submit a tract modification.
- 39. <u>Prior to the clearance of any tract map conditions</u>, the applicant shall show proof that all fees have been paid to the Department of City Planning, Expedited Processing Section.
- 40. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigation Costs. Applicant shall do all of the following:
 - a. Defend 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 <u>but not limited to</u>, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify of 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.
 - b. 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 judgment or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.
 - c. 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 (b).
 - d. 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 (b).
 - e. If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interests, execute the indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

f. 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 that 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 include actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with <u>any</u> 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-STANDARD CONDOMINIUM CONDITIONS

CC-1. That a landscape plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect, be submitted to and approved by the Advisory Agency in accordance with CP-6730 prior to obtaining any permit. The landscape plan shall identify tree replacement on a 1:1 basis by a minimum of 24-inch box trees for the unavoidable loss of desirable trees on the site. 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.

In the event the subdivider decides not to request a permit before the recordation of the final map, the following statement shall appear on the plan and be recorded as a covenant and agreement satisfactory to the Advisory Agency guaranteeing that:

- a. The planting and irrigation system shall be completed by the developer/builder prior to the close of escrow of 50 percent of the units of the project or phase.
- b. Sixty days after landscape and irrigation installation, the landscape professional shall submit to the homeowners/property owners association a Certificate of Substantial Completion (Sec. 12.40 G LAMC.)
- c. The developer/builder shall maintain the landscaping and irrigation for 60 days after completion of the landscape and irrigation installation.
- d. The developer/builder shall guarantee all trees and irrigation for a period of six months and all other plants for a period of 60 days after landscape and irrigation

installation.

CC-2. In order to expedite the development, the applicant may apply for a building permit for a commercial/industrial building. However, prior to issuance of a building permit for a commercial/industrial building, the registered civil engineer, architect or licensed land surveyor shall certify in a letter to the Advisory Agency that all applicable tract conditions affecting the physical design of the building and/or site, have been included into the building plans. Such letter is sufficient to clear this condition. In addition, all of the applicable tract conditions shall be stated in full on the building plans and a copy of the plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Advisory Agency prior to submittal to the Department of Building and Safety for a building permit.

OR

If a building permit for a commercial/industrial building will not be requested, the project civil engineer, architect or licensed land surveyor must certify in a letter to the Advisory Agency that the applicant will not request a permit for a commercial/industrial building and intends to acquire a building permit for a condominium building(s). Such letter is sufficient to clear this condition.

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 unsubdivided property. The one-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 one-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.
- (I) That any necessary additional street dedications be provided to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 2010.
- 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 street, 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 <u>prior to recordation of the final</u> <u>map</u>.
- S-3. That the following improvements be either constructed <u>prior to recordation of the final map</u> 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) Construct new street light: one (1) on Carlos Avenue. If street widening per BOE improvement conditions, relocate and upgrade streetlight; one (1) on Bronson Avenue.
 - (d) Plant street trees and remove any existing trees within dedicated streets or proposed dedicated streets as required by the Urban Forestry Division of the Bureau of Street Services. Parkway tree removals shall be replanted at a 2: 1 ratio. All street tree plantings shall be brought up to current standards. When the City has previously been paid for tree plantings, the sub divider or contractor

shall notify the Urban Forestry Division at: (213) 847-3077 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 2010.
- (i) That the following improvements be either constructed prior to recordation of the final map or that the construction be suitably guaranteed:
 - a) Improve Bronson Avenue being dedicated and adjoining the subdivision by the construction of the following:
 - (1) A concrete curb, a concrete gutter, and a 9-foot concrete sidewalk with tree wells.
 - (2) Suitable surfacing to join the existing pavements and to complete a 30-foot wide half roadway.
 - (3) Any necessary removal and reconstruction of existing improvements.
 - (4) The necessary transitions to join the existing improvements.

Note: Street trees exist along Bronson Avenue and denial of their removal could impact the ability to widen Bronson Avenue roadway. Should the Board of Public Works deny the removal of street trees, then improve Bronson Avenue being dedicated with the following:

- (5) Removal and replacement of existing concrete curb, gutter at existing location and full-width concrete sidewalk up to the new property line including any necessary removal and reconstruction of the existing improvements satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- (6) Improve all newly dedicated property line return or corner cut with concrete sidewalk and the reconstruction of all existing curb ramp per the latest Bureau of Engineering Standard and Special Order 01-1020.
- b) Improve Carlos Avenue being dedicated and adjoining the subdivision with construction of a new concrete sidewalk and repair and/or replacement of concrete curb, gutter and roadway pavement including any necessary removal and reconstruction of the existing improvements satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- c) Improve the off-site curb ramp at northwesterly corner of Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue intersection per Bureau of Engineering Special Order No. 01-1020, satisfactory to the City Engineer

NOTES:

The Advisory Agency approval is the maximum number of units permitted under the tract action. However, the existing or proposed zoning may not permit this number of units.

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 which 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)

The City of Los Angeles determined based on the whole of the administrative record that the project is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332, and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies.

The proposed project and potential impacts were analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This document establishes guidelines and thresholds of significant impact and provide the data for determining whether or not the impacts of a proposed project reach or exceed those thresholds. Analysis of the proposed project determined that it is Categorically Exempt from environmental review pursuant to Article III, Section I, and Class 32 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Class 32 Exemption is intended to promote infill development within urbanized areas.

FINDINGS OF FACT (SUBDIVISION MAP ACT)

In connection with the approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83510-CN 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 <u>MAP</u> WILL BE/IS CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

The subject property is comprised of three (3) lots resulting in approximately 38,826 square feet of lot area with a 248-foot frontage along Bronson Avenue and a 148-foot frontage along Carlos Avenue. The subject property is zoned C4-1-SN and R4-2 within

the Hollywood Community Plan Area with a Highway Oriented Commercial and High Density Residential land use designation.

The Vesting Tentative Tract Map describes and illustrates a land use consistent with the proposed General Plan Land Use Designation of Highway Oriented Commercial and High Density Residential and C4-1-SN and R4-2 zoning of the site. The proposed use is permitted in the designated zones. The proposed project is the construction of a 24-story, residential high rise with a maximum height of 275 feet and the maintenance of an existing residential structure with four (4) dwelling units on-site. The high-rise would contain 128 new residential dwelling units, including 11 percent of the total number of dwelling units as affordable housing for Very Low Income Households. The applicant has requested the following under Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA: 1) 35% Density Bonus for a Housing Development with a total of 128 units [with 12 units - 11% of the base density set aside for Very Low Income Households] in lieu of the base density of 98 units; with one (1) On-Menu Incentive to permit averaging of floor area, density, open space, and parking throughout the project site, an Off-Menu Incentive to permit a maximum floor area of 234,745 square feet for a corresponding floor area ratio of approximately 6.74:1 averaged across the project site in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 FAR in the C4-1-SN zone; and 6:1 FAR in the R4-2 zone, an Off-Menu waiver or modification of a development standard to permit a the elimination of required side yards along Bronson Avenue and the property's interior lot line in lieu of the otherwise required 16 foot side yards at both locations pursuant to LAMC Section 12.16.C.2 and 12.11. C.2; and an Off-Menu waiver or modification of a development standard to permit reduced building separation of 13 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 54 feet. 2) Site Plan Review for a development project that creates or results in an increase of 50 or more dwelling units or guest rooms. 3) a Waiver of Dedication and Improvements to the Public Right of Way pertaining to an otherwise required dedications along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue.

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 Vesting Tentative Tract Map was prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer and contains the required components, dimensions, areas, notes, legal description, ownership, applicant, and site address information as required by the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC"). The Vesting Tentative Tract Map is for the merger and subdivision of three (3) lots into one (1) lot with five (5) commercial condominiums.

The Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) implements the goals, objectives, and policies of the Community Plan through adopted zoning regulations. The Zoning Code regulates, but is not limited to, the maximum permitted density, height, and the subdivision of land. The Hollywood Community Plan does not address subdivision explicitly, however, the plan does provide for land designations with the corresponding zone and the encouragement of higher density residential uses near major public transportation centers and encourage multiple family residential and mixed-use development in commercial zones.

The proposed development with residential units is contingent upon approval of Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA.

Therefore, the Vesting Tentative Tract Map for the merger and subdivision of land to create a residential development with 128 new residential units is allowable under the zone and the land use designation and will be consistent with the General and Community Plans and the request is consistent with Article 7 (Division of Land Regulations) of the Los

Angeles Municipal Code. The project site is not governed by a specific plan that regulates residential uses.

(b) THE <u>DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT</u> OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION ARE CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

Pursuant to Section 66418 of the Subdivision Map Act, "design" of a map refers to street alignments, grades and widths; drainage and sanitary facilities and utilities, including alignments and grades thereof; location and size of all required easements and rights-of-way; fire roads and firebreaks; lot size and configuration; traffic access; grading; land to be dedicated for park or recreational purposes; and other such 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. In addition, 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." Section 17.05-C of the LAMC enumerates design standards for Subdivisions and requires that each subdivision map be designed in conformance with the Street Design Standards and in conformance to the General Plan.

Section 17.05-C, third paragraph, 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"). The requested map meets the required components of a Vesting Tentative Tract Map. The project is located within an Outside Flood Zone, and Special Grading Area. The project is not located within a Liquefaction area and Landslide area.

The design and layout of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map are consistent with the design standards established by the Subdivision Map Act and Division of Land Regulations of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Several public agencies (including Department of Building and Safety, the Fire Department, and the Department of Water and Power) have reviewed the map and found the subdivision design satisfactory. These agencies have imposed improvement requirements and/or conditions of approval. Therefore, as conditioned, the design and improvements of the proposed subdivision are consistent with the applicable General and Specific Plans.

(c) THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED <u>TYPE</u> OF DEVELOPMENT.

The subject property is comprised of three (3) lots resulting in approximately 38,826 square feet of lot area with a 248-foot frontage along Bronson Avenue and a 148-foot frontage along Carlos Avenue. The subject property is zoned C4-1-SN and R4-2 within the Hollywood Community Plan Area with a Highway Oriented Commercial and High Density Residential land use designation.

The development of the proposed project is consistent with existing development and urban character of the surrounding community. Surrounding uses are within multiple residential and commercial zones and are generally developed with a combination of commercial and residential multi-family structures.

Surrounding properties are developed with a mix of residential, commercial retail/restaurant, commercial office, and public facilities uses. To the west, abutting the

project site, land uses include the Los Angeles County Superior Courthouse. The project site is bordered to the north by multi-family housing. To the east, across Bronson Avenue, uses include multi-family residential, commercial and the Hollywood 101 Freeway. To the south of the project site, land uses include various commercial uses, including a fast-food restaurant, a gas station, a two-story self-storage facility, and a liquor store.

Removal of trees on-site and street trees through the development of the proposed project will be replaced as per the requirements of the Bureau of Street Services, Urban Forestry Division. The proposed development is an allowable use under the proposed C4-1-SN and R4-2 Zones and the building will be consistent with the regulations of the underlying zone with regard to floor area and height. The proposed residential development with 128 new dwelling units is contingent upon approval of Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA. In addition, the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, however it is located within an Outside Flood Zone. The Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division, will require that the project satisfy the requirement of the City's Grading Regulations as enumerated in Section 91.3000 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Therefore, material evidence supports that the 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 geographic locations where planned and anticipated densities are permitted through its Community Plans and Specific Plans. Zoning relating to the sites throughout the city, are allocated based on the type of land use, physical suitability and future population growth expected to occur. The subject property is zoned CR-1 and C2-1 within the Hollywood Community Plan Area with a Highway Oriented Commercial and High Density Residential land use designation. The proposed residential development is contingent upon approval of Case No. Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA. As such, the construction of the proposed uses on the project site would be consistent with the land use designation of the site and the applicable zoning of the site.

Surrounding properties are developed with a mix of residential, commercial retail/restaurant, commercial office, and public facilities uses. To the west, abutting the project site, land uses include the Los Angeles County Superior Courthouse. The project site is bordered to the north by multi-family housing. To the east, across Bronson Avenue, uses include multi-family residential, commercial and the Hollywood 101 Freeway. To the south of the project site, land uses include various commercial uses, including a fast-food restaurant, a gas station, a two-story self-storage facility, and a liquor store. Therefore, the proposed construction, use, and maintenance of a residential development would be a compatible use in the surrounding area.

Based on the density calculation and land uses in the vicinity, this subdivision involves a density consistent with the General Plan and Zoning affecting the site, as approved by Case No. Case No. CPC-2021-6886-DB-SPR-WDI-HCA. There are no known physical impediments or hazards that would be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the same zone or vicinity in which the property is located as a result of the project's proposed density. Therefore, the 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 site, as well as the surrounding area, is developed with structures and no identified fish, wildlife, or established habitat is located on-site. As such, the proposed design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements are not anticipated to cause any substantial damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

The subject site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles and therefore, the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or avoidably injury to fish or 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 Los Angeles Municipal Code (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).

The project is not located on a hazardous materials site and/or on a site having unsuitable soil conditions, however the project is located outside a flood zone. The project would not place any occupants or residents near a hazardous materials site or involve the use or transport of hazardous materials or substances.

The area surrounding the property is fully developed with similar uses indicating that sewers and other services are available. Additionally, the project has been determined to be categorically exempt from CEQA which indicates that no adverse impacts to the public health or safety would occur as a result of the design and 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 contains legally recorded lots identified by the Assessor Parcel Map No. 5545003029, 5545003014, and 5545003023. The site is surrounded by private properties that adjoin improved public streets and sidewalks designed and improved to the specific requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code for providing public access throughout the area. The project site does not adjoin or provide access to a public resource, natural habitat, public park, or any officially recognized public recreation area. Needed public access for roads and utilities will be acquired by the City prior to the recordation of the proposed tract map.

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 the 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 applicant has prepared and submitted materials which consider the local climate, contours, configuration of the parcels 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 lot layout of the subdivision has taken into consideration the maximizing of the north/south orientation.

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. 83510-CN.

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP Advisory Agency

Kevin Golden

Kevin Golden Deputy Advisory Agency

The above action shall become effective upon the decision date noted at the top of this letter unless an appeal has been submitted to the Los Angeles City Planning Commission within 10 calendar days of the decision date. If you wish to appeal, a Master Appeal Form No. CP-7769, <u>must</u> be submitted, accepted as complete, and appeal fees paid by 4:30 PM on May 16, 2022* at one of the Department's Development Services Centers, located at:

Downtown Figueroa Plaza 201 North Figueroa Street, 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 482-7077 San Fernando Valley Marvin Braude San Fernando Valley Constituent Service Center 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 251 Van Nuys, CA 91401 (818) 374-5050 West Los Angeles West Los Angeles Development Services Center 1828 Sawtelle Boulevard, 2nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025 (310) 231-2598

*Please note the cashiers at the public counters close at 3:30 PM.

Forms are also available on-line at http://cityplanning.lacity.org/

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 Public Counter staff at (213) 482-7077, (818) 374-5050, or (310) 231-2598.

No sale of separate parcels is permitted prior to recordation of the final parcel map. The owner is advised that the above action must record within 36 months of the date of approval, unless an extension of time has been requested in person before 4:30 p.m.

No requests for time extensions or appeals received by mail shall be accepted.

COVID-19 UPDATE Interim Appeal Filing Procedures



Fall 2020

Consistent with Mayor Eric Garcetti's "Safer At Home" directives to help slow the spread of COVID-19, City Planning has implemented new procedures for the filing of appeals for non-applicants that eliminate or minimize in-person interaction.

OPTION 1: Online Appeal Portal

(planning.lacity.org/development-services/appeal-application-online)

Entitlement and CEQA appeals can be submitted online and payment can be made by credit card or e-check. The online appeal portal allows appellants to fill out and submit the appeal application directly to the Development Services Center (DSC). Once the appeal is accepted, the portal allows for appellants to submit a credit card payment, enabling the appeal and payment to be submitted entirely electronically. A 2.7% credit card processing service fee will be charged - there is no charge for paying online by e-check. **Appeals should be filed early to ensure DSC staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow Appellants time to submit payment**. On the final day to file an appeal, the application must be submitted and paid for by 4:30PM (PT). Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30PM (PT) on the next succeeding working day. Building and Safety appeals (LAMC Section 12.26K) can only be filed using Option 2 below.

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.

Metro DSC

(213) 482-7077 201 N. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Van Nuys DSC (818) 374-5050 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard Van Nuys, CA 91401

West Los Angeles DSC

(310) 231-2901 1828 Sawtelle Boulevard West Los Angeles, CA 90025

City Planning staff will follow up with the Appellant via email and/and or phone to:

- Confirm that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions
- Provide a receipt for payment

Exhibit C Vesting Tentative Tract Map

Note Note Note <th> SURVEYOR'S NOTES: GROSS SITE AREA: 51.368.149.50, FT. OR 0.8046-ACRES NET SITE AREA: 57.661.29.50, FT. OR 0.8046-ACRES NET SITE AREA: 57.661.29.50, FT. OR 0.8046-ACRES NET SITE AREA: 51.268.149.50, OUL 23.50, FT. OR 0.8265-ACRES PROTECTE DIEES: NOVE THES TO BE REMOVED: FOUR SITE ADDESSES: 1715, 1719, 1721, 1721, 1733, 1735, 1737, AND 1739 NO. BRONSON AVENUE STRET ADDESSES: 1715, 1719, 1721, 1721, 1723, 1735, 1737, AND 1739 NO. BRONSON AVENUE OBSTRET MAP NO.: HIR-5-ANPI THES PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE HILLSDE AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. PROPOSED SEWAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SANTARY SEVERIN DERONSON ANENUE PROPOSED SEWAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SANTARY SEVERIN DERONAN ANENUE DEDICATION & BRONSON ANENUE, LICCAL STREET - 607 (REQ.) 91 STREET DEDICATION CRUDS APPROVED UARE 23, 2016. CITY PLANCASE NO, CPC-2013- ONI-GRA-SPCA-MSC. PROPOSED SEWAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SANTARY SERVERTY STADUARDS AND ARE SUBJECT DEDICATION SHOWN HEREIN ARE DASED ON INVIGATE LA STREET 7 AND REAL DEDICATION AND 15 RADUES AND EXIST. DEDICATION SHOWN HEREIN ARD ENARCHENT OF TRANSPORTATION. 'SEE CITY OF LOS ANGLES MOBILI'Y PLAN 2035. APPROVED UARE 23, 2016. CITY PLANCASE NO, CPC-2013- ONIO-GRA-SPCA-MSC. SASESSOR'S PARCEL NUBBER', 5545-003- ONI , 023 AND 02</th> <th> Decomposition of the service of the servic</th> <th> LEGAL DESCRIPTION: PARCEL 1: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 5 AND 6 OF THE BROKAW TRACT. IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 1. PAGE 39 OF MAPS, IN THE CORDEO OF THE CONNER RECORDER OF SAD COUNTY. ACQUIRED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY PARCEL 63/932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDENNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR COURTE OS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY PARCEL 63/932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDENNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR CONCEPTION, BY PARCEL 63/932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDENNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR CORDER DAPIL 22, 1975 IN BOOK D6/27, PAGE 124 OFFICIAL RECORDS. BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH 100,00 FEET OF THE EAST 139.50 FEET OF SAID LOT 6: THENCE ALONG THE FLAST LUNE OF LAST SUD LOT NORTH 00' 15' 08' WEST 44, 94 FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCARE SOUTHWESTERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 15.00 FEET 10 A REVERSE CURVE CONCARE NORTHERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 126.00 FEET;. THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 82' 38' 05' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 71.03 FEET;. THENCE TANGENT NORTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 37' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 70.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTH AND AND SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTH A</th>	 SURVEYOR'S NOTES: GROSS SITE AREA: 51.368.149.50, FT. OR 0.8046-ACRES NET SITE AREA: 57.661.29.50, FT. OR 0.8046-ACRES NET SITE AREA: 57.661.29.50, FT. OR 0.8046-ACRES NET SITE AREA: 51.268.149.50, OUL 23.50, FT. OR 0.8265-ACRES PROTECTE DIEES: NOVE THES TO BE REMOVED: FOUR SITE ADDESSES: 1715, 1719, 1721, 1721, 1733, 1735, 1737, AND 1739 NO. BRONSON AVENUE STRET ADDESSES: 1715, 1719, 1721, 1721, 1723, 1735, 1737, AND 1739 NO. BRONSON AVENUE OBSTRET MAP NO.: HIR-5-ANPI THES PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE HILLSDE AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN THE LIQUEFACTION (AREA. PROPOSED SEWAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SANTARY SEVERIN DERONSON ANENUE PROPOSED SEWAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SANTARY SEVERIN DERONAN ANENUE DEDICATION & BRONSON ANENUE, LICCAL STREET - 607 (REQ.) 91 STREET DEDICATION CRUDS APPROVED UARE 23, 2016. CITY PLANCASE NO, CPC-2013- ONI-GRA-SPCA-MSC. PROPOSED SEWAGE DISPOSAL: EXISTING SANTARY SERVERTY STADUARDS AND ARE SUBJECT DEDICATION SHOWN HEREIN ARE DASED ON INVIGATE LA STREET 7 AND REAL DEDICATION AND 15 RADUES AND EXIST. DEDICATION SHOWN HEREIN ARD ENARCHENT OF TRANSPORTATION. 'SEE CITY OF LOS ANGLES MOBILI'Y PLAN 2035. APPROVED UARE 23, 2016. CITY PLANCASE NO, CPC-2013- ONIO-GRA-SPCA-MSC. SASESSOR'S PARCEL NUBBER', 5545-003- ONI , 023 AND 02	 Decomposition of the service of the servic	 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: PARCEL 1: THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 5 AND 6 OF THE BROKAW TRACT. IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 1. PAGE 39 OF MAPS, IN THE CORDEO OF THE CONNER RECORDER OF SAD COUNTY. ACQUIRED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY PARCEL 63/932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDENNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR COURTE OS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY PARCEL 63/932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDENNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR CONCEPTION, BY PARCEL 63/932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDENNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR CORDER DAPIL 22, 1975 IN BOOK D6/27, PAGE 124 OFFICIAL RECORDS. BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH 100,00 FEET OF THE EAST 139.50 FEET OF SAID LOT 6: THENCE ALONG THE FLAST LUNE OF LAST SUD LOT NORTH 00' 15' 08' WEST 44, 94 FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCARE SOUTHWESTERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 15.00 FEET 10 A REVERSE CURVE CONCARE NORTHERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 126.00 FEET;. THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 82' 38' 05' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 71.03 FEET;. THENCE TANGENT NORTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 37' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 70.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTH AND AND SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31' 11' 32' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTH A
PARKING	2 STORY LA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT NORTH RELOCATED TO BE NU TO BE NU Hogy B	PARKING	N 89°58'H8' W 578 P-0.°H7'H1' R=524.61' L=7.28' N 89°58'H8' W 578 N 89°58'H8' W 578 N 89°58'H8' 578 N 80°58'H8' 578 N

HOLLYWOOD

BOULEVARD







Exhibit D Categorical Exemption No. ENV-2021-6887-CE and Appendices



Categorical Exemption

CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING CITY HALL 200 NORTH SPRING STREET LOS ANGELES CA 90012

Bronson Residential Tower Project

Case Number: ENV-2021-6887-CE

Project Location: 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90028

Community Plan Area: Hollywood

Council District: 13 – Mitch O'Farrell

Project Description: The Project includes the construction use and maintenance of a 229.015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, three levels of above-ground parking, and one subterranean parking level. Of the 128 dwelling units, 11 units would be set aside for Very Low Income Households. The Lombardi Structures would remain in place and would not be altered by the Project. The proposed building would be 24 stories, reaching a maximum height of 275 feet. The Project would include 17,778 square feet of open space. The Project would provide 134 vehicle parking spaces. Also, the Project would include 89 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 9 short-term bicycle parking spaces. The 22 non-protected trees on the Project Site would be removed and replaced in accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. The Project would require the export of approximately 10,000 cubic yards of soil to be disposed of at a regional dump location. To allow for the development of the Project, the Project Applicant is seeking the following approvals: 1) A 35 percent ministerial density bonus pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(c)(1) to permit a maximum residential density of 133 dwelling units (4 existing dwelling units and 128 new dwelling units) with 11 dwelling units (11 percent of the base density) reserved for Very Low Income Households; 2) A Site Plan Review pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05 a development project resulting in an increase of 50 or more dwelling units; 3) An On-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(8) to allow an averaging of floor area, density, open space, and parking over the Project Site; 4) An Off-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(3) to allow a maximum floor area of 234,745 square feet or a corresponding floor area ratio of 6.74:1 averaged across the site in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 in the C4-1-SN zoned portion of the Project Site and 6:1 in the R4-2 zoned portion of the site; 5) A Waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) to reduce the side yard along Bronson Avenue and eliminate the side yard along the west side of the property in lieu of the otherwise required 16-foot side yards at both locations; 6) A Waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) to allow reduced building separation of 13 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 54 feet per LAMC Section 12.21 C.2; 7) A maximum required parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A); 8) A Vesting Tentative Tract Map for merger and condominium purposes pursuant to LAMC Section 17.06 A; and 9) A Waiver of dedications and improvements (WDIs) pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I to waive a nine-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the property's entire eastern lot line (along Bronson Avenue) and a four-foot dedication and improvement requirement along Carlos Avenue.

PREPARED FOR: The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning PREPARED BY: CAJA Environmental Services 9410 Topanga Cnyn Blvd Chatsworth, CA 91311 PROJECT APPLICANT: 1717 Bronson, LLC 1717 Bronson Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90028

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION

BRONSON RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT

FEBRUARY 2022

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Existing Conditions

The 0.86-acre Project Site is located at 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue at the southwest corner of Carlos Avenue and Bronson Avenue in the Hollywood Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles (City). The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) for the Project Site are 5545-003-014, 5545-003-023, and 5545-003-029. The Project Site is bordered on the north by Carlos Avenue, on the south by a restaurant, on the west by a Los Angeles County Superior Court building and associated parking, and to the east by Bronson Avenue. Land uses in the greater Project Site area include US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the north; Hollywood Boulevard and commercial uses to the south; commercial uses to the west; and the US 101 Freeway and commercial uses to the east. The northern portion of the Project Site is currently vacant but was previously developed with four residential units. The northern portion is used as surface parking. The southern portion of the Project Site is developed with a two-story residential building and a barn (Lombardi Structures). There are 22 trees on the Project Site and 8 street trees located in the public right-of-way (ROW) along Bronson Street, listed as follows:¹

On-site Trees

- 4 brush cherry (*Syzygium australe*)
- 7 ficus (*Ficus microcarpa*)
- 1 Canary Island date palm (*Phoenix canariensis*)
- 1 olive (Olea europaea)
- 1 camphor (Cinnamomum camphora)
- 3 Mexican fam palm (*Washingtonia robusta*)
- 1 carob (*Cerotonia siliqua*)
- 1 Japanese persimmon (Diospyros kaki)
- 2 mock orange (*Pittosporum undulatum*)
- 1 Australian blackwood (Acacia melanoxylon)

¹ Tree Inventory and Map, Jan C. Scow, December 5, 2020. Refer to Appendix A.

Street Trees

- 4 magnolia (*Magnolia grandiflora*)
- 3 queen palm (Syagrus romanzoffiana)
- 1 ficus (*Ficus rubiginosa*)

None of these trees is a protected tree as defined by the City.²

Regional access to the Project Site is provided by the US 101 Freeway located just to the east of the Project Site. The Project Site is zoned R4-2 (Multiple Dwelling Zone, Height District 2) and C4-1-SN (Commercial Zone, Height District 1, Sign District), with General Plan land use designations of High Density Residential and Highway Oriented Commercial. The Project Site is also located within the boundaries of the following:

- ZI-2452 Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles
- ZI-2374 State Enterprise Zone: Los Angeles
- ZI-2488 Redevelopment Project Area: Hollywood
- ZI-2330 Sign District: Hollywood Signage (CRA Area)
- ZI-2331 Sign District: Hollywood Signage (Media District)
- ZI-2433 Revised Hollywood Community Plan Injunction
- ZI-2427 Freeway Adjacent Advisory Notice for Sensitive Uses
- ZI-2492 Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area Individual Historic Resources
- ZI-2424 Mitigation Measures for Certain Residential Densities Near Freeway

Project Characteristics

The Project includes the development of the Project Site with an approximately 229,015-squarefoot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, three levels of above-ground parking, and one subterranean parking level. Of the 128 dwelling units, 11 units would be set aside for Very Low Income Households. The Lombardi Structures would remain in place and would not be altered by the Project. A breakdown of the types of dwelling units is shown on Table 1. The proposed building would be 24 stories, reaching a maximum height of 275 feet.

² Protected trees and shrubs as defined by the City include oak trees (Quercus spp.) and Southern California black walnut trees (Juglans californica), western sycamore trees (Platanus racemosa), California bay trees (Umbellularia californica), Mexican elderberry shrubs (Sambucus Mexicana), and toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia).

Dweiling Unit Breakdown						
Units Size	Number of Units					
1-bedroom	38					
2-bedroom	37					
5-bedroom	53					
Total	128					
Source: Steinberg Hart, May 11, 2021.						

Table 1

Open Space

As shown on Table 2, based on open space requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), the Project would be required to include a minimum of 17,700 square feet of open space. As shown on Table 3, the Project would provide 17,778 square feet of open space.

LAMC Open Space Requirements Summary						
Number of Unit Type	Open Space Requireme	nt	Size			
38 1-bedrooom Units	100 sf/du		3,800 sf			
37 2-bedroom Units	125 sf/du		4,625 sf			
5-bedroom Units	175 sf/du		9,275 sf			
		Total	17,700 sf			
LAMC = Los Angeles Municipal Code du = dwelling unit sf = square feet Source: Steinberg Hart, May 11, 2021.						

Table 2

Project Open Space						
Open Space	Size					
Common Open Space	9,603 sf					
Recreation Room	4,425 sf					
Private Open Space	3,750 sf					
Total	17,778					
sf = square feet						
Source: Steinberg Hart, May 11, 2021.						

Table 3

Vehicle Parking

As discussed in more detail later the subheading "Requested Approvals," the Applicant is requesting a Density Bonus approval for the proposed Project. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A), because the Project Site is located within 0.5 miles of a major transit stop (i.e., at the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard and Bronson Avenue), the Project is allowed a vehicle parking reduction: 0.5 vehicle parking spaces per unit. Thus, the Project would be required to provide a minimum of 64 vehicle parking spaces. The Project would provide 134 vehicle parking spaces.
Bicycle Parking

As shown on Table 4, the Project would be required to provide and would provide 89 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 9 short-term bicycle parking spaces for the residential portion of the Project Site.

Bicycle Parking Required and Provided			
Units	Number of Units	LAMC Section 12.21 A.16(a)(1)(i) Requirement	Number of Spaces
Long-Term Spac	es Required		
Units 1-25	25	1.0 space/unit	25
Units 26-100	75	1.0 space/1.5 units	50
Units 101-200	28	1.0 space/2.0 units	14
	То	tal Required Long Term	89
Short-Term Space	es Required		
Units 1-25	25	1.0 space/10 units	3
Units 26-100	75	1.0 space/15 units	5
Units 101-200	28	1.0 space/20 units	1
Total Required Short Term		9	
			LT: 89
Bicycle Spaces Provided ST: 9			
LAMC = Los Angeles Municipal Code LT = long term ST = short term			
Source: Steinberg H	lart, May 11, 2021.		

Tree Removal and Replacement

There are 22 non-protected trees on the Project Site and eight (8) street trees located adjacent to the Project Site. Five (5) of the on-site trees would be removed and replaced in accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. The remaining 17 on-site trees would be protected in place. None of the street trees would be removed.

Construction Schedule

The Project's estimated construction schedule is shown on Table 5. Project construction is anticipated to begin in December 2022, ending in December 2024. The estimated amount of export is 10,000 cubic yards.

Estimated Project Construction Schedule		
Phase	Start Date	Finish Date
Grading	12/1/2022	1/1/2023
Site Prep (Trenching)	1/1/2023	2/1/2023
Building Construction	2/1/2023	2/1/2024
Finishing (Architectural Coating)	2/1/2024	12/1/2024
Note: The schedule assumes 5-day work weeks.		
Courses DM Doublement 2021		
Source: DIVI Development 2021.		

Table 5 Estimated Project Construction Schedule

Requested Approvals

To allow for development of the Project, the Project Applicant is seeking the following approvals from the City:

- A 35 percent ministerial density bonus pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(c)(1) to permit a maximum residential density of 133 dwelling units (4 existing dwelling units and 128 new dwelling units) with 11 dwelling units (11 percent of the base density) reserved for Very Low Income Households;
- 2. Site Plan Review pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05;
- 3. On-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(8) to allow an averaging of floor area, density, open space, and parking over the Project Site;
- 4. Off-menu incentive pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(3) to allow a maximum floor area of 234,745 square feet or a corresponding floor area ration of 6.74:1 averaged across the site in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 in the C4-1-SN zoned portion of the Project Site and 6:1 in the R4-2 zoned portion of the site;
- Waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) to reduce the side yard along Bronson Avenue and eliminate the side yard along the west side of the property in lieu of the otherwise required 16-foot side yards at both locations;
- Waiver of development standard pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) to allow reduced building separation of 13 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 54 feet per LAMC Section 12.21 C.2;
- 7. A maximum required parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A);
- 8. Vesting Tentative Tract Map for merger and condominium purposes pursuant to LAMC Section 17.06 A; and
- 9. Waiver of dedications and improvements (WDIs) pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I to waive a nine-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the property's entire

eastern lot line (along Bronson Avenue) and a four-foot dedication and improvement requirement along Carlos Avenue.

Additionally, Pursuant to various sections of the City's Code, the Applicant will request approvals and permits from various City Department (and other municipal agencies) for Project construction actions including, but not limited to: demolition, excavation, shoring, grading, foundation, and building and tenant improvements.

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION

Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3 (Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA]), Article 19 (Categorical Exemptions), Section 15300 (Categorical Exemptions) includes a list of classes of projects that have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and which shall, therefore, be exempt from the provisions of CEQA.

For the reasons discussed in detail later in this document, the Project is categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental documents under Class 32 in Section 15332, Article 19, Chapter 3, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Class 32 is intended to promote infill development within urbanized areas. The class consists of environmentally benign in-fill projects that are consistent with local general plan and zoning requirements. Class 32 is not intended to be applied to projects that would result in any significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality effects. Application of this exemption, as all categorical exemptions, is limited by certain exceptions identified in section 15300.2.

15332. In-Fill Development Projects.

Class 32 consists of projects characterized as in-fill development meeting the conditions described in this section.

- (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
- (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
- (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
- (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

Note: Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21084, Public Resources Code.

15300.2. Exceptions

(a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where

designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

- (b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.
- (c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.
- (d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.
- (e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
- (f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Discussion of Section 15332(a)

The Project would be consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.

General Plan

As demonstrated below, the Project is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan and the Hollywood Community Plan. The Project is not subject to any Specific Plan.

The Project advances the following objectives from the General Plan's Framework Element:

- <u>Objective 3.2.</u>: Provide for the spatial distribution of development that promotes an improved quality of life by facilitating a reduction of vehicular trips, vehicle miles traveled, and air pollution. The Project is located near a high-intensity commercial corridor well served by mass transit. The plethora of transit options and the vicinity to local goods and services will encourage residents of the Project to utilize public transportation.
- <u>Objective 3.4</u>: Encourage new multi-family residential, retail commercial, and office development in the City's neighborhood districts, community, regional, and downtown

centers as well as along primary transit corridors/boulevards, while at the same time conserving existing neighborhoods and related districts. The Project advances this objective by locating new market-rate units and affordable housing units near a high-intensity commercial corridor located approximately 0.5 miles away from the Hollywood and Vine Metro B Line station. Furthermore, the Project helps to conserve the Lombardi Structures by building entirely on the vacant portion of the Project Site.

The Project advances the following objectives from the General Plan's Housing Element:

- <u>Objective 1.1.2</u>: *Expand affordable rental housing for all income groups that need assistance*. The Project will expand affordable rental housing by providing the 12 Very Low Income units in a City with a critical shortage of affordable housing. More importantly, the Project results in the net addition of 12 55-year covenanted affordable units to the City's housing stock.
- <u>Objective 2.5.2</u>: Foster the development of new affordable housing units citywide and within each Community Plan area. The Project advances this objective by incorporating 12 Very Low Income units in a City with a critical need for such units. Moreover, the Project is a net addition to the City's covenanted affordable housing stock. Also, the existing for-rent units located within the Lombardi Structures will not be demolished.

The Project advances the following Community Plan objectives:

- Objective 1: To coordinate the development of Hollywood with that of other parts of the City of Los Angeles and the metropolitan area. To further the development of Hollywood as a major center of population, employment, retail services, and entertainment; The Project will further development of Hollywood as a major center of population by providing 128 brand new dwelling units including 12 Very Low Income units near a commercial corridor and 2.5 miles of a major transit stop (Metro B Line Station at Hollywood and Vine). The Project will also provide housing in a growing job center, allowing residents to live near where they work. As mentioned, the Project is also located in a transit rich area, allowing residents to readily utilize nearby public transportation options such as the B Line and Metro buses.
- Objective 3: To make provision for the housing required to satisfy the varying needs and desires of all economic segments of the Community, maximizing the opportunity for individual choice. The Project advances this objective by incorporating 12 Very Low Income units in a City with a critical need for such units. The Project also contains a healthy mix 1-, 2-, and 5- bedroom units. The mixture of units, including the Very Low Income will satisfy varying needs of all economic segments within the Community. Moreover, the Project's 12 55-year covenanted affordable units is a net addition to the City's affordable housing stock.
- <u>Objective 6</u>: *"To make provision for a circulation system coordinated with land uses and densities..."* The Project Site is located near Hollywood Boulevard, one of the predominant transit corridors in the City. The Project Site is accessible via multiple bus

routes and the Metro B Line. Therefore, the local circulation system is well equipped to handle the Project's use and density.

Zoning

As required by state law, Section 12.22 of the LAMC implements the State's density bonus provisions by setting forth the density bonus program requirements, incentives, and procedures. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22A.25(c)(1), the Applicant is requesting a ministerial approval from the City for a 35 percent density increase in exchange for providing 11 Very Low Income units. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915(p)(2)(A), as a density bonus development, the Project is allowed a maximum vehicle parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit.

Additionally, as a density bonus development, the Project is allowed relief from various zoning requirements associated with the Project Site. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f)(8), the Applicant is requesting an on-menu incentive to allow for averaging of floor area, density, open space, and parking throughout the Project Site. Also, pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(g)(3), the Applicant is requesting an off-menu incentive to allow a maximum floor area of 234,745 square feet for a corresponding floor area ratio of approximately 6.74:1 averaged across the Project Site, in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 FAR allowed in the C4-1-CN zoned portion and 6:1 FAR allowed in the R4-2 zoned portion. Further, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1), the Applicant is requesting a waiver of development standard pursuant to LAMC Section 12.16.C.2 and 12.11.C.2 to allow the elimination of required side yards along Bronson Avenue and the Project Site's interior lot line in lieu of the otherwise required 16-foot side yards at both locations, and a waiver of development standard pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21.C.2 to allow reduced building separation of 13 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 54 feet.

Because the Project includes the creation of 50 or more dwelling units, the Project is subject to Site Plan Review requirements, pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05.C.1(b). Also, for merger and condominium purposes, the Project is subject to Vesting Tentative Tract Map requirements, pursuant to LAMC Section 17.06.A.

Lastly, pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I.3, the Applicant is requesting a Waiver of Dedication and Improvements to the public right of way pertaining to otherwise required dedications along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue.

Discussion of Section 15332(b)

The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.

The Project Site is located within City limits, is 0.86 acres in size, and is completely surrounded by urban uses. The Project Site is bordered on the north by Carlos Avenue, on the south by an alley and one-story commercial structure consisting of multiple storefronts, on the west by a Los Angeles County Superior Court building and associated parking, and to the east by Bronson Avenue. Land uses in the greater Project Site area include the US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the north; Hollywood Boulevard and commercial uses to the south; commercial uses to the west; and the US 101 Freeway and commercial and residential uses to the east. The northern portion of the Project Site is currently vacant but was previously developed with four residential units. The southern portion of the Project Site is developed with the Lombardi Structures. Therefore, the Project is within City limits on a site of no more than five acres that is substantially surrounded by urban uses.

Discussion of Section 15332(c)

The Project Site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species.

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City. The northern portion of the Project Site is currently vacant but was previously developed with 16 residential units. The northern portion is used as surface parking. The southern portion of the Project Site is developed with the Lombardi Structures, which would remain. There are no special-status plant species, wetlands, riparian habitat, or other sensitive habitat on the Project Site. Five of the on-site trees would be removed and replaced in accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. Depending on the exact timing of the Project construction, it is possible that the trees could contain nesting birds, which are protected by existing regulations. However, the Project Applicant would be required to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), as well as the regulations of the California Fish and Game Code, which prohibits take of all birds and their active nests, if present in the trees on the Project Site. Thus, the Project would not harm any species protected by the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1531 et seg.), the Native Plant Protection Act (Chapter 10, commencing with Section 1900, of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code), or the California Endangered Species Act (Chapter 1.5, commencing with Section 2050, of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code). Thus, the Project would not affect endangered, rare, or threatened species.

Discussion of Section 15332(d)

Approval of the Project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

TRAFFIC

A Transportation Assessment was prepared for the Project by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., dated May 2021 (refer to Appendix B). The Transportation Assessment was reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) on July 1, 2021 (refer to Appendix B).

Methodology

Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), made effective in January 2014, required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to change the CEQA Guidelines regarding the analysis of transportation impacts. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis shifted from vehicular delay (level of service [LOS]) to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), create multimodal networks, and promote mixed-use developments.

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) *Transportation Assessment Guidelines* (TAG) defines the methodology of analyzing a project's transportation impacts in accordance with SB 743. Per the TAG, the CEQA transportation analysis contains the following thresholds for identifying impacts:

- Threshold T-1: Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies
- Threshold T-2.1: Causing Substantial VMT
- Threshold T-2.2: Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel
- Threshold T-3: Substantially Increasing Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use

An evaluation of the Project's potential impacts under these metrics follows the TAG and is presented below.

Threshold T-1

Table 2.1-1 of the TAG identifies the City plans, policies, programs, ordinances, and standards relevant in determining project consistency. Attachment D of the TAG, Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Worksheet provides a structured approach to evaluate whether a project conflicts with the City's plans, programs, ordinances, or policies and to streamline the review by highlighting the most relevant plans, policies, and programs when assessing potential impacts to the City's transportation system. The Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Worksheet for the Project is provided in Appendix C of the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37, the Project seeking WDIs pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I to waive a nine-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the property's entire eastern lot line (along Bronson Avenue) and a four-foot dedication and improvement requirement along Carlos Avenue.

As stated in Section 2.1.4 of the TAG, a project that generally conforms with, and does not obstruct the City's development policies and standards, will generally be considered to be consistent. As detailed in Appendix C of the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B, the Project is substantially consistent with the City documents listed on Table 2.1-1 of the TAG. Therefore, the Project would not result in a significant impact under Threshold T-1. A detailed discussion of the plans, programs, ordinances, or policies related to the Project is provided below.

Mobility Plan

The Mobility Plan combines "complete street" principles with the following five goals that define the City's mobility priorities:

• <u>Safety First</u>: Design and operate streets in a way that enables safe access for all users, regardless of age, ability, or transportation mode of choice.

- <u>World Class Infrastructure</u>: A well-maintained and connected network of streets, paths, bikeways, trails, and more provides Angelenos with the optimum variety of mode choices.
- <u>Access for All Angelenos</u>: A fair and equitable system must be accessible to all and must pay particularly close attention to the most vulnerable users.
- <u>Collaboration, Communication, and Informed Choices</u>: The impact of new technologies on our day-to-day mobility demands will continue to become increasingly important to the future. The amount of information made available by new technologies must be managed responsibly in the future.
- <u>Clean Environments and Healthy Communities</u>: Active transportation modes such as bicycling and walking can significantly improve personal fitness and create new opportunities for social interaction, while lessening impacts on the environment.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the specific policies of the Mobility Plan is provided on Table 6 and Appendix C of the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B). The Mobility Plan identifies key corridors within the Study Area as components of various "mobility-enhanced networks." Though no specific improvements have been identified and there is no schedule for implementation, the mobility-enhanced networks represent a focus on improving a particular aspect of urban mobility, including transit, neighborhood connectivity, bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. The Project would be designed with the mobility-enhanced networks as a top priority.

Policy	Consistency Discussion
Chapter 1 – Safety First	
Policy 1.1, Roadway User Vulnerability Design, plan, and operate streets to prioritize the safety of the most vulnerable roadway user.	Consistent . Access to the Project Site would be provided via two driveways – one driveway along Bronson Avenue, a designated Modified Avenue III, and one driveway along Carlos Avenue, a designated Local Street. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress and egress movements. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue.
	Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37, the Project seeking WDI pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I to waive a nine-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the property's entire eastern lot line (along Bronson Avenue) and a four-foot dedication and improvement requirement along Carlos Avenue. The Project would provide an enhanced pedestrian experience on this portion of the site.
Policy 1.6 Multi-Modal Detour Facilities	Consistent . The Project Applicant would be required by the City to prepare and implement

Table 6Project Consistency with Mobility Plan 2035

Policy	Consistency Discussion
Design detour facilities to provide safe	a construction management plan that would
passage for all modes of travel.	include, to the extent necessary, detour rates
	for all applicable travel modes, including
	pedestrian and transit users.
Chapter 2 – World Class Infrastructure	
Policy 2.3 Podestrian Infrastructure	Consistent Soveral streets within the Study
Popognize welking as a component of every	Area are designated Dedestrian Enhanced
trip and ansure high quality redestrian assess	Nied die designaleu Fedestrian improvemente
inp and ensure nigh-quality pedestrian access	Districts where pedestrian improvements
in all site planning and public right-or-way	could be prioritized to provide better
modifications to provide a safe and	connectivity to and from major destinations
comfortable walking environment.	within communities, including Franklin Avenue
	west of Van Ness Avenue, Gower Street
	between Carlos Avenue and Carlton Way,
	Bronson Avenue between Carlos Avenue and
	Carlton Way, and Hollywood Boulevard west
	of Van Ness Avenue and east of Wilton Place.
	The Project does not propose narrowing or
	shifting existing sidewalk placement or paving.
	narrowing shifting or removing an existing
	narkway Further the Project is open to
	easements that could widen the sidewalks and
	onhance the podestrian environment
Deliev 2.4 Neighborhood Enhanced Network	Consistent Several streats within the Study
Provide a clow apoed potwork of locally	Area are designated parts of the
	Area are designated parts of the
serving streets.	Regulation Average Carles Average Calman
	Franklin Avenue, Carlos Avenue, Selma
	Avenue west of Gower Street, Bronson
	Avenue between Yucca Street and Carlos
	Avenue and between Hollywood Boulevard
	and Carlton Way, Carlton Way east of
	Bronson Avenue, Canyon Drive south of
	Carlton Way, and Harold Way east of Canyon
	Drive. The Project would add some traffic to
	surrounding streets but would not affect travel
	speed or safety.
Policy 2.5 Transit Network	Consistent. Hollywood Boulevard is
Improve the performance and reliability of	designated as part of the Transit Enhanced
existing and future bus service	Network. The Project would develop transit
	accessible residential space within a high-
	quality transit area. There is sufficient capacity
	within the existing and future transit system to
	accommodate the additional ridership
	generated by the Project.
Policy 2.6 Bicycle Networks	Consistent. Hollywood Boulevard is
Provide safe, convenient, and comfortable	designated as part of the Bicycle Enhanced
local and regional bicycling facilities for people	Network. There are existing bicycle lanes on
of all types and abilities (includes scooters	Franklin Avenue which would not be affected
skateboards rollerblades etc.)	by the Project The Project would provide
	short-term and long-term bicycle parking for

Policy	Consistency Discussion
	residents and visitors in accordance with LAMC requirements.
Chapter 3 – Access for all Angelenos	·
Policy 3.1 Access for All Recognize all modes of travel, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular modes – including goods movement – as integral components of the City's transportation system.	Consistent . The Project encourages multi- modal transportation alternatives and access for all travel modes to and from the Project Site. The Project provides pedestrian and bicycle access separate from vehicular access and provides bicycle parking to encourage walking and bicycling. It encourages transit usage by developing a residential project within a high-guality transit area.
Policy 3.2 People with Disabilities Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.	Consistent . The Project's vehicular and pedestrian entrances would be designed consistent with LADOT standards and all requirements from the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
Policy 3.3 Land Use Access and Mix Promote equitable land use decisions that result in fewer vehicle trips by providing greater proximity and access to jobs, destinations, and other neighborhood services.	Consistent. The Project's residential units located within a high-quality transit area would help to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit trips for both commuting and accessing neighborhood services.
<u>Policy 3.4 Transit Services</u> Provide all residents, workers, and visitors with affordable, efficient, convenient, and attractive transit services.	Consistent . The Project is located within a high-quality transit area, providing a mix of high-frequency local and late-night buses.
<u>Policy 3.8 Bicycle Parking</u> Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure, and well-maintained bicycle parking facilities.	Consistent . The Project would provide convenient and secure long-term and short-term parking for bicycles for residents and visitors.
Chapter 4 – Collaboration, Communication,	& Informed Choices
Policy4.8TransportationDemandManagement StrategiesEncouragegreaterutilizationofTransportationDemandManagement(TDM)strategiestoreducedependenceoccupancyvehicles.	Consistent . The Project's TDM program, described in more detail under Threshold T-2.1, below, includes unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking.
Policy 4.13 Parking and Land Use <u>Management</u> Balance on-street and off-street parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.	Consistent . The Project would provide sufficient off-street parking to meet Project parking requirements. The Project would also retain on-street parking in front of the Project Site.
Chapter 5 – Clean Environments & Healthy	Communities
Policy 5.1 Sustainable Transportation Encourage the development of a sustainable transportation system that promotes environmental and public health.	Consistent . The Project would provide secure long-term bicycle parking for residents and short-term bicycle parking for visitors, and it would provide easements to widen the pedestrian sidewalks along Bronson Avenue

Table 6 **Project Consistency with Mobility Plan 2035**

and Carlos Avenue. These features would

Table 6		
Project Consistency with Mobility Plan 2035		

Policy	Consistency Discussion
	promote active transportation modes such as
	bicycling and walking and improve access to
	nearby public transit.
Policy 5.2 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Support ways to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita.	Consistent . The Project is estimated to generate lower VMT per capita for residents than the average for the area, as demonstrated under Threshold T-2.1, below. Additionally, it would implement TDM measures including unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking as project design features.
Source: Gibson, May 2021. Refer to Appendix B.	

Access to the Project would be provided via two driveways: one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue and additional entrances on Carlos Avenue. All entrances would be designed consistent with LADOT standards and all requirements from the ADA. The Project is seeking WDIs pursuant to LAMC Section 12.37 I to waive a nine-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the property's entire eastern lot line (along Bronson Avenue) and a four-foot dedication and improvement requirement along the Project frontages to accommodate pedestrian circulation and to provide an enhanced pedestrian experience.

The Project is located within a high-quality transit area and would provide bicycle parking for residents and visitors, thereby promoting public and active transportation modes and reducing the Project VMT per capita for residents compared to the average for the area, as demonstrated under Threshold T-2.1, below. Further, the Project does not propose modifying, removing, or otherwise negatively affect existing bicycle infrastructure.

Thus, the Project would be consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan.

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan introduces guidelines for the City to follow to enhance the City's position as a regional leader in health and equity, encourage healthy design and equitable access, and increase awareness of equity and environmental issues.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles is provided on Table 7. The Project prioritizes safety and access for all individuals utilizing the site by complying with all ADA requirements, widening the sidewalks, and improving pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project Site, if required. Further, the Project supports healthy lifestyles by locating housing within a high-quality transit area and providing bicycle parking. The Project includes 12 affordable housing units to meet the diverse needs of the community and to provide a vibrant residential community near an active commercial center of Hollywood.

Thus, the Project would be consistent with the goals of Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles.

Table 7 Project Consistency with Plan for a Healthy Les Angeles		
Policy	Consistency Discussion	
Chapter 1 – Los Angeles, a Leader in Health	and Equity	
Policy 1.5 Plan for Health Improve Angelenos' health and well-being by incorporating a health perspective into land use, design, policy, and zoning decisions through existing tools, practices, and	Consistent . The Project supports healthy lifestyles by locating housing within a high-quality transit area, improving pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project Site, and providing bicycle parking.	
Policy 1.6 Poverty and Health Reduce the debilitating impact that poverty has on individual, familial, and community health and well-being by: promoting cross- cutting efforts and partnerships to increase access to income; safe, healthy, and stable affordable housing options; and attainable opportunities for social mobility.	Consistent. The Project includes 12 affordable housing units.	
Policy 1.7 Displacement and Health Reduce the harmful health impacts of displacement on individuals, families and communities by pursuing strategies to create opportunities for existing residents to benefit from local revitalization efforts by: creating local employment and economic opportunities for low-income residents and local small businesses; expanding and preserving existing housing opportunities available to low-income residents; preserving cultural and social resources; and creating and implementing tools to evaluate and mitigate the potential displacement caused by large- scale investment and development.	Consistent . The Project provides 12 affordable housing units within a high-quality transit area near an active commercial center of the Hollywood community. The Project does not displace any currently active housing; rather, it converts vacant land into an active and vibrant residential community.	
Chapter 5 – An Environment Where Life Thrives		
Policy 5.7 Land Use Planning for Public Health and GHG Emission Reduction Promote land use policies that reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions, result in improved air quality and decreased air pollution, especially for children, seniors, and others susceptible to respiratory diseases.	Consistent . The Project is estimated to generate VMT per capita for residents and employees at least 15 percent lower than the average for the area as demonstrated under Threshold T-2.1, below. Further, it would provide unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking to further reduce VMT per capita. VMT directly contributes to GHG emissions, so a reduced VMT per capita also reduces GHG emissions per capita.	

Land Use Element of the General Plan

The City General Plan's Land Use Element contains 35 Community Plans that establish specific goals and strategies for the various neighborhoods across Los Angeles. The Project is located within the Hollywood Community Plan area.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the Hollywood Community Plan is provided on Table 8. The Project would provide both market-rate and affordable residential units to further the development of Hollywood as a major center of population. The Project is consistent with the circulation standards and criteria of the Hollywood Community Plan as the transportation system within the vicinity of the Project Site would adequately serve the traffic generated by the Project without major congestion. In addition, the Project would implement TDM strategies as project design features, including unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking, to further reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips generated by the Project. Thus, the Project would promote and encourage development standards in line with the goals and objectives of the Hollywood Community Plan.

The City is currently in the process of updating the Hollywood Community Plan to guide development for the Hollywood area through Year 2040. Hollywood Community Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report was released for public review in October 2019. As of April 2021, the City Planning Commission moved to adopt the Hollywood Community Plan and the accompanying Environmental Impact Report. Action by the City Council's Planning and Land Use Management Committee and the full City Council is still needed to formally adopt the Hollywood Community Plan and certify the accompanying Environmental Impact Report.

Objective	Consistency Discussion	
<u>Objective 1</u> :	Consistent. The Project would provide both	
To coordinate the development of Hollywood	market-rate and affordable residential units to	
with that of other parts of the City of Los	further the development of Hollywood as a	
Angeles and the metropolitan area. To further	major center of population. The Project would	
the development of Hollywood as a major	also propose a development that is located	
center of population, employment retail	near an active commercial center of the	
services, and entertainment; and to	Hollywood Community.	
perpetuate its image as the international		
center of the motion picture industry.		
Objective 3:	Consistent. The Project's provision of both	
To make provision for the housing required to	market-rate and affordable units in a variety of	
satisfy the varying needs and desires of all	configurations would contribute to the goal of	
economic segments of the Community,	providing all economic segments of the	
maximizing the opportunity for individual	community with opportunities to have their	
choice.	needs and desires met.	
<u>Objective 6</u> :	Consistent. The Project would provide	
To make provision for a circulation system	residential uses in proximity to Metro and	
coordinated with land uses and densities and	LADOT bus stops. The Project's proximity to	
adequate to accommodate traffic; and to	transit provides alternative modes of	
encourage the expansion and improvement of	transportation for residents and visitors to take	
public transportation service.	to and from the Project Site.	
Source: Gibson, May 2021. Refer to Appendix B.		

 Table 8

 Project Consistency with the Hollywood Community Plan

Redevelopment Plan

The Project is located within the Redevelopment Plan for the Hollywood Redevelopment Project. A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the Redevelopment Plan is provided on Table 9. The Project promotes and encourages development standards in line with the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan including, but not limited to, encouraging the expansion and improvement of public transportation service, providing housing to support the varied economic needs of the community, maximizing opportunity for individual choice, and designing a circulation system proportional to land use densities that will accommodate estimated traffic.

Thus, the Project would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan.

Consistency Discussion
Consistent . The Project would provide a mix of market-rate and affordable residential dwelling units, as well as a variety of one-, two- , and five-bedroom units, to meet various residential needs in the Hollywood area.
Consistent . The Project's provision of both market-rate and affordable units in a variety of configurations would contribute to the goal of providing all economic segments of the community with opportunities to have their needs and desires met.
Consistent . The Project would improve the pedestrian environment by separating pedestrian access from vehicular access, providing easements for widening the sidewalks along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue, and enhancing the Project frontages with new street trees.
The Project would provide unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles and encourage the use of active modes of transportation.
Further, the Project would provide residential uses in proximity to Metro and LADOT bus stops. The Project's proximity to transit provides alternative modes of transportation for residents and visitors to take to and from the Project Site.

 Table 9

 Project Consistency with the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan

LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 (Bicycle Parking)

LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 details the bicycle parking requirements for new developments. As further detailed in Section 5E, the proposed short-term and long-term bicycle parking supply for the residential uses would satisfy the LAMC requirements.

LAMC Section 12.26J (TDM Ordinance)

LAMC Section 12.26J, the TDM Ordinance, establishes trip reduction requirements for nonresidential projects in excess of 25,000 square feet. The Project does not propose non-residential uses in excess of 25,000 sf. Therefore, LAMC Section 12.26J is not applicable.

Vision Zero Action Plan/Vision Zero Corridor Plans

Vision Zero implements projects that are designed to increase safety on the most vulnerable City streets. As discussed in Chapter 2, Franklin Avenue east of Beachwood Drive and Hollywood Boulevard are identified as part of the HIN. In May 2019, LADOT installed new minor street crosswalks and continental crosswalk upgrades within the Study Area as part of the Vision Zero Hollywood Boulevard Safety Improvement Projects. No additional improvements are currently planned near the Project Site. Nonetheless, the Project would not preclude future Vision Zero safety projects by the City on adjacent streets. Thus, the Project would not conflict with Vision Zero.

Streetscape Plans

The Project Site is not located within the boundaries of any streetscape plan and thus, streetscape plans do not apply to the Project.

Citywide Design Guidelines

The Pedestrian-First Design approach of Citywide Design Guidelines identifies design strategies that "create human scale spaces in response to how people actually engage with their surroundings, by prioritizing active street frontages, clear paths of travel, legible wayfinding, and enhanced connectivity. Pedestrian-First Design promoted healthy living, increases economic activity at the street level, enables social intersection, creates equitable and accessible public spaces, and improves public safety."

The Pedestrian-First Design guidelines are as follows:

- <u>Guideline 1</u>: Promote a safe, comfortable, and accessible pedestrian experience for all.
- <u>Guideline 2</u>: Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.
- <u>Guideline 3</u>: Design projects to actively engage with streets and public space and maintain human scale.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the guidelines of the Pedestrian-First Design approach is provided on Table 10.

The Project design includes separate pedestrian and vehicular access points, widened sidewalks, and improved pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project. The Project's residential lobby would face Bronson Avenue to help activate the pedestrian enhanced district. Thus, the Project design provides for the safety, comfort, and accessibility of pedestrians, aligning with the Pedestrian-First Design approach.

Guideline	Consistency Discussion
Cuideline 1: Dremete a sefe semfertable and	Consistency Discussion
Guideline T. Promote a sale, comiortable, and	Consistent . The Project provides for the
accessible pedestrian experience for all	safety, comfort, and accessibility of
Design projects to be safe and accessible and	pedestrians in a number of ways. First, the
contribute to a better public right-of-way for	Project would provide pedestrian access via a
people of all ages, genders, and abilities,	lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue, separate
especially the most vulnerable - children,	from vehicular access. Additionally, the
seniors, and people with disabilities.	Project would provide easements to widen the
	sidewalks along Bronson Avenue and Carlos
Guideline 2: Carefully incorporate vehicular	Avenue and enhance them with new street
access such that it does not degrade the	trees.
pedestrian experience	
Design to avoid pedestrian and vehicular	Vehicular access to the Project Site would be
conflicts and to create an inviting and	provided via two driveways – one driveway
comfortable public right-of-way. A pleasant	along Bronson Avenue and one driveway
and welcoming public realm reinforces	along Carlos Avenue. Both driveways would
walkability and improves the quality of life for	accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress
users	and egress movements Pedestrian and
	hicycle access would be provided separate
Guideline 3: Design projects to actively	from the vehicular access. Therefore, the
ongage with streets and public space and	Project would not result in conflict between
maintain human scale	nodestrians and vehicles
New projects should be designed to contribute	pedestrians and venicles.
te a vibrant and attractive public realm that	The Droject's residential Johny which would
to a vibrant and attractive public realm that	The Project's residential lobby, which would
promotes a sense of civic pride. Better	tace Bronson Avenue, would help to activate
connections within the built environment	the pedestrian enhanced district consistent
contribute to a livable and accessible city and	with the goals of the Mobility Plan.
a healthier public realm.	
Source: Gibson, May 2021. Refer to Appendix B.	

Table 10		
Project Consistency with Citywide Design Gui	idelines	

Threshold T-2.1

The information below describes the methodology by which vehicle trips and VMT are calculated in City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Version 1.3 ((VMT Calculator), as detailed in City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation. LADOT developed the VMT Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for developments within City limits, which are based on the following types of one-way trips:

- <u>Home-Based Work Production</u>: trips to a workplace destination originating from a residential use
- <u>Home-Based Other Production</u>: trips to a non-workplace destination (e.g., retail, restaurant, etc.) originating from a residential use
- <u>Home-Based Work Attraction</u>: trips to a workplace destination originating from a residential use

As detailed in City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, the household VMT per capita threshold applies to Home-Based Work Production and Home-Based Other Production trips, and the work VMT per employee threshold applies to Home-Based Work Attraction trips, as the location and characteristics of residences and workplaces are often the main drivers of VMT, as detailed in Appendix 1 of Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.

Other types of trips generated in the VMT Calculator include Non-Home-Based Other Production (trips to a non-residential destination originating from a non-residential use), Home-Based Other Attraction (trips to a non-workplace destination originating from a residential use), and Non-Home-Based Other Attraction (trips to a non-residential destination originating from a non-residential use). These trip types are not factored into the VMT per capita and VMT per employee thresholds as those trips are typically localized and are assumed to have a negligible effect on the VMT impact assessment. However, those trips are factored into the calculation of total project VMT for screening purposes when determining if VMT analysis would be required.

Table 2.2-1 of the TAG details the following daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee impact criteria for the APC areas:

APC	Daily Household	Daily Work VMT/Employee				
AIO	vivi 1/Oapita					
Central	6.0	7.6				
East LA	7.2	12.7				
Harbor	9.2	12.3				
North Valley	9.2	15.0				
South LA	6.0	11.6				
South Valley	9.4	11.6				
West LA	7.4	11.1				

The Project is located within the Central APC and thus, has a daily household VMT per capita impact threshold of 6.0 and a daily work VMT per employee impact threshold of 7.6.

Travel Behavior Zones (TBZ)

The City developed TBZ categories to determine the magnitude of VMT and vehicle trip reductions that could be achieved through TDM strategies. As detailed in City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, the development of the TBZs considered the population density, land use density, intersection density, and proximity to transit of each Census tract in the City and are categorized as follows:

- 1. <u>Suburban (Zone 1)</u>: Very low-density primarily centered around single-family homes and minimally connected street network
- 2. <u>Suburban Center (Zone 2)</u>: Low-density developments with a mix of residential and commercial uses with larger blocks and lower intersection density
- 3. <u>Compact Infill (Zone 3)</u>: Higher density neighborhoods that include multi-story buildings and well-connected streets
- 4. <u>Urban (Zone 4)</u>: High-density neighborhoods characterized by multi-story buildings with a dense road network

The VMT Calculator determines a project's TBZ based on the latitude and longitude of a project address. The Project located within a Compact Infill (Zone 3) TBZ.

Mixed-Use Development Methodology

As detailed in City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, the VMT Calculator accounts for the interaction of land uses within a mixed-use development and considers the following sociodemographic, land use, and built environment factors for a project area:

- Land use density of the project
- Transportation network connectivity
- Availability of and proximity to transit
- Proximity to retail and other destinations
- Vehicle ownership rates
- Household size

Trip Lengths

The VMT Calculator determines a project's VMT based on trip length information from the City's Travel Demand Forecasting Model, which considers the traffic analysis zones within 0.125 miles of a project to determine the average trip length and trip type, which factor into the calculation of a project's VMT.

Population and Employment Assumptions

As previously stated, the VMT thresholds identified in the TAG are based on household VMT per capita and work VMT per employee. Thus, the VMT Calculator contains population assumptions developed based on Census data for the City and employment assumptions derived from multiple data sources, including Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) 2012 Developer Fee Justification Study, Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, the San Diego Association of Governments Activity Based Model, the United States Department of Energy, and other modeling

resources. A summary of population and employment assumptions for various land uses is provided on Table 1 of City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation.

TDM Measures

Additionally, the VMT Calculator measures the reduction in VMT resulting from a project's incorporation of TDM strategies as project design features or mitigation measures. The following seven categories of TDM strategies are included in the VMT Calculator:

- 1. Parking
- 2. Transit
- 3. Education and Encouragement
- 4. Commute Trip Reductions
- 5. Shared Mobility
- 6. Bicycle Infrastructure
- 7. Neighborhood Enhancement

TDM strategies within each of these categories have been empirically demonstrated to reduce trip-making or mode choice in such a way as to reduce VMT, as documented in California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures.

PROJECT VMT ANALYSIS

The VMT Calculator was used to evaluate Project VMT for comparison to the VMT impact criteria. Based on guidance from the City, the VMT Calculator was modeled for the Project's land uses and their respective sizes as the primary input.

The Project only consists of residential uses and thus, per City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator User Guide, would not generate work VMT per employee and would not result in a significant work VMT impact. As such, the VMT analysis presented below evaluates the household VMT per capita generated by the residential uses of the Project.

Project VMT

The Project incorporates design features that include measures to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips to the Project Site. For the purposes of this analysis, the following Project design features were accounted for in the VMT evaluation:

- Unbundled parking
- Bike parking per LAMC

The VMT analysis results based on the VMT Calculator are summarized on Table 11. The VMT Calculator estimates that the Project would generate a total daily VMT of 3,094 and a total homebased production VMT of 1,426. Thus, the Project would generate an average household VMT per capita of 4.8. The average household VMT per capita would not exceed the Central APC significant household VMT impact threshold of 6.0 and therefore, the Project would not result in a significant VMT impact.

Project Information						
Land Use	Size					
Multi-Family Housing	117 du					
Affordable Housing	11 du					
Project Analysis [a]						
Resident Population	299					
Employee Population	0					
Project Area Planning Commission	Central					
Travel Behavior Zone (TBZ)	Compact Infill					
Maximum Allowable VMT Reduction [b]	40%					
VMT Analysis [c]						
Daily Vehicle Trips	491					
Total Daily VMT	3,094					
Total Home-Based Production VMT	1,426					
Household VMT/Capita [d]	4.8					
Impact Threshold	6.0					
Significant Impact	NO					
du = dwelling unit						
[a] VMT results based on the City of Los Angel	les VMT Calculator Version 1.3 (July 2020).					
[b] The maximum allowable VMT reduction	n is based on the Project's designated IBZ as					
determined in Transportation Demand Mai	agement Strategies in LA VMT Calculator (LADOT,					
August 2018) and Quantifying Greenhous	e Gas Mitigation Measures (California Air Pollution					
[c] Project design features include:						
1. Unbundled parking						
2. Bike parking per LAMC						
[d] Based on home-based production trips only	<i>′</i> .					
Source: Gibson, May 2021. Refer to Appendix B.						

Table 11 VMT Analysis Summary

Threshold T-2.2

The intent of Threshold T-2.2 is to assess whether a transportation project would induce substantial VMT by increasing vehicular capacity on the roadway network, such as the addition of through traffic lanes on existing or new highways, including general purpose lanes, high-occupancy-vehicle lanes, peak-period lanes, auxiliary lanes, and lanes through grade-separated interchanges.

The Project is not a transportation project. Thus, further evaluation is not required.

Threshold T-3

Access Overview

Vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided via two driveways, one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and leftturn ingress and egress movements and would be 20 feet wide. The Project would also widen the sidewalks along the Project frontages to accommodate pedestrian circulation to provide an enhanced pedestrian experience. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access points via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue and additional entrances on Carlos Avenue.

Project Hazards Analysis

Potential Geometric Design Hazards

The vehicular driveways would provide adequate sight distance. Bronson Avenue runs straight and at a slight, consistent grade in front of the Project Site. Carlos Avenue has a curve adjacent to the Project Site, but the Project design would accommodate adequate sight distance triangles free of obstruction for vehicular ingress and egress. The Project design would not result in any impediments to the visibility of approaching vehicles, pedestrians, or bicycles. Additionally, the vehicular driveways would intersect Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue at right angles to maximize sight distance.

As discussed previously, the Project would generate fewer than 100 trips during any single peak hour, which is fewer than two vehicles every minute. The Project driveways would have the capacity to accommodate the Project vehicle trips and as such, no queuing hazards related to operation of the driveway would occur.

Consistency with Modal Priority Networks

The Project vehicular driveways are not proposed along a street designated as part of the Bicycle enhanced BEN/BLN, TEN, or HIN. However, Carlos Avenue is designated as part of the NEN, and Bronson Avenue is designated as part of the PED by the Mobility Plan. The Project design would not result in any impediments to the visibility of approaching vehicles, pedestrians, or bicycles, and the Project vehicular driveways would intersect Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue at right angles to maximize sight distance and be designed to City standards. Thus, the Project vehicular driveways would present no substantial conflict with any of those modal priorities. Moreover, the Project would not preclude or interfere with the implementation of future roadway improvements benefiting transit, pedestrians, or bicycles.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Activity

Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access points via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue. The Project would result in a modest increase in both pedestrian and bicycle activity along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue. However, the access locations would be designed to accommodate wider sidewalks and enhanced connectivity that meet the City's requirements to further protect pedestrian and bicycle safety. The driveways would not cross any existing bicycle infrastructure, and there would be adequate sight distance for drivers entering and exiting the driveway to see oncoming pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, the Project would result in significant vehicle-pedestrian or vehicle-bicycle conflicts.

Summary

Based on the information above, the Project would not result in hazards from the design or operation, and Project impacts related to Threshold 3-1 would be less than significant..

NOISE

The analysis below is based primarily on technical data prepared by DKA Planning, dated June 2, 2021 (refer to Appendix C).

Regulatory Setting

General Plan Noise Element

The City's General Plan contains a Noise Element that includes objectives and policies intended to guide the control of noise to protect residents, workers, and visitors. Its primary goal is to manage long-term noise impacts to preserve acceptable noise environments for all types of land uses. The Noise Element contains no quantitative or other thresholds of significance for evaluating a project's noise impacts. However, the Noise Element does contain a land use and noise compatibility table, which is included as Table 12. Policy P16 of the Noise Element instructs to use, "as appropriate," this table "or other measures that are acceptable to the city, to guide land use and zoning reclassification, subdivision, conditional use and use variance determinations and environmental assessment considerations, especially relative to sensitive uses, as defined by this chapter...^{*3} "Noise sensitive" uses are defined as "single-family and multi-unit dwellings, long-term care facilities (including convalescent and retirement facilities), dormitories, motels, hotels, transient lodgings, and other residential uses; houses of worship; hospitals; libraries; schools; auditoriums; concert halls; outdoor theaters; nature and wildlife preserves, and parks.^{*4} The Noise Element further instructs that the table is designed "to help guide determination of appropriate land use and mitigation measures vis-à-vis existing or anticipated ambient noise levels."

³ Noise Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, February 1999.

⁴ Ibid.

Land Use Category		Day-Night Average Exterior Sound Level (CNEL dB)						
	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	
Residential Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Home	А	С	С	С	Ν	U	U	
Residential Multi-Family	Α	А	С	С	Ν	U	U	
Transient Lodging, Motel, Hotel	А	А	С	С	Ν	U	U	
School, Library, Church, Hospital, Nursing Home		Α	С	С	N	Ν	U	
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters		С	С	C/N	U	U	U	
Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports		С	С	С	C/U	U	U	
Playground, Neighborhood Park		А	А	A/N	Ν	N/U	U	
Golf Course, Riding Stable, Water Recreation, Cemetery	А	А	А	А	Ν	A/N	U	
Office Building, Business, Commercial, Professional		Α	Α	A/C	С	C/N	Ν	
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture		А	Α	A	A/C	C/N	N	

 Table 12

 City of Los Angeles Noise Element – Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use

A = Normally Acceptable - Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements.

C = Conditionally Acceptable - New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply system or air conditioning will normally suffice.

N = N ormally Unacceptable - New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

U = Clearly Unacceptable - New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

Source: Noise Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan – Exhibit I

Los Angeles Municipal Code

The LAMC contains a number of regulations that would apply to the Project's temporary construction activities and long-term operations.

Section 41.40(a) would prohibit the Project's construction activities from occurring between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M., Monday through Friday. Subdivision (c) would further prohibit such activities from occurring before 8:00 A.M. or after 6:00 P.M. on any Saturday, or on any Sunday or national holiday.

<u>SEC.41.40. NOISE DUE TO CONSTRUCTION, EXCAVATION WORK—WHEN</u> <u>PROHIBITED</u>

(a) No person shall, between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. of the following day, perform any construction or repair work of any kind upon, or any excavating for, any building or structure, where any of the foregoing entails the use of any power drive drill, riveting machine excavator or any other machine, tool, device or equipment which makes loud noises to the disturbance of persons occupying sleeping quarters in any dwelling hotel or apartment or other place of residence. In addition, the operation, repair or servicing of construction equipment and the

job-site delivering of construction materials in such areas shall be prohibited during the hours herein specified. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates the foregoing provision shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor punishable as elsewhere provided in this Code.

(c) No person, other than an individual homeowner engaged in the repair or construction of this single-family dwelling shall perform any construction or repair work of any kind upon, or any earth grading for, any building or structure located on land developed with residential buildings under the provisions of Chapter I of this Code, or perform such work within 500 feet of land so occupied, before 8:00 A.M. or after 6:00 P.M. on any Saturday or national holiday nor at any time on any Sunday. In addition, the operation, repair, or servicing of construction equipment and the job-site delivering of construction materials in such areas shall be prohibited on Saturdays and on Sundays during the hours herein specific...

Section 112.05 of the LAMC establishes noise limits for powered equipment and hand tools operated within 500 feet of residential zones. Of particular importance is subdivision (a), which institutes a maximum noise limit of 75 dBA at 50 feet for the types of construction vehicles and equipment that would be required for the Project's construction. However, the LAMC notes that these limitations would not necessarily apply if it can be proven that compliance would be technically infeasible despite the use of noise-reducing means or methods.

<u>SEC.112.05 MAXIMUM NOISE LEVEL OF POWERED EQUIPMENT OR POWERED</u> <u>HAND TOOLS</u>

Between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M., in any residential zone of the City or within 500 feet thereof, no person shall operate or cause to be operated any powered equipment or powered hand tool that produces a maximum noise level exceeding the following noise limits at a distance of 50 feet therefrom:

- (a) 75 dBA for construction, industrial, and agricultural machinery including crawlertractors, dozers, rotary drills and augers, loaders, power shovels, cranes, derricks, motor graders, paving machines, off-highway trucks, ditchers, trenchers, compactors, scrapers, wagons, pavement breakers, compressors and pneumatic or other powered equipment;
- (b) 75 dBA for powered equipment of 20 HP or less intended for infrequent use in residential areas, including chain saws, log chippers and powered hand tools;
- (c) 65 dBA for powered equipment intended for repetitive use in residential areas, including lawn mowers, backpack blowers, small lawn and garden tools and riding tractors.

Said noise limitations shall not apply where compliance therewith is technically infeasible. The burden of proving that compliance is technically infeasible shall be upon the person or persons charged with a violation of this section. Technical infeasibility shall mean that said noise limitations cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or other noise reduction devices or techniques during the operation of the equipment.

Section 112.01 of the LAMC would prohibit any amplified noises, especially those from outdoor sources (e.g., outdoor speakers, stereo systems, etc.) from exceeding the ambient noise levels of adjacent properties by more than 5 dBA. Any amplified noises would also be prohibited from being audible at any distance greater than 150 feet from the Project's property line, as the Project is located within 500 feet of residential zones.

SEC.112.01 RADIOS, TELEVISION SETS, AND SIMILAR DEVICES

- (a) It shall be unlawful for any person within any zone of the City to use or operate any radio, musical instrument, phonograph, television receiver, or other machine or device for the producing, reproducing or amplification of the human voice, music, or any other sound, in such a manner, as to disturb the peace, quiet, and comfort of neighbor occupants or any reasonable person residing or working in the area.
- (b) Any noise level caused by such use or operation which is audible to the human ear at a distance in excess of 150 feet from the property line of the noise source, within any residential zone of the City or within 500 feet thereof, shall be a violation of the provisions of this section.
- (c) Any noise level caused by such use or operation which exceeds the ambient noise level on the premises of any other occupied property, or if a condominium, apartment house, duplex, or attached business, within any adjoining unit, by more than five (5) decibels shall be a violation of the provisions of this section.

Section 112.02 would prevent Project heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and other mechanical equipment from elevating ambient noise levels at neighboring residences by more than 5 dBA.

<u>SEC.112.02. AIR CONDITIONING, REFRIGERATION, HEATING, PLUMBING,</u> <u>FILTERING EQUIPMENT</u>

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, within any zone of the city, to operate any air conditioning, refrigeration or heating equipment for any residence or other structure or to operate any pumping, filtering or heating equipment for any pool or reservoir in such manner as to create any noise which would cause the noise level on the premises of any other occupied property ... to exceed the ambient noise level by more than five decibels.

The LAMC also provides regulations regarding vehicle-related noise, including Sections 114.02, 114.03, and 114.06. Section 114.02 prohibits the operation of any motor driven vehicles upon any property within the City in a manner that would cause the noise level on the premises of any occupied residential property to exceed the ambient noise level by more than 5 dBA. Section 114.03 prohibits loading and unloading causing any impulsive sound, raucous or unnecessary

noise within 200 feet of any residential building between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. Section 114.06 requires vehicle theft alarm systems to be silenced within five minutes.

Existing Conditions

Noise-Sensitive Receptors

The Project Site is located along the Hollywood Boulevard corridor and is adjacent to the Hollywood Freeway. Sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the Project Site include, but are not limited to, the following representative sampling:

- Multi-family residences, 1720 Bronson Avenue; 70 feet east of the Project Site
- Multi-family residences, 5919 Carlos Avenue; 80 feet north of the Project Site
- Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments, 5940 Carlos Avenue; 170 feet west of the Project Site
- Hallmart Apartments, 1810 Bronson Avenue; 350 feet north of the Project Site
- Multi-family residences, 5855 Carlton Way; 380 feet south of the Project Site
- Multi-family residences, 1661-1671 Bronson Avenue; 390 feet south of the Project Site

Existing Ambient Noise Conditions

In June 2021, DKA Planning took short-term noise measurements near the Project Site to determine the ambient noise conditions near the location of sensitive receptors (refer to Table 13).⁵ The primary source of noise near the Project Site is vehicle traffic, as transportation noise is the main source of noise in urban environments. The Project Site is as close as 80 feet to the mainline of the Hollywood Freeway, with an off-ramp to Hollywood Boulevard even closer. Other noise is generated from Hollywood Boulevard, approximately 220 feet to the south of the Project Site, which carries approximately 1,808 eastbound/westbound vehicle trips during the morning peak hour on Bronson Avenue to the south.⁶

⁵ Noise measurements were taken using a Quest Technologies SoundPro DL Sound Level Meter. The SoundPro DL meter complies with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) for general environmental measurement instrumentation. The meter was equipped with an omni-directional microphone, calibrated before the day's measurements, and set at approximately five feet above the ground.

⁶ City of Los Angeles, Manual Traffic Count Summary. https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/manual_counts/BRONSON.N.HOLLYWOOD.180515.MA N.pdf, 2018 counts adjusted 1% annually to reflect 2021 volumes.

Table 13 Existing Noise Levels

Noise Measurement Location	Sound Level (dBA L _{eq})
1. Multi-family Residences, 1720 Bronson Avenue	62.2
2. Hallmart Apartments, 1810 North Bronson Avenue	65.7
3. Multi-Family Residences, 5855 Carlton Way	63.7
4. Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments, 5940 Carlos Avenue	67.1
Source: DKA Planning, 2021. Refer to Appendix C.	

Thresholds of Significance

On-Site Construction Noise Threshold

Based on guidelines from the City of Los Angeles City Department of Planning, the on-site construction noise impact would be considered significant if the following occurred:

- Construction activities lasting more than one day would exceed existing ambient exterior sound levels by 10 dBA (hourly L_{eq}) or more at a noise-sensitive use;
- Construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a three-month period would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA (hourly L_{eq}) or more at a noise-sensitive use; or
- Construction activities of any duration would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA (hourly L_{eq}) at a noise-sensitive use between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, or at any time on Sunday.

Operational Noise Thresholds

In addition to applicable City standards and guidelines that would regulate or otherwise manage a project's operational noise impacts, the following criteria are adopted to assess the impacts of the Project's operational noise sources:

• Project operations would cause ambient noise levels at off-site locations to increase by 3 dBA CNEL or more to or within "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" noise and land use compatibility categories, as defined by the City's General Plan Noise Element (refer to Table 12).

• Project operations would cause any 5 dBA or greater noise increase.⁷

Project Impacts

On-Site Construction Activities

Project construction would generate noise during the estimated 24 months of demolition, excavation/grading, building construction, paving, architectural coatings, and other related construction activities (refer to Table 5). During all construction phases, noise-generating activities would be permitted to occur at the Project Site between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 9:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, in accordance with Section 41.40(a) of the LAMC. On Saturdays, construction activities would be permitted to occur between 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M.

Noise levels would generally peak during the demolition and grading phases, when diesel-fueled heavy-duty equipment (e.g., excavators, dozers) would be needed to move debris and dirt. This equipment is mobile in nature and does not always operate at in a steady-state mode full load, but rather powers up and down depending on the duty cycle needed to conduct work. As such, equipment would occasionally idle during which time no noise would be generated. Mobile equipment would often operate away from off-site receptors, continuously moving around.

During other phases of construction (e.g., site preparation, building construction, architectural coatings), noise levels would generally be lower, because this phase would be less reliant on heavy equipment with internal combustion engines. Smaller equipment (e.g., forklifts, generators, powered hand tools, pneumatic equipment) would generally be utilized. Off-site secondary noises would be generated by construction worker vehicles, vendor deliveries, and haul trucks.

Because the Project's construction phase would occur for more than three months, the applicable City threshold of significance for the Project's construction noise impacts is an increase of 5 dBA over existing ambient noise levels. As shown on Table 14, when considering ambient noise levels, the use of multiple pieces of powered equipment (i.e., rubber tired dozers and tractor/loader/backhoe)simultaneously would increase ambient noise negligibly. These construction noise levels would not exceed the City's significance threshold of 5 dBA. Therefore, the Project's on-site construction noise impact would be less than significant.

⁷ As a 3 dBA increase represents a barely noticeable change in noise level, this threshold considers any increase in ambient noise levels to or within a land use's "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" noise/land use compatibility categories to be significant so long as the noise level increase can be considered barely perceptible. For instances when the noise level increase would not necessarily result in "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" noise/land use compatibility or "clearly unacceptable" noise/land use compatibility, a readily noticeable 5 dBA increase would still be considered significant. Increases less than 3 dBA are unlikely to result in noticeably louder ambient noise conditions and would therefore be considered less than significant.

Receptor	Maximum Construction Noise Level (dBA Leq)	Existing Ambient Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	New Ambient Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	Increase (dBA L _{eq})	Significant Impact?	
Multi-family Residences, 1720 Bronson Avenue	63.5	62.2	65.9	3.7	No	
Multi-family Residences, 5919 Carlos Avenue	63.5	67.1	68.7	1.6	No	
Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments, 5940 Carlos Avenue	60.3	67.1	67.9	0.8	No	
Hallmart Apartments, 1810 Bronson Avenue	55.9	65.7	66.1	0.4	No	
Multi-Family Residences, 5855 Carlton Way	47.4	63.7	63.8	0.1	No	
Multi-Family Residences, 1661-1671 Bronson Avenue	35.2	63.7	63.7	0.0	No	
Source: DKA Planning, 2021. R	efer to Appendix C.	·				

 Table 14

 Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Off-Site Sensitive Receptors

Off-Site Construction Activities

The Project would also generate noise at off-site locations from haul trucks moving debris from the Project Site during demolition and grading activities, respectively; vendor and contractor trips; and worker commute trips. These activities would generate up to an estimated 223 peak-hourly passenger car equivalent (PCE) vehicle trips, as summarized on Table 15. This includes converting noise from heavy-duty truck trips to an equivalent number of passenger vehicle trips.

Construction Phase	Worker Trips ^a	Vendor Trips	Haul Trips	Total
Demolition	10	0	9 ^b	19
Grading	10	0	213°	223
Building Construction	115	60 ^d	0	175
Architectural Coating	23	0	0	23

Table 15Estimated Hourly Construction Vehicle Trips

^a Assumes all worker trips occur in the peak hour of construction activity.

^b The project would generate 69 haul trips over a 21-day period. Because haul trucks emit more noise than passenger vehicles, a 19.1 passenger car equivalency (PCE) was used to convert haul truck trips to a passenger car equivalent.

^c This phase would generate about 1,715 one-way haul trips over a 22-day period. Assumes a 19.1 PCE.

^{*d*} This phase would generate about 22 vendor truck trips daily over a seven-hour work day. Assumes a 19.1 PCE.

Source: DKA Planning, 2021.

The greatest number of construction-related trips would occur during the building construction phase, which would generate about 223 peak hourly PCE vehicle trips, assuming all workers travel to the worksite at the same time. This would represent about 12.3 percent of traffic volumes on Hollywood Boulevard (at Bronson Avenue), the likely route for haul trucks accessing the Hollywood Freeway. Hollywood Boulevard carries about 1,808 eastbound/westbound vehicles during the morning peak hour at Bronson Avenue to the south.⁸ Because the Project's construction-related trips would not cause a doubling in traffic volumes on this major arterial, the Project's construction-related traffic would not increase existing noise levels by 3 dBA or more. Therefore, the Project's noise impacts from construction-related traffic would be less than significant.

On-Site Operational Activities

During operation, the Project would produce noise from both on- and off-site sources. As discussed below, the Project would not increase surrounding noise levels by more than 5 dBA CNEL, the minimum threshold of significance adopted by this analysis. As a result, the Project's on-site operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Mechanical Equipment

The Project would house mechanical equipment responsible for operating the residential building that would generate incremental long-term noise. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment would be located on the building rooftop along the northeast portion of the roof facing the Hollywood Freeway and Bronson Avenue. While this equipment could generate a sound pressure level of up to 81.9 dBA at one foot, the elevation of this noise source and the presence of a roof edge create an effective noise barrier that reduces noise levels from rooftop HVAC units by 8 dBA or more.⁹ This equipment could generate noise levels that average 50 to 65 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet (81.9 dBA at one foot).¹⁰

Nearby receptors, such as residences west of the Project Site, would be negligibly impacted, as these receptors would be shielded from any line-of-sight for two reasons. First, receptors east of the Project Site across Bronson Avenue are two stories in height, approximately 220 feet lower than the height of the Project's rooftop mechanical equipment. The Hollywood Silvercrest apartments to the west are approximately 100 feet tall, over 120 feet lower than the Project's rooftop equipment. Second, the presence of the Project's roof edge and a 35-foot-high mechanical screen would serve as an effective noise barrier that would reduce noise levels from rooftop HVAC units by 8 dBA or more at lower receptors.

⁸ City of Los Angeles, Manual Traffic Count Summary. https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/manual_counts/BRONSON.N.HOLLYWOOD.180515.MA N.pdf, 2018 counts adjusted 1% annually to reflect 2021 volumes.

 ⁹ City of Moreno Valley, Moreno Valley WalMart Noise Impact Analysis, Table 901; February 10, 2015 and City of Pomona, Pomona Ranch Plaza WalMart Expansion Project, Table 4.4-5; August 2014.
 ¹⁰ Ibid.

Other mechanical equipment would be housed within the Project building itself, such as a 285square-foot generator, 659-square-foot utilities vault, 243-square-foot electrical room, 259square-foot pump room, and 248-square-foot FCC vault inside Level 1 of the podium garage. Level 2 of the podium parking garage would also include a mechanical room fully integrated into the garage's design. A water tank with a 120,000-gallon capacity would be located within the garage's basement. The noise generated by this equipment would likely not be audible from outside of the Project building.

Auto-Related Activities

Some vehicle-related noise at the Project Site would come from vehicles entering and exiting the building at a mid-block driveways on Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue. These garage driveways are close as 100 feet and 90 feet to residences across Bronson and Carlos, respectively. As shown on Table 16, vehicles entering the parking garage would increase ambient noise levels by less than 0.1 dBA L_{eq} , below the 3 dBA threshold that the most sensitive humans can detect changes in noise levels.

Receptor	Maximum Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	Existing Ambient Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	New Ambient Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	Increase (dBA L _{eq})	Significant?	
Residences, North Side of Carlos Avenue	27.3	67.1	67.1	<0.1	No	
Residences, East Side of Bronson Avenue	33.4	62.2	62.2	<0.1	No	
Source: DKA Planning, 2021, using FTA Noise Impact Assessment Spreadsheet. Assumes 75 percent of trip generation accessed site on Bronson Avenue, 25% on Carlos Avenue. Assumes average of 7 vehicles during average daytime hours (i.e., 7 A.M. to 7 P.M.) and 3 during nighttime hours (7 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) on Carlos Avenue and 22 average daytime hourly trips and 8 average nighttime hourly trips on Bronson Avenue based on ITE Trip Generation Manual (10 th Edition) Time of Day Distribution assumptions for Multi-Family Housing (Mid-Rise) land use						

 Table 16

 Estimated Parking-Garage-Related Noise Levels at Off-Site Sensitive Receptors

24-hour CNEL noise levels would similarly be negligible, given the low trip generation rates associated with off-peak hours overnight. Parking garage-related noise impacts for other receptors would also be negligible given their more remote locations and/or the lack of a line of sight from the garage. As such, the Project's parking lot activities would have no noticeable effect on the surrounding noise environment.

Outdoor Uses

While most operations would be conducted inside the development, outdoor activities could include human conversation, recreational activities, trash collection, landscape maintenance, and loading and unloading of deliveries. These are discussed below.

• *Human Conversation*. Noise associated with everyday human activities would largely be contained internally within the Project. Noise could include passive activities such

as human conversation and socializing in outdoor spaces, including the following locations:

- Private balconies (Levels 5-23). These small, recessed balconies would generally be private spaces for some tenants on all elevations. Some larger shared balconies are proposed on several floors facing Bronson Avenue outside of interior communal lounges.
- Fitness deck (Level 5). A 4,041-square-foot outdoor deck would be located outside the indoor fitness are facing Carlos Avenue along the western property line.
- Roof-top (Level 24) open space. A 7,368-square-foot outdoor space for passive recreation and dining is planned outside the interior clubroom. This area would be along the northwest corner of the roof.

While there are numerous outdoor spaces that provide opportunities for residents and guests to enjoy passive recreation, any noise impacts on nearby receptors would be negligible. First, any activities would be intermittent activities that would produce negligible impacts from human speech, based on the Lombard effect. This phenomenon recognizes that voice noise levels in face-to-face conversations generally increase proportionally to background ambient noise levels, but only up to approximately 67 dBA at a reference distance of one meter. Specifically, vocal intensity increases about 0.38 dB for every 1.0 dB increase in noise levels above 55 dB, meaning people talk slightly above ambient noise levels in order to communicate.¹¹ Second, the roof-top activities would be about 240 feet above grade, about 120 to 220 feet higher than the roofs of sensitive receptors that are over 70 feet away from these locations. As such, there would be no line of sight from rooftop activities to nearby receptors. Third, 35-foot-high mechanical equipment screening would shield residences on the south side of Bronson Avenue from the outdoor patio along the northwest corner of the roof. Finally, the Project Site's proximity to the Hollywood Freeway and the orientation of many of these spaces toward the freeway would ensure no substantial increases in noise from these outdoor spaces.

- *Recreation*. An 809-square-foot outdoor pool and 105-square-foot spa area are proposed along the southern portion of the roof. As with the rooftop open space, the pool would be about 120 to 220 feet higher than the roofs of sensitive receptors that are over 70 feet away from these locations. As such, there would be no line of sight from this wading pool to nearby receptors.
- *Trash Collection*. On-site trash and recyclable materials would be managed inside Level 1 of the parking garage. Trash and recycling trucks would access these facilities from Carlos Avenue or Bronson Avenue. Solid waste activities would include use of trash compactors and hydraulics associated with the refuse trucks themselves. Noise

¹¹ Acoustical Society of America, Volume 134; Evidence that the Lombard effect is frequency-specific in humans, Stowe and Golob, July 2013.

levels of approximately 71 dBA L_{eq} and 66 dBA L_{eq} could be generated by collection trucks and trash compactors, respectively, at 50 feet of distance^{.12} Some noise would be attenuated by an eight-foot wall along the property line. These activities would be intermittent and would comply with LAMC Section 113.01,which regulates noise from garbage collection and disposal.

Landscape Maintenance. Noise from gas-powered leaf flowers, lawnmowers, and other landscape equipment can generated substantial bursts of noise during regular maintenance. For example, gas powered leaf blowers and other equipment with two-stroke engines can generated 100 dBA L_{eq} and cause nuisance or potential noise impacts for nearby receptors.¹³ The landscape plan focuses on a modest palette of accent trees and raised planters that would minimize the need for powered landscaping equipment, as some of this can be managed by hand. A landscape buffer toward the rear of the property would include additional groundcover that would result in minimal need for powered equipment. Any intermittent landscape equipment would operate during the day and would represent a negligible impact and ultimately be subject to compliance with LAMC Section 112.05 governing powered equipment and hand tools, and other nuisance regulations.

Off-Site Operational Noise

The majority of the Project's operational noise would be from the Project's traffic. However, as stated previously, the Project would generate approximately 491 daily trips. The majority of the Project's operational noise impacts would be from off-site vehicle travel to and from the Project Site. This would likely result in minor increases in traffic volumes on Hollywood Boulevard and local streets during peak and off-peak hours, which carries up to 1,808 eastbound/westbound vehicles in the morning peak hour. Because it takes a doubling of traffic volumes to increase ambient noise levels by 3 dBA L_{eq}, the Project's reduction in traffic would neither increase ambient noise levels 3 dBA or more into "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" noise/land use compatibility categories, nor increase ambient noise levels 5 dBA or more. Twenty-four hour CNEL impacts would similarly be minimal, far below the City's criterion for significant operational noise impacts, which begin at 3 dBA. Therefore, the Project's traffic-related noise impact would be less than significant.

¹² RK Engineering Group, Inc. Wal-Mart/Sam's Club reference noise level, 2003.

¹³ Erica Walker et al, Harvard School of Public Health; Characteristics of Lawn and Garden Equipment Sound; 2017

AIR QUALITY

The analysis below is based primarily on air quality modeling conducted by DKA Planning, dated May 30, 2021 (refer to Appendix D).

Sensitive Receptors

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, depending on the population groups and the activities involved. Generally speaking, sensitive land uses, or sensitive receptors, are those where sensitive individuals are most likely to spend time. Individuals most susceptible to poor air quality include children, the elderly, athletes, and those with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. As a result, sensitive receptors to air quality may include schools (i.e., elementary schools or high schools), child care centers, parks and playgrounds, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, convalescent facilities, retirement facilities, residences, and athletic facilities. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project Site include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Multi-family residences, 1720 North Bronson Avenue; 70 feet east of the Project Site
- Multi-family residences, 5919 Carlos Avenue; 80 feet north of the Project Site
- Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments, 5940 Carlos Avenue; 170 feet west of the Project Site
- Hallmart Apartments, 1810 North Bronson Avenue; 350 feet north of the Project Site
- Multi-family residences, 5855 Carlton Way; 380 feet south of the Project Site
- Multi-family residences, 1661-1671 North Bronson Avenue; 390 feet south of the Project Site

Other sensitive land uses are located at greater distances from the Project Site and would experience lesser impacts.

Project Construction Emissions Impacts

Construction of the Project is anticipated to take approximately 24 months. During this time, a variety of diesel powered vehicles and equipment would be operated on-site. Demolition and grading for the Project would require vehicles such as excavators, bulldozers, loaders, and other heavy equipment. The building construction phase would require vehicles such as forklifts, skid steer loaders, and a crane. Table 5 summarizes the estimated construction schedule that was used to model the Project's air quality impacts.

The Project's daily regional and local emissions from construction, as estimated using SCAQMD's CalEEMod 2016.3.2 model, are shown on Table 17. The thresholds of significance for each air pollutant are also shown for comparison. As shown, the Project's regional construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. Local emissions also would not exceed SCAQMD LSTs for NO_X, CO, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. As a result, the Project's construction-related emissions impacts on regional and localized air quality would be less than significant.
					-		
Construction Voor	Emissions in lbs per day						
Construction Year	VOC	NOx	СО	SOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	
2022	2	33	15	<1	2	1	
2023	1	8	12	<1	1	1	
2024	8	9	14	<1	1	1	
Maximum Regional Emissions	8	33	15	<1	2	1	
Regional Daily Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55	
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Maximum Localized Emissions	7	6	7	<1	1	<1	
Localized Significance Threshold	-	74	680	-	5	3	
Exceed Threshold?	-	No	No	-	No	No	
Note: The construction dates shown on Table 5 used for the modeling of air quality emissions in the							

 Table 17

 Estimated Regional and Localized Construction Emissions

Note: The construction dates shown on Table 5 used for the modeling of air quality emissions in the CalEEMod software. If construction activities commence later than what is assumed, emissions would be lower because of the increased penetration of newer equipment with lower certified emission levels. The emissions shown on this table assume implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust Emissions).

Source: DKA Planning, 2021 based on CalEEMod 2016.3.2 model runs. LST analyses based on 1-acre site with 25-meter distances to receptors in Central LA source receptor area. Modeling documentation included in Appendix D.

Operational Emissions

Emissions associated with the Project's operations were also calculated using CalEEMod 2016.3.2. As shown on Table 18, development of the Project would not generate pollutant emissions would in excess of SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, nor would the emissions exceed SCAQMD LSTs for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. As a result, the Project's operations-related emissions impacts on regional and localized air quality would be less than significant.

WATER QUALITY

During the Project's construction and operational phases, in accordance with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance, the Project Applicant would be required to incorporate appropriate stormwater pollution control measures into the design plans and submit these plans to the City's Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Watershed Protection Division (WPD) for review and approval. Upon satisfaction that all stormwater requirements have been met, WPD staff would stamp the plan approved. Through compliance with the City's LID Ordinance, the Project would satisfy the City's water quality standards. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to operational water quality would occur.

Estimated Regional and Ed		Daily Op	Stational		<u></u>				
Emissions Source		Emissions in lbs per day							
	VOC	NOx	СО	SOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}			
Area	6	2	11	<1	<1	<1			
Energy	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1			
Mobile	1	3	7	<1	2	1			
Regional Emissions	6	5	18	<1	2	1			
Regional Significance Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55			
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No			
Localized Emissions	6	2	11	<1	<1	<1			
Localized Significance Thresholds ¹	'	64	680	<u></u> ا	<u> 1 </u>	1			
Exceed Threshold?	<u> </u>	No	No	<u> </u>	No	No			
¹ Localized significance thresholds assumes a 1-acre lot size and a 25-meter (82-foot) receptor distance in the Central LA SRA.									
Source: DKA Planning, 2021. Refer to Appendix D.									

 Table 18

 Estimated Regional and Localized Daily Operational Emissions

Discussion of Section 15332(e)

As discussed below, the Project can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection

The Project includes development of the site with an approximately 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, adding a residential population to the Project Site that could result in an increased need for fire protection services at the Project Site. The factors that the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) considers in determining whether fire protection services for a project is adequate include whether the project: (1) is within the maximum response distance for the land uses proposed; (2) complies with emergency access requirements; (3) complies with fire-flow requirements; and (4) complies with fire hydrant placement. Pursuant to LAMC Section 57.09.07, the maximum response distance between a high-density residential/commercial neighborhood land use and a LAFD station that houses an engine or truck company is 1.5 miles. If this distance is exceeded, all structures shall be constructed with automatic fire sprinkler systems. The Project Site is Fire Station 82, which is 1.0 miles away. Regardless, the Project would be constructed with automatic fire sprinkler systems pursuant to LAMC Section 57.09.07.

No.	Address	Distance from Project Site			
82	5769 Hollywood Boulevard	1.0 miles			
27	7 1327 Cole Avenue 1.4 miles				
Source: LAFD, <u>http://www.lafd.org/fire-stations/find-your-station</u> , 2021.					

Table 19Fire Stations Serving the Project Site

All ingress/egress associated with the Project would be designed and constructed in conformance to all applicable City Building and Safety Department and LAFD standards and requirements for design and construction. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts related to emergency access. The required fire flow for the Project would be confirmed in consultation with the LAFD during the plan check approval process. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to fire protection services would occur.

Police Protection

The Project includes development of the site with an approximately 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, adding a residential population to the Project Site that could result in an increased need for police protection services at the Project Site. However, in accordance with the City's regulations, the Project developer would be required to refer to "Design Out Crime Guidelines: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design," published by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). Contact the Community Relations Division, located at 100 W. 1st Street, #250, Los Angeles, CA 90012; (213) 486-6000. The Project would include standard security measures such as adequate security lighting, controlled residential access, and secure parking facilities. Through compliance with LAPD requirements, no significant Project impacts related to police protection services would occur.

Schools

The Project includes development of the site with an approximately 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, adding a residential population to the Project Site and potentially increasing demand for school services. Pursuant to the California Government Code Section 65995/California Education Code Section 17620, mandatory payment of the school fees established by the LAUSD in accordance with existing rules and regulations regarding the calculation and payment of such fees would, by law, fully address any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools as a result of the Project. Therefore, no significant Project impacts to school services would occur.

Parks

The Project includes development of the site with an approximately 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, adding a residential population to the Project Site that could increase the demand on existing parks in the area. The Project would include 17,778 square feet of usable open space for the exclusive use of Project residents and guests that would alleviate potential increases in demand for parks. Additionally, pursuant to Ordinance 184,505 (Parks

Dedication and Fee Update), for the market-rate dwelling units, the Project Applicant would be required to pay an in-lieu fee to the City for the purpose of developing park and recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would occur.

Other Public Facilities

The Project development of the site with an approximately 229,015-square-foot residential building, with 128 dwelling units, adding a residential population to the Project Site that could increase the demand for library services. Libraries in the vicinity of the Project Site include the following:

- Frances Howard Goldwyn-Hollywood Regional Branch Library
- Will & Ariel Durant Branch Library
- Louis B. Mayer Library
- Cahuenga Branch Library
- John C. Fremont Branch Library

Although the Project could increase the demand for library services in the Project Site area, because the area is well served by several existing libraries, the Project would not cause the need for new or altered library facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts. These existing libraries are expected to adequately serve the needs of future occupants of the Project. As stated in the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, LAPL is committed to increasing the number of people who use library services and the number of library cardholders. Because the Project is consistent with the allowable density and uses allowed under the current zoning and General Plan designations, the Project would not substantially increase demands upon library services, as compared to the use projections in the LAPL's 2015-2020 Strategic Plan. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to library facilities would occur.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Wastewater

The Project Site is located within the service area of the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which has been designed to treat a maximum dry-weather daily flow of 450 million gallons per day (mgd) and a peak wet-weather flor of 800 mgd.¹⁴ Full secondary treatment prevents virtually all particles suspended in effluent from being discharged into the Pacific Ocean and is consistent with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board's (LARWQCB) discharge policies for the Santa

¹⁴ City of Los Angeles Department of Sanitation, <u>https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/home/portal/s-lsh-wwd/s-lsh-wwd-cw/s-lsh-wwd-cw-p-hwrp;jsessionid=eZqfxN9kH7JNCMKvC8S0n8GklyH7VwNMZ03aN9oSSgGtF5ixQkRV!2143003606! 2064592652?_afrLoop=11698142585277113&_afrWindowMode=0&_afrWindowId=null&_adf.ctrlstate=1dl2da31dl_1#!%40%40%3F_afrWindowId%3Dnull%26_afrLoop%3D11698142585277113%2 6_afrWindowMode%3D0%26_adf.ctrl-state%3D1dl2da31dl_5, accessed May 2021.</u>

Monica Bay. The HTP currently treats an average daily flow of approximately 275 mgd. Thus, there is an available capacity of no less than approximately 175 mgd available capacity. The Project would generate an increase of approximately 24,040 gallons of wastewater per day (or 0.02 mgd) (refer to Table 20). It should be noted that this amount does not take into account the net decrease associated with the effectiveness of water conservation measures required in accordance with the City's Green Building Code, which would likely reduce the Project's water consumption (and wastewater generation) shown on Table 20. With a remaining daily capacity of 175 mgd, the HTP would have adequate capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to wastewater treatment would occur.

Lotimatou						
Land Use	Size	Water Consumption Rate ²	Total (gallons/day)			
<u>Residential</u>						
1-bedroom du	38 du	110 gpd/du	4,180			
2-bedroom du	37 du	150 gpd/du	5,550			
5-bedroom du	53 du	270 gpd/du	14,310			
		Net Total	24,040			
du = dwelling unit gpd =	gallons per day					
^{<i>i</i>} Conservatively assumes that all water converts to wastewater.						
² Source: City of Los Angel	es Bureau of Sar	nitation, Sewer Generation Rate	es, April 6, 2012.			

Table 20
Estimated Wastewater Generation and Water Consumption

Pursuant to City policy, the Bureau of Sanitation would check the gauging of the sewer lines and make the appropriate decisions on how best to connect to the local sewer lines at the time of construction. A final approval for sewer capacity and connection permit would be made at the time of construction. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to local sewer infrastructure would occur.

Water

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides water service to the Project Site. LADWP's water supply sources include the Los Angeles Aqueduct (LAA), local groundwater, the SWP (supplied by the Metropolitan Water District [MWD]), the Colorado River Aqueduct (also supplied by MWD), and recycled water.

The California Urban Water Management Planning Act of 1984 requires every municipal water supplier who serves more than 3,000 customers or provides more than 3,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water to prepare an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) every five years to identify short-term and long-term water resources management measures to meet growing water demands during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years. In the UWMP, the water supplier must describe the water supply projects and programs that may be undertaken to meet the total water use of the service area. The UWMP that is applicable to the Project is LADWP's 2020 UWMP. The 2020 UWMP provides historical and forecasted water demands for the City. Total water demand varies annually and is contingent on various factors including: population growth,

weather, water conservation, drought, and economically activity. Table 21 shows a breakdown of historical water demand for the LADWP service area. Table 22 provides LADWP's projected water demand from 2025 to 2045 for average year, single dry year, and multi dry year hydrological conditions. Demographic projections were provided for the LADWP service area by the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), who received the data from SCAG. SCAG applied its 2020 Regional Transportation Plan demographic data to water service areas for MWD's member agencies. These data were used for water demand projections in LADWP's 2020 UWMP. The Project's uses and density are allowed under the existing zoning and land use designation for the Project Site and as such, the residential population associated with the Project was accounted for in the 2020 UWMP. Service area population is expected to continue to grow over the next 25 years at a rate of 0.7 percent annually.¹⁵

Based on its 2020 UWMP, LADWP has supply capabilities that would be sufficient to meet expected demands from 2025 through 2045 under single dry-year and multiple dry-year hydrologic conditions.

As shown on Table 20, the Project would consume an increase of approximately 24,040 gallons of water per day. According to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), any project that is consistent with the City's General Plan, the projected water demand associated with that project is considered to be accounted for in the most recently adopted Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which is prepared by the LADWP to ensure that existing and projected water demand within its service area can be accommodated.¹⁶ As discussed previously, the Project is consistent with the City's General Plan land use designation for the Project Site. Additionally, the Project Applicant would be required to comply with the water efficiency standards outlined in Los Angeles City Ordinance No. 180822 and in the Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) to minimize water usage. Further, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant would be required to consult with LADWP to determine Project-specific water supply service needs and all water conservation measures that shall be incorporated into the Project. As such, the Project would not require new or additional water supply or entitlements. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to water supply would occur.

¹⁵ 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, LADWP, p. 1-5.

¹⁶ Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Amir Tabakh, correspondence, February 11, 2015.

											Non	-	
Fiscal Year	Single Fa	amily	Multi-Fa	mily	Comme	rcial	Indust	rial	Governr	nent	Reven	ue	Total
Ending Average	AF	%	AF	%	AF	%	AF	%	AF	%	AF	%	AF
2016-2020	170,660	35%	141,088	28%	88,680	18%	14,938	3%	39,628	8%	40,690	8%	495,685
2011-2015	206,652	37%	161,592	29%	96,832	18%	17,855	3%	43,573	8%	26,139	6%	552,768
2006-2010	236,154	38%	180,277	29%	106,964	17%	23,196	4%	42,956	7%	30,617	5%	620,165
2001-2005	239,754	37%	190,646	29%	109,685	17%	21,931	3%	41,888	6%	52,724	8%	656,628
1996-2000	222,748	36%	191,819	31%	111,051	18%	23,560	4%	39,421	6%	33.696	5%	622,295
1991-1995	197,322	34%	177,104	30%	110,724	19%	21,313	4%	38,426	7%	39,364	7%	584,253
30-Year Average	212,215	36%	173,755	30%	103,990	18%	20,465	3%	40,982	7%	37,205	6%	588,611
AF = Acre Feet													
Source: 2020 Urban W	/ater Manage	ement P	lan, LADWP										

 Table 21

 Breakdown of Historical Water Demand for LADWP's Service Area

	Years						
Hydrological Conditions ¹	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045		
Average Year	642,600	660,200	678,800	697,800	710,500		
Single Dry Year	674,700	693,200	712,700	732,700	746,000		
Multi-Dry Year (Year 1)	657,900	675,800	694,900	714,400	727,400		
Multi-Dry Year (Year 2)	661,700	679,700	698,900	718,500	731,500		
Multi-Dry Year (Year 3)	674,400	693,200	712,800	732,700	746,000		
Multi-Dry Year (Year 4)	661,600	679,600	698,900	718,400	731,500		
Multi-Dry Year (Year 5)	655,700	673,600	692,600	712,000	724,900		
AFY = acre-feet per year							
Source: 2020 UWMP, LADWP, Exhibits 11E, 11F, and 11G.							

Table 22Service Area Reliability Assessment (AFY)

Solid Waste

The landfills that serve the City and the capacity of these landfills are shown on Table 23. As shown, the landfills have an approximate available daily intake of 18,366 tons. The Project would generate a net increase of approximately 0.26 tons of solid waste per day.¹⁷ This total is a conservative and does not account for the net decrease associated with the previous use and the effectiveness of recycling efforts, which the Project would be required by the City to implement. With a remaining daily intake capacity of approximately 18,366 tons of solid waste per day, the landfills serving the City could accommodate the Project's approximately net increase of 0.26 tons of solid waste per day.

Landfill Capacity					
Landfill Facility	Estimated Remaining Life (years)	Estimated Remaining Disposal Capacity (million tons)	Permitted Intake (tons/day)	Daily Disposal (tons/day)	Available Daily Intake (tons/day)
Sunshine Canyon	18	69.7	12,100	6,387	5,713
Chiquita Canyon	28	56.9	12,000	5,525	6,475
Antelope Valley	18	10.9	3,600	2,113	1,487
Lancaster	22	9.9	3,000	363	3,137
Calabasas	8	4.3	3,500	1,946	1,554
Total 18,366					
Source: County of Los Angeles, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, 2019 Annual Report, September 2020.					

Table 23

The Project's solid waste would be handled by private waste collection services. Pursuant to Section 66.32 of the LAMC, the Project's solid waste contractor must obtain, in addition to all other required permits, an Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939) Compliance Permit from the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN). The Project would be required to comply with LAMC Section 12.21 A.19, which requires new development to provide an adequate recycling area or room for collecting and loading recyclable materials. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with CALGreen Code waste reduction measures for the operation of the Project. Recycling bins shall be provided at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable material. These bins shall be emptied and recycled accordingly as a part of the Project's regular solid waste disposal program. For these reasons, the Project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, and would not otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Therefore, no significant Project impacts related to solid waste would occur.

¹⁷ 128 units x 4 lbs of solid waste/day = 512 lbs/2,000 lbs = 0.256 lbs/day, rounded up to 0.26 lbs/day.

Categorical Exemption Exceptions

Section 15300.2 (Exceptions), Article 19, Chapter 3, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations includes Exceptions to Categorical Exemptions for certain activities. For the reasons discussed below, none of the Exceptions apply to the Project.

15300.2. Exceptions

- (a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.
- (b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.
- (c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.
- (d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.
- (e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
- (f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Discussion of Exceptions

Section 15300.2 (a) - Location:

Not applicable. The Project does not fall under the definitions of Classes 3, 4, 5, 5, or 11.

Section 15300.2(b) - Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact analysis considers the potential impacts associated with implementation of the Project in conjunction with other "related projects" in the vicinity of the Project Site that could be developed within the same timeframe as the Project. There are 20 related projects in the vicinity of the Project Site (refer to Table 4 of the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B). The source of this list is LADOT. As discussed below, the Project would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts resulting from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time, and this Exception does not apply.

Air Quality

The SCAQMD recommends that any construction-related emissions and operational emissions from individual development projects that exceed the project-specific mass daily emissions thresholds identified above also be considered cumulatively considerable.¹⁸ Individual projects that generate emissions not in excess of SCAQMD's significance thresholds would not contribute considerably to any potential cumulative impact. The SCAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of the emissions generated by a set of cumulative development projects nor provides thresholds of significance to be used to assess the impacts associated with these emissions. As discussed previously, the Project would not produce VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ emissions in excess of SCAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore, the cumulative air quality impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

Water Quality

The sites of the Project and the related projects are located in an urbanized area where most of the surrounding properties are already developed. The existing storm drainage system serving this area has been designed to accommodate runoff from an urban built-out environment. When new construction occurs it generally does not lead to substantial additional runoff, since new developments is required to control the amount and quality of stormwater runoff coming from their respective sites. Moreover, little if any additional cumulative runoff is expected from the Project and the related project sites, since the area is highly developed with impervious surfaces. Additionally, all new development in the City is required to comply with the City's LID Ordinance and incorporate appropriate stormwater pollution control measures into the design plans to ensure that water quality impacts are minimized. Any subsequent developments would be required to perform the same level of water quality impact analysis as the Project, and any impacts would be mitigated as necessary/appropriate. Therefore, the cumulative water quality impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

¹⁸ White Paper on Regulatory Options for Addressing Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution Emissions, SCAQMD Board Meeting, September 5, 2003, Agenda No. 29, Appendix D, p. D-3.

Noise

Construction

Based on the Transportation Assessment prepared for Project, there are 20 related projects in the area that could be built and become operational on a schedule similar to the Project (refer to Table 4 in the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B). Of these, only one is located within 1,000 feet of the Project Site.¹⁹ This related project is the potential 38-acre Hollywood Central Park facility that could be built in the airspace above the Hollywood Freeway. While it is likely that this related project would begin construction after the Project is operational in 2024, this analysis reflects a conservative scenario where both projects are built concurrently.

Given the proximity of the Hollywood Freeway, any concurrent construction of a park above the airspace over the freeway would be within 100 feet of the Project and could impact shared sensitive receptors that would have a direct line of sight to both locations. This would include the residences on the north side of Carlos Avenue and the east side of Bronson Avenue across from the Project Site.

As with the Project, this related project would be required to comply with the LAMC's restrictions, including construction hours and noise from powered equipment.

Estimated cumulative construction noise levels are shown on Table 24. As shown, these noise levels would not exceed the City's significance threshold of 5 dBA for construction noise. Therefore, cumulative construction noise impacts would not be significant.

Receptor	Maximum Construction Noise Level (dBA Leq)	Existing Ambient Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	New Ambient Noise Level (dBA L _{eq})	Increase (dBA L _{eq})	Significant Impact?
Multi-family Residences, 1720 Bronson Avenue	63.6	62.2	66.0	3.8	No
Multi-family Residences, 5919 Carlos Avenue	63.6	67.1	68.7	1.6	No
Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments, 5940 Carlos Avenue	60.4	67.1	67.9	0.8	No
Hallmart Apartments, 1810 Bronson Avenue	57.2	65.7	66.3	0.6	No
Multi-Family Residences, 5855 Carlton Way	47.9	63.7	63.8	0.1	No
Multi-Family Residences, 1661-1671 Bronson Avenue	37.9	63.7	63.7	0.0	No
Source: DKA Planning 2021 P	efer to Annendix C				

Table 24 Estimated Cumulative Construction Noise Levels at Off-Site Sensitive Receptors

Source: DKA Planning, 2021. Reter to Appenaix 6.

Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., Transportation Study Assessment for the Hollywood/Bronson 19 Residential Tower Project, May 2021.

Operation

As stated previously, only one of the related projects is located within 1,000 feet of the Project Site – Related Project No.1 (Hollywood Central Park). The site of this related project is located approximately 500 feet northwest of the Project Site. Given the distance of this related project, intervening development that attenuates noise, and the low noise operational noise levels associated with the Project, the related project in combination with the Project would not generate operational noise levels that would result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels (i.e., 3 dBA). Therefore, cumulative operational noise levels would be less than significant.

Traffic

Threshold T-1

In addition to potential Project-specific impacts, the TAG requires that the Project be reviewed in combination with nearby Related Projects to determine if there may be a cumulatively significant impact resulting from inconsistency with a particular program, plan, policy, or ordinance. In accordance with the TAG, the cumulative analysis must include consideration of any Related Projects within 0.50 miles of the Project Site and any transportation system improvements in the vicinity. Related Projects located within 0.50 miles of the Project site are identified on Table 4 in the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B.

Similar to the Project, the Related Projects would be individually responsible for complying with relevant plans, programs, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system. Thus, the Project, together with the Related Projects, would not result in cumulative impacts with respect to consistency with each of the plans, ordinances, or policies reviewed. The Project and the Related Projects would not interfere with any of the general policy recommendations and/or pilot proposals. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts related to this threshold would occur.

Threshold T-2.1

Cumulative effects of development projects are determined based on the consistency with the air quality and GHG emissions reduction goals of the RTP/SCS in terms of development location, density, and intensity. The RTP/SCS presents a long-term vision for the region's transportation system through Year 2045 and balances the region's future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals.

As detailed in the TAG, for projects that do not demonstrate a project impact by applying an efficiency-based impact threshold (i.e., household VMT per capita or work VMT per employee) in the project impact analysis, a less than significant impact conclusion is sufficient in demonstrating there is no cumulative VMT impact, as those projects are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG emissions reduction goals of the RTP/SCS.

As discussed previously, the Project would not result in a significant VMT impact. Further, the Project would be designed to further reduce single-occupancy trips to the Project Site through

various TDM strategies that would be incorporated as part of the Project design, including unbundled parking and provision of LAMC-required bicycle parking. Furthermore, the Project Site is well-served by various local bus lines and would contribute to the productivity and use of the regional transportation system. The Project would both provide housing near transit and encourage active transportation by providing new bicycle parking infrastructure, in line with RTP/SCS goals. Thus, the Project would encourage a variety of transportation options and would be consistent with the RTP/SCS goal of maximizing mobility and accessibility in the region. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to any potentially significant cumulative impact under this threshold

Threshold T-2.2

The TAG requires that the Project be reviewed in combination with Related Projects with access points along the same block as the Project to determine if there may be a cumulatively significant impact. None of the Related Projects on Table 4 in the Transportation Assessment included as Appendix B are located along the same block as the Project. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts related to a substantial increase hazards due to geometric design features, including safety, operational, or capacity would occur.

Public Services

Fire Protection

Implementation of the Project and the related projects could result in a net increase in the number of residents in the area and would likely cumulatively increase demand for fire protection services. Cumulative development requires the LAFD to continually evaluate the need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain adequate service ratios. As with the proposed Project, the related projects would be subject to the Fire Code and other applicable regulations of the LAMC including, but not limited to, automatic fire sprinkler systems for high-density buildings and/or residential projects located farther than 1.5 miles from the nearest LAFD Engine or Truck Company to compensate for additional response time, and other recommendations made by the LAFD to ensure fire protection safety. Compliance with the applicable regulatory measures would ensure that LAFD would be able to provide adequate facilities to accommodate future growth and maintain acceptable levels of service. Furthermore, the increased demands for additional LAFD staffing, equipment, and facilities would be funded via existing mechanisms (e.g., property taxes and government funding) to which the Project and related projects would contribute. Additionally, any subsequent developments would be required to perform the same level of fire protection impact analysis as the Project, and any impacts would be mitigated as necessary/appropriate. Therefore, the cumulative impact to fire protection from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

Police Protection

Implementation of the Project and the related projects could result in a net increase in the number of residents in the area and would likely cumulatively increase the demand for police protection services. Cumulative development requires the LAPD to continually evaluate the need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain adequate service ratios. As with the proposed Project, the related projects would be subject to the review and oversight of the LAPD related to crime prevention features, and other applicable regulations of the LAMC. The review process would ensure the ability of the LAPD to provide adequate facilities to accommodate future growth and maintain acceptable levels of service. Furthermore, the increased demands for additional LAPD staffing, equipment, and facilities would be funded via existing mechanisms (e.g., property taxes and government funding) to which the Project and related projects would contribute. Additionally, any subsequent developments would be required to perform the same level of police protection impact analysis as the Project, and any impacts would be mitigated as necessary/appropriate. Therefore, the cumulative impact to police protection from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

Schools

Implementation of the Project and the related projects could result in a net increase in the number of residents in the area and could increase the need for school services. Similar to the Project Applicant, the applicants of all the related projects would be required to pay the state mandated applicable school fees to the LAUSD to ensure that no significant impacts to school services would occur. Therefore, the cumulative impact to schools from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

Parks

The Project and the related projects could cumulatively increase demand for parks and recreational services. However, as with the Project, the applicants of residential projects would be subject to the City's Park and Recreation Ordinance and must comply with LAMC open space requirements, ensuring that any potential impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. Any subsequent developments would be required to perform the same level of parks and recreational impact analysis as the Project, and any impacts would be mitigated as necessary/appropriate. Therefore, the cumulative impact to parks from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

Other Public Facilities

Implementation of the residential related projects in concert with the Project could result in a net increase in the number of residents in the Project Site area and could further increase the demand for library services. However, the Project Site area is well served by several existing libraries, and cumulative development would not cause the need for new or altered library facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to library services would be less than significant. Therefore, the cumulative impact to library services from successive projects of the same type in the same place over time would not be significant.

Utilities

Wastewater

Implementation of the related project in concert with the Project could increase the need for wastewater treatment. Table 25 shows that the cumulative development in the Project Site area could result in the need to treat approximately 872,931 gallons of water per day (or 0.87 mgd per day). It should be noted that this amount does not take into account the net decrease in wastewater generation (and water consumption) that would occur as a result of removal of existing uses for the related project or the effectiveness of water conservation measures required in accordance with the City's Green Building Code, both of which would likely substantially reduce the cumulative water consumption and wastewater generation shown on Table 23. With a remaining treatment capacity of approximately 175 mgd, the HTP would have adequate capacity to accommodate the wastewater treatment requirements of cumulative development. No new or upgraded treatment facilities would be required. Therefore, the cumulative wastewater impacts related to water treatment would be less than significant.

Estimated Candiative Water Consumption and Wastewater Ceneration					
Land Uses	Size	Water Consumption/ Wastewater	Total (gpd)		
		Generation Rate ²			
Hollywood Central Park	38 acres	NA	30,015 ³		
Multi-Family Residential	2,731 du	160 gpd/du	436,960		
Commercial/Retail	75,306 sf	0.08 gpd/sf	6,024		
Restaurant	57,553	0.3 gpd/sf	17,266		
Office	1,780,069 sf	0.15 gpd/sf	267,010		
Supermarket	26,000 sf	0.08 gpd/sf	2,080		
Hotel	552 rooms	130 gpd/room	71,760		
Sound Stage	222,200 sf	0.08 gpd/day	17,776		
		Total Related Projects	848,891		
		Plus Project	24,040		
		Total	872,931		
gpd = gallons per day	du = dwelling unit	sf = square feet			

 Table 25

 Estimated Cumulative Water Consumption and Wastewater Generation¹

 Assumes wastewater generation equals water consumption.
 Source: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, Sewer Generation Rates Table, March 20, 2002. This rate does not assume the effectiveness of any current water conservation measures that are required in the City.

³ Source: Crossroads Hollywood EIR, page IV.M.1-45, May 2017.

Water

Implementation of the related projects could increase the need for water supply in the City. Table 25 shows that the cumulative development in the Project Site area could result in the need to treat approximately 872,931 gallons of water per day (or 0.87 mgd per day). It should be noted that this amount does not take into account the net decrease in water consumption (and wastewater generation) that would occur as a result of removal of existing uses for the related project or the effectiveness of water conservation measures required in accordance with the City's Green

Building Code, both of which would likely substantially reduce the cumulative water consumption (and wastewater generation) shown on Table 23.

LADWP (through its UWMP) anticipates that its projected water supplies will meet demand through the year 2040. In terms of the City's overall water supply condition, any related project that is consistent with the City's General Plan has been taken into account in the planned growth of the water system. In addition, any related project that conforms to the demographic projections from SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS and is located in the service area is considered to have been included in LADWP's water supply planning efforts so that projected water supplies would meet projected demands. Similar to the Project, each related project would be required to comply with City and State water code and conservation programs for both water supply and infrastructure.

Related projects that propose changing the zoning or other characteristics beyond what is within the General Plan would be required to evaluate the change under CEQA review process. The CEQA analysis would compare the existing to the proposed uses and the ability of LADWP supplies and infrastructure to provide a sufficient level of water service. Future development projects within the service area of the LADWP would be subject to the water conservation measures outlined in the City's Green Building Code, which would partially offset the cumulative demand for water. LADWP undertakes expansion or modification of water service infrastructure to serve future growth in the City as required in the normal process of providing water service. For these reasons, cumulative impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Solid Waste

As shown on Table 26, implementation of the Project in conjunction with the related project would result in an estimated solid waste generation of approximately 12.73 tons per day. It should be noted that this amount does not take into account the net decrease in solid waste generation that would occur as a result of removal of existing uses or the effectiveness of recycling measures required in accordance with existing City's recycling regulations, both of which would likely substantially reduce the cumulative solid waste generation. With a remaining daily capacity of approximately 18,366 tons of solid waste per day, the landfills serving the Project and related project would have adequate capacity to accommodate cumulative solid waste generation. Additionally, all development in the City is require to comply with City and state recycling regulations. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to solid waste generation would be less than significant.

Estimated Cumulative Solid Waste Generation				
Land Uses	Size	Solid Waste Generation Rate ¹	Total (tpd)	
Hollywood Central Park	76,500 sf	0.005 lbs/day/sf	0.19	
Multi-Family Residential	2,731 du	4 lbs/day/du	5.5	
Commercial/Retail	75,306 sf	0.005 lbs/day/sf	0.18	
Restaurant	57,553	0.005 lbs/day/sf	0.14	
Office	1,780,069 sf	0.006 lbs/day/sf	5.3	
Supermarket	26,000 sf	0.005 lbs/day/sf	0.06	
Hotel	552 rooms	2 lbs/day/room	0.55	
Sound Stage	222,200 sf	0.005 gpd/day	0.55	
		Total Related Projects	12.47	
		Plus Project	0.26	
		Total	12.73	
tpd = tons per daydu = dwelling unitsf = square feet1City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, "Solid Waste Generation," 1981.				

Table 26Estimated Cumulative Solid Waste Generation

Section 15300.2(c) – Significant Effects Due to Unusual Circumstances

There are no unusual circumstances related to implementation of the Project or with the Project Site, which is mostly flat. The Project includes infill development of a site located in Hollywood, a highly urbanized portion of the City. The proposed uses are allowed under the existing zoning and land use designation for the Project Site. Additionally, the Project Site is not located in a designated "environmentally sensitive area." While no unusual circumstances exist, as described above, there is also not a reasonable possibility that any significant effects could result from development of the Project. Specifically, no significant impacts related to traffic, noise, air quality, water quality, public services, and/or utilities would occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, this Exception does not apply to the Project.

Section 15300.2(d) – Scenic Highways

The Project Site is not visible from any scenic highway. Therefore, this Exception does not apply to the Project.

Section 15300.2(e) – Hazardous Waste Sites

The Project Site is not included on any list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.²⁰ Thus, the Project would not create a hazard to the public or the environment as a result of being listed on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, this Exception does not apply to the Project.

²⁰ Department of Toxic Substances Control, <u>https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress</u>, accessed May 2021.

Section 15300.2(f) – Historic Resources

The analysis below is based on the Historic Resources Memo prepared by ESA, dated January 5, 2022, included as Appendix E. As discussed in detail, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Regulatory Setting

Numerous laws and regulations require federal, state, and local agencies to consider the effects a project may have on cultural resources. These laws and regulations stipulate a process for compliance, define the responsibilities of the various agencies proposing the action, and prescribe the relationship among other involved agencies.

Historical Architectural and Archaeological Resources

Historic and archaeological resources are governed by federal, state, and local (i.e., City) regulations that provide the framework for the identification and protection of these resources. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and CEQA are the primary regulations governing historic and archaeological resources in California. Regulations governing historic resources are also applicable to archaeological resources since the latter are also considered historic resources. Regulations applicable to historic and archaeological resources are discussed below.

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

The principal federal law addressing historic properties is the NHPA, as amended, and its implementing regulations. The term "historic properties" refers to "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register."

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) was established by the NHPA of 1966, as "an authoritative guide to be used by federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation's historic resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment." The National Register recognizes a broad range of cultural resources that are significant at the national, state, and local levels and can include districts, buildings, structures, objects, prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-period archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and cultural landscapes.

<u>Criteria</u>

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Properties of potential significance must meet one or more of the following four established criteria:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

<u>Context</u>

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant within a historic context. National Register Bulletin #15 states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated within its historic context. Historic contexts are "those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific...property or site is understood and its meaning...is made clear." A property must represent an important aspect of the area's history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity to qualify for the National Register.

Integrity

In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the ability of a property to convey its significance." The National Register recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. Thus, the retention of the specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

Criteria Considerations

Certain types of properties, including religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces or graves, cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not considered eligible for the National Register unless they meet one of the seven categories of Criteria Consideration A through G, in addition to meeting at least one of the four significance criteria discussed above, and possess integrity as defined above. Criteria Consideration G states that "a property achieving significance within the last 50 years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance." This is intended to prevent the listing of properties for which insufficient time may have passed to allow the proper evaluation of its historical importance.

<u>State</u>

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA is the principal statute governing environmental review of projects occurring in the state and is codified at Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq. CEQA requires lead agencies to determine if a proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, including significant effects on historical or unique archaeological resources. Under PRC Section 21084.1, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

The CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15064.5) recognize that historical resources include: (1) a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) a resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); and (3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California by the lead agency, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. The fact that a resource does not meet the three criteria outlined above does not preclude the lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1, provided the determination is supported by substantial evidence.

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for a historical resource contained in the CEQA Guidelines, then the site may be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083, which is as a unique archaeological resource. As defined in PRC Section 21083.2 a "unique" archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or,
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If an archaeological site meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC Section 21083.2, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2, which state that if the lead agency determines that a project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be

made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place (PRC Section 21083.1(a)). If preservation in place is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be required. The CEQA Guidelines note that if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4)).

A significant effect under CEQA would occur if a project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). Substantial adverse change 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)). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2), the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that:

- Convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
- Account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- Convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA.

In general, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Standards) or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Guidelines) shall be considered to have mitigated its impacts to historical resources to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(3)). Both Secretary of the Interior Standards were codified in the Federal Register in 1995. The Standards and Guidelines are a series of concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. The Standards comprise four different treatment approaches— preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction-each with their own set of standards (ranging from six to ten standards). Depending on the project, either preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, reconstruction, or a combination of the above may be required to mitigate a project under CEQA. The Standards for Rehabilitation are applicable to most rehabilitation and adaptive reuse projects involving continuation of existing use or changes in use. Standards 1 through 7 govern the use, repair and preservation of historic properties. Standard 8 is for significant archaeological resources. Standard 9 governs new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, and requires that the new work be differentiated from the old, and that it shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. Standard 10 governs new additions and adjacent or related new construction

and requires that new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register is "an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the State and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change" (PRC Section 5024.1[a]). The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria (PRC Section 5024.1[b]). Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register.

To be eligible for the California Register, a prehistoric or historic-period property must be significant at the federal, state, and/or local level under one or more of the following four criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A resource eligible for the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance (integrity) to be recognizable as a historical resource and to convey the reason for its significance. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but it may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.

Additionally, the California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the National Register and those formally determined eligible for the National Register;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward; and
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

Other resources that may be nominated to the California Register include:

- Historical resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through 5 (those properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, and/or a local jurisdiction register);
- Individual historical resources;
- Historical resources contributing to historic districts; and
- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as an historic preservation overlay zone.

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event human remains are discovered, the County Coroner be contacted to determine the nature of the remains. In the event the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, the Coroner is required to contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours to relinquish jurisdiction.

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98

PRC Section 5097.98, as amended by Assembly Bill (AB) 2641, provides procedures in the event human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project implementation. PRC Section 5097.98 requires that no further disturbances occur in the immediate vicinity of the discovery, that the discovery is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural and archaeological standards, and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials. PRC Section 5097.98 further requires the NAHC, upon notification by a County Coroner, designate and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) regarding the discovery of Native American human remains. Once the MLD has been granted access to the site by the landowner and has inspected the discovery, the MLD has 48 hours to provide recommendations to the landowner for the treatment of the human remains and any associated grave goods.

In the event that no descendant is identified, or the descendant fails to make a recommendation for disposition, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendant, the landowner may, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains and burial items on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance.

Local

Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance

In addition to the National Register and the California Register, two additional types of historic designations may apply at a local level, including designation of a Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) and classification of an Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). Of these, the designation of an HCM is relevant to the Project and is discussed below.

The Los Angeles City Council adopted the Cultural Heritage Ordinance in 1962 and amended it in 2007 (Los Angeles Administrative Code, Chapter 9, Division 22, Article 1, Section 22.171.7). The Cultural Heritage Ordinance was revised in 2018 (Ordinance No. 185472, amending Section

22.171 of Article 1, Chapter 9, Division 22 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code). The Cultural Heritage Ordinance establishes criteria for designating a local historical resource as an HCM. According to the Cultural Heritage Ordinance, an HCM is any site (including significant trees or other plant life located on the site), building, or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City. HCMs are regulated by the City's Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council.

The Cultural Heritage Ordinance states that a Historic-Cultural Monument designation is reserved for those resources that have a special aesthetic, architectural, or engineering interest or value of a historic nature and meet one of the criteria that follows:

- [It] is identified with important events of national, state, or local history, or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic or social history of the nation, state, city or community;
- [It] is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
- [It] embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.

Designation recognizes the unique architectural value of certain structures and helps to protect their distinctive qualities. Any interested individual or group may submit nominations for HCM status. Buildings may be eligible for HCM status if they retain their historic design and materials. Those that are intact examples of past architectural styles or that have historic associations may meet the criteria listed in the Cultural Heritage Ordinance.

The Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance provides that compliance with the Standards is part of the process for review and approval by the Cultural Heritage Commission of proposed alterations to HCMs (see Los Angeles Administrative Code Section 22.171.14.a.1). Thus, the Standards are used for regulatory approvals for designated resources but not for resource evaluations.

Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.106.4.5 (Permits for Historical and Cultural Buildings)

In addition, LAMC Section 91.106.4, which deals with permits, contains a provision for permits for historical and cultural buildings. This subsection states Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Department (LADBS) "shall not issue a permit to demolish, alter or remove a building or structure of historical, archaeological or architectural consequence if such building or structure has been officially designated, or has been determined by state or federal action to be eligible for designation, on the National Register of Historic Places, or has been included on the City of Los Angeles list of Historic-Cultural monuments, without the department having first determined whether the demolition, alteration or removal may result in the loss of or serious damage to a significant historical or cultural asset." Furthermore, pursuant to LAMC Section 91.106.4.5.1, LADBS "shall not issue a building permit for demolition of a building or structure for which the original building permit was issued more than 45 years prior to the date of submittal of the

application for demolition pre-inspection, or where information submitted with the application indicates that the building or structure is more than 45 years old based on the date the application is submitted," without having first provided the required notice and taken the required actions at least 30 days prior to issuance of the demolition of building or structure permit. The required notice involves the department sending written notice of the demolition pre- inspection application via U.S. mail to the abutting property owners and occupants, as well as the Council District Office and Certified Neighborhood Council Office representing the site, for which a demolition pre-inspection has been proposed for a building or structure.

Additionally, any interested individual may apply for a proposed designation of a Historic Cultural Monument. Upon the determination by the Planning Director that the application is complete—or upon initiation by City Council, Cultural Heritage Commission, or Planning Director—no permit for the demolition substantial alteration, or removal shall be issued. The site, building, or structure, regardless of whether a permit exits, shall not be demolished, pending final determination by the Commission and City Council whether the proposed site, building, or object or structure shall be designated a Historic- Cultural Monument, pursuant to Cultural Heritage Ordinance No. 185472, amending Section 22.171 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code. Also, if the property has been previously identified in a survey or has been nominated for designation and it is determined by the City that a project is subject to CEQA review, the City may require preparation of a historical resource assessment report and CEQA impacts analysis, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, prior to issuance of a demolition permit. Once the process pursuant to LAMC Section 91.106.4.5.1 is completed, the LADBS will then be able to issue the applicable permits.

Identification of Historic Properties Affected

Historic Properties on Project Site

For the purposes of CEQA, there is one previously identified eligible historical resource recorded within the Project Site, the Lombardi House, which could be directly impacted by the Project as the result of alteration to its immediate surroundings. The Lombardi House, located at 1717 Bronson Avenue, is a two- story, multi-family residential property. The residence was originally built as a single-family dwelling circa 1904 – 1905, in the Shingle style with deep gables, steeply pitched roof, and a wrap-around porch. It was later modified into the Colonial Revival style c. 1930 and reoriented to face east onto Bronson Avenue. The building was extensively renovated in 2012, with many architectural details reconstructed at this time.

The wood-frame residence is set back from the east property line by an extensive front lawn with tall, mature trees enclosed by a tall hedge. There are smaller fruit trees and bushes scattered around the property. The building has an asymmetrical footprint, with a cross-gabled roof covered in asphalt shingles and exteriors clad in beveled wood clapboard siding. The main entry is at the north end of the east façade, under a two-story portico with thin, square columns supporting a full-length widow's walk at the attic level, in front of the east-facing gable. Underneath the widow's walk at the second level is a partial-length balcony supported by carved brackets, accessible through a pair of French doors with sidelights at the second level. Below the balcony is a single-leaf, wood-paneled entry door with 4-pane vertical sidelights and a fanlight transom.

The southern end of the front elevation has a gable at the second level with a bay window of three 1/1 wood sash with a pent roof, and a small 1:1 clerestory window with a fanlight at the attic level. Below are three casement windows with sidelights, separated by engaged columns, and an attached wooden railing that mimics the original wrap-around porch that previously existed in this location. The faux porch railing continues around the southwest corner and along the southern elevation, interrupted only by a large half-moon porch with brick stairs that radiate outward in a matching semi-circular pattern.

The two-story, partial-length porch is off-center to the west, with a second-floor balcony supported by four Doric columns. The balcony has a simple wood railing and is accessible through a singleleaf door on the second level. A classical pediment above the balcony is supported by Doric columns that match the first level colonnade, with a carved wood, clover-shape vent at the attic level. Pedimented roof dormers on either side of the balcony have matching clover wood carvings and 2-pane casement windows. The entry at the first level has a single-leaf glazed door with two sets of 10-pane sidelights on either side, and above the door are three small rectangular clerestory windows. This portico faces south towards Hollywood Boulevard and was the original entry for the building. Both corners of this elevation have an engaged column at the corner, as well as multiple tripartite casement windows.

The west elevation has a projecting entry bay with a shed roof and a single-leaf door at its center, with multiple 2-pane casement windows in a variety of sizes on either side. The eastern half has a recessed gable at the second level, with exposed rafter tails from the rear-facing gable along the western half.

The north elevation has two projecting gabled bays with multiple two-pane casement windows. The wider of the bays is at the center of the elevation and recessed from the first; it has a large modern metal staircase to the second floor and a balcony attached to its front façade. The first and second levels of the house are separated by wide, enclosed eaves that give the appearance of a skirted roof, except for the second, more recessed bay on the north elevation.

The accessory building on the property is a reconstruction that was erected in 2012. It is not a historical resource, nor does it contribute to the significance of the subject property.

According to a 2010 survey report, the subject property was previously surveyed four times by the City of Los Angeles. The first historic resource survey was completed in 1986; a second historic resource survey took place in 1997, which updated findings of the earlier survey; a third historic resource survey took place in 2003 and a fourth in 2010. Both the 1997 and 2003 surveys were reconnaissance level surveys, in contrast to the 1986 and the 2010 surveys which were intensive surveys. Additionally, in the City's inventory of historic resources, a DPR form from 2002, using a previous Historic Resources Inventory form from 1979 to supplement its findings, stated the house was deemed significant mainly for its architecture as it was one of the "rare pre-1905 houses of Hollywood." An inventory form from 1979 also highlighted that this home survived the commercial development of the neighborhood, and its particular architecture combines the verticality of the Victorian era with that of the newer more simplified Colonial Style. A DPR report from 2009 only states that the property retained integrity and was currently undergoing

renovations. A detailed integrity analysis was not included with any of the previous documentation.

It currently has status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation). The building has had significant alterations, including additions, window replacements, and porch infill and does not retain enough integrity for listing in the National Register.

After evaluation under the following contexts and themes, it is eligible under criteria A/1/1 as a rare example of residential development that pre-dates Hollywood's consolidation with the City of Los Angeles in 1910.

Context:	Pre-Consolidation Communities of Los Angeles, 1850-1932
Theme:	Hollywood, 1850-1910
Sub-theme:	Important Events in Hollywood History, 1850-1910

Additionally, it is eligible under criteria C/3/3 as an excellent example of American Colonial revival architecture in Hollywood.

Context:	Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme:	American Colonial Revival, 1895-1960
Sub-theme:	American Colonial Revival, Early, 1895-1940

The existence of character-defining features of the Lombardi House was confirmed in 2021 by an architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History. The current condition of the character-defining features listed below was not assessed because the Project does not propose any physical alterations to the Lombardi House.

- Setback from Bronson Avenue (east property line) that creates a front lawn
- Cross-gabled shingled roof (originally wood, now asphalt)
- Beveled wood clapboard siding
- Location of main entrance at north end of east elevation (paneled door with sidelights and fanlight above). Style and location are not original, but location is historic.
- Wooden railing that runs along south end of east (front) elevation as well as the south elevation (possibly original material but likely designed to mimic original wrap-around porch no longer extant)

- Eave overhang along south side of east (front) elevation that extends to the south facade as well
- Front-facing gable at south end of front (east) elevation with small clerestory window at top
- Balcony at second level above front entrance
- Wood shingles/wood clapboard siding
- Deep gables
- Remnants of wrap-around porch
- Porch addition on east façade (1949)
- Steeply pitched gable on west elevation
- Wide, overhanging eave that runs the length of the rear (west) elevation
- Semi-circular portico on south elevation
- Pair of gabled roof dormers on south roof slope (but not their windows)
- Projecting pediment centered on south elevation above portico with clover-shaped detailing

Historic Properties Adjacent to Project Site

5941 West Hollywood Boulevard (Salvation Army Tabernacle Church/former Hawaii Theater)

5941 West Hollywood Boulevard is a one-story commercial building in the Streamline Moderne style, designed by architect Carl Moeller, and constructed in 1939. It is located mid-block on the north side of Hollywood Boulevard. There is a wide driveway that runs directly east of the building, forming an alley that provides access to additional buildings at the rear. The building originally opened on May 6, 1940, as the Hawaii Theatre, and later became the Hawaii Music Hall in 1945. The theatre had round glass walls overlooking the sidewalk on either side of the front entrance, with a tropical mural over the box marquee. Inside, there was a single level of seating and décor that included tropical jungle murals.

The theatre was closed in July 1963 and the building was gutted in 1965 to be converted into the Salvation Army Tabernacle. It remains their Hollywood headquarters to this day. Additional renovations were carried out to the building in 2015, resulting in the appearance we see today. Currently, the building has a rectangular footprint and horizontal massing with exteriors clad in smooth stucco. The front façade is divided into three bays with a centered entrance, echoing its former use as a movie theater. The building's elevations are divided into two levels with a decorative painted belt course dividing them. The lower level is rounded at the southeast and

southwest corners overlooking Hollywood Boulevard, and a single ribbon of glass block. The second level of the elevations has a blocky, square style, and serves as a parapet or an arched roof that is hidden behind.

In 1994, the building was given a status of 2S2, which determined it eligible for National Register by consensus through the Section 106 process and listed in the California Register. It does not appear to have been evaluated since, and it is unlikely that the status is still applicable. While the footprint and general massing of the building have remained the same, all decorative details from its previous life as a theater have been removed. The rounded edges of the second level of the front façade have been altered to be straight ninety-degree corners, and the multiple decorative neon lights have been removed from the building, including two large columns that original were atop the building.

Additionally, the former cantilevered marquee has been removed. For purposes of this report, the building has been evaluated as a historic resource, but it is unlikely that status would remain if challenged.

5951 West Hollywood Boulevard (Florentine Gardens)

5951 West Hollywood Boulevard, commonly known as Florentine Gardens, is a significant example of a commercial property associated with the entertainment industry. Between the 1930s and 1950s,

Florentine Gardens was one of Hollywood's most popular dinner theaters and nightclubs, known for its celebrity-studded lineups and risqué performances. It is located on the north side of Hollywood Boulevard, mid-block between Branson and Gower.

When it opened in 1938, Florentine Gardens was a dinner theater. For \$1.50, the audience would be treated to some Italian food, partially nude girls, an emcee, dancers, a singer and more. Whereas the Sunset Strip featured many upscale nightspots, Hollywood Boulevard had more of the working-class nightspots, including Florentine Gardens. Various performers made appearances at the Florentine Gardens, including such big acts as the Mills Brothers and Sophie Tucker, and Marilyn Monroe (then Norma Jean Baker) celebrated her first marriage to Jim Dougherty with as reception at the club.

Florentine Gardens was a popular nightspot for servicemen during World War II, but the business went bankrupt shortly afterwards in 1948. It later reopened as the Cotton Club, a venue for black performers, although its successful run was short lived. Today the building still stands and is an event space, a filming location, and an occasionally nightclub with DJs and performers.

The building was evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (Individual Resources – 1/28/20) and was given the status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation) with eligibility criteria of A/1/1. It was evaluated under the following contexts and themes:

Context:Entertainment Industry, 1908 – 1980Theme:Commercial Properties Associated with the Entertainment Industry, 1908 –
1980

Sub-theme: Social Scene Associated with the Entertainment Industry, 1908 – 1980

The building has undergone significant alterations including door and window replacement, and its original Moorish decorative elements have been removed, rendering it not eligible for the National Register. More research on the original appearance of the building is needed to confirm the status of its architectural integrity.

1740 Gower Street (First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood)

The First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood is part of a church campus located at 1740 North Gower Street, a large site that encompasses the entire city block bounded by Yucca Street on the north, Carlos Avenue on the south, La Baig Avenue on the east, and Gower Street on the west. The historic core of the campus is located in the southwest corner and consists of two historic buildings: a large, four-story church at the corner of Gower Street and Carlos Avenue and a smaller, two-story chapel building (Wylie Chapel) to its immediate east. The church and chapel are connected by a cloister. Both were constructed in 1923 and designed by architect H.M. Patterson in the Late Gothic Revival style. The church is anchored by a five-story buttressed tower that culminates in a vented belfry. The chapel is capped by a large central lantern, and its façade is pierced by a rose window. The buildings are setback from Carlos Avenue, forming a small yard planted with groundcover, manicured shrubs, and mature Canary Island pine trees.

The First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood was organized in 1903, and shortly thereafter acquired the parcel at the northeast corner of Gower Street and Carlos Avenue for \$300. By 1909, the congregation had erected a small building on the property, but as the population of Hollywood grew in subsequent years the congregation outgrew its modest guarters. In 1922, H.M. Patterson was hired to design a new church on the Gower Street site. Patterson was a noted ecclesiastical architect, best known for designing landmark churches in the Late Gothic Revival style, and the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood is generally considered to be one of his most significant commissions. The church building as well as the adjoining chapel were completed in 1923, and the campus included offices, a cafeteria, study and lecture rooms, and Sunday school classrooms. The main church building was constructed and furnished at a cost of \$475,000, with an interior finished with mahogany, and seated 1,800 people. Over time, as the congregation continued to grow, it acquired additional lots until it came to own the entire block bounded by Gower and Yucca streets and Carlos and La Baig avenues. The small, single-family homes that historically occupied these lots were demolished to make way for additional buildings to serve the church and its affiliated school. While these later buildings, which post-date World War II, feature brick exterior walls and are generally compatible with the 1923 church and chapel, they clearly read as modern additions to the historic campus.

The buildings were evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (*Historic Districts, Planning Districts, and Multi-Property*

Resources – 1/28/20), and was given the status codes of 3S (appears individually eligible for the National Register through survey evaluation), 3CS (appears individually eligible for the California Register through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation). The survey found it eligible as a potential district under criteria C/3/3, as an excellent example of Late Gothic Revival institutional architecture in Hollywood, as well as a work of noted ecclesiasiastical architect H.M. Patterson.

Context:Architecture and Engineering 1850 - 1980Theme:Period Revival, 1919 - 1950Sub-theme:Late Gothic Revival, 1919 - 1939

The buildings appear to have had few, if any alterations, and retain a high level of architectural and historic integrity.

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard is a one-story commercial building in the Streamline Moderne style, designed by noted Los Angeles architect Gordon Kaufmann and constructed in 1936. It is located mid- block on the north side of Hollywood Boulevard. There is a wide driveway that runs directly west of the building, forming an alley that provides access to a large structure to the rear. The buildings appear to share a party wall, but it is unclear whether they are two separate structures or one unified building.

5939 Hollywood Boulevard originally housed the "Palms Grill", and currently is used as the Salvation Army's Youth Shelter. It is constructed of brick with an asymmetrical rectangular footprint and an asymmetrical curved façade. While windows on the front façade have been infilled or boarded over, a ribbon of eight 1/1/1 fixed-pane windows with a continuous concrete sill is still evident. It runs the partial length of the front façade, around the corner and north along the west elevation. A single-leaf door on the front elevation is off-center to the west. A second entrance to the building along the west elevation is currently boarded up but appears to contain a single-leaf glass and metal door. There are four additional 1/1 plate glass, fixed-pane windows on the west elevation, as well as a 3:3 display window set into a slightly projecting bay. The building has scalloped coping at the cornice line and three concrete string courses that run along the lower parts of the elevation at the southwest corner, underneath the ribbon of windows.

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard is an excellent example of the Streamline Moderne commercial architecture in Hollywood and designed by a noted Los Angeles architect. It was evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (*Individual Resources – 1/28/20*), and was given the status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation) with eligibility criteria of C/3/3. It was evaluated under the following contexts and themes:

Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850 – 1980 Sub-context: L.A. Modernism, 1919 – 1980

Theme: Related Responses to Modernism, 1926 – 1970

Sub-theme: Streamline Moderne, 1934 – 1945

With alterations that include door and window replacement, the building may not retain sufficient integrity for listing in the National Register, although some of the changes to the windows appear to be reversible. More research is needed to confirm the original appearance of the building, especially its windows and doors, before it status as a historical resource can be confirmed.

1756 North Tamarind Avenue

1756 North Tamarind Avenue is a three-story apartment building constructed in 1929. It is three bays wide, with rectangular massing, a symmetrical façade, a flat roof and a unique Mediterranean Revival style highlighted by carved Churrigueresque low-relief ornamentation around the entry and at the upper levels of the front façade. It is constructed of brick with a concrete façade and faces west onto Tamarind Avenue. Windows are almost exclusively 8-paned casements in a variety of configurations. Details include a quoined door surround, faux balconies of concrete relief, a small ornamental grille centered on the front elevation at the third level, and exteriors clad in vines. The building is setback from Tamarind Avenue with a grassy lawn in front, as well as a small rear yard to the north of Carlos Avenue.

The building was evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (*Individual Resources – 1/28/20*), and was given the status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation). After evaluation under the following contexts and themes, it is eligible under criteria A/1/1 as a rare remaining example of an intact 1920s multi-family residence in Hollywood. The 1920s represented a significant period of growth in Hollywood, and intact examples of multi-family residences dating to this era are increasingly rare.

- Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850 1980
- Theme: Early Residential Development, 1880 1930
- Sub-theme: Early Multi-Family Residential Development, 1880 1930

Additionally, it is eligible under criteria C/3/3 as an excellent example of a 1920s apartment house in Hollywood, exhibiting the distinctive features of the property type. Designed to maximize lot coverage, apartment houses were an important type of multi-family property in Los Angeles during the early decades of the 20th century, and 1756 North Tamarind is an intact and important remnant from this period of residential development.

Context:	Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850 – 1980
Sub-context:	Multi-Family Residential Development, 1910 – 1980
Theme:	Multi-Family Residential, 1910 – 1980

While the building has had alterations, including the likely replacement of its original windows, overall, it retains a high level of architectural and historical integrity and likely would be eligible for the California Register and status as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument.

CEQA Impacts Analysis

Identified below are the thresholds for determining the significance of environmental effects on historical resources are derived from the CEQA Guidelines as defined in §15064.5 and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. Pursuant to this guidance, a project that would physically detract, either directly or indirectly, from the integrity and significance of the historical resource such that its eligibility for listing in the National Register, California Register, or as a City Historic-Cultural Monument (LAHCM) would no longer be maintained, is considered a project that would result in a significant impact on the historical resource. Adverse impacts, that may or may not rise to a level of significance, result when one or more of the following occurs to a historical resource: demolition, relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration, or new construction on the site or in the vicinity.

Adverse impacts, that may or may not rise to a level of significance, result when one or more of the following occurs to a historical resource:

- Demolition of a significant resource;
- Relocation that does not maintain the integrity and significance of a significant resource;
- Conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a significant resource which does not conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings; or
- Construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on the site or in the vicinity

Direct Impacts

Despite the shared site, the Project would have no direct adverse impact to the Lombardi House. The building would remain intact in its current location and would not be materially altered by the new construction on the Project Site. The Project does not include the demolition, relocation, rehabilitation, alteration, or conversion of the Lombardi House. The building's existing massing, form, and architectural features would remain intact and unchanged. The Project is designed in a modern style that will be easily differentiated from Lombardi House. The Lombardi House would remain unchanged and in its original location after implementation of the Project. All of its exterior character-defining features, as well as its interior spaces, would remain unaltered and continue to convey its historical significance. The Project would not affect the integrity of location, design, materials, or workmanship of the Lombardi House. Accordingly, because all the existing physical elements that characterize the Lombardi House would continue to convey the property's historic significance, integrity of feeling would also remain unaffected. The construction of the Project

does nothing to alter the building's history as one of the few remaining early residences along Hollywood Boulevard. Therefore, integrity of association would also remain unaffected by the Project. While there would be alterations to the setting with the removal of trees, the landscaping is not historical nor is it a character defining feature of the Lombardi House. The aspects of the historical setting that currently exist and are important to the Lombardi House, would remain intact. They include the main public entrance and primary façade of the Lombardi House, both of which would continue to face and be accessible via the sidewalk off Bronson Avenue to the east.

Therefore, direct impacts to the Lombardi House would be less than significant, and, in this regard, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.

Indirect Impacts

Historical Resources Within Project Site

As discussed above, the historical resource the Lombardi House (1717 Bronson Avenue) is part of the Project Site and will be immediately adjacent to the construction site. Although direct impacts on the building associated with the new construction are considered less than significant, the Project has the potential for other indirect impacts associated with construction to occur. The new building will be substantially taller than the Lombardi House, and there is potential for substantial adverse effects associated with the setting of the historical resource. Because the Project would construct a 24-story residential tower immediately to the north of the Lombardi House, thereby adding considerable height and mass to the parcel, the immediate surroundings of the Lombardi House would be altered.

However, the broader setting of the Lombardi House (Hollywood) as well as its immediate block, have continued to change since its original construction. With a location immediately adjacent to Hollywood Boulevard, what was originally a quiet residential and somewhat bucolic setting in the early 20th century has become a nexus of dense commercial development that continues to this day. Following World War II, density, and the scale of development in Hollywood increased substantially. With the opening of the US-101 in 1954, the area became even more accessible, spurring further development. When Los Angeles voters rescinded the 150-foot height limit in 1957, Hollywood became an epicenter for the development and construction of larger and taller buildings, both commercial and residential.

Hollywood's first post-height limit "skyscraper" was the 20-story Sunset and Vine Tower constructed at the southeast corner of Sunset and Vine in 1963. Rising over 290 feet in height, the Sunset and Vine Tower was almost twice the height of any height-limit era building in Hollywood. Designed in a Corporate Modern style, the rectangular steel-frame and glass curtain wall building presented a stark silhouette that radically altered the Hollywood skyline. Additional high-rises on Sunset soon followed including a 185-foot office building constructed in 1968 at the southwest corner of Sunset Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard, and a 22-story office tower constructed in 1971 at the northwest corner of Sunset and Argyle.

In the 1960s and 1970s Hollywood's population became more ethnically diverse, as new immigrant groups began settling in the area. Community and residential densities continued to

increase, as original single-family homes, bungalow courts, and smaller apartment buildings were replaced with larger multi-family residential complexes. By the 1980s the Hollywood community was in a state of economic decline as commercial development became focused more intensely elsewhere in the City. The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles established the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area in 1986 to encourage development in the area, and the Project Site lies within its boundaries. Towards the end of the 1990s, Hollywood began to experience a resurgence in development, and the increase in density and scale of that development that continues today. Recent development in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site includes 1150 N El Centro, a 20-story building of 230 feet (approximately .75 from project site) as well as 1755 Argyle Avenue, an 18-story residential tower (approximately.40 away from project site). Additionally, plans have been approved for a 22-story residential tower at the southwest corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Gower Street, only .25 miles away from the Project Site.

The construction of a residential tower immediately to the north of the Lombardi House is simply the continued evolution of a neighborhood that has been transformed over the last century and it will have no effect on the significance of the Lombardi House. After construction of the Project, the Lombardi House would remain intact and in its original location. All of its character-defining features would remain unchanged and continue to be viewable and discernable by the public. The building would continue to convey its historic significance and maintain its eligibility for listing as a historical resource. The building's eligibility for the California Register or potential designation as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument would not be threatened. The Project does not involve alteration that would result in a change in status for the Lombardi House. In summary, the Project would not materially impair the historic setting of the Lombardi House. Therefore, the direct impacts on the historical resources would be less than significant in regard to the historic setting.

Historical Resources Adjacent to Project Site

Indirect impacts were analyzed to determine if the Project would result in a substantial material change to the integrity and significance of historical resources adjacent to the Project Site, which are identified and described below. Four of the resources have been determined eligible for listing in the California Register or for local designation; one resource is currently listed in the California Register. None of the resources are currently considered eligible for the National Register. These resources were recently identified through a survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area conducted in January of 2020.

The following historical resources are physically separated from the Project Site by other buildings and streets, at distances that range from 150 feet to 750 feet, and the Project would not result in any direct or physical impact to these resources. There are no historical resources directly adjacent to the Project Site other than Lombardi House, which is contained within the Project Site as detailed above. The only potential indirect impact to historical resources adjacent to the Project Site regards changes in views due to implementation of the Project and potential effects on the setting, feeling, and association of these adjacent historical resources. For purposes of CEQA, a direct view of the Project Site is defined as an unobstructed view from the front elevation of a historic building at ground level toward the Project Site. A primary view of a historical resource is defined as the primary public view of the front elevation of a historical resource from the public right-of-way. As discussed below, project impacts to all these possible views from historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site would be either "no impact" or "less than significant."

The Project would have no impact on the following historical resources as they generally do not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair any of these resources or interrupt primary views of these resources in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of these historical resources to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of these historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site would remain intact.

5941 West Hollywood Boulevard (Salvation Army Tabernacle Church/former Hawaii Theater)

The building is approximately 250 feet to the west/southwest of the Project Site and has no direct views. It is oriented to the south, towards Hollywood Boulevard, and is separated from the Project Site by multiple intervening buildings. Additionally, the historical resource's immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. The Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

5951 West Hollywood Boulevard (Florentine Gardens)

The building is approximately 325 feet to the west/southwest of the Project Site and has no direct views. It is oriented to the west, towards Gower, and to the south, towards Hollywood Boulevard. It is separated from the Project Site by multiple intervening buildings. Additionally, the historical resource's immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. The Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

1740 Gower Street (First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood)

The buildings are located approximately 750 feet to the west/northwest of the Project Site and have limited, direct views of the Project Site. While they face south towards along Carlos Avenue, they are separated from the Project Site by a full block and multiple intervening buildings. Additionally, the historical resources' immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the
prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. For these reasons, the Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard

The Project would be northeast of this historical resource by approximately 150 feet. The building is oriented to the south onto Hollywood Boulevard and is built directly up the property line on the east side and there are no windows or doors on the eastern elevation. A direct view is defined as an unobstructed view of the Project Site from the front elevation of the resource at ground level from the public right-of-way; therefore, this would be considered an indirect view. The view would not adversely affect the resource, especially as its immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource to the project Site would remain intact.

1756 North Tamarind Avenue

The Project would be southeast of this historical resource by approximately 150 feet and there is a direct line of sight from the rear yard of 1756 Tamarind Avenue onto the Project Site. However, the building's primary façade faces west onto Tamarind Avenue and the Project Site is not visible from the front yard. There is an indirect view of the resource from Bronson Avenue that is currently interrupted by existing buildings, and that would not change with project completion. Additionally, the historical resource's immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed and this block of Tamarind Avenue is a dead end cul-de-sac that directly overlooks the Hollywood Freeway. For these reasons, the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource to the Project Site would remain intact.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards Review

New proximate construction on the Project Site could alter the character of the historic setting associated with Lombardi House. In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. New construction should be differentiated from the old and compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property to

avoid impacts to the historic integrity of the property and its environment. New additions and adjacent or related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

The Project does not include any alterations to Lombardi House, and it would retain all the exterior and important character defining features. Because the exterior integrity of the building would be retained, the change in use would not detract from the significance of the building's primary distinctive materials and features. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 1.

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The project would retain and preserve the historic character of the building. No materials would be removed, nor would there be any alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Therefore, Project conforms to Standard 2.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

The Project recognizes the distinctive historic and architectural character of the Lombardi House and retains all the character-defining features and materials that cause the property to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. No conjectural features would be added and there would be no changes that create a false sense of historical development. Additionally, the Project is designed in a modern style that clearly differentiates it from the Lombardi House. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 3.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The Project would retain and preserve primary character-defining features of the Lombardi House, including alterations to the building that have acquired significance in their own right. The Lombardi House will not be physically altered in any way. While no changes or alterations to accessory buildings are currently planned, they were built outside of the period of significance and have not attained additional significance. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 4.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The Project retains all the distinctive exterior character-defining materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the Lombardi House. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 5.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

The Lombardi House remains in good condition and while it shares a site with the planned construction, it is not a part of the Project. The Project will not alter its character-defining features. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 6.

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

The Lombardi House will not be subjected to any chemical or physical treatments in the course or as a result of the Project. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 7.

Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Any potential to encounter archaeological or Native American resources is considered remote, in the unlikely event resources are encountered during Project implementation, those resources would be documented, protected, and preserved in place in accordance with the Standards. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 8.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The Project does not include any new additions or exterior alterations to the Lombardi House itself, rather it consists solely of a new adjacent structure. The new work is in a contemporary modern style that will be easily and significantly differentiated from the old. Lombardi House is separated from the Project by approximately 13 feet, and it will remain protected in its own setting, environment and surroundings, protected by current landscaping features that prevent views into the property from the public right of way or out of the property onto the public right of way. When standing in the public right-of-way on Bronson Avenue, the view of the Lombardi House is limited, and the resource is mostly hidden from view. Additionally, there are no public views of the resource from the north or the south. The Project will do nothing to change this setting.

Additionally, it is important to note that the environment of the historical resource has continually been evolving over the last 120 years. With a location immediately adjacent to Hollywood Boulevard, what was originally a quiet residential and somewhat bucolic setting in the early 20th century has become a nexus of commercial development that continues to this day. Following World War II, density, and the scale of development in Hollywood increased substantially. With the opening of the US-101 in 1954, the area became even more accessible, spurring further development. When Los Angeles voters rescinded the 150-foot height limit in 1957, Hollywood became an epicenter for the development and construction of larger and taller buildings, both commercial and residential. Hollywood's first post-height limit "skyscraper" was the 20-story

Sunset and Vine Tower constructed at the southeast corner of Sunset and Vine in 1963. Rising over 290 feet in height, the Sunset and Vine Tower was almost twice the height of any height-limit era building in Hollywood. Designed in a Corporate Modern style, the rectangular steel-frame and glass curtain wall building presented a stark silhouette that radically altered the Hollywood skyline. Additional high-rises on Sunset soon followed including a 185-foot office building constructed in 1968 at the southwest corner of Sunset Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard, and a 22-story office tower constructed in 1971 at the northwest corner of Sunset and Argyle.

In the 1960s and 1970s Hollywood's population became more ethnically diverse, as new immigrant groups began settling in the area. Community and residential densities continued to increase, as original single-family homes, bungalow courts, and smaller apartment buildings were replaced with larger multi-family residential complexes. By the 1980s the Hollywood community was in a state of economic decline as commercial development became focused more intensely elsewhere in the City. The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles established the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area in 1986 to encourage development in the area, and the Project Site lies within its boundaries. Towards the end of the 1990s, Hollywood began to experience a resurgence in development, and the increase in density and scale of that development that continues today. Recent development in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site includes 1150 N EI Centro, a 20-story building of 230 feet (approximately.40 away from project site). Additionally, plans have been approved for a 22-story residential tower at the southwest corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Gower Street, only .25 miles away from the Project Site.

The construction of a residential tower immediately to the north of Lombardi House is simply the continued evolution of a neighborhood that has been transformed over the last century and it will have no effect on the significance of the Lombardi House. After construction of the Project, the Lombardi House would remain intact and in its original location. All of its character-defining features would remain unchanged and continue to be viewable and discernable by the public. The building would maintain its historic integrity and maintain its eligibility for listing as a historical resource.

Standard 10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The Project will be constructed adjacent to the resource and if the new construction were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the Lombardi House and other historical resources in the Project vicinity would be unaffected and unimpaired. Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 10.

APPENDIX A – TREE DATA

Jan C. Scow Consulting Arborists, LLC

Disease and Pest Diagnosis, Hazard Evaluation, Restorative Pruning Advice, Value Assessment

1744 Franklin Street Unit B Santa Monica, CA 90404 (818) 789-9127

12/5/20

Marc Levun Gonzales Law Group APC 800 Wilshire Blvd Ste 860 Los Angeles, CA 90017

15-Digit Application Number:

SUBJECT: Tree inspection at 1715-1739 N Bronson Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90028 REFERENCES:

- 1) LA City Protected Tree Ordinance #177404
- 2) City of LA, UF Division-Land Development memo "Clearance Letters for Clearance Summary Worksheets" (undated, unsigned)
- 3) Proposal for Tree Inventory/Protected Tree Report, dated 11/19/20, Scow
- 4) Tree Inventory and Tree Inventory Map, dated 12/5/20, Lancaster

We were asked to inspect the subject site (consisting of three parcels) and provide an opinion about whether there are any protected trees on or near the site. Protected tree species under the LA City Protected Tree Ordinance #177404 are as follows: all California native oaks, Western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*), and California bay (*Umbellularia californica*).

We visited the site on 12/5/20 and inspected all three parcels and the surrounding properties. *There are no protected trees located on or near this site under the LA City Protected Tree Ordinance #177404* that would be impacted by the proposed project. We did not observe evidence that protected trees had ever existed on this site.

There are eight street trees at this property, which are protected under a different LA City tree ordinance. Please see the referenced Tree Inventory and Map for more details.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance or if you have any additional questions. Our goal is to satisfy our clients and help them to better care for their trees in the most effective way possible. We look forward to working with you toward that goal!

Sincerely,

Jan C. Scow

ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist #382 Board Certified Master Arborist #WE-1972B



LEGAL DESCRIPTION (APN: 5545-003-029)

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. STATE OF CALIFORNIA. AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: THE NORTH 131.9 FEET OF THE SOUTH 216.9 FEET OF THE EAST ONE-HALF OF LOT OF THE BROKAW TRACT, IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 1, PAGE 39 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

TITLE EXCEPTIONS (APN: 5545-003-029)

A. Property taxes, which are a lien not yet due and payable, including any assessments collected with taxesto be levied for the fiscal year 2020-2021.

B. Property taxes, including any personal property taxes and any assessments collected with taxes, are as follows: Tax Identification No.: 5545-003-029 Fiscal Year: 2019-2020 1st Installment: \$10,908.82, PAID 2nd Installment: \$10,908.80, OPEN (Delinguent after April 10) Penalty and Cost: \$1,100.88 Homeowners Exemption: \$0.00 Code Area: 00200

C. The lien of supplemental or escaped assessments of property taxes. if any, made pursuant to theprovisions of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 75) or Part 2. Chapter 3. Articles 3 and 4 respectively, of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California as a result of the transfer of titleto the vestee named in Schedule A or as a result of changes in ownership or new construction occurringprior to Date of Policy.

1. Water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not disclosed by the public records.

2. Covenants, conditions and restrictions but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, medical condition, citizenship, primary language, and immigrationstatus, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restrictionis permitted by applicable law, as set forth in the documentRecording No: Book 1932, Page 93 of DeedsSaid covenants, conditions and restrictions provide that a violation thereof shall not defeat the lien of anymortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value.

 $\sqrt{3}$. The ownership of said Land does not include rights of access to or from the street, highway, or freewayabutting said Land, such rights having been relinguished by the document, Recording No: Book D-349, Page 117 of Official Records Affects: The Northerly line of said land.

4. The Land described herein is included within a project area of the Redevelopment Agency shown below, and that proceedings for the redevelopment of said project have been instituted under theRedevelopment Law (such redevelopment to proceed only after the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan)as disclosed by a document. Redevelopment Agency: The Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area Recording Date: May 9, 1986 Recording No: 86–581562 of Official Records

5. Matters contained in that certain document Entitled: Waiver of Damages, Indemnification Agreement and Right of Ingress and Egress- Covenant to Run With the Land Executed by: Pristine Properties, LLC and City of Los Angeles Recording Date: November 7, 2013 Recording No: 20131591562 of Official Records Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars.

Among other things, said document provides for: Approval conditions for encroachment of temporaryimprovements onto an easement. <u>6</u> An irrevocable offer to dedicate an easement over a portion of

said Land for Purpose(s): Public street purposes Recording Date: February 14, 2014 Recordina No: 20140163916 of Official Records Affects: A portion of said land as more particularly described in said document.Said offer was accepted by resolution, a certified copy of whichwas recorded April 3, 2015, as Instrument

7. Matters contained in that certain document Entitled: Master Covenant and Agreement Executed by: Jacques Massachi and City of Los Angeles Recording Date: November 14, 2016 Recording No: 20161418764 of Official Records Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars. Among other things, said document provides for: Conditions of approval and agreement of compliance.

8. Matters contained in that certain document Entitled: Master Covenant and Agreement Regarding On-Site Stormwater Mitigation Measures and Maintenance Executed by: Jacques Massachi and City of Los Angeles Recording Date: November 30, 2016 Recording No: 20161504743 of Official Records Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars.

9. The effect of a Deed as set forth below: Grantor: Pristine Properties, LLC, a California limited liability Grantee: Lombardi House, LLC, a California limited liability company Dated: November 7, 2017

Recording Date: November 14, 2017 Recording No.: 20171304957 of Official Records

No. 20150367614, of Official Records.

The Company requires that an affidavit (attached) be completed and executed by the above grantor andthat said affidavit be acknowledged before a notary who is an employee of the title or escrow Company and then submitted to the Title Officer for review. The Company further requires a statement of information from the above grantors in order to complete this report, based on the effect of documents, proceedings, liens, decrees, or other matters which do not specifically describe said Land, but which if any do exist, may affect the title or impose liens orencumbrances thereon.

10. Please be advised that our search did not disclose any open Deeds of Trust of record. If you should haveknowledge of any outstanding obligation, please contact the Title Department immediately for further review prior to closing.

- INDICATES PLOTTED ITEMS

(R1)- ORDER NO. 00128965-987-OC1-K27

(R2)- ORDER NO. 00129301-987-OC1-K27

LEGAL DESCRIPTION (APN: 5545-003-014 AND 5545-003-023)

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: PARCEL 1

THOSE PORTIONS OF LOTS 5 AND 6 OF THE BROKAW TRACT, IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY

OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 1, PAGE 39 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, ACQUIRED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY PARCEL 63932 OF FINAL ORDER OF CONDEMNATION, FILED IN SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. C67440, (STATE PARCEL NO. 63932) IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY, A CERTIFIED COPY OF SAID FINAL ORDER BEING RECORDED APRIL 22, 1975 IN BOOK D6627, PAGE 124 OFFICIAL RECORDS.

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH 100,00 FEET OF THE EAST 139.50 FEET OF SAID LOT 6: THENCE ALONG THE FAST LINE OF LAST SAID LOT NORTH 00° 15' 08" WEST 44.94 FEFT TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 15.00 FEET: THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 82° 38' 05" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 21.63 FEET TO A REVERSE CURVE CONCAVE NORTHERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 126.00 FEET; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 32° 17' 49" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 71.03 FEET; THENCE TANGENT NORTH 50° 35' 24" WEST 17.24 FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 74.00 FEET; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 31° 11' 32" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 40.29 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF PARCEL 6 OF STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY RELINQUISHMENT NO. 258 BY RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY COMMISSION, A CERTIFIED COPY OF WHICH RESOLUTION WAS RECORDED

OCTOBER 8, 1963 IN BOOK D2210, PAGE 842 OFFICIAL RECORDS IN SAID OFFICE; THENCE ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE 89° 44' 62" WEST 2.88 FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHERLY AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 526.00 FEET; THENCE ALONG LAST CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 01° 03' 11' AN ARC DISTANCE OF 9.67 FEET TO A POINT IN THE NORTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID NORTH 100.00 FEET OF THE EAST 139.50 FEET OF SAID LOT 6; THENCE ALONG SAID PROLONGATION AND SAID WESTERLY LINE SOUTH 00° 15' 08" EAST 115.58 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID NORTH 100.00 FEET TO THE EAST 139.60 FEET OF SAID LOT 6; THENCE ALONG LAST SAID SOUTHERLY LINE NORTH 89° 33' 15" WEST 139.50 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. PARCEL 2:

THE NORTH 61 FEET OF THE SOUTH 277.9 FEET OF THE EAST HALF OF LOT 6 OF BROKAW TRACT, IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP Recorded in BOOK 1, PAGE 39 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

TITLE EXCEPTIONS (APN: 5545-003-014 AND 5545-003-023

A. Property taxes, which are a lien not yet due and payable, including any assessments collected with taxes to be levied for the fiscal year 2020-2021.

B. Property taxes, including any personal property taxes and any assessments collected with taxes, are as follows: Tax Identification No.: 5545-003-014 Fiscal Year: 2019-2020

1st Installment: \$10,260.27, PAID. 2nd Installment: \$10,260.27, OPEN (Delinguent after April 10) Penalty and Cost: \$1,036.02

Homeowners Exemption: \$0.00 Code Area: 00200

C. Property taxes, including any personal property taxes and any assessments collected with taxes, are as follows: Tax Identification No.: 5545–003–023 Fiscal Year: 2019–2020 1st Installment: \$8,312.31, PAID.

2nd Installment: \$8,312.30, OPEN (Delinguent after April 10) Penalty and Cost: \$841.23 Homeowners Exemption: \$0.00 Code Area: 00200

D. The lien of supplemental or escaped assessments of property taxes, if any, made pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 75) or Part 2, Chapter 3, Articles 3 and 4, respectively, of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California as a result of the transfer of title to the vestee named in Schedule A or as a result of changes in ownership or new construction occurring prior to Date of Policy.

1. Water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not disclosed by the public records.

2. Covenants, conditions and restrictions but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, medical condition, citizenship, primary language, and immigration status, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restriction is permitted by applicable law, as set forth in the documentRecording No: in Book 1932, Page 93 Deeds Affects: A portion of the Land described herein.

 $\cancel{3}$ The ownership of said Land does not include rights of access to or from the street, highway, or freeway abutting said Land, such rights having been relinquished by the document, Recording No: in Book D-349, Page 117 Official Records Affects: the Northerly line of said land

4. An instrument entitled Waiver of Damages, Indemnification Agreement and Right of Ingress and Egress -Covenant to Run with the Land Executed by: Pristine Properties. LLC In favor of: City of Los Angeles

Recording Date: November 07. 2013 Recording No: as Instrument No. 20131591562 Official Records Which among other things provides: Approval conditions for encroachment of temporary improvements onto an easement Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars.

5. Matters contained in that certain document Entitled: Memorandum Summarizing Non-Confidential Provisions of a Notice of Intent to Withdraw Units from Rental Housing Use Executed by: Pristine Properties, LLC Recording Date: May 27, 2016 Recording No: as Instrument No. 20160611558 Official Records Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars. 6. A Notice Entitled: Notice of Constraints to Landlords and Successors in Interest Executed by: City of Los Angeles Recording Date: August 08, 2016

Recording No: as Instrument No. 20160931199 Official Records Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars. and Recording Date: August 08, 2016 and Recording No: as Instrument No. 20160931226 Official Records

7. Covenants, conditions and restrictions but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including, but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, medical condition, citizenship, primary language, and immigration status, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restriction is permitted by applicable laws, as set forth in the document referred to in the numbered item last above

8. An instrument entitled Master Covenant and Agreement Executed by: Jacques Massachi In favor of: City of Los Angeles Recording Date: November 14, 2016 Recording No: as Instrument No. 20161418764 Official Records Which among other things provides: Conditions of approval and agreement of compliance Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars. 9. An instrument entitled Master Covenant and Agreement Regarding On-Site Stormwater Mitigation

Measures and Maintenance Executed by: Jacques Massachi In favor of: City of Los Angeles

Recording Date: November 30, 2016 Recording No: as Instrument No. 20161504743 Official Records Which among other things provides: Agreement regarding stormwater devices Reference is hereby made to said document for full particulars.

10. Any rights of the parties in possession of a portion of, or all of, said Land, which rights are not disclosed by the public records. The Company will require, for review, a full and complete copy of any unrecorded agreement, contract,

license and/or lease, together with all supplements, assignments and amendments thereto, before issuing any policy of title insurance without excepting this item from coverage. The Company reserves the right to except additional items and/or make additional requirements after reviewing said documents.

11. Matters which may be disclosed by an inspection and/or by a correct ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey of said Land that is satisfactory to the Company, and/or by inquiry of the parties in possession thereof.

12. Please be advised that our search did not disclose any open Deeds of Trust of record. If you should have knowledge of any outstanding obligation, please contact the Title Department immediately for further review prior to closing.

13. The effect of a Grant Deed From: LOMBARDI HOUSE, LLC, a California limited liability company To: LOMBARDI AM, LLC, a Californian limited liability company as to a 50% interest and LOMBARDI JM, LLC, a California limited liability company as to a 50% interest as tenants in common Dated: February 26, 2020 Recording Date: March 17, 2020 Recording No.: 20200308190, of Official Records

SURVEYOR'S NOTES:

- 1. THE INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON WAS BASED ON A FIELD SURVEY UNDERTAKEN ON MARCH 20TH, 2020 AT THE REQUEST OF JACQUES MASSACHI.
- 2. EXISTING ABOVE GROUND UTILITY APPURTENANCES HAVE BEEN LOCATED BY FIELD SURVEY. ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. THEY HAVE BEEN OBTAINED FROM THE BEST AVAILABLE SOURCES BUT FROM OTHERS NOT CONNECTED WITH THIS COMPANY, THEREFORE NO GUARANTEE IS MADE AS TO THE ACCURACY OR THOROUGHNESS OF SAID INFORMATION.
- 3. THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREON IS THE SAME AS THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN CHICAGO TITLE COMPANY REPORT(S) ORDER NO. 00129301-987-OC1-K27 DATED MARCH 31, 2020 AND ORDER NO. 00128965-987-OC1-K27 DATED MARCH 13, 2020. ALL EASEMENTS, COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS REFERENCED IN SAID TITLE COMMITMENT OR APPARENT FROM PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF THE SITE OR OTHERWISE KNOWN TO ME HAVE BEEN PLOTTED HEREON OR OTHERWISE NOTED AS TO THEIR EFFECT ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.
- 4. BOUNDARY LINES SHOWN HEREON WERE ESTABLISHED FROM PUBLIC AND/OR PRIVATE SURVEY MONUMENTS WHOSE CHARACTER AND SOURCE ARE SO NOTED HEREON.
- 5. THIS PRINT OF SURVEY REFLECTS BOUNDARY LINES OF THE DESCRIBED LAND WHICH "CLOSE" BY ENGINEERING CALCULATION.
- 6. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY HAS DIRECT PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICLE ACCESS TO BRONSON AVENUE AND CARLOS AVENUE.
- 7. AT THE TIME OF THIS SURVEY, THERE WAS NO OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE OF EARTH MOVING WORK, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION, OR BUILDING ADDITIONS
- 8. NO PARTY WALLS WERE FOUND ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

BASIS OF BEARING

AT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

THE BEARING OF N 0° 00' 00" W ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF BRONSON AVENUE (FORMALLY KNOWN AS HARTFORD AVENUE) AS SHOWN ON BROKAW TRACT, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 1, PAGE 39 OF MAPS WAS USED AS THE BASIS OF BEARING FOR THIS SURVEY.

BENCH MARK (ID NO. 20570)

1 IN BOLT IN CONC. MON; BUR J-12; 5 FT. SOUTH OF SOUTH CURB LINE FRANKLIN AVENUE; 7 FT. WEST OF WEST CURB LINE BRONSON

ELEV. = 429.822 NGVD 1929, 1985 RECORD

AVENUE

ZONING AND BUILDING SETBACKS

ZONING : R4-2 FRONT YARD - 10 FT. SIDE YARD - 10% LOT WIDTH. REAR YARD - 15 FT

FLOOD ZONE

FLOOD ZONE - X

FLOOD MAP PANEL NO. & DATE - 06037C1605F 26-SEP-2008

LOT AREA SUMMARY

5545-003-014 = 8,509 S.F. 5545-003-029 = 18,400 S.F. 5545-003-023 = 11,917 S.F.

TOTAL GROSS AREA = 38,826 S.F. (0.89 ACRES) TOTAL NET AREA = 37,639 S.F. (0.86 ACRES)



LEGEND:

T.C.B

BLDG

R W

INV

W.V.

EDISON

ELEC. B ELEC. M

—76*2*——

EL-SPOT







#WE-12464A

Jan C. Scow Consulling Arborists, LLC 1744-B Franklin Street Santa Monica, CA 90404



Tree #	Species	DSH (inches)*	Height**	Spread***	Health	Structure
1	Syzygium australe	8,5 @ 3'	38	4r	fair	poor
2	Syzygium australe	15 @ grade	38	4r	fair	poor
3	Syzygium australe	9	38	4r	good	poor
4	Syzygium australe	~18 @ 3'	40	4r	good	poor
5	Ficus microcarpa	8	38	4r	good	fair
6	Phoenix canariensis	28	15BTF	12r	fair	good
7	Olea europaea	30	32	12r	fair	fair
8	Cinnamomum camphora	7,5	28	8r	good	fair
9	Ficus microcarpa	8 @ 4'	36	4r	good	fair
10	Ficus microcarpa	8 @ 3'	38	4r	good	fair
11	Ficus microcarpa	9	45	4r	good	fair
12	Ficus microcarpa	8 @ 3.5'	38	4r	good	fair
13	Ficus microcarpa	8	38	4r	good	fair
14	Ficus microcarpa	8 @ 4'	38	4r	good	fair
15	Washingtonia robusta	14,14	45BTF	8r	fair	good
16	Washingtonia robusta	14	35BTF	6r	good	good
17	Washingtonia robusta	16	45BTF	6r	fair	good
18	Ceratonia siliqua	45 @ 1.5'	42	25/22/27/19	fair	fair
19	Diospyros kaki	13	25	9r	fair	fair
20	Pittosporum undulatum	8,8	25	11/18/13/—	poor	poor
21	Pittosporum undulatum	18 @ 3.5'	30	16r	poor	fair
22	Acacia melanoxylon	16	40	18r	good	fair
ST23	Magnolia grandiflora	4 @ 4'	14	6r	fair	fair
ST24	Magnolia grandiflora	4 @ 4'	16	6r	fair	fair
ST25	Magnolia grandiflora	4 @ 2'	14	6r	fair	fair
ST26	Magnolia grandiflora	4	14	6r	fair	good
ST27	Syagrus romanzoffiana	13	18BTF	10r	fair	good
ST28	Syagrus romanzoffiana	14	18BTF	12r	good	good
ST29	Syagrus romanzoffiana	12	20BTF	12r	good	good
ST30	Ficus rubiginosa	15,8	30	13r	fair	fair

* Diameter measured at the standard height of 4.5-feet above grade, unless otherwise specified. ** Height is estimated in feet. BTF is brown trunk feet for palm tree heights. *** Canopy spread is the distance in feet to the North/East/South/West. "r" indicates canopy as a radius estimated in feet.

APPENDIX B – TRANSPORTATION DATA

TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT FOR THE HOLLYWOOD/BRONSON RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT

HOLLYWOOD, CALIFORNIA



MAY 2021

PREPARED FOR

GONZALES LAW GROUP, APC



TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT FOR THE HOLLYWOOD/BRONSON RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT

HOLLYWOOD, CALIFORNIA

May 2021

Prepared for:

GONZALES LAW GROUP, APC

Prepared by:

GIBSON TRANSPORTATION CONSULTING, INC.

555 W. 5th Street, Suite 3375 Los Angeles, California 90013 (213) 683-0088

Ref: J1874

Table of Contents

Project Description 1 Project Location 2 Study Scope 2 Organization of Report 2 Project Context 6 Study Area 6 Existing Transportation Conditions 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology. 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 55 VMT Methodolog T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodolog T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 60 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 61 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazar	1.	Introduction	1
Project Location 2 Study Scope 2 Organization of Report 2 2 Organization of Report 2 2 Project Context 6 Study Area 6 Existing Transportation Conditions 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Arcess Overview		Project Description	1
Study Scope 2 Organization of Report 2 2. Project Context 6 Study Area 6 Existing Transportation Conditions 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 61 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63		Project Location	2
Organization of Report 2 2. Project Context. 6 Study Area 6 Existing Transportation Conditions. 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Generation 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis. 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies. 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-3.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 40 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63		Study Scope	2
2. Project Context. 6 Study Area. 6 Existing Transportation Conditions. 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 60 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4C: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 64		Organization of Report	2
Study Area 6 Existing Transportation Conditions. 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 40 Cumulative Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4C: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis	2.	Project Context	
Existing Transportation Conditions 7 Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis		Study Area	6
Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions 13 3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Distribution 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 <		Existing Transportation Conditions	7
3. Project Traffic 33 Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 9. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		Future Cumulative Transportation Conditions	
Project Trip Generation 33 Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Hazards Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66	3.	Project Traffic	
Project Trip Distribution 34 Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 64 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		Project Trip Generation	
Project Trip Assignment 34 4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		Project Trip Distribution	
4. CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts 38 Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Section 4C: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 66		Project Trip Assignment	
Methodology 38 Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Section 4C: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 66	4.	CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts	
Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies		Methodology	
or Policies Analysis 40 Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies 40 Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Section 4C: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 66		Section 4A: Threshold T-1 – Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances,	
Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies		or Policies Analysis	
Cumulative Analysis 46 Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-3.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 66		Plans. Programs. Ordinances. and Policies	
Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis 55 VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 60 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 66		Cumulative Analysis	
VMT Methodology 55 Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 60 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 62 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 66		Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 – Causing Substantial VMT Analysis	
Project VMT Analysis 59 Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		VMT Methodology	
Cumulative Analysis 60 Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional 62 Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		Project VMT Analysis	
Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis		Cumulative Analysis	60
Automobile Travel Analysis 62 Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards 63 Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 – Substantially Inducing Additional	
Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis		Automobile Travel Analysis	62
Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis 63 Access Overview 63 Project Hazards Analysis 63 Cumulative Analysis 65 Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis 66 Analysis Methodology 66 Project Safety Analysis 67		Section 4D: Threshold T-3 – Substantially Increasing Hazards	
Access Overview		Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis	63
Project Hazards Analysis		Access Overview	63
Cumulative Analysis		Proiect Hazards Analvsis	63
Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis		Cumulative Analysis	
Analysis Methodology		Section 4E: Freeway Safety Analysis	
Project Safety Analysis		Analysis Methodology.	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Project Safety Analysis	

Table of Contents, cont.

5.	Non-CEQA Transportation Analysis	68
	Section 5A – Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Assessment	
	Existing Facilities	
	Cumulative Analysis	70
	Section 5B – Project Access, Safety, and Circulation Assessment Project Access	
	Passenger Loading Evaluation	72
	Operational Evaluation	73
	Intersection Queuing Analysis	75
	Section 5C – Residential Street Cut-Through Analysis	82
	Section 5D – Construction Impact Analysis	83
	Construction Evaluation Criteria	83
	Project Construction Details	84
	Grading Phase	84
	Building Construction and Finishing Phases	85
	Potential Impacts on Access, Transit, and Parking	
	Construction Management Plan	87
	Section 5E – Parking	89
	Parking Supply.	89
	Vehicle Parking Code Requirements	89
	Bicycle Parking Code Requirements	89
6.	Summary & Conclusions	93

References

Appendix A:	Memorandum o	of Understanding
-------------	--------------	------------------

- Appendix B: Traffic Volume Data
- Appendix C: CEQA T-1 Plans, Policies, Programs Consistency Worksheet
- Appendix D:VMT Analysis WorksheetsAppendix E:HCM Analysis Worksheets

List of Figures

<u>NO.</u>

1	Project Site Plan	4
2	Project Site Location	5
3	Study Area & Analyzed Intersections	
4	Intersection Lane Configurations	19
5	Existing Intersection Mobility Facilities	
6	Existing Transportation Designations & Pedestrian Destinations	21
7	Existing Transit Service	22
8	Existing Conditions (Year 2021) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	23
9	Locations of Related Projects.	24
10	Related Project-Only Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	25
11	Future without Project Conditions (Year 2024) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	
12	Future Transportation Facilities & Roadway Modal Priorities	27
13	Project Trip Distribution	
14	Project-Only Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	
15	Existing with Project Conditions (Year 2021) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	77
16	Future with Project Conditions (Year 2024) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	78

List of Tables

<u>NO.</u>

1	Study Intersections	
2	Existing Transit Service in Study Area	
3A	Transit System Capacity in Study Area – Morning Peak Hour	
3B	Transit System Capacity in Study Area – Afternoon Peak Hour	
4	Related Projects List	
5	Project Trip Generation	
6	Project Consistency with Mobility Plan 2035	
7	Project Consistency with Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles	
8	Project Consistency with Hollywood Community Plan	
9	Project Consistency with Hollywood Redevelopment Plan	
10	Project Consistency with Citywide Design Guidelines	54
11	VMT Analysis Summary	61
12	Intersection Level of Service	79
13	Existing Conditions (Year 2021) Intersection Levels of Service	80
14	Future Conditions (Year 2024) Intersection Levels of Service	
15	Vehicle Parking Code Requirements	91
16	Bicycle Parking Code Requirements	

Chapter 1 Introduction

This study presents the transportation assessment for the proposed Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower Project (Project) located at 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue (Project Site) in the *Hollywood Community Plan* (Los Angeles Department of City Planning [LADCP], 1988) (the Hollywood Community Plan) area of the City of Los Angeles, California (City). The methodology and base assumptions used in the analysis were established in consultation with the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project proposes a 24-story residential development with up to 128 apartment units (including 12 affordable units). The Project Site is located in City Council District 13 and is comprised of three parcels in the Los Angeles County Assessor's records (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APN] 5545-003-029, 5545-003014, and 5545-003-023). All previously existing buildings on the Project Site have been demolished except for The Lombardi House on APN 5545-003-029, which will remain on the Project Site until after Project implementation.

The Project would include approximately 134 parking spaces within three levels of above ground and one level of subterranean parking. The Project would also provide a total of 98 bicycle parking spaces, including nine short-term spaces and 89 long-term spaces. Primary vehicular access would be provided via two driveways: one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress and egress movements. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue and additional entrances on Carlos Avenue.

The conceptual Project site plan is shown in Figure 1.

PROJECT LOCATION

As illustrated in Figure 2, the Project Site is generally bounded by Carlos Avenue to the north, Bronson Avenue to the east, adjacent commercial uses to the south, and the Los Angeles Superior Court facility and parking lot to the west. Bronson Avenue provides primary local and regional access to the Project Site. The Hollywood Freeway (US 101) travels below the Bronson Avenue overpass directly across the street from the Project Site. The most direct route to US 101 is via Hollywood Boulevard, located approximately 100 feet southeast of the Project Site.

The Project is located within 0.25 miles of Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) bus stops serving Lines 180, 181, and 217 at Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard (Intersection #4), Line 207 at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue (Intersection #1), and LADOT Downtown Area Short Hop (DASH) Hollywood Clockwise and Hollywood Counterclockwise lines at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue (Intersection #1). The Metro B Line Hollywood/Vine station for is located less than 0.50 miles west of the Project Site.

STUDY SCOPE

The scope of analysis for this study was developed in consultation with LADOT and is consistent with the LADOT *Transportation Assessment Guidelines* (July 2020) (TAG) and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 and following).

The base assumptions and technical methodologies (i.e., vehicle miles traveled [VMT], trip generation, study locations, analysis methodology, etc.) were identified and agreed to in a Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which was reviewed and approved by LADOT on February 10, 2021. A copy of the signed MOU is provided in Appendix A.

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

This report is divided into six chapters, including this introduction. Chapter 2 describes the Project Context including the study area and existing and future cumulative transportation conditions.

Chapter 3 presents the Project Traffic including the Project trip generation, trip distribution, and trip assignment. Chapter 4 details the CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts including TAG Thresholds T-1 through T-3 and the LADOT Freeway Safety Analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the Non-CEQA Transportation Analyses including the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit assessments, Project access, safety, and circulation assessments, residential street cut-through analysis, construction impact analysis, and parking analysis. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the analyses and study conclusions. The appendices contain supporting documentation, including the MOU that outlines the study scope and assumptions, and additional details supporting the technical analyses.









PROJECT SITE LOCATION

FIGURE 2

Chapter 2 Project Context

A comprehensive data collection effort was undertaken to develop a detailed description of existing and future conditions in the Project Study Area. The Existing Conditions analysis includes an assessment of the existing freeway and street systems, an analysis of traffic volumes and current operating conditions, and an assessment of the existing public transit service, as well as pedestrian and bicycle circulation, at the time environmental analysis commenced in Year 2021. An inventory of lane configurations, signal phasing, parking restrictions, etc., for the analyzed intersections was also collected, along with peak period traffic counts.

In addition, this Chapter contains a discussion of the future conditions detailing the assumptions used to develop the Future without Project Conditions in Year 2024, which correspond to anticipated occupancy of the Project.

STUDY AREA

The Study Area includes four study intersections along Bronson Avenue and Gower Street as shown in Figure 3. The intersections were selected in consultation with LADOT based on the following factors identified in the TAG:

- 1. Primary Project driveway(s)
- 2. Intersections at either end of the block on which the Project is located or up to 600 feet from the primary Project driveway(s)
- 3. Unsignalized intersections that are adjacent to the Project site or that are expected to be integral to the Project's site access and circulation plan
- 4. Signalized intersections in proximity to the Project site where 100 or more net new Project trips would be added

As listed in Table 1, the four study intersections identified for detailed analysis of the above conditions include three signalized intersections and one unsignalized intersection. The existing lane configurations at the analyzed intersections are provided in Figure 4.

EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

Existing Street System

The existing street system in the Study Area consists of a regional roadway system including freeways, arterials, collector, and local streets that provide regional, sub-regional, or local access and circulation within the Study Area. These transportation facilities generally provide two to six travel lanes and usually allow parking on either side of the street. Typically, the speed limits range between 25 and 35 miles per hour (mph) on the streets and between 55 and 65 mph on freeways.

Street classifications are designated in *Mobility Plan 2035, An Element of the General Plan* (LADCP, September 2016) (Mobility Plan) and incorporated in the Hollywood Community Plan. The Mobility Plan defines specific street standards to provide an enhanced balance between traffic flow and other important street functions including transit routes and stops, pedestrian environments, bicycle routes, building design and site access, etc. Per the Mobility Plan, street classifications are defined as follows:

- <u>Freeways</u> are high-volume, high-speed roadways with limited access provided by interchanges that carry regional traffic through and do not provide local access to adjacent land uses.
- <u>Arterial Streets</u> are major streets that serve through traffic, as well as provide access to major commercial activity centers. Arterials are divided into two categories:
 - <u>Boulevards</u> represent the widest Arterial Streets that typically provide regional access to major destinations and include two categories:
 - <u>Boulevard I</u> provides up to four travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 40 mph, and generally includes a right-of-way (ROW) width of 136 feet and pavement width of 100 feet.
 - <u>Boulevard II</u> provides up to three travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 35 mph, and generally includes a ROW width of 110 feet, and pavement widths of 80 feet.

- <u>Avenues</u> are typically narrow arterials that pass through both residential and commercial areas and include three categories:
 - <u>Avenue I</u> provides up to two travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 35 mph, with a ROW width of 100 feet and pavement width of 70 feet.
 - <u>Avenue II</u> provides up to two travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 30 mph, with a ROW width of 86 feet and pavement width of 56 feet.
 - <u>Avenue III</u> provides up to two travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 25 mph, with a ROW width of 72 feet and pavement width of 46 feet.
- <u>Collector Streets</u> are generally located in residential neighborhoods and provide access to and from Arterial Streets for local traffic and are not intended for cut-through traffic. They provide one travel lane in each direction with operating speed of 25 mph, with a ROW width generally at 66 feet and pavement width of 40 feet.
- <u>Local Streets</u> are intended to accommodate lower volumes of vehicle traffic and provide parking on both sides of the street. They provide one travel lane in each direction with a target operating speed of 15 to 20 mph. Pavement widths may vary between 30-36 feet within a ROW width of 50-60 feet. Local Streets include two categories:
 - <u>Continuous</u> Local Streets connect to other streets at both ends
 - Non-continuous Local Streets lead to a dead-end

Primary regional access to the Project Site is provided by US 101 within the Study Area. The arterial providing access to the Project Site is Bronson Avenue. The following is a brief description of the roadways in the Study Area, including their classifications under the Mobility Plan:

Freeways

 <u>US 101</u> – US 101 is a freeway that generally runs in the north-south direction and is located approximately 100 feet north of the Project Site. Nearest to the Study Area, US 101 provides four travel lanes in each direction. Access to and from US 101 is available via interchanges along Hollywood Boulevard approximately 250 feet southeast of the Project Site.

<u>Roadways</u>

• <u>Bronson Avenue</u> – Bronson Avenue is a designated Modified Avenue III and generally travels in the north-south direction within the Study Area. It is located along the eastern boundary of the Project Site and provides two travel lanes, one lane in each direction.

Unmetered parking is generally available on both sides of the street, with two-hour time restrictions on the west side of the street north of Yucca Street, within the Study Area. The approximate paved width of Bronson Avenue is 40 feet within the Study Area.

- <u>Franklin Avenue</u> Franklin Avenue is a designated Modified Avenue II and generally travels in the east-west direction. It is located north of the Project Site and provides four travel lanes, two lanes in each direction, with left-turn lanes at major intersections. Franklin Avenue currently has Class III bicycle routes on both sides of the street within the Study Area. Unmetered parking is generally available on both sides of the street, with two-hour time restrictions on the south side of the street west of Bronson Avenue, within the Study Area. Travel lanes are typically 11 to 12 feet wide, and the approximate paved width of Franklin Avenue is 55 feet within the Study Area.
- <u>Hollywood Boulevard</u> Hollywood Boulevard is a designated Avenue I and generally travels in the east-west direction. It is located south of the Project Site and provides four travel lanes, two lanes in each direction, with left-turn lanes at major intersections. Twohour, unmetered parking is generally available on both sides of the street within the Study Area. Travel lanes are typically 11-12 feet wide, and the approximate paved width of Hollywood Boulevard is 58-60 feet within the Study Area.
- <u>Gower Street</u> Gower Street is a designated Modified Avenue III and generally travels in the north-south direction within the Study Area. It is located west of the Project Site and provides four travel lanes, two lanes in each direction, with a raised median north of Carlos Avenue, a two-way left-turn lane south of Carlos Avenue, and left-turn lanes at major intersections. Unmetered parking is generally available on both sides of the street north of Carlos Avenue and the west side of the street south of Carlos Avenue within the Study Area. Travel lanes are typically 11-12 feet wide, and the approximate paved width of Gower Street is 60-75 feet within the Study Area.
- <u>Carlos Avenue</u> Carlos Avenue is a designated Local Street and generally travels in the east-west direction. It is located along the northern boundary of the Project Site, terminating at Bronson Avenue, and provides two travel lanes, one lane in each direction. Unmetered parking is generally available on the north side of the street west of La Baig Avenue and on both sides of the street east of Tamarind Avenue within the Study Area. The approximate paved width of Carlos Avenue is 25-32 feet within the Study Area.

The existing mobility facilities at each of the analyzed study intersections are detailed in Figure 5 and the Mobility Plan street designations within the Study Area are shown in Figure 6.

Existing Pedestrian Facilities

The walkability of existing facilities is based on the availability of pedestrian routes necessary to accomplish daily tasks without the use of an automobile. These attributes are quantified by WalkScore.com and assigned a score out of 100 points. With the various commercial businesses

and cultural facilities adjacent to residential neighborhoods, the walkability of the area is approximately 88 points¹. This compares to the walk score of 67 points for the adjacent Hollywood United neighborhood.

Currently surrounding the Project frontage, sidewalks along both sides of Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue provide complete pedestrian connections. The intersections of Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue (Intersection #1), Gower Street & Carlos Avenue (Intersection #2), and Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard (Intersection #4) provide signalized pedestrian crossings near the Project Site with pedestrian phasing, continental crosswalk striping, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible curb ramps. The existing pedestrian facilities provided at the study intersections are further detailed in Figure 5.

Pedestrian destinations within 0.25 miles of the Project Site are illustrated in Figure 6, including various commercial uses located along Franklin Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard.

Existing Bicycle System

Based on 2010 Bicycle Plan, A Component of the City of Los Angeles Transportation Element (LADCP, adopted March 1, 2011) (2010 Bicycle Plan), the existing bicycle system consists of a limited network of bicycle lanes (Class II) and bicycle routes (Class III). Class II bicycle lanes are a component of street design with dedicated striping, separating vehicular traffic from bicycle traffic. Class III bicycle routes and bicycle-friendly streets are those where motorists and cyclists share the roadway and there is no separated striping for bicycle travel. Bicycle routes and bicycle-friendly streets are preferably placed on Collector and lower volume Arterial Streets. Bicycle routes with shared lane markings, or "sharrows", remind bicyclists to ride farther from parked cars to prevent collisions, increase awareness of motorists that bicycles may be in the travel lane, and shows bicyclists the correct direction of travel. There are currently Class III bicycle routes along Franklin Avenue within the Study Area.

¹ Walk Score (www.walkscore.com) rates the Project Site with a score of 94 of 100 possible points (scores accessed on December 8, 2020 for 1489 Sunset Boulevard). Walk Score calculates the walkability of specific addresses by considering the ease of living in the neighborhood with a reduced reliance on automobile travel.

The components of the 2010 Bicycle Plan have been incorporated into the bicycle network of the Mobility Plan. The Mobility Plan consists of a Low-Stress Bikeway System and a Bicycle Lane Network (BLN). The Low-Stress Bikeway System is comprised of the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN), the Neighborhood Enhanced Network, and Bike Paths. The BEN includes protected bicycle lanes (Class IV), which provide bicycle infrastructure including cycle tracks, bicycle traffic signals, and demarcated areas to facilitate turns at intersections and along neighborhood streets. These Class IV networks typically provide mini-roundabouts, cross-street stop signs, crossing islands at major intersection crossings, improved street lighting, bicycle boxed, and bicycle-only left-turn pockets. The Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) and Bicycle Paths are relatively unchanged from the 2010 Bicycle Plan.

Existing Transit System

The Project Study Area includes a 0.50-mile radius around the Project Site as well as a 0.25-mile radius around each study intersection, as shown in Figure 3, and is served by bus lines operated by Metro and LADOT. Figure 7 illustrates the existing transit service and transit stops within the Study Area.

Table 2 summarizes the transit lines operating in the Study Area for each of the service providers in the region, the type of service (peak vs. off-peak, express vs. local), and the frequency of service, as described above. The average frequency of transit service during the peak hour was derived from the number of peak-period stops made nearest the Project Site.

Tables 3A and 3B summarize the total residual capacity of the Metro and LADOT bus lines during the morning and afternoon peak hours based on the frequency of service of each line and the maximum seated and standing capacity of each bus. As shown in Tables 3A and 3B, the transit lines within 0.25 miles walking distance of the Project Site currently have available capacity for 800 additional riders during the morning peak hour and 792 additional riders during the afternoon peak hour. The transit lines with bus stops or stations located more than 0.25 miles from the Project Site were not included.

Vision Zero

As described in *Vision Zero: Eliminating Traffic Deaths in Los Angeles by 2025* (City of Los Angeles, August 2015), Vision Zero is a traffic safety policy that promotes strategies to eliminate transportation-related collisions that result in severe injury or death. Vision Zero has identified the High Injury Network (HIN), a network of streets included based on collision data from the last five years, where strategic investments will have the biggest impact in reducing death and severe injury. Within the Study Area, Franklin Avenue east of Beachwood Drive and Hollywood Boulevard are identified in the HIN.

Existing Traffic Volumes

Traffic count data collection is generally conducted during times with typical travel demand patterns (i.e., when local schools are in session, businesses in full operation, weeks without holidays, etc.). Due to the ongoing Safer at Home/Safer LA: Emergency Orders² in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, typical traffic patterns are disrupted and LADOT is allowing the use of historical traffic count data with application of an adjustment factor.

Historical weekday morning (7:00 AM to 10:00 AM) and afternoon (3:00 PM to 6:00 PM) peak hour traffic count data from Year 2018 was compiled for three of the four study intersections. The historical traffic counts were then increased at a rate of 1% per year to estimate Existing Year 2021 traffic volumes. Historic counts are not available at Bronson Avenue & Carlos Avenue (Intersection #3), a two-way stop-controlled intersection adjacent to the Project Site. Thus, peak hour traffic volume estimation at this location was developed based on available historical peak hour intersection counts and turning movement data at adjacent intersections.

The existing peak hour traffic volumes, representing Existing Conditions in Year 2021, are illustrated in Figure 8. The traffic count details are provided in Appendix B.

² The standing public health orders issued by the City and/or County of Los Angeles beginning March 2020 and remaining in effect until further notice.

FUTURE CUMULATIVE TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

The forecast of Future without Project Conditions was prepared in accordance with procedures outlined in the TAG. Specifically, two requirements are provided for developing the cumulative traffic volume forecast:

"The Transportation Assessment must estimate ambient traffic conditions for the study horizon year selected during the scoping phase and recorded in the executed MOU. The study must clearly identify the horizon year and annual ambient growth rate used for the study. The horizon year should align with the development project's expected completion year. For development projects constructed in phases over several years, the Transportation Assessment should analyze intermediary milestones before the buildout and completion of the project. The annual ambient growth rate shall be determined by LADOT staff during the scoping process and can be based on an adopted TSP, the most recent SCAG regional transportation model, the citywide transportation model, or other empirical information approved by LADOT.

"The Transportation Assessment must consider related projects. For related development projects, this should include the associated trip generation for known development projects within one-half mile (2,640 foot) radius of the project site and one-quarter mile (1,320 foot) radius of the farthest outlying study intersections. Consultation with the Department of City Planning and LADOT may be required to compile the related projects list. The City's ZIMAS database can be used to assist in identifying development projects that have submitted applications to the City of Los Angeles. Project access and circulation constraints would be determined by adding project-generated trips to future base traffic volumes including ambient growth and related projects and conducting the operational analysis."

The ambient growth factor discussed below likely includes some traffic increases resulting from the Related Projects. Therefore, through some inherent double counting of vehicles, the traffic analysis provides a highly conservative estimate of Future without Project traffic volumes.

The Future without Project traffic volumes, therefore, include ambient growth, which reflects increase in traffic due to regional growth and development outside the Study Area, as well as traffic generated by ongoing or entitled projects near or within the Study Area.

Ambient Traffic Growth

Existing traffic is expected to increase as a result of regional growth and development outside the Study Area. Based on discussions with LADOT during the MOU process, an ambient growth

factor of 1% per year compounded annually was applied to be conservative by adjusting the existing traffic volumes to reflect the effects of the regional growth and development by Year 2024. The total adjustment applied over the four-year period between Year 2021 and the anticipated buildout year of the Project was 3.03%. This growth factor accounts for increases in traffic due to potential projects plus projects not yet proposed and projects located outside the Study Area.

Related Projects

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this study also considers the effects of the Project on other developments either proposed, approved, or under construction (collectively, the Related Projects). Including this analysis step, the potential impact of the Project is evaluated within the context of past, present, and probable future developments capable of producing cumulative impacts. In accordance with the procedures outlined in the TAG, Related Projects within 0.50 miles of the Project Site and within 0.25 miles of any study intersection were considered for analysis.

The list of Related Projects is based on information provided by LADCP and LADOT in January 2021, as well as recent studies of development projects in the area. The Related Projects are detailed in Table 4 and their approximate locations shown in Figure 9. Though the buildout years of many of these Related Projects are uncertain and may be well beyond the buildout year of the Project, and notwithstanding that some may never be approved or developed, they were all considered as part of this Study and conservatively assumed to be completed by the Project buildout Year 2024. Therefore, the traffic growth due to the development of Related Projects considered in this analysis is highly conservative and, by itself, substantially overestimates the actual traffic volume growth in the Hollywood area that would likely occur in the next three years prior to Project buildout. With the addition of the 1% per year ambient growth factor previously discussed, the Future without Project Condition is even more conservative.

In addition, the list of Related Projects includes the City's draft update to the Hollywood Community Plan, which is currently in the environmental review stages. Based on preliminary information available from the City, the updated Hollywood Community Plan will propose updates to land use policies and plans that would primarily increase commercial and residential development potential in and near the Regional Center Commercial portion of the community and along selected corridors in the Hollywood Community Plan area. Corresponding decreases in development potential would

be primarily focused on low- to medium-scale multi-family residential neighborhoods to conserve existing density and intensity of those neighborhoods. The Hollywood Community Plan update, once adopted, will be a long-range plan designed to accommodate population, housing, and employment growth in Hollywood until Year 2040. Only the initial period of any such projected growth, which is accounted for in the ambient growth factor, would overlap with the Project's future baseline forecast, as the Project would be completed in Year 2024, well before the update to the Hollywood Community Plan's horizon year.

It can be assumed that the projected growth reflected by the list of Related Projects, which in itself is a conservative assumption, as discussed above, would account for any overlapping growth that may be assumed by the updated Hollywood Community Plan upon its adoption. With the addition of the ambient growth factor previously discussed, the Future without Project Conditions is even more conservative. Using these assumptions, the potential operational traffic impacts of the Project were evaluated. The development of estimated traffic volumes added to the study intersections as a result of Related Projects involves the use of a three-step process: trip generation, trip distribution, and trip assignment.

Trip Generation. Trip generation estimates for the Related Projects were provided by LADOT or were calculated using a combination of previous study findings and the trip generation rates contained in *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers [ITE], 2017). The Related Projects trip generation estimates summarized in Table 4 are conservative in that they do not in every case account for either the trips generated by the existing uses to be removed or the likely use of other travel modes (e.g., transit, bus, bicycling, walking, carpool, etc.) Further, in many cases, they do not account for the internal capture trips within a multi-use development or for the interaction of trips between multiple Related Projects, in which one Related Project serves as the origin for a trip destined for another Related Project.

Trip Distribution. The geographic distribution of the traffic generated by the Related Projects is dependent on several factors. These include the type and density of the proposed land uses, the geographic distribution of the population from which the employees/residents and potential patrons of the proposed developments are drawn, and the location of these projects in relation to the surrounding street system. These factors are considered along with logical travel routes through the street system to develop a reasonable pattern of trip distribution.

<u>**Traffic Assignment</u>**. The trip generation estimates for the Related Projects were assigned to the local street system using the trip distribution pattern described above. Figure 10 shows the peak hour traffic volumes associated with these Related Projects at the four study intersections.</u>

Future without Project Traffic Volumes

The Future without Project Conditions peak hour traffic volumes include the combination of Existing Conditions traffic volumes, ambient growth to Year 2024, and Related Project traffic. These volumes at the four study intersections are shown in Figure 11.

Future Roadway Improvements

The analysis of Future Conditions accounted for roadway improvements that were funded and reasonably expected to be implemented prior to the buildout of the proposed Project. Any roadway improvement that would result in changes to the physical configuration at the study intersections would be incorporated into the analysis. Other proposed traffic / trip reduction strategies such as transportation demand management (TDM) programs for individual buildings and developments were omitted from the Future Conditions analyses. The following plans were evaluated for their potential effects on the future roadway configurations.

Mobility Plan. In the Mobility Plan, the City identifies key corridors as components of various "mobility-enhanced networks." Each network is intended to focus on improving a particular aspect of urban mobility, including transit, neighborhood connectivity, bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. The specific improvements that may be implemented in those networks have not yet been identified, and there is no schedule for implementation; therefore, no changes to intersection lane configurations were made because of the Mobility Plan. However, the following mobility-enhanced networks included corridors within the Study Area and are depicted in Figure 12:

 <u>Transit Enhanced Network (TEN)</u>: The TEN aims to improve existing and future bus services through reliable and frequent transit service in order to increase transit ridership, reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips, and integrate transit infrastructure investments within the surrounding street system. Hollywood Boulevard is designated as part of the TEN.

- <u>NEN</u>: The NEN reflects the synthesis of the bicycle and pedestrian networks and serves as a system of Local Streets that are slow moving and safe enough to connect neighborhoods through active transportation. Several streets within the Study Area are designated parts of the NEN, including Franklin Avenue, Carlos Avenue, Selma Avenue west of Gower Street, Bronson Avenue between Yucca Street and Carlos Avenue and between Hollywood Boulevard and Carlton Way, Carlton Way east of Bronson Avenue, Canyon Drive south of Carlton Way, and Harold Way east of Canyon Drive.
- <u>BEN</u>: Within the Study Area, Hollywood Boulevard has been identified as part of the BEN.
- <u>Pedestrian Enhanced District (PED)</u>: The Mobility Plan aims to promote walking to reduce the reliance on automobile travel by providing more attractive and pedestrian-friendly sidewalks, as well as adding pedestrian signalizations, street trees, and pedestrianoriented design features. Several streets within the Study Area are designated PEDs, where pedestrian improvements could be prioritized to provide better connectivity to and from major destinations within communities, including Franklin Avenue west of Van Ness Avenue, Gower Street between Carlos Avenue and Carlton Way, Bronson Avenue between Carlos Avenue and Carlton Way, and Hollywood Boulevard west of Van Ness Avenue and east of Wilton Place.

<u>Safe Routes to School</u>. The Safe Routes to School program seeks to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort on routes to and from school. The program invests in "school zone projects, neighborhood street projects and traffic safety education" and includes improvements such as continental and scramble crosswalks, curb extensions and ramps, rectangular rapid flashing beacons, traffic signals, and bicycle facilities. The nearest school to the Project Site is Grant Elementary School on Wilton Place south of Hollywood Boulevard, approximately 0.25 miles southeast of the Project Site. The Grant Elementary School Safe Routes to School Plan identifies several infrastructure improvements projects along Hollywood Boulevard, Carlton Way, Harold Way, and Sunset Boulevard. No improvements are identified at any of the four study intersections, and the Project is located outside of the Grant Elementary School Safe Routes to School Plan area.
































-	_		
- 1	\cap	1	
	U		









FUTURE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES & ROADWAY MODAL PRIORITIES

FIGURE 12

TABLE 1 STUDY INTERSECTIONS

No.	North/South Street	East/West Street
1.	Bronson Avenue	Franklin Avenue
2.	Gower Street	Carlos Avenue
3. [a]	Bronson Avenue	Carlos Avenue
4.	Bronson Avenue	Hollywood Boulevard

Notes:

[a] Unsignalized intersection.

TABLE 2EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICE IN STUDY AREA

Provider Poute and Service Area		Sorvice Type	Hours of Operation	Average Headway (minutes)					
Provider, Ro		Service Type	Hours of Operation	Morning Peak Hour		Afternoon Peak Hour			
Metro Bus S	Service			NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB		
180/181	Eastbound to Pasadena - Westbound to Hollywood via Los Feliz Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard	Local/Late Night	24-hours	17	17	16	16		
207	Northbound to Hollywood - Southbound to Athens via Western Avenue	Local	24-hours	13	15	13	13		
[a] 217	Northbound to Vermont/Sunset - Southbound to Howard Hughes Center via Hollywood Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Cienega Boulevard	Local/Late Night	24-hours	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
LADOT DASH Bus Service				NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB		
HWC	Hollywood Clockwise	Local	6:00 A.M 8:00 P.M.	30	N/A	30	N/A		
HWCC	Hollywood Counterclockwise	Local	6:00 A.M 8:00 P.M.	N/A	30	N/A	30		

Notes:

Metro - Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. LADOT DASH - Los Angeles Department of Transportation Downtown Area Short Hop.

NB - Northbound. EB - Eastbound. SB - Southbound. WB - Westbound.

[a] Metro Line 217 Owl Route stops at the intersection of Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 4:30 A.M.

 TABLE 3A

 TRANSIT SYSTEM CAPACITY IN STUDY AREA - MORNING PEAK HOUR

		Capacity	Peak Hour Ridership [b]				Average Remaining		Average Remaining		
Pro	vider, R	oute, and Service Area	per Trip	Peak Load		Average Load		Capacity per Trip		Peak Hour Capacity	
			[a]	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB
Met	ro Bus S	Service									
	180/181	Eastbound to Pasadena - Westbound to Hollywood via Los Feliz Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard	50	10	9	6	6	44	44	154	154
	207	Northbound to Hollywood - Southbound to Athens via Western Avenue	50	7	11	3	7	47	43	223	172
[c]	217	Northbound to Vermont/Sunset - Southbound to Howard Hughes Center via Hollywood Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Cienega Boulevard	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LAE	DOT DAS	SH Bus Service									
	HWC	Hollywood Clockwise	30	5	N/A	2	N/A	28	N/A	56	N/A
	HWCC	Hollywood Counterclockwise	30	N/A	4	N/A	3	N/A	27	N/A	41
Total Remaining Peak Hour Transit System Capacity							m Capacity	8	00		

Notes:

Metro - Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. LADOT DASH - Los Angeles Department of Transportation Downtown Area Short Hop.

NB - Northbound. EB - Eastbound. SB - Southbound. WB - Westbound.

[a] Capacity assumptions:

Metro Bus - 40 seated / 50 standing

LADOT DASH Bus - 25 seated / 30 standing

[b] Based on ridership data provided by Metro in 2019 and LADOT in 2019

[c] Metro Line 217 Owl Route stops at the intersection of Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 4:30 A.M.

 TABLE 3B

 TRANSIT SYSTEM CAPACITY IN STUDY AREA - AFTERNOON PEAK HOUR

		Capacity	Peak Hour Ridership [b]				Average Remaining		Average Remaining		
Pro	Provider, Route, and Service Area		per Trip	Peak	Load	Average Load		Capacity per Trip		Peak Hour Capacity	
			[a]	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB
Met	ro Bus S	Service						_			
	180/181	Eastbound to Pasadena - Westbound to Hollywood via Los Feliz Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard	50	14	11	10	8	40	42	150	156
	207	Northbound to Hollywood - Southbound to Athens via Western Avenue	50	4	25	3	16	47	34	225	162
[c]	217	Northbound to Vermont/Sunset - Southbound to Howard Hughes Center via Hollywood Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Cienega Boulevard	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LAL	DOT DAS	SH Bus Service									
	HWC	Hollywood Clockwise	30	9	N/A	2	N/A	28	N/A	56	N/A
	HWCC	Hollywood Counterclockwise	30	N/A	6	N/A	2	N/A	28	N/A	42
Total Remaining Peak Hour Transit System Capacity							79	92			

Notes:

Metro - Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. LADOT DASH - Los Angeles Department of Transportation Downtown Area Short Hop.

NB - Northbound. EB - Eastbound. SB - Southbound. WB - Westbound.

[a] Capacity assumptions:

Metro Bus - 40 seated / 50 standing

LADOT DASH Bus - 25 seated / 30 standing

[b] Based on ridership data provided by Metro in 2019 and LADOT in 2019

[c] Metro Line 217 Owl Route stops at the intersection of Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 4:30 A.M.

					Trip Generation [a]							
No.	Project	Address	Use		Mor	ning Peak H	lour	Aftern	ternoon Peak Hour			
				Dally	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total		
1.	Hollywood Central Park	Hollywood Freeway (US 101)	38 acre park, amphitheater and neighborhood uses	2,298	104	69	173	115	89	204		
2.	5750 Hollywood	5750 Hollywood Blvd	161 apartment units and 4,747 sf commercial	1,180	22	66	88	68	38	106		
3.	Hollywood Gower Mixed-Use	6100 W Hollywood Blvd	220 apartment units and 3,270 sf restaurant	1,439	24	76	100	86	46	132		
4.	Mixed-Use	5901 Sunset Blvd	274,000 sf office and 26,000 sf supermarket	3,839	350	61	411	122	339	461		
5.	Mixed-Use	5939 W Sunset Blvd	299 apartment units, 38,440 sf office and 5,064 sf of restaurant and 3,739 sf retail	3,731	152	191	343	182	152	334		
6.	6140 Hollywood	6140 Hollywood Blvd	102 hotel rooms, 27 condominium units and 11,460 sf restaurant	1,782	76	62	138	78	58	136		
7.	Sunset Bronson Studios	5800 W Sunset Blvd	404,799 sf office	2,690	356	48	404	64	314	378		
8.	Mixed-Use	6220 W Yucca St	210 hotel rooms, 136 apartment units, 3,450 sf retail and 9,120 sf restaurant	2,652	88	111	199	130	85	215		
9.	5600 Hollywood	5600 Hollywood Blvd	200 apartment units	722	16	43	59	35	24	59		
10.	Sunset Gower Studios	1438 N Gower St	169,400 sf sound stage, 52,800 sf production support, 852,830 sf office and 6,516 sf restaurant	4,108	424	67	491	77	410	487		
11.	Pantages Theater Office	6225 W Hollywood Blvd	210,000 sf office	1,918	243	33	276	43	411	254		
12.	Modera Argyle	1546 N Argyle Ave	276 apartment units, 9,000 sf retail and 15,000 sf restaurant	2,013	43	127	170	128	51	179		
13.	Palladium Residences	6201 W Sunset Blvd	731 apartment units (37 affordable) and 24,000 sf of retail and restaurant uses	4,913	128	228	356	234	169	403		
14.	citizenM Hotel	1718 Vine St	240 hotel rooms and 5,373 sf restaurant	1,101	58	41	99	35	42	77		
15.	6200 W Sunset Boulevard	6200 W Sunset Blvd	270 apartment units, 1,750 sf quality restaurant, 2,300 sf pharmacy and 8,070 sf retail	1,778	26	97	123	100	35	135		
16.	Hollywood Center MU (Formerly Millennium)	1720 N Vine St	1,005 residential units (872 apartment units, 133 affordable senior housing units) and 30,176 sf retail	6,346	171	290	461	368	264	632		
17.	6250 Sunset (Nickelodeon)	6250 W Sunset Blvd	200 apartment units and 4,700 sf retail	1,473	52	80	132	71	50	121		
18.	Mixed-Use	1657 N Western Ave	91 apartment units and 15,300 sf retail	702	10	29	39	37	25	62		
19.	Multi-Family	1310 N Gordon St	60 apartment units	293	5	14	19	14	9	23		
20.	Apartments	5600 W Franklin Ave	54 apartment units and 6 affordable units	287	5	15	20	14	9	23		
OTH	IER AREA-WIDE PROJECTS											
Proj	ect	Description		Extents								
Hollywood Community Plan Update The Hollywood Community Plan Update proposes updates to land use policies and the land use diagram. The proposed changes would primarily increases commercial and residential development potential in and near the Regional Center Commercial portion of the community and along selected corridors in the Community Plan Area. South of City of Burbank, City of Gle north of Melrose Avenue; south of Melrose Avenue			endale, and S /lulholland Dr the City of V nega Bouleva	SR 134; west ive, City of W Vest Hollywo ard and La B	of Interstate /est Hollywoo od and north rea Avenue.	e 5; od, i of						

TABLE 4 RELATED PROJECTS LIST

Notes: [a] Related project information provided by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation in January 2021, Department of City Planning, and recent traffic studies prepared in the area. This list includes known development projects within one-half mile (2,460 foot) radius of the Project Site and one-quarter (1,320 foot) radius of the farthest outlying study intersections...

Chapter 3 Project Traffic

Trip generation estimates, trip distribution patterns and trip assignments were prepared for the Project. These components form the basis of the Project's traffic analysis.

PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

The number of peak hour trips expected to be generated by the Project was estimated using morning and afternoon peak hour rates for high-rise multifamily housing published in *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition,* as well as morning and afternoon peak hour rates for affordable housing units published in the TAG based on empirical data collected in the City in 2016.

An appropriate trip generation reduction to account for public transit usage was made in accordance with the TAG and reviewed and approved by LADOT as part of the MOU:

 <u>Transit Usage</u>: A 10% transit usage reduction was applied to the trip generation estimates (with the exception of the affordable housing units, for which transit usage is assumed to be inherent in the trip generation rates) in accordance with the TAG methodology for a development within 0.25 miles of a Metro bus stop. The Project Site is located within 0.25 miles of Metro Bus stops serving Lines 180, 181, and 217 at Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard, Line 207 at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue, and LADOT DASH Hollywood Counterclockwise at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue, as shown in Figure 7.

After accounting for the adjustment described above, the Project is estimated to generate 38 morning peak hour trips (10 inbound, 28 outbound) and 42 afternoon peak hour trips (25 inbound, 17 outbound), as summarized in Table 5.

PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION

The geographic distribution of trips generated by the Project is primarily dependent on the location of employment and commercial uses from which tenants of the Project would be drawn, characteristics of the street system serving the Project Site, existing intersection traffic volumes, the location of the proposed driveways, as well as input from LADOT staff.

The intersection-level trip distribution for the Project is shown in Figure 13. Generally, the regional pattern is as follows:

- 24% to/from the north
- 26% to/from the east
- 24% to/from the south
- 26% to/from the west

PROJECT TRIP ASSIGNMENT

The Project trip generation estimates summarized in Table 5 and the trip distribution pattern shown in Figure 13, were used to assign the Project-generated traffic through the study intersections. Figure 14 illustrates the Project-only traffic volumes at the study intersections during typical weekday morning and afternoon peak hours.





PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION





PROJECT-ONLY PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES

TABLE 5 PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

L and Uso	ITE Land Bate		nd Bato Morning Peak Hour		Afternoon Peak Hour			
Land Use	Use	Nate	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Generation Rates [a]								
Multifamily Housing (High-Rise)	222	per du	24%	76%	0.31	61%	39%	0.36
Affordable Housing - Family	[b]	per du	37%	63%	0.49	56%	44%	0.35
<u>Trip Generation Estimates</u> Multi-family Housing <i>Transit/Walk Adjustment - 10%</i> [c] Affordable Housing	222 [b]	116 du 12 du	9 (1) 2	27 (3) 4	36 (4) 6	26 (3) 2	16 (1) 2	42 (4) 4
	тоти	AL PROJECT TRIPS	10	28	38	25	17	42

Notes:

du: dwelling unit

[a] Except as noted, trip generation source is Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017.

[b] Per LADOT's *Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, residential or mixed-use developments inside a Transit Priority Area (TPA) which include Affordable Housing Units are eligible to use a City specific trip generation rate based on vehicle trip count data collected at affordable housing sites in the City of Los Angeles in 2016.

[c] The Project Site is located within 0.25-mile of Metro Bus stops serving Lines 180, 181, and 217 at Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard, Line 207 at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue, and LADOT DASH Hollywood Counterclockwise at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue, therefore a 10% transit adjustment was applied to account for transit usage and walking visitor arrivals.

Chapter 4 CEQA Analysis of Transportation Impacts

This chapter presents the results of an analysis of CEQA-related transportation impacts. The analysis identifies potential conflicts the Project may have with adopted City plans and policies and the improvements to resolve those conflicts, as well as the results of a Project VMT analysis that satisfies State requirements under *State of California Senate Bill* 743 (Steinberg, 2013) (SB 743), and an identification of evident hazards which would be created due to geometric design features.

METHODOLOGY

SB 743, made effective in January 2014, required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to change the CEQA guidelines regarding the analysis of transportation impacts. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis shifted from vehicular delay (level of service [LOS]) to VMT, in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), create multimodal networks, and promote mixed-use developments.

The TAG defines the methodology of analyzing a project's transportation impacts in accordance with SB 743. Per the TAG, the CEQA transportation analysis contains the following thresholds for identifying significant impacts:

- Threshold T-1: Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies
- Threshold T-2.1: Causing Substantial VMT
- Threshold T-2.2: Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel
- Threshold T-3: Substantially Increasing Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use

The thresholds were reviewed and analyzed, as detailed in the following Sections 4A through 4D. In addition, a CEQA safety analysis of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) freeway facilities for the Project is provided in Section 4E.

Section 4A: Threshold T-1

Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies Analysis

Threshold T-1 assesses whether a project would conflict with an adopted program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

PLANS, PROGRAMS, ORDINANCES, AND POLICIES

Table 2.1-1 of the TAG identifies the City plans, policies, programs, ordinances, and standards relevant in determining project consistency. Attachment D of the TAG, *Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Worksheet* provides a structured approach to evaluate whether a project conflicts with the City's plans, programs, ordinances, or policies and to streamline the review by highlighting the most relevant plans, policies, and programs when assessing potential impacts to the City's transportation system. The *Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Worksheet* for the Project is provided in Appendix C. The Project is in the process of seeking waivers of dedication and vacating an existing dedication; if those waivers are granted, then the Project would be in compliance with the Mobility Plan.

As stated in Section 2.1.4 of the TAG, a project that generally conforms with, and does not obstruct the City's development policies and standards will generally be considered to be consistent. As detailed in Appendix C, the Project is generally consistent with the City documents listed in Table 2.1-1 of the TAG; therefore, the Project would not result in a significant impact under Threshold T-1. A detailed discussion of the plans, programs, ordinances, or policies related to the Project is provided below.

Mobility Plan

The Mobility Plan combines "complete street" principles with the following five goals that define the City's mobility priorities:

- <u>Safety First</u>: Design and operate streets in a way that enables safe access for all users, regardless of age, ability, or transportation mode of choice.
- <u>World Class Infrastructure</u>: A well-maintained and connected network of streets, paths, bikeways, trails, and more provides Angelenos with the optimum variety of mode choices.
- <u>Access for All Angelenos</u>: A fair and equitable system must be accessible to all and must pay particularly close attention to the most vulnerable users.
- <u>Collaboration, Communication, and Informed Choices</u>: The impact of new technologies on our day-to-day mobility demands will continue to become increasingly important to the future. The amount of information made available by new technologies must be managed responsibly in the future.
- <u>Clean Environments and Healthy Communities</u>: Active transportation modes such as bicycling and walking can significantly improve personal fitness and create new opportunities for social interaction, while lessening impacts on the environment.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the specific policies of the Mobility Plan is provided in Table 6 and Appendix C. As detailed in Chapter 2, the Mobility Plan identifies key corridors within the Study Area as components of various "mobility-enhanced networks." Though no specific improvements have been identified and there is no schedule for implementation, the mobility-enhanced networks represent a focus on improving a particular aspect of urban mobility, including transit, neighborhood connectivity, bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. The Project would be designed with the mobility-enhanced networks as a top priority.

Access to the Project would be provided via two driveways: one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue and additional entrances on Carlos Avenue. All entrances would be designed consistent with LADOT standards and all requirements from the ADA. The Project is in the process of seeking waivers of dedication and vacating an existing dedication, and the Project would also widen the sidewalks along the Project frontages to accommodate pedestrian circulation if required.

The Project is located within a high-quality transit area and would provide bicycle parking for residents and visitors, thereby promoting public and active transportation modes and reducing the Project VMT per capita for residents compared to the average for the area, as demonstrated in Section 4B. Further, the Project does not propose modifying, removing, or otherwise negatively affect existing bicycle infrastructure.

Thus, the Project would be consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan.

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan (LADCP, March 2015) introduces guidelines for the City to follow to enhance the City's position as a regional leader in health and equity, encourage healthy design and equitable access, and increase awareness of equity and environmental issues.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles is provided in Table 7. The Project prioritizes safety and access for all individuals utilizing the site by complying with all ADA requirements, widening the sidewalks, and improving pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project Site if required. Further, the Project supports healthy lifestyles by locating housing within a high-quality transit area and providing bicycle parking. The Project includes 12 affordable housing units to meet the diverse needs of the community and provide a vibrant residential community near an active commercial center of Hollywood.

Thus, the Project would be consistent with the goals of Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles.

Land Use Element of the General Plan

The City General Plan's Land Use Element contains 35 Community Plans that establish specific goals and strategies for the various neighborhoods across Los Angeles. The Project is located within the Hollywood Community Plan area.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the Hollywood Community Plan is provided in Table 8. The Project would provide both market-rate and affordable residential units to further the development of Hollywood as a major center of population. The Project is consistent with the circulation standards and criteria of the Hollywood Community Plan as the transportation system within the vicinity of the Project Site would adequately serve the traffic generated by the Project without major congestion, as further detailed in Section 5B. In addition, the Project would implement TDM strategies as project design features, including unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking, to further reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips generated by the Project, as discussed in further detail in Section 4B. Thus, the Project would promote and encourage development standards in line with the goals and objectives of the Hollywood Community Plan.

The City is currently in the process of updating the Hollywood Community Plan to guide development for the Hollywood area through Year 2040. *Hollywood Community Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report* (Terry A. Hayes Associates, Inc., November 2018) was released for public review in October 2019. As of April 2021, the City Planning Commission moved to adopt the Hollywood Community Plan and the accompanying Environmental Impact Report. Action by the City Council's Planning and Land Use Management Committee and the full City Council is still needed to formally adopt the Hollywood Community Plan and certify the accompanying Environmental Impact Report. Such actions are anticipated to take place in 2021.

Redevelopment Plan

The Project is located within the *Redevelopment Plan for the Hollywood Redevelopment Project* (The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, May 2003) (Redevelopment Plan). A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the Redevelopment Plan is provided in Table 9. The Project promotes and encourages development standards in line with the goals

and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan including, but not limited to, encouraging the expansion and improvement of public transportation service, providing housing to support the varied economic needs of the community, maximizing opportunity for individual choice, and designing a circulation system proportional to land use densities that will accommodate estimated traffic. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan.

Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.21.A.16 (Bicycle Parking)

LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 details the bicycle parking requirements for new developments. As further detailed in Section 5E, the proposed short-term and long-term bicycle parking supply for the residential uses would satisfy LAMC requirements.

LAMC Section 12.26J (TDM Ordinance)

LAMC Section 12.26J, the TDM Ordinance (1993), establishes trip reduction requirements for non-residential projects in excess of 25,000 square feet (sf). The Project does not propose non-residential uses in excess of 25,000 sf. Therefore, LAMC Section 12.26J is not applicable.

Vision Zero Action Plan / Vision Zero Corridor Plans

Vision Zero implements projects that are designed to increase safety on the most vulnerable City streets. As discussed in Chapter 2, Franklin Avenue east of Beachwood Drive and Hollywood Boulevard are identified as part of the HIN. In May 2019, LADOT installed new minor street crosswalks and continental crosswalk upgrades within the Study Area as part of the Vision Zero Hollywood Boulevard Safety Improvement Projects. No additional improvements are currently planned near the Project Site. Nonetheless, the Project would not preclude future Vision Zero safety projects by the City on adjacent streets. Thus, the Project does not conflict with Vision Zero.

Streetscape Plans

The Project is not located within the boundaries of any streetscape plan and, therefore, streetscape plans do not apply to the Project.

Citywide Design Guidelines

The Pedestrian-First Design approach of *Citywide Design Guidelines* (Los Angeles City Planning Urban Design Studio, October 2019) identifies design strategies that "create human scale spaces in response to how people actually engage with their surroundings, by prioritizing active street frontages, clear paths of travel, legible wayfinding, and enhanced connectivity. Pedestrian-First Design promoted healthy living, increases economic activity at the street level, enables social intersection, creates equitable and accessible public spaces, and improves public safety."

The Pedestrian-First Design guidelines are:

- <u>Guideline 1</u>: Promote a safe, comfortable, and accessible pedestrian experience for all.
- <u>Guideline 2</u>: Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.
- <u>Guideline 3</u>: Design projects to actively engage with streets and public space and maintain human scale.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the guidelines of the Pedestrian-First Design approach is provided in Table 10.

The Project design includes separate pedestrian and vehicular access points, widened sidewalks, and improved pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project. The Project's residential lobby would face Bronson Avenue to help activate the pedestrian enhanced district. Thus, the Project design provides for the safety, comfort, and accessibility of pedestrians, aligning with the Pedestrian-First Design approach.

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

In addition to potential Project-specific impacts, the TAG requires that the Project be reviewed in combination with nearby Related Projects to determine if there may be a cumulatively significant impact resulting from inconsistency with a particular program, plan, policy, or ordinance. In accordance with the TAG, the cumulative analysis must include consideration of any Related Projects within 0.50 miles of the Project Site and any transportation system improvements in the vicinity. Related Projects located within 0.50 miles of the Project site are identified in Table 4. Similar to the Project, the Related Projects would be individually responsible for complying with relevant plans, programs, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system. Thus, the Project, together with the Related Projects, would not result in cumulative impacts with respect to consistency with each of the plans, ordinances, or policies reviewed. The Project and the Related Projects would not interfere with any of the general policy recommendations and/or pilot proposals and, therefore, there would be no significant Project impact or cumulative impact.

TABLE 6PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH MOBILITY PLAN 2035

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency
Chapter 1 – Safety First	
Policy 1.1, Roadway User Vulnerability Design, plan, and operate streets to prioritize the safety of the most vulnerable roadway user.	Consistent. Access to the Project would be provided via two driveways – one driveway along Bronson Avenue, a designated Modified Avenue III, and one driveway along Carlos Avenue, a designated Local Street. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress and egress movements. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue. The Project is in the process of seeking waivers of dedication and vacating an existing dedication; if those waivers are granted, then the Project would be in compliance with the Mobility Plan.
Policy 1.6 Multi-Modal Detour Facilities Design detour facilities to provide safe passage for all modes of travel.	Consistent. The construction management plan that would be prepared to address non-CEQA impacts would include detour routes for all applicable travel modes, including pedestrian and transit users.
Chapter 2 – World Class Infrastructure	
Policy 2.3 Pedestrian Infrastructure Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high-quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.	Consistent. Several streets within the Study Area are designated Pedestrian Enhanced Districts where pedestrian improvements could be prioritized to provide better connectivity to and from major destinations within communities, including Franklin Avenue west of Van Ness Avenue, Gower Street between Carlos Avenue and Carlton Way, Bronson Avenue between Carlos Avenue and Carlton Way, and Hollywood Boulevard west of Van Ness Avenue and east of Wilton Place. The Project does not propose narrowing or shifting existing sidewalk placement or paving, narrowing, shifting, or removing an existing parkway. Further, the Project is open to easements that could widen the sidewalks and enhance the pedestrian environment.
Policy 2.4 Neighborhood Enhanced <u>Network</u> Provide a slow speed network of locally serving streets.	Consistent. Several streets within the Study Area are designated parts of the Neighborhood Enhanced Network, including Franklin Avenue, Carlos Avenue, Selma Avenue west of Gower Street, Bronson Avenue between Yucca Street and Carlos Avenue and between Hollywood Boulevard and Carlton Way, Carlton Way east of Bronson Avenue, Canyon Drive south of Carlton Way, and Harold Way east of Canyon Drive. The Project would add some traffic to surrounding streets but would not affect travel speed or safety.
Policy 2.5 Transit Network Improve the performance and reliability of existing and future bus service.	Consistent. Hollywood Boulevard is designated as part of the Transit Enhanced Network. The Project would develop transit-accessible residential space within a high-quality transit area. As discussed in Chapter 2, there is sufficient capacity within the existing and future transit system to accommodate the additional ridership generated by the Project.

TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH MOBILITY PLAN 2035

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency			
Policy 2.6 Bicycle Networks Provide safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. (includes scooters, skateboards, rollerblades, etc.)	Consistent. Hollywood Boulevard is designated as part of the Bicycle Enhanced Network. There are existing bicycle lanes on Franklin Avenue which would not be affected by the Project. The Project would provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for residents and visitors in accordance with LAMC requirements.			
Chapter 3 – Access for All Angelenos				
Policy 3.1 Access for All Recognize all modes of travel, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular modes – including goods movement – as integral components of the City's transportation system.	Consistent. The Project encourages multi-modal transportation alternatives and access for all travel modes to and from the Project Site. The Project provides pedestrian and bicycle access separate from vehicular access and provides bicycle parking to encourage walking and bicycling. It encourages transit usage by developing a residential project within a high-quality transit area.			
Policy 3.2 People with Disabilities Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.	Consistent. The Project's vehicular and pedestrian entrances would be designed consistent with LADOT standards and all requirements from the Americans with Disabilities Act.			
Policy 3.3 Land Use Access and Mix Promote equitable land use decisions that result in fewer vehicle trips by providing greater proximity and access to jobs, destinations, and other neighborhood services.	Consistent. The Project's residential units located within a high- quality transit area will help to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit trips for both commuting and accessing neighborhood services.			
Policy 3.4 Transit Services Provide all residents, workers, and visitors with affordable, efficient, convenient, and attractive transit services.	Consistent. The Project is located within a high-quality transit area providing a mix of high-frequency local and late-night buses.			
Policy 3.5 Multi-Modal Features Support "first-mile, last-mile solutions" such as multi-modal transportation services, organizations, and activities in the areas around transit stations and major bus stops (transit stops) to maximize multi- modal connectivity and access for transit riders.	Consistent. The Project would provide bicycle parking for residents and visitors, helping with easy access to nearby transit or for longer-distance multi-modal travel.			
Policy 3.8 Bicycle Parking Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure, and well-maintained bicycle parking facilities.	Consistent. The Project would provide convenient and secure long-term and short-term parking for bicycles for residents and visitors.			
Chapter 4 – Collaboration, Communication, & Informed Choices				

TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH MOBILITY PLAN 2035

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency
Policy 4.8 Transportation Demand Management Strategies Encourage greater utilization of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles.	Consistent. The Project's TDM program, described in more detail in Section 4B of this transportation assessment, includes unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking.
Policy 4.13 Parking and Land Use Management Balance on-street and off-street parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.	Consistent. The Project would provide sufficient off-street parking to meet Project parking requirements. The Project would also retain on-street parking in front of the Project Site.

Chapter 5 – Clean Environments & Healthy Communities

Policy 5.1 Sustainable Transportation Encourage the development of a sustainable transportation system that promotes environmental and public health.	Consistent. The Project would provide secure long-term bicycle parking for residents and short-term bicycle parking for visitors, and it would provide easements to widen the pedestrian sidewalks along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue. These features would promote active transportation modes such as bicycling and walking and improve access to nearby public transit.
Policy 5.2 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Support ways to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita.	Consistent. The Project is estimated to generate lower VMT per capita for residents than the average for the area, as demonstrated in Section 4B of this transportation assessment. Additionally, it would implement TDM measures including unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking as project design features.

Notes:

[a] Objectives, Policies, Programs, or Plans based on information provided in *Mobility Plan 2035: An Element of the General Plan* (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, January 2016).

TABLE 7 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH PLAN FOR A HEALTHY LOS ANGELES

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency
Chapter 1 – Los Angeles, a Leader in Health and Equity	
Policy 1.5 Plan for Health Improve Angelenos' health and well-being by incorporating a health perspective into land use, design, policy, and zoning decisions through existing tools, practices, and programs.	Consistent. The Project supports healthy lifestyles by locating housing within a high-quality transit area, improving pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project Site, and providing bicycle parking.
Policy 1.6 Poverty and Health Reduce the debilitating impact that poverty has on individual, familial, and community health and well-being by: promoting cross-cutting efforts and partnerships to increase access to income; safe, healthy, and stable affordable housing options; and attainable opportunities for social mobility.	Consistent. The Project includes 12 affordable housing units.
Policy 1.7 Displacement and Health Reduce the harmful health impacts of displacement on individuals, families and communities by pursuing strategies to create opportunities for existing residents to benefit from local revitalization efforts by: creating local employment and economic opportunities for low-income residents and local small businesses; expanding and preserving existing housing opportunities available to low-income residents; preserving cultural and social resources; and creating and implementing tools to evaluate and mitigate the potential displacement caused by large-scale investment and development.	Consistent. The Project provides 12 affordable housing units within a high-quality transit area near an active commercial center of the Hollywood community. The Project does not displace any currently active housing; rather, it converts vacant land into an active and vibrant residential community.
Chapter 2 – A City Built for Health	·

TABLE 7 (CONTINUED)PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH PLAN FOR A HEALTHY LOS ANGELES

Chapter 5 – An Environment Where Life Thrives			
Policy 5.7 Land Use Planning for Public Health and GHG Emission Reduction Promote land use policies that reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions, result in improved air quality and decreased air pollution, especially for children, seniors and others susceptible to respiratory diseases.	Consistent. The Project is estimated to generate VMT per capita for residents and employees at least 15% lower than the average for the area as demonstrated in Section 4B of this transportation assessment. Further, it would provide unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking to further reduce VMT per capita. VMT directly contributes to GHG emissions, so a reduced VMT per capita also reduces GHG per capita.		

Notes:

[a] Objectives, Policies, Programs, or Plans based on information provided in *Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan* (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, March 2015).

TABLE 8 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH HOLLYWOOD COMMUNITY PLAN

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency			
Plan Objectives and Policies				
Objective 1: To coordinate the development of Hollywood with that of other parts of the City of Los Angeles and the metropolitan area.	Consistent. The Project would provide both market-rate and affordable residential units to further the development of Hollywood as a major center of population. The Project would also propose a development that is located near an active commercial center of the			
population, employment retail services, and entertainment; and to perpetuate its image as the international center of the motion picture industry.	Hollywood Community.			
Objective 3: To make provision for the housing required to satisfy the varying needs and desires of all economic segments of the Community, maximizing the opportunity for individual choice.	Consistent. The Project's provision of 12 affordable units and both market-rate and affordable units in a variety of configurations would contribute to the goal of providing all economic segments of the community with opportunities to have their needs and desires met.			
Objective 6: To make provision for a circulation system coordinated with land uses and densities and adequate to accommodate traffic; and to encourage the expansion and improvement of public transportation service.	Consistent. The Project would provide residential uses in proximity to Metro and LADOT bus stops. The Project's proximity to transit provides alternative modes of transportation for residents and visitors to take to and from the Project Site.			

Notes: [a] Objectives, Policies, Programs, or Plans based on information provided in the *Hollywood Community Plan* (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 1998).

TABLE 9 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH HOLLYWOOD REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency		
Plan Objectives and Policies			
Goal 3: Promote a balanced community meeting the needs of the residential, commercial, industrial, arts and entertainment sectors.	Consistent. The Project would provide a mix of market-rate and affordable residential dwelling units, as well as a variety of one-, two-, three-, and five-bedroom units, to meet various residential needs in the Hollywood area.		
Goal 9: Provide housing choices and increase the supply and improve the quality of housing for all income and age groups, especially for persons with low and moderate incomes; and to provide home ownership opportunities and other housing choices which meet the needs of the resident population.	Consistent. The Project's provision of 12 affordable units and both market-rate and affordable units in a variety of configurations would contribute to the goal of providing all economic segments of the community with opportunities to have their needs and desires met.		
Goal 12: Support and encourage a circulation system which will improve the quality of life in Hollywood, including pedestrian, automobile, parking and mass transit systems with an emphasis on serving existing facilities and meeting future needs.	Consistent. The Project would improve the pedestrian environment by separating pedestrian access from vehicular access, providing easements for widening the sidewalks along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue, and enhancing the Project frontages with new street trees.		
	The Project would provide unbundled parking and provision of bicycle parking to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles and encourage the use of active modes of transportation.		
	Further, the Project would provide residential uses in proximity to Metro and LADOT bus stops. The Project's proximity to transit provides alternative modes of transportation for residents and visitors to take to and from the Project Site.		

Notes:

[a] Objectives, Policies, Programs, or Plans based on information provided in the draft text of the *Hollywood Redevelopment Project* (Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, May 1986).

TABLE 10 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH CITYWIDE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Objective, Policy, Program, or Plan [a]	Analysis of Project Consistency
Pedestrian-First Design	
<u>Guideline 1: Promote a safe, comfortable, and</u> <u>accessible pedestrian experience for all</u> Design projects to be safe and accessible and contribute to a better public right-of-way for people of all ages, genders, and abilities, especially the most vulnerable - children, seniors, and people with disabilities.	Consistent. The Project provides for the safety, comfort, and accessibility of pedestrians in a number of ways. First, the Project would separate pedestrian access from vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue. Additionally, the Project would provide easements to widen the sidewalks along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue and enhance them with new street trees.
Guideline 2: Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience Design to avoid pedestrian and vehicular conflicts and to create an inviting and comfortable public right-of-way. A pleasant and welcoming public realm reinforces walkability and improves the quality of life for users.	Vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided via two driveways – one driveway along Bronson Avenue and one driveway along Carlos Avenue. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress and egress movements. As discussed above, pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the Project would result in conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. The Project's residential lobby, which would face Bronson Avenue, would help to activate the pedestrian enhanced district consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan.
Guideline 3: Design projects to actively engage with streets and public space and maintain human scale New projects should be designed to contribute to a vibrant and attractive public realm that promotes a sense of civic pride. Better connections within the built environment contribute to a livable and accessible city and a healthier public realm.	

Notes: [a] Objectives, Policies, Programs, or Plans based on information provided in the *Citywide Design Guidelines* (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 2019).

Section 4B: Threshold T-2.1 Causing Substantial VMT Analysis

Threshold T-2.1 states that a residential project would result in a significant VMT impact if it would generate household VMT per capita less than 15% below the existing average household VMT per capita for the Area Planning Commission (APC) area in which a project is located. Similarly, a commercial project would result in a significant VMT impact if it would generate work VMT per employee less than 15% below the existing average work VMT per employee for the APC area in which the project is located.

The VMT analysis presented below was conducted in accordance with the TAG, which satisfies State requirements under SB 743.

VMT METHODOLOGY

The following describes the methodology by which vehicle trips and VMT are calculated in *City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Version 1.3* (LADOT, July 2020) (VMT Calculator), as detailed in *City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation* (LADOT and LADCP, May 2020). LADOT developed the VMT Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for developments within City limits, which are based on the following types of one-way trips:

- <u>Home-Based Work Production</u>: trips to a workplace destination originating from a residential use
- <u>Home-Based Other Production</u>: trips to a non-workplace destination (e.g., retail, restaurant, etc.) originating from a residential use
- <u>Home-Based Work Attraction</u>: trips to a workplace destination originating from a residential use

As detailed in *City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation*, the household VMT per capita threshold applies to Home-Based Work Production and Home-Based Other Production trips, and

the work VMT per employee threshold applies to Home-Based Work Attraction trips, as the location and characteristics of residences and workplaces are often the main drivers of VMT, as detailed in Appendix 1 of *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (OPR, December 2018).

Other types of trips generated in the VMT Calculator include Non-Home-Based Other Production (trips to a non-residential destination originating from a non-residential use), Home-Based Other Attraction (trips to a non-workplace destination originating from a residential use), and Non-Home-Based Other Attraction (trips to a non-residential destination originating from a non-residential use). These trip types are not factored into the VMT per capita and VMT per employee thresholds as those trips are typically localized and are assumed to have a negligible effect on the VMT impact assessment. However, those trips are factored into the calculation of total project VMT for screening purposes when determining if VMT analysis would be required.

Table 2.2-1 of the TAG details the following daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee impact criteria for the APC areas:

APC	Daily Household VMT per Capita	Daily Work VMT per Employee
Central	6.0	7.6
East LA	7.2	12.7
Harbor	9.2	12.3
North Valley	9.2	15.0
South LA	6.0	11.6
South Valley	9.4	11.6
West LA	7.4	11.1

Source: TAG

The Project is located within the Central APC and, therefore, has a daily household VMT per capita impact threshold of 6.0 and a daily work VMT per employee impact threshold of 7.6.

Travel Behavior Zones (TBZ)

The City developed TBZ categories to determine the magnitude of VMT and vehicle trip reductions that could be achieved through TDM strategies. As detailed in *City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation*, the development of the TBZs considered the population density, land use density, intersection density, and proximity to transit of each Census tract in the City and are categorized as follows:

- 1. <u>Suburban (Zone 1)</u>: Very low-density primarily centered around single-family homes and minimally connected street network
- 2. <u>Suburban Center (Zone 2)</u>: Low-density developments with a mix of residential and commercial uses with larger blocks and lower intersection density
- 3. <u>Compact Infill (Zone 3)</u>: Higher density neighborhoods that include multi-story buildings and well-connected streets
- 4. <u>Urban (Zone 4)</u>: High-density neighborhoods characterized by multi-story buildings with a dense road network

The VMT Calculator determines a project's TBZ based on the latitude and longitude of a project address. The Project located within a Compact Infill (Zone 3) TBZ.

Mixed-Use Development Methodology

As detailed in *City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation*, the VMT Calculator accounts for the interaction of land uses within a mixed-use development and considers the following sociodemographic, land use, and built environment factors for a project area:

- Land use density of the project
- Transportation network connectivity
- Availability of and proximity to transit
- Proximity to retail and other destinations
- Vehicle ownership rates
- Household size

Trip Lengths

The VMT Calculator determines a project's VMT based on trip length information from the City's Travel Demand Forecasting Model, which considers the traffic analysis zones within 0.125 miles of a project to determine the average trip length and trip type, which factor into the calculation of a project's VMT.

Population and Employment Assumptions

As previously stated, the VMT thresholds identified in the TAG are based on household VMT per capita and work VMT per employee. Thus, the VMT Calculator contains population assumptions developed based on Census data for the City and employment assumptions derived from multiple data sources, including *2012 Developer Fee Justification Study* (Los Angeles Unified School District, 2012), *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition* (ITE, 2012), the San Diego Association of Governments Activity Based Model, the United States Department of Energy, and other modeling resources. A summary of population and employment assumptions for various land uses is provided in Table 1 of City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation.

TDM Measures

Additionally, the VMT Calculator measures the reduction in VMT resulting from a project's incorporation of TDM strategies as project design features or mitigation measures. The following seven categories of TDM strategies are included in the VMT Calculator:

- 1. Parking
- 2. Transit
- 3. Education and Encouragement
- 4. Commute Trip Reductions
- 5. Shared Mobility
- 6. Bicycle Infrastructure
- 7. Neighborhood Enhancement
TDM strategies within each of these categories have been empirically demonstrated to reduce trip-making or mode choice in such a way as to reduce VMT, as documented in *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, 2010).

PROJECT VMT ANALYSIS

The VMT Calculator was used to evaluate Project VMT for comparison to the VMT impact criteria. Based on guidance from the City, the VMT Calculator was modeled for the Project's land uses and their respective sizes as the primary input.

The Project only consists of residential uses and, therefore, per *City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator User Guide* (LADOT and LADCP, May 2020), would not generate work VMT per employee and would not result in a significant work VMT impact. As such, the VMT analysis presented below evaluates the household VMT per capita generated by the residential uses of the Project.

Project VMT

The Project incorporates design features that include measures to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips to the Project Site. For the purposes of this analysis, the following Project design features were accounted for in the VMT evaluation:

- Unbundled parking
- Bike parking per LAMC

The VMT analysis results based on the VMT Calculator are summarized in Table 11. The VMT Calculator estimates that the Project would generate a total daily VMT of 3,094 and a total homebased production VMT of 1,426. Thus, the Project would generate an average household VMT per capita of 4.8. The average household VMT per capita would not exceed the Central APC significant household VMT impact threshold of 6.0 and, therefore, the overall Project would not result in a significant VMT impact and no mitigation measures would be required. The detailed output from the VMT Calculator is provided in Appendix D.

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

Cumulative effects of development projects are determined based on the consistency with the air quality and GHG reduction goals of *Connect SoCal – The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy of the Southern California Association of Governments* (Southern California Association of Governments [SCAG], Adopted September 2020) (RTP/SCS) in terms of development location, density, and intensity. The RTP/SCS presents a long-term vision for the region's transportation system through Year 2045 and balances the region's future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals.

As detailed in the TAG, for projects that do not demonstrate a project impact by applying an efficiency-based impact threshold (i.e., household VMT per capita or work VMT per employee) in the project impact analysis, a less than significant impact conclusion is sufficient in demonstrating there is no cumulative VMT impact, as those projects are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG goals of the RTP/SCS.

As described above, the Project would not result in a significant VMT impact. Further, the Project would be designed to further reduce single occupancy trips to the Project Site through various TDM strategies that would be incorporated as part of the Project design, including unbundled parking and provision of LAMC-required bicycle parking. Therefore, the Project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact under Threshold T-2.1, and no further evaluation or mitigation measures would be required.

Furthermore, the Project Site is well-served by various local bus lines and would contribute to the productivity and use of the regional transportation system. The Project would both provide housing near transit and encourage active transportation by providing new bicycle parking infrastructure, in line with RTP/SCS goals. Thus, the Project would encourage a variety of transportation options and would be consistent with the RTP/SCS goal of maximizing mobility and accessibility in the region.

TABLE 11 VMT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project Information						
Land Use	Size					
Multi-Family Housing	116 du					
Affordable Housing	12 du					
Project Analysis [a]						
Resident Population	299					
Employee Population	0					
Project Area Planning Commission	Central					
Travel Behavior Zone (TBZ)	Compact Infill					
Maximum Allowable VMT Reduction [b]	40%					
VMT Analysis [c]						
Daily Vehicle Trips	491					
Total Daily VMT	3,094					
Total Home-Based Production VMT	1,426					
Household VMT per Capita [d]	4.8					
Impact Threshold	6.0					
Significant Impact	NO					

Notes:

- du = dwelling units. sf = square feet.
- [a] VMT results based on the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Version 1.3 (July 2020).
- [b] The maximum allowable VMT reduction is based on the Project's designated TBZ as determined in *Transportation Demand Management Strategies in LA VMT Calculator* (LADOT, August 2018) and *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, 2010).
- [c] Project design features include:
 - 1. Unbundled parking
 - 2. Bike parking per LAMC
- [d] Based on home-based production trips only (see Appendix D, Report 4).

Section 4C: Threshold T-2.2 Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel Analysis

The intent of Threshold T-2.2 is to assess whether a transportation project would induce substantial VMT by increasing vehicular capacity on the roadway network, such as the addition of through traffic lanes on existing or new highways, including general purpose lanes, high-occupancy vehicle lanes, peak period lanes, auxiliary lanes, and lanes through grade-separated interchanges.

The Project is not a transportation project that would induce automobile travel. Therefore, further evaluation is not required, and the Project would not result in a significant impact under Threshold T-2.2.

Section 4D: Threshold T-3

Substantially Increasing Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Analysis

Evaluation is required for projects that propose new access points or modifications along the public ROW (i.e., street dedications) under Threshold T-3. Project access plans were reviewed to determine if the Project would substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features, including safety, operational, or capacity impacts.

ACCESS OVERVIEW

As described in Chapter 1, vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided via two driveways: one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress and egress movements and would be 20 feet wide. Along the Project frontage, the Project is in the process of seeking waivers of dedication and vacating an existing dedication, and the Project would provide easements to widen the sidewalks and improve sight distance and paths of vehicular, pedestrian, or bicycle travel, if required. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access points via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue and additional entrances on Carlos Avenue.

PROJECT HAZARDS ANALYSIS

Potential Geometric Design Hazards

The vehicular driveways would provide adequate sight distance. Bronson Avenue runs straight and at a slight, consistent grade in front of the Project Site. Carlos Avenue has a curve adjacent to the Project Site, but the design will accommodate adequate sight distance triangles free of obstruction for vehicular ingress and egress. The design would not result in any impediments to the visibility of approaching vehicles, pedestrians, or bicycles. Additionally, the vehicular driveways would intersect Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue at right angles to maximize sight distance.

Based on the analysis in Chapter 3, the Project would generate fewer than 100 trips during any single peak hour, which is less than two vehicles every minute. The driveway would have the capacity to accommodate the Project trips and, therefore, no queuing hazards are expected to occur related to operation of the driveway.

Consistency with Modal Priority Networks

The Project vehicular driveways are not proposed along a street designated as part of the BEN/BLN, TEN, or HIN. However, Carlos Avenue is designated as part of the NEN, and Bronson Avenue is designated as part of the PED by the Mobility Plan. The design does not result in any impediments to the visibility of approaching vehicles, pedestrians, or bicycles, and the Project vehicular driveways would intersect Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue at right angles to maximize sight distance and be designed to City standards. Thus, the Project vehicular driveways would present no substantial conflict with any of those modal priorities. Moreover, the Project would not preclude or interfere with the implementation of future roadway improvements benefiting transit, pedestrians, or bicycles.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Activity

As discussed above, pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access points via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue. The Project would result in a modest increase in both pedestrian and bicycle activity along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue; however, the access locations would be designed to accommodate wider sidewalks and enhanced connectivity that meet the City's requirements to further protect pedestrian and bicycle safety. The driveways would not cross any existing bicycle infrastructure and there is adequate sight distance for drivers entering and exiting the driveway to see oncoming pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to result in significant vehicle-pedestrian or vehicle-bicycle conflicts.

<u>Summary</u>

Based on this review, the Project would not result in hazards from the design or operation and would not result in a significant traffic impact.

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

In addition to potential Project-specific impacts, the TAG requires that the Project be reviewed in combination with Related Projects with access points along the same block as the Project to determine if there may be a cumulatively significant impact. None of the Related Projects in Table 4 and Figure 9 are located along the same block as the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in cumulative impacts that would substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features, including safety, operational, or capacity impacts.

Section 4E Freeway Safety Analysis

LADOT issued *Interim Guidance for Freeway Safety Analysis* (May 1, 2020) (City Freeway Guidance) identifying City requirements for a CEQA safety analysis of Caltrans facilities as part of a transportation assessment.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The City Freeway Guidance relates to the identification of potential safety impacts at freeway offramps as a result of increased traffic from development projects. It provides a methodology and significance criteria for assessing whether additional vehicle queuing at off-ramps could result in a safety impact due to speed differentials between the mainline freeway lanes and the queued vehicles at the off-ramp.

Based on the City Freeway Guidance, a transportation assessment for a development project must include analysis when the project adds 25 or more peak hour trips to any freeway off-ramp. A project would result in a significant impact at such a ramp if each of the following three criteria were met:

- 1. Under a scenario analyzing future conditions upon project buildout, with project traffic included, the off-ramp queue would extend to the mainline freeway lanes³.
- 2. A project would contribute at least two vehicle lengths (50 feet, assuming 25 feet per vehicle) to the queue.
- 3. The average speed of mainline freeway traffic adjacent to the off-ramp during the analyzed peak hour(s) is greater than 30 mph.

³ If an auxiliary lane is provided on the freeway, then half the length of the auxiliary lane is added to the ramp storage length.

Should a significant impact be identified, mitigation measures to be considered include TDM measures to reduce a project's trip generation, investments in active transportation or transit system infrastructure to reduce a project's trip generation, changes to the traffic signal timing or lane assignments at the ramp intersection, or physical changes to the off-ramp. Any physical change to the ramp would have to improve safety, not induce greater VMT, and not result in secondary environmental impacts.

PROJECT SAFETY ANALYSIS

Based on the Project's trip generation estimates and trip assignments, which are detailed in Chapter 3, the Project would not add 25 or more peak hour trips to any freeway off-ramp locations. Therefore, no further freeway off-ramp queuing analysis is required as it is assumed that the Project would not result in a significant safety impact with that level of peak hour trips, and no corrective measures at any freeway off-ramps would be required.

Chapter 5 Non-CEQA Transportation Analysis

This chapter summarizes the non-CEQA transportation analysis of the Project. It includes an evaluation of Project traffic, proposed access provisions, safety, and circulation operations of the Project, and pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the vicinity of the Project. This chapter also evaluates the Project's operational conditions, parking supply and requirements, and effects due to Project construction.

Per Section 3.1 of the TAG, any deficiencies identified based on the non-CEQA transportation analysis is "not intended to be interpreted as thresholds of significance, or significance criteria for purposes of CEQA review unless otherwise specifically identified in Section 2." Section 3 of the TAG identifies the following four non-CEQA transportation analyses for reviewing potential transportation deficiencies that may result from a development project:

- Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Access Assessment
- Project Access, Safety, and Circulation Evaluation
- Residential Street Cut-Through Analysis
- Project Construction

The four non-CEQA transportation analyses are reviewed in detail in Sections 5A through 5D. In addition, a review of the proposed parking and the City's parking requirement for the Project is provided in Section 5E.

Section 5A Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Assessment

This section assesses the Project's potential effect on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Factors to consider when assessing a project's potential effect on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities, include the following:

- Would the project directly or indirectly result in a permanent removal or modification that would lead to the degradation of pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities?
- Would a project intensify use of existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities?

EXISTING FACILITIES

Pedestrians and Bicycles

Existing pedestrian facilities adjacent to the Project Site include sidewalks on Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue. There are Class III bicycle routes on Franklin Avenue within the Study Area. The Project would replace, or slightly relocate, existing curb cuts and would not introduce any modifications or disruptions to bicycle facilities along Bronson Avenue or Carlos Avenue. As such, the Project would not directly or indirectly result in a permanent removal or modification that would lead to the degradation of pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Although the Project may intensify use of existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as well as vehicular traffic volumes using Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue, none of the volumes of any of those travel modes are anticipated to reach a level where any degradation, capacity constraint, or conflict would arise.

Figure 6 shows a map of commercial and institutional facilities within walking distance of the Project Site that could attract pedestrian activity.

<u>Transit</u>

As detailed in Chapter 2 and illustrated in Figure 7, there are several transit stops on Franklin Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard serving bus lines operated by Metro and LADOT. The nearest stops to the Project Site are located at Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard (Intersection #4), approximately 150 feet south of the Project Site, serving Metro Lines 180, 181, and 217. Approximately 0.17 miles to the north, bus stops at Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue (Intersection #1) serve Metro Line 207 and LADOT DASH Hollywood Clockwise and Hollywood Counterclockwise lines. The eastbound stop at Hollywood Boulevard provides bus shelters and benches; the eastbound and westbound stops at Franklin Avenue provide bus shelters and benches.

Tables 3A and 3B summarize the total residual capacity of the Metro and LADOT bus lines during the morning and afternoon peak hours based on the frequency of service of each line and the maximum seated and standing capacity of each bus. As shown in Tables 3A and 3B, the transit lines within 0.25 miles walking distance of the Project Site currently have additional capacity for 800 additional riders during the morning peak hour and 792 additional riders during the afternoon peak hour.

INTENSIFICATION OF USE

The Project would not directly or indirectly result in a permanent removal or modification of infrastructure or degrade pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Although the Project may slightly intensify use of existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, there is adequate capacity in existing facilities to accommodate all foreseeable future demand for those facilities. Overall, the Project would not result in the deterioration of any existing facilities serving pedestrians or bicyclists.

The Project would result in some intensification of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activity in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, given the Project Site's location near local bus and rail services in Hollywood and its proximity to active commercial centers, it is ideally located to encourage non-automobile trips to and from those destinations and reach additional public transit routes. The amount of additional pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activity generated by the Project would not strain the capacity of facilities and operations dedicated to those modes.

Transit Ridership

The Project is estimated to add approximately eight new transit riders during the morning peak hour and seven riders during the afternoon peak hour. This was calculated based on the 10% transit usage adjustment applied to the Multifamily Housing trip generation estimates and inherent to the Affordable Housing – Family trip generation estimates in Table 5, along with application of an average vehicle occupancy factor of 1.55 for trips in Los Angeles County as identified in *SCAG Regional Travel Demand Model and 2012 Model Validation* (SCAG, March 2016). This Project transit trip estimate is a small fraction (approximately 1%) of the residual peak hour transit capacity estimated in Tables 3A and 3B, and, therefore, the Project would not place a significant strain on capacity. As such, the Project would not lead to the degradation of transit facilities or significantly intensify use of transit facilities.

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

The Related Projects, all of which are located more than 0.50 miles from the Project Site, would result in some additional intensification of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activity in the Study Area. However, as with the Project, the incremental increase in activity from the Related Projects would not strain the capacity of the sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or transit system.

Section 5B Project Access, Safety, and Circulation Assessment

This section summarizes access, safety, and circulation at and around the Project Site. It includes a quantitative evaluation of the Project's access and circulation operations, including the anticipated LOS at the study intersections and anticipated traffic queues.

PROJECT ACCESS

Vehicles

Vehicular access to the Project Site access would be provided via two driveways: one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue. Both driveways would accommodate right-turn and left-turn ingress and egress movements.

Pedestrians and Bicycles

Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided separate from the vehicular access via a lobby entrance on Bronson Avenue. These facilities would provide adequate capacity and allow safer movement for pedestrians and bicycles to, from, and around the Project Site.

PASSENGER LOADING EVALUATION

The Project proposes all passenger loading to take place along Carlos Avenue. Additionally, unmetered on-street parking is allowed on Carlos Avenue. As such, approximately four on-street spaces adjacent to the Project Site can serve passenger loading purposes when not in use by parked vehicles. Given the fact that Project trip generation is estimated to be under two vehicles per minute during peak hours as shown in Table 5 (most of which would not be using a loading

zone), and passenger loading operations tend to be brief, there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate Project passenger loading demand.

OPERATIONAL EVALUATION

Intersection operation conditions were evaluated for typical weekday morning (7:00 AM to 10:00 AM) and afternoon (3:00 PM to 6:00 PM) peak periods. A total of four study intersections, three signalized and one unsignalized, were selected for detailed transportation analysis in consultation with LADOT.

The following traffic conditions were developed and analyzed as part of this study:

- <u>Existing Conditions (Year 2021)</u> The analysis of existing traffic conditions provides a basis for the assessment of future traffic conditions.
- <u>Existing with Project Conditions (Year 2021)</u> This analysis condition analyzes the potential intersection operating conditions that could be expected if the Project were built under existing conditions. In this analysis, the Project-generated traffic is added to the Existing Conditions.
- <u>Future without Project Conditions (Year 2024)</u> This analysis projects the future traffic growth and intersection operating conditions that could be expected as a result of regional growth and related project traffic in the Study Area by Year 2024. The Future without Project Conditions are projected by adding ambient traffic growth and traffic from related projects to Existing Conditions. This analysis provides the conditions by which the Project impacts are evaluated in the future at full buildout.
- <u>Future with Project Conditions (Year 2024)</u> This analysis condition analyzes the potential intersection operating conditions that could be expected if the Project is fully occupied in the projected buildout year. In this analysis, the Project-generated traffic is added to Future without Project Conditions (Year 2024).

<u>Methodology</u>

In accordance with the TAG, the intersection delay and queue analyses for the operational evaluation were conducted using the *Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition* (Transportation Research Board, 2016) (HCM) methodology, which was implemented using Synchro software and signal timing worksheets from the City to analyze intersection operating conditions. The HCM

signalized methodology calculates the average delay, in seconds, for each vehicle passing through the intersections, while the HCM unsignalized two-way stop-control methodology calculates the control delay, in seconds, for the intersection approach with the highest delay (typically, left-turns from the side street to Bronson Avenue). Table 12 presents a description of the LOS categories, which range from excellent, nearly free-flow traffic at LOS A, to stop-and-go conditions at LOS F, for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

The queue lengths were estimated using Synchro, which reports the 95th percentile queue length for signalized and unsignalized intersections in vehicles per lane, which can be converted into linear distance by multiplying the vehicle queue by 25 feet per vehicle. The reported queues are calculated using the HCM signalized and unsignalized intersection methodology.

LOS and queuing worksheets for each scenario are provided in Appendix E.

Existing with Project Conditions

Traffic Volumes. The Project-only morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes described in Chapter 3 and shown in Figure 14 were added to the existing morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes shown in Figure 8. The resulting volumes are illustrated in Figure 15 and represent Existing with Project Conditions, assuming Project operation under Existing Conditions.

Intersection LOS. Table 13 summarizes the intersection LOS under Existing and Existing with Project Conditions during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours for the study intersections. As shown in Table 13, two of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at LOS A or B during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under both Existing and Existing with Project Conditions. Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard (Intersection #4) is anticipated to operate at LOS C during the morning peak hour and LOS E during the afternoon peak hour under both Existing and Existing with Project Conditions. Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard (Intersection #4) is anticipated to operate at LOS C during the morning peak hour and LOS E during the afternoon peak hour under both Existing and Existing with Project Conditions. Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue (Intersection #1) is anticipated to operate at LOS F during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under both Existing and Existing with Project Conditions. As such, two of the four intersections are deficient under Existing Conditions. With implementation of the Project, none of the study intersections are anticipated to result in an unacceptable LOS that did not exist without the Project.

Future with Project Conditions

All future adjustments, including cumulative traffic growth (i.e., ambient growth and Related Project traffic) and transportation infrastructure improvements described in Chapter 2 are incorporated into this analysis.

Traffic Volumes. The Project-only morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes described in Chapter 3 and shown in Figure 14 were added to the Future without Project (Year 2024) morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes shown in Figure 11. The resulting volumes are illustrated in Figure 16 and represent Future with Project Conditions after development of the Project in Year 2024.

Intersection LOS. Table 14 summarizes the results of the Future without Project and Future with Project Conditions during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours for the four study intersections. As shown in Table 14, two of the study intersections are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under both Future and Future with Project Conditions (Year 2024). Bronson Avenue & Franklin Avenue (Intersection #1) and Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard (Intersection #4) are anticipated to operate at LOS F during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under both Future with Project Conditions (Year 2024). As such, two of the four intersections continue to demonstrate poor LOS under Future without Project Conditions (Year 2024). With implementation of the Project, neither of the study intersections operating at acceptable levels of service are anticipated to operate at unacceptable LOS. Project traffic does cause the intersection of Carlos Avenue & Bronson Avenue to degrade from LOS B to LOS C during the afternoon peak hour, but LOS C is an acceptable operating condition.

INTERSECTION QUEUING ANALYSIS

The study intersections were also analyzed to determine whether the lengths of intersection turning lanes could accommodate vehicle queue lengths. The queue lengths were estimated using Synchro software, which reports the 95th percentile queue length, in vehicles, for each approach lane, which can be converted into linear distance by multiplying vehicle lengths by 25

feet. The reported queues are calculated using the HCM signalized intersection methodology. Detailed queuing analysis worksheets are provided in Appendix E.









		Delay [a]			
Service	Description	Signalized	Unsignalized		
A	EXCELLENT. No vehicle waits longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used.	≤ 10	≤ 10		
В	VERY GOOD. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.	> 10 and ≤ 20	> 10 and ≤ 15		
С	GOOD. Occasionally drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles.	> 20 and ≤ 35	> 15 and ≤ 25		
D	FAIR. Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive backups.	> 35 and ≤ 55	> 25 and ≤ 35		
E	POOR. Represents the most vehicles intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.	> 55 and ≤ 80	> 35 and ≤ 50		
F	FAILURE. Backups from nearby locations or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.	> 80	> 50		

TABLE 12INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE

Notes:

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition* (Transportation Research Board, 2016). [a] Measured in seconds.

TABLE 13EXISTING CONDITIONS (YEAR 2021)INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE

No	Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing C	Conditions	Existing with Project Conditions		
		T Cak Hour	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	
1.	Bronson Avenue &	AM	151.6	F	151.4	F	
[a]	Franklin Avenue	PM	101.1	F	101.4		
2.	Gower Street &	AM	7.0	A	7.2	A	
[a]	Carlos Avenue	PM	6.2	A	6.3	A	
3.	Bronson Avenue &	AM	14.0	B	14.0	B	
[b]	Carlos Avenue	PM	14.0	B	14.3	B	
4.	Bronson Avenue &	AM	32.0	C	34.0	C	
[a]	Hollywood Boulevard	PM	57.8	E	58.1	E	

Notes:

Delay is measured in seconds per vehicle. LOS = Level of Service.

[a] Intersection analysis based on HCM 6th Edition Signalized methodology, which calculates the average intersection delay, in seconds, for each vehicle passing through the intersection.

[b] Intersection analysis based on the HCM 6th Edition Two-Way Stop Control Unsignalized methodology, which calculates the control delay, in seconds, for each individual approach of an intersection. The reported control delay represents the worst-case approach, and does not account for traffic gaps created by adjacent traffic signals.

TABLE 14FUTURE CONDITIONS (YEAR 2024)INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE

No	Intersection	Peak Hour	Future with Cond	out Project itions	Future with Project Conditions		
		i cak noui	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	
1.	Bronson Avenue &	AM	169.4	F	169.3	F	
[a]	Franklin Avenue	PM	119.2	F	119.5		
2.	Gower Street &	AM	7.0	A	7.2	A	
[a]	Carlos Avenue	PM	6.2	A	6.3	A	
3.	Bronson Avenue &	AM	14.9	B	14.9	ВС	
[b]	Carlos Avenue	PM	14.8	B	15.2		
4. [a]	Bronson Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard	AM PM	202.4 193.7	F	206.8 201.1	ΨΨ	

Notes:

Delay is measured in seconds per vehicle. LOS = Level of Service.

[a] Intersection analysis based on HCM 6th Edition Signalized methodology, which calculates the average intersection delay, in seconds, for each vehicle passing through the intersection.

[b] Intersection analysis based on the HCM 6th Edition Two-Way Stop Control Unsignalized methodology, which calculates the control delay, in seconds, for each individual approach of an intersection. The reported control delay represents the worst-case approach, and does not account for traffic gaps created by adjacent traffic signals.

Section 5C Residential Street Cut-Through Analysis

This section summarizes the residential street cut-through analysis for the Project. The objective of the residential street cut-through analysis is to determine potential increases in average daily traffic volumes on designated Local Streets, as classified in the City's General Plan, that can be identified as cut-through trips generated by the Project and that can adversely affect the character and function of those streets. Per Section 3.5.2 of the TAG, cut-through trips are defined as those that feature travel along a Local Street with residential land-use frontage, as an alternative to a higher classification street segment, to access a destination that is not within the neighborhood in which the Local Street is located.

Due to the fact that this is a residential Project, trips to and from the Project are not considered cutthrough traffic as that only applies to commercial and industrial traffic. Thus, the Project does not meet the criteria to conduct a Local Residential Street Cut-Through Analysis.

Section 5D Construction Impact Analysis

This section summarizes the construction schedule and construction impact analysis for the Project. The construction impact analysis relates to the temporary impacts that may result from the construction activities associated with the Project and was performed in accordance with Section 3.4, Project Construction, of the TAG.

CONSTRUCTION EVALUATION CRITERIA

Section 3.4.3 of the TAG identifies three types of in-street construction impacts that require further analysis to assess the effects of Project construction on the existing pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation. The three types of impacts and related populations are:

- 1. Temporary transportation constraints potential impacts on the transportation system
- 2. Temporary loss of access potential impacts on visitors entering and leaving sites
- 3. Temporary loss of bus stops or rerouting of bus lines potential impacts on bus travelers

The factors used to determine the significance of a project's impacts involve the likelihood and extent to which an impact might occur, the potential inconvenience caused to users of the transportation system, and consideration for public safety. Construction activities could potentially interfere with pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas. As detailed in Section 3.4.4 of the TAG, the proposed construction plans should be reviewed to determine whether construction activities would require any of the following actions:

- Street, sidewalk, or lane closures
- Block existing vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian access along a street or to parcels fronting the street
- Modification of access to transit stations, stops, or facilities during revenue hours

- Closure or movement of an existing bus stop or rerouting of an existing bus line
- Creation of transportation hazards

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

The Project is anticipated to be constructed over a 24-month period, with completion anticipated in Year 2024. Peak haul truck activity occurs during the grading phase and peak worker activity occurs during the building construction and finishing phases. These phases of construction were studied in greater detail.

GRADING PHASE

The peak period of truck activity during construction would occur during the grading of the Project Site. With the implementation of the Construction Management Plan, which is described in more detail below, it is anticipated that almost all haul truck activity to and from the Project Site would occur outside of the morning and afternoon peak hours. In addition, as discussed in more detail in the following section, worker trips to and from the Project Site would also occur outside of the peak hours. Therefore, no peak hour construction traffic impacts are expected during the grading phase of construction.

Haul trucks would travel on approved truck routes designated within the City. Haul truck traffic would take the most direct route to the appropriate freeway ramps. The haul route will be reviewed and approved by the City.

Grading Phase Trip Generation

Based on projections compiled for the Project, approximately 3,900 cubic yards (CY) of material would be excavated and removed from the Project Site over a 30-day period. It is anticipated that a maximum of nine trucks per workday, based on an anticipated haul truck capacity of 16 CY, would be required during this phase. Thus, up to 18 daily truck trips (nine inbound, nine outbound) are forecasted to occur during the grading phase, with approximately four trips per hour (two

inbound, two outbound) uniformly over a typical six-hour, off-peak hauling period (10:00 AM to 4:00 PM).

Because construction trucks (such as earth-hauling trucks and cement trucks) are larger and slower than the passenger vehicles that make up the majority of the vehicles on the roads, they have a greater effect on traffic than a passenger vehicle. *Transportation Research Circular No. 212, Interim Materials on Highway Capacity* (Transportation Research Board, 1980) defines passenger car equivalency (PCE) for a vehicle as the number of through moving passenger cars to which it is equivalent based on the vehicle's headway and delay-creating effects. Table 8 of *Transportation Research Circular No. 212* and Exhibit 22.11 of the HCM suggest a PCE of 2.0 for trucks traveling on level terrain. Assuming a PCE factor of 2.0, the 18 daily truck trips would be equivalent to 36 daily PCE trips. The four hourly truck trips would be equivalent to approximately eight PCE trips per hour (four inbound, four outbound).

In addition, a maximum of 20 daily construction workers is anticipated during the grading phase. The 20 construction workers would result in 40 one-way vehicle trips (20 inbound, 20 outbound), to and from the Project Site on a daily basis. It is anticipated that the majority of workers would arrive on-site prior to the weekday morning commuter peak hour and leave prior to or after the afternoon commuter peak hour. Therefore, no peak hour construction traffic impacts are expected during the grading phase of construction.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION AND FINISHING PHASES

During the building construction and finishing phases, parking for construction workers would generally be provided on-site, in local public parking facilities or, if needed, at an adjacent private plaza until the on-site parking facility is available. Restrictions against workers parking in the public ROW in the vicinity of (or adjacent to) the Project Site would be identified as part of the Construction Management Plan. Construction materials storage and truck staging would generally be contained on-site or in the parking lane along the Project frontage on Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue.

The traffic impacts associated with construction workers depends on the number of construction workers employed during various phases of construction, as well as the travel mode and travel

time of the workers. In general, the hours of construction typically require workers to be on-site before the weekday morning commuter peak period and allow them to leave before or after the afternoon commuter peak period (i.e., arrive at the site prior to 7:00 AM and depart before 4:00 PM or after 6:00 PM). Therefore, most, if not all, construction worker trips would occur outside of the typical weekday commuter peak periods.

According to construction projections prepared for the Project, the building construction and finishing phases would employ the most construction workers, with a maximum of 200 workers per day. The estimated number of daily vehicle trips associated with the construction workers is approximately 400 one-way trips (200 inbound and 200 outbound trips), but nearly all of those trips would occur outside of the peak hours, as described above. As such, the building construction and finishing phases of Project construction is not expected to cause a traffic impact at any of the study intersections.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON ACCESS, TRANSIT, AND PARKING

Project construction is not expected to create hazards for roadway travelers, bus riders, or parkers, so long as commonly practiced safety procedures for construction are followed. Such procedures and other measures (e.g., to address temporary traffic control, lane closures, sidewalk closures, etc.) have been incorporated into the Construction Management Plan. The construction-related impacts associated with access and transit are anticipated to be less than significant, and the implementation of the Construction Management Plan described below would further reduce those impacts.

<u>Access</u>

Construction activities are expected to be primarily contained within the Project Site boundaries. However, it is expected that construction fences may encroach into the public ROW (e.g., sidewalks and roadways) adjacent to the Project Site. The curb lanes on Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue, which are used for parking, may be temporarily closed throughout the construction period. Temporary traffic controls would be provided to direct traffic around any closures as required in the Construction Management Plan, and emergency access would not be impeded.

The use of the public ROW would require temporary re-routing of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The Construction Management Plan would include measures to ensure pedestrian and bicycle safety along the affected sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and temporary walkways (e.g., use of lightduty barriers and cones, use of directional signage, maintaining continuous and unobstructed pedestrian paths, and/or providing overhead covering).

<u>Transit</u>

There are no existing bus stops located adjacent to the Project Site and, thus, no temporary relocation of any bus stop is anticipated due to the construction of the Project.

Parking 197

The curb lanes along Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue are anticipated to be used for staging, deliveries, and/or crane placement during construction. Thus, construction activities would potentially result in temporary loss of up to six public parking spaces.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

A detailed Construction Management Plan, including street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes, and a staging plan would be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to commencing construction and is part of the building permit approval. The Construction Management Plan would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Management Plan shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site, and shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:

- Advance bilingual notification of adjacent property owners and occupants of upcoming construction activities, including durations and daily hours of operation.
- Temporary pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular traffic controls during all construction activities on Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue to ensure traffic safety on public ROWs. These controls shall include, but not be limited to, flag people trained in pedestrian and bicycle safety.
- Scheduling of construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding arterial streets.
- Spacing of trucks so as to discourage a convoy effect.
- Containment of construction activity within the Project Site boundaries to the extent feasible.
- Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers shall be implemented as appropriate, including along all identified Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) pedestrian routes to nearby schools.
- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., to occur outside the commuter peak hours, so as to not impede school drop-off and pick-up activities and students using LAUSD's identified pedestrian routes to nearby schools.
- Maintenance of a log, available on the job site at all times, documenting the dates of hauling and the number of trips (i.e., trucks) per day.
- Identification of a construction manager and provision of a telephone number for any inquiries or complaints from residents regarding construction activities. The telephone number shall be posted at the site readily visible to any interested party during site preparation, grading, and construction.

It is likely that the Construction Management Plan would also be submitted for approval to the City by the Related Projects prior to the start of construction activities. As part of the LADOT and/or Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety established review process of construction management plans, potential overlapping construction activities and proposed haul routes would be reviewed to minimize the impacts of cumulative construction activities on any particular roadway.

Section 5E Parking Analysis

This section provides an analysis of the proposed parking and the potential parking impacts of the Project.

PARKING SUPPLY

The Project would provide a total of 134 vehicular parking spaces and 98 (89 long-term and nine short-term) bicycle parking spaces on-site.

VEHICLE PARKING CODE REQUIREMENTS

The parking requirements for the residential use of the Project were calculated by applying the appropriate parking ratios for a residential development under the requirements of *Assembly Bill No. 2345 Planning and Zoning: Density Bonuses: Annual Report: Affordable Housing* (Gonzalez, 2019-2020) (AB 2345). The minimum requirement is 0.5 spaces per residential dwelling unit.

As shown in Table 15, the Project would require a minimum of 64 spaces for the 128 dwelling units. The Project's proposed 134 spaces would satisfy the AB 2345 requirement for minimum on-site parking supply.

BICYCLE PARKING CODE REQUIREMENTS

LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 details the long-term and short-term bicycle parking requirements for new developments, which are summarized in Table 16. As shown, the Project would require a total of 89 long-term and nine short-term bicycle parking spaces. The Project's proposed 89 long-term

and nine short-term bicycle parking spaces would satisfy the LAMC requirements for on-site bicycle parking supply.

TABLE 15VEHICLE PARKING CODE REQUIREMENTS

Land Use	Size	Parking Rate	Total Spaces	
Residential	128 du	0.50 sp /	1 du	64
	64			

Notes

[a] Residential parking rates per Assembly Bill No. 2345 Planning and Zoning: Density Bonuses: Annual Report: Affordable Housing (Gonzalez, 2019-2020).

TABLE 16BICYCLE PARKING CODE REQUIREMENTS

Land Use	Size	Short-Term				Long-Term			
		Rate [a]		Requirement		Rate [a]	Requirement		
Residential (1-25 du)	25 du	1.0 sp	/	10 du	3 sp	1.0 sp	/	1 du	25 sp
Residential (26-100 du)	75 du	1.0 sp	/	15 du	5 sp	1.0 sp	/	1.5 du	50 sp
Residential (101-128 du)	28 du	1.0 sp	/	20 du	1 sp	1.0 sp	/	2.0 du	14 sp
Total Short-Term 9 sp Total Long-Term							89 sp		
Total Code Bicycle Parking Requirement							98 sp		

Notes

[a] Bicycle requirements as calculated by Section 12.21.A.16 of *Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)* and proposed amendments per Case No. CPC-2016-4216-CA and Council File No. 12-1297-S1.

Chapter 6 Summary and Conclusions

This study was undertaken to analyze the potential transportation impacts of the Project on the transportation system. The following summarizes the results of this analysis:

- The Project is located at 1725, 1729, and 1739 North Bronson Avenue.
- The Project proposes 116 market-rate apartment units and 12 affordable apartment units and is anticipated to be completed in Year 2024.
- Vehicular access would be provided via two driveways, one along Bronson Avenue and one along Carlos Avenue.
- The Project is estimated to generate 38 net new morning peak hour trips and 42 net new afternoon peak hour trips.
- The Project would be consistent with the City's plans, programs, ordinances, and polices and would not result in any geometric design hazard impacts.
- The Project would not result in VMT impacts and would not require mitigation.
- The Project provides adequate internal circulation to accommodate vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic without impeding through traffic movements on City streets.
- The addition of Project trips would not adversely affect any residential Local Streets.
- Construction traffic would be generated outside of the commuter morning and afternoon peak hours to the extent feasible and would be substantially less than the traffic generated by operation of the Project. A Construction Management Plan would be prepared to ensure that construction impacts are minimized.
- The Project would provide a total of 134 vehicle parking spaces within four levels of above ground and one level of subterranean parking and a total of 89 long-term and nine short-term bicycle parking spaces.

References

2010 Bicycle Plan, A Component of the City of Los Angeles Transportation Element, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, adopted March 1, 2011.

2012 Developer Fee Justification Study, Los Angeles Unified School District, 2012.

Assembly Bill No. 2345 Planning and Zoning: Density Bonuses: Annual Report: Affordable Housing, Gonzalez, 2019-2020.

City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, Los Angeles Department of Transportation and Los Angeles Department of City Planning, May 2020.

City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator User Guide, Los Angeles Department of Transportation and Los Angeles Department of City Planning, May 2020.

City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Version 1.3, Los Angeles Department of Transportation, July 2020.

Citywide Design Guidelines, Los Angeles City Planning Urban Design Studio, October 2019.

Connect SoCal – The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy, Southern California Association of Governments, Adopted September 2020.

Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition, Transportation Research Board, 2016.

Hollywood Community Plan, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 1988.

Hollywood Community Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report, Terry A. Hayes Associates, Inc., November 2018.

Interim Guidance for Freeway Safety Analysis, Los Angeles Department of Transportation, May 2020.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, City of Los Angeles.

Mobility Plan 2035, An Element of the General Plan, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, September 2016.

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, March 2015.

Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, 2010.
References, cont.

Redevelopment Plan for the Hollywood Redevelopment Project, The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, May 2003.

SCAG Regional Travel Demand Model and 2012 Model Validation, Southern California Association of Governments, March 2016.

State of California Senate Bill 743, Steinberg, 2013.

Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, December 2018.

Transportation Research Circular No. 212, Interim Materials on Highway Capacity, Transportation Research Board, 1980.

Transportation Assessment Guidelines, Los Angeles Department of Transportation, July 2020.

Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012.

Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017.

Vision Zero: Eliminating Traffic Deaths in Los Angeles by 2025, City of Los Angeles, August 2015.

Appendix A

Memorandum of Understanding



IV. STUDY AREA AND ASSUMPTIONS

Project Buildout Year: 2024 Ambient Growth Rate: 1.0 % Per Yr.

Related Projects List, researched by the consultant and approved by LADOT, attached? (Required) Ves No

STUDY INTERSECTIONS and/or STREET SEGMENTS (May be subject to LADOT revision after access, safety and circulation evaluation)

- 1
 Bronson Ave & Franklin Ave
 4
 Bronson Ave & Hollywood Blvd
- 2
 Gower St & Carlos Ave
 5

 3
 Bronson Ave & Carlos Ave
 6

Is this Project located on a street within the High Injury Network? Yes Vo

V. ACCESS ASSESSMENT

- a. Does the project exceed 1,000 total DVT? Yes No
- b. Is the project's frontage 250 linear feet or more along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? ☐Yes ☑No
- c. Is the project's building frontage encompassing an entire block along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? Yes No

If questions a., b., or c. is Yes then complete Attachment C.1: Access Assessment Criteria.

VI. SITE PLAN AND MAP OF STUDY AREA			
Does the attached site plan or map of study area show	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Each study intersection and/or street segment	V		
Project Vehicle Peak Hour trips at each study intersection			
Project Vehicle Peak Hour trips at each project access point	V		
Project driveways (show widths and directions or lane assignment)			
Pedestrian access points and any pedestrian paths	V		
Pedestrian loading zones	R		
Delivery loading zone or area			
Bicycle parking onsite			
Bicycle parking offsite (in public right-of-way)			r

VII. CONTACT INFORMATION

	CONSULTANT	DEVELOPER
Name:	Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc.	1717 Bronson Holdings, LLC
Address:	555 W. 5th St. Suite 3375, Los Angeles, CA 90013	800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 860, Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone Nu	umber: (213) 683-0088	(213) 279-6965
E-Mail:	Imullarkey-williams@gibsontrans.com	chris@gonzaleslawgroup.com
		Rk la

Approved by:	x			× yr	2-10-2021
		Consultant's Representative	Date	LADOT Representative	*Date

*MOUs are generally valid for two years after signing. If after two years a transportation assessment has not been submitted to LADOT, the developer's representative shall check with the appropriate LADOT office to determine if the terms of this MOU are still valid or if a new MOU is needed.



Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This MOU acknowledges that the Transportation Assessment for the following Project will be prepared in accordance with the latest version of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines:

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower

Project Address: 1725, 1729, 1739 N Bronson Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90028

Project Description: ______ The Project would consist of a 24-story residential development with 128 apartment units (12 affordable units).

Parking would be provided in one subterranean and four above ground levels with access via Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue.

LADOT Project Case Number: CEN 20-50709 Project Site Plan attached? (Required) Ves No

II. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) MEASURES

Provide any transportation demand management measures that are being considered where the eligibility needs to be verified in advance (e.g. bike share kiosks, unbundled parking, microstransit service, etc.). Note that LADOT staff will make the final determination if TDM measures eligibility for a particular project. Please confirm eligibility with the LADOT Planning and Bureau staff assigned to your project.

1	Unbundle Parking	4	
2		5	
3		6	

Select any TDM measures that are currently being considered that may be eligible as a Project Design Feature¹:



III. TRIP GENERATION

Trip Generation Adjustment (Exact amount of credit subject to approval by LADOT)	Yes	No
Transit Usage	~	
Existing Active or Previous Land Use		•
Internal Trip		~
Pass-By Trip		~
Transportation Demand Management (See above)		~

Trip generation table including a description of the existing and proposed land uses, rates, estimated morning and afternoon peak hour volumes (ins/outs/totals), proposed trip credits, etc. attached? (*Required*) 🖓 Yes 🗅 No

AM Trips PM Trips	<u>IN</u> 10 25	<u>OUT</u> 28 17	<u>TOTAL</u> 38 42	NET Daily Vehicle Trips (DVT) DVT (ITE ed.) _502 DVT (VMT Calculator ver. <u>1.3</u>)
----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--

¹ At this time Project Design Features are only those measures that are also shown to be needed to comply with a local ordinance, affordable housing incentive program, or state law.

³Select if reduced parking supply is pursued as a result of a parking incentive as permitted by the City's Bicycle Parking Ordinance, State Density Bonus Law, or a the City's Transit Oriented ted Community Guidelines.

Appendix B

Traffic Volume Data

Turning Movement Count Report AM

Location ID: 6 North/South: Brons East/West: Frankl

Bronson Avenue Franklin Avenue

Date:	05/03/18
City:	Los Angeles, CA

	9	Southboun	d		Westbound North			Northboun	d		Eastbouna		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totala
Movements:	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	TOLAIS.
07:00	15	14	5	3	257	20	7	8	6	11	104	10	460
07:15	11	15	11	2	282	21	13	13	5	15	148	17	553
07:30	24	26	32	10	321	33	22	19	6	7	203	12	715
07:45	29	38	28	18	275	39	20	51	9	15	204	21	747
08:00	18	49	39	7	290	46	27	16	13	28	170	14	717
08:15	28	38	21	2	274	61	26	30	5	14	175	17	691
08:30	22	30	28	13	263	49	39	10	12	20	224	20	730
08:45	30	42	31	8	247	52	34	25	9	14	187	17	696
09:00	20	30	23	4	275	45	36	19	11	28	170	28	689
09:15	29	30	28	5	282	46	33	13	11	18	169	20	684
09:30	29	33	19	2	276	45	26	20	12	20	193	26	701
09:45	20	28	23	10	293	53	24	20	9	20	146	23	669
Total Volume:	275	373	288	84	3335	510	307	244	108	210	2093	225	8052
Approach %	29%	40%	31%	2%	85%	13%	47%	37%	16%	8%	83%	9%	
		_											
Peak Hr Begin:	7:45												
PHV	97	155	116	40	1102	195	112	107	39	77	773	72	2885
PHF		0.868			0.974			0.806			0.873		0.966

Prepared by City Count, LLC. (www.citycount.com)

Turning Movement Count Report PM

Location ID: 6 North/South: Brons East/West: Frank

Bronson Avenue Franklin Avenue

Date:	05/03/18
City:	Los Angeles, CA

	S	outhboun	d	Westbound			Northbound			Eastbound			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totala
Movements:	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	TOLAIS:
15:00	26	16	27	10	208	16	50	29	14	12	278	27	713
15:15	25	30	32	13	219	24	59	28	13	16	329	27	815
15:30	32	28	25	8	226	34	60	27	14	18	294	29	795
15:45	29	20	23	14	246	29	69	24	10	11	286	26	787
16:00	30	34	21	12	208	24	82	33	10	15	299	22	790
16:15	12	28	30	13	220	26	83	45	13	23	296	32	821
16:30	26	28	36	15	226	20	65	37	11	14	330	22	830
16:45	17	18	28	21	228	16	64	32	10	15	362	20	831
17:00	29	19	23	14	183	24	80	43	13	18	286	23	755
17:15	20	31	20	14	172	24	54	50	17	16	329	23	770
17:30	24	20	31	10	189	23	94	33	4	14	350	20	812
17:45	19	22	18	13	251	23	75	29	15	13	339	26	843
Total Volume:	289	294	314	157	2576	283	835	410	144	185	3778	297	9562
Approach %	32%	33%	35%	5%	85%	9%	60%	30%	10%	4%	89%	7%	
		-											
Peak Hr Begin:	16:00												
PHV	85	108	115	61	882	86	294	147	44	67	1287	96	3272
PHF		0.856			0.971			0.860			0.913		0.984

Prepared by City Count, LLC. (www.citycount.com)

	No	rth	Ec	ast	South		W	est
Leg:	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle
07:00	5	0	0	0	9	0	5	0
07:15	2	0	0	0	5	0	3	0
07:30	9	0	1	0	2	0	6	0
07:45	10	0	0	0	3	0	11	0
08:00	22	0	0	0	17	2	16	1
08:15	18	0	0	0	10	0	9	0
08:30	5	0	0	0	12	0	7	0
08:45	12	1	0	0	10	0	3	0
09:00	5	0	0	0	4	1	4	1
09:15	5	1	0	0	5	2	9	1
09:30	15	0	0	0	4	0	10	0
09:45	6	0	0	0	4	0	6	0

Pedestrian/Bicycle Count Report

	No	rth	East		So	uth	West	
Leg:	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle
15:00	26	2	0	0	16	0	21	1
15:15	19	0	0	0	12	0	19	0
15:30	23	0	0	0	5	0	9	1
15:45	19	0	0	0	5	0	17	0
16:00	19	1	0	0	10	2	6	0
16:15	29	1	0	0	6	1	13	0
16:30	24	1	0	0	6	1	10	0
16:45	33	0	0	0	5	0	21	0
17:00	34	0	0	0	13	1	11	0
17:15	41	1	0	0	8	1	20	0
17:30	48	0	0	0	5	1	18	0
17:45	27	0	0	0	15	0	19	0

Turning Movement Count Report AM

Location ID: 13 North/South: Bronso East/West: Hollywo

Bronson Avenue Hollywood Blvd

Date:	05/02/18
City:	Los Angeles, CA

	S	Southboun	d		Westbound	d	1	Northboun	d		Eastbound	1	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totals
Movements:	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	TOLAIS.
07:00	22	21	22	10	204	10	16	10	3	2	78	5	403
07:15	14	9	29	7	228	15	38	27	5	5	88	8	473
07:30	25	31	23	12	236	26	36	30	9	2	104	12	546
07:45	31	55	24	21	217	22	28	36	3	8	103	8	556
08:00	39	79	32	12	243	41	41	36	7	10	134	16	690
08:15	29	89	24	21	207	42	40	42	6	8	123	16	647
08:30	31	56	30	19	246	41	38	37	7	5	100	19	629
08:45	31	55	30	11	233	41	30	45	8	12	112	15	623
09:00	22	51	35	9	209	39	35	32	7	7	114	10	570
09:15	26	72	27	24	246	40	44	29	8	14	122	13	665
09:30	29	55	29	12	211	31	41	29	5	7	112	7	568
09:45	31	33	23	11	193	33	30	27	7	11	112	13	524
Total Volume:	330	606	328	169	2673	381	417	380	75	91	1302	142	6894
Approach %	26%	48%	26%	5%	83%	12%	48%	44%	9%	6%	85%	9%	
		-											
Peak Hr Begin:	8:00	<u> </u>											
PHV	130	279	116	63	929	165	149	160	28	35	469	66	2589
PHF		0.875			0.945			0.957			0.891		0.938

Prepared by City Count, LLC. (www.citycount.com)

Turning Movement Count Report PM

Location ID: 13 North/South: Bronso East/West: Hollyw

Bronson Avenue Hollywood Blvd Date: 05/02/18 City: Los Angeles, CA

	5	Southboun	d		Westbound	d	1	Northboun	d		Eastbound		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totala
Movements:	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	Totals:
15:00	20	36	32	13	172	17	44	46	16	10	190	21	617
15:15	22	29	26	19	165	15	31	54	15	8	190	29	603
15:30	22	42	24	19	165	16	46	57	14	6	183	27	621
15:45	25	26	25	22	169	24	32	83	19	5	192	22	644
16:00	19	40	21	22	174	24	44	68	14	11	182	18	637
16:15	16	36	16	25	178	20	33	60	7	14	192	19	616
16:30	16	45	23	17	168	18	36	69	15	7	181	39	634
16:45	18	30	19	22	159	14	21	78	15	13	166	40	595
17:00	12	49	20	16	192	17	37	63	14	10	180	38	648
17:15	16	33	22	33	188	16	40	74	18	14	206	38	698
17:30	17	47	24	17	198	21	43	94	11	15	181	32	700
17:45	9	51	18	20	180	30	46	77	10	18	186	25	670
Total Volume:	212	464	270	245	2108	232	453	823	168	131	2229	348	7683
Approach %	22%	49%	29%	9%	82%	9%	31%	57%	12%	5%	82%	13%	
		-											
Peak Hr Begin:	17:00												
PHV	54	180	84	86	758	84	166	308	53	57	753	133	2716
PHF		0.903			0.979			0.890			0.914		0.970

Prepared by City Count, LLC. (www.citycount.com)

	No	rth	Ec	ast	So	South		est
Leg:	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle
07:00	12	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
07:15	2	0	1	1	1	1	7	0
07:30	6	3	5	1	0	0	7	0
07:45	9	0	7	0	1	1	8	0
08:00	8	1	2	0	0	0	4	0
08:15	15	2	4	0	2	1	1	1
08:30	7	0	6	0	0	0	7	0
08:45	21	1	8	0	2	0	0	0
09:00	10	3	5	1	0	0	7	0
09:15	11	1	9	2	0	0	10	0
09:30	17	4	6	0	0	0	8	0
09:45	13	3	2	0	1	0	7	0

Pedestrian/Bicycle Count Report

	No	rth	Ec	ast	So	uth	West	
Leg:	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle
15:00	18	0	1	0	2	1	10	0
15:15	9	2	5	1	1	0	17	0
15:30	11	1	15	0	0	1	7	0
15:45	19	1	5	1	1	1	11	0
16:00	21	3	7	0	0	1	5	1
16:15	20	0	12	1	2	1	7	0
16:30	14	0	5	0	1	0	9	0
16:45	27	3	9	0	2	0	11	1
17:00	23	0	6	1	0	1	11	0
17:15	23	2	10	0	1	1	15	0
17:30	13	3	10	0	0	2	18	2
17:45	23	3	8	1	1	2	21	0



City Of Los Angeles Department Of Transportation MANUAL TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY

STREET: North/South BRONSON AV East/West YUCCA ST Day: WEDNESDAY Date: July 7, 2010 Weather: SUNNY 7-10AM 3-6PM Hours: Chekrs: KL/CY School Day: YES District: HOLLYWOOD **I/S CODE** 22255 N/BS/B E/BW/BDUAL-WHEELED 32 32 2 0 BIKES 1 21 11 0 BUSES 0 0 0 0 N/B TIME S/B TIME E/B TIME W/B TIME AM PK 15 MIN 40 9.00 107 9.15 6 8.00 0 7.00 PM PK 15 MIN 5.30 109 5.45 3.30 0 3.00 96 8 AM PK HOUR 408 8.00 7.00 132 8.30 8.45 18 0 PM PK HOUR 331 5.00 347 5.00 23 3.00 0 3.00

NORTHBOUND Approach

Hours	Lt	Th	Rt	Total
7-8	3	75	0	78
8-9	5	101	0	106
9-10	7	109	0	116
3-4	11	217	0	228
4-5	8	208	0	216
5-6	16	315	0	331
			-	
TOTAL	50	1025	0	1075

EASTBOUND Approach

Hours	Lt	Th	Rt	Total
7-8	3	0	8	11
8-9	6	0	12	18
9-10	7	0	9	16
3-4	6	0	17	23
4-5	3	0	6	9
5-6	13	0	7	20
TOTAL	38	0	59	97

(Rev Oct 06)

SOUTHBOUND Approach

Hours	Lt	Th	Rt	Total
7-8	0	217	2	219
8-9	0	315	1	316
9-10	0	376	3	379
3-4	0	289	3	292
4-5	0	312	5	317
5-6	0	337	10	347
TOTAL	0	1846	24	1870

WESTBOUND Approach

Hours	Lt	Th	Rt	Total
7-8	0	0	0	0
8-9	0	0	0	0
9-10	0	0	0	0
3-4	0	0	0	0
4-5	0	0	0	0
5-6	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0

TOTAL	XING	S/L	XING	N/L
N-S	Ped	Sch	Ped	Sch
297	1	0	16	0
422	3	0	124	0
495	0	0	61	0
520	1	0	50	0
533	1	0	29	0
678	3	0	82	0
2945	9	0	362	0

TOTAL

XING W/L

L XING E/L

E-W	Ped	Sch	Ped	Sch
11	3	0	0	0
18	6	0	0	0
16	6	0	0	0
23	22	0	0	0
9	25	1	0	0
20	25	0	0	0
97	87	1	0	0

Turning Movement Count Report AM

Location ID: North/South:

Gower Street

7

East/West:

Carlos Avenue

Date: 05/02/18 Los Angeles, CA City:

	S	Southboun	d	١	Nestbound	1	I	Northboun	d		Eastbound	1	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totala
Movements:	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	TOLAIS:
07:00	4	145	1	0	1	3	1	49	0	1	1	1	207
07:15	4	177	3	4	0	1	2	49	2	1	1	2	246
07:30	3	187	4	5	0	3	1	68	1	4	0	0	276
07:45	5	211	1	7	0	1	2	77	1	2	0	1	308
08:00	6	224	4	7	0	10	3	89	2	3	0	2	350
08:15	5	170	1	9	0	9	4	96	9	1	0	2	306
08:30	3	232	4	7	3	4	4	83	8	10	0	7	365
08:45	14	241	2	2	0	6	7	73	7	5	0	4	361
09:00	8	227	6	9	1	12	3	81	2	8	1	2	360
09:15	4	180	1	12	1	13	4	89	1	5	3	1	314
09:30	1	213	4	8	0	9	3	80	3	6	0	1	328
09:45	3	189	4	3	1	5	4	73	2	3	1	1	289
Total Volume:	60	2396	35	73	7	76	38	907	38	49	7	24	3710
Approach %	2%	96%	1%	47%	4%	49%	4%	92%	4%	61%	9%	30%	
		-											
Peak Hr Begin:	8:30												
PHV	29	880	13	30	5	35	18	326	18	28	4	14	1400
PHF		0.897			0.673			0.953			0.676		0.959

Prepared by City Count, LLC. (www.citycount.com)

Turning Movement Count Report PM

Location ID: North/South:

Gower Street

7

East/West:

Carlos Avenue

Date: 05/02/18 Los Angeles, CA City:

	S	outhboun	d	١	Nestbound	d	I	Northboun	d		Eastbound	1	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totala
Movements:	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	R	Т	L	TOLAIS:
15:00	3	153	4	13	0	4	6	158	6	1	0	1	349
15:15	4	137	3	5	0	8	5	129	5	9	0	2	307
15:30	3	130	3	13	0	8	11	133	6	2	0	1	310
15:45	3	112	2	8	0	3	9	165	8	5	0	3	318
16:00	4	134	4	7	0	7	11	163	7	4	0	2	343
16:15	8	135	10	4	0	7	15	157	5	4	0	4	349
16:30	9	125	5	5	1	6	14	174	11	9	1	1	361
16:45	8	123	2	8	0	7	22	147	3	7	0	6	333
17:00	3	134	2	9	0	2	6	204	6	7	0	3	376
17:15	2	131	4	10	1	19	9	181	7	4	0	3	371
17:30	4	110	8	6	0	8	11	168	4	3	0	1	323
17:45	3	154	10	12	0	9	10	169	7	2	0	1	377
Total Volume:	54	1578	57	100	2	88	129	1948	75	57	1	28	4117
Approach %	3%	93%	3%	53%	1%	46%	6%	91%	3%	66%	1%	33%	
		-											
Peak Hr Begin:	17:00												
PHV	12	529	24	37	1	38	36	722	24	16	0	8	1447
PHF		0.846			0.633			0.905			0.600		0.960

Prepared by City Count, LLC. (www.citycount.com)

	No	rth	Ec	ast	So	uth	W	est
Leg:	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle
07:00	0	0	2	1	2	0	5	0
07:15	0	0	3	2	3	0	4	0
07:30	0	0	12	0	2	0	2	0
07:45	0	0	13	0	3	0	8	0
08:00	1	0	9	0	1	0	0	0
08:15	3	0	9	1	5	0	4	0
08:30	2	0	4	1	0	0	6	1
08:45	6	0	8	0	0	0	3	0
09:00	1	1	13	0	2	0	0	1
09:15	2	0	26	0	4	0	3	0
09:30	2	1	3	0	3	0	7	0
09:45	0	0	14	0	3	0	5	0

Pedestrian/Bicycle Count Report

	No	rth	Ec	ast	So	uth	W	est
Leg:	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle	Peds	Bicycle
15:00	0	0	6	2	0	0	4	0
15:15	3	0	15	0	4	0	6	0
15:30	2	0	15	0	3	0	6	0
15:45	2	0	9	0	1	0	3	2
16:00	2	0	9	1	5	0	8	1
16:15	5	0	11	0	5	0	5	1
16:30	0	0	4	1	0	0	4	0
16:45	1	0	15	0	2	0	4	0
17:00	2	0	7	0	3	0	4	0
17:15	2	0	11	0	5	0	7	0
17:30	6	0	13	0	3	0	10	0
17:45	6	0	16	1	6	0	5	0

Appendix C

CEQA T-1 Plans, Policies, Programs Consistency Worksheet

The worksheet provides a structured approach to evaluate the threshold T-1 question below, that asks whether a project conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. The intention of the worksheet is to streamline the project review by highlighting the most relevant plans, policies and programs when assessing potential impacts to the City's circulation system.

Threshold T-1: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

This worksheet does not include an exhaustive list of City policies, and does not include community plans, specific plans, or any area-specific regulatory overlays. The Department of City Planning project planner will need to be consulted to determine if the project would obstruct the City from carrying out a policy or program in a community plan, specific plan, streetscape plan, or regulatory overlay that was adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety. LADOT staff should be consulted if a project would lead to a conflict with a mobility investment in the Public Right of Way (PROW) that is currently undergoing planning, design, or delivery. This worksheet must be completed for all projects that meet the Section I. Screening Criteria. For description of the relevant planning documents, **see Attachment D.1**.

For any response to the following questions that checks the box in bold text ((i.e. Yes or No), further analysis is needed to demonstrate that the project does not conflict with a plan, policy, or program.

I. SCREENING CRITERIA FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

If the answer is 'yes' to any of the following questions, further analysis will be required:

Does the project require a discretionary action that requires the decision maker to find that the project would substantially conform to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan?

Yes No

Is the project known to directly conflict with a transportation plan, policy, or program adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety?

Yes No

Is the project required to or proposing to make any voluntary modifications to the public right-of-way (i.e., dedications and/or improvements in the right-of-way, reconfigurations of curb line, etc.)?

Yes No

II. PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A. Mobility Plan 2035 PROW Classification Standards for Dedications and Improvements

These questions address potential conflict with:



Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

A.1 Does the project include additions or new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I, and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone? Yes No

A.2 If **A.1 is yes**, is the project required to make additional dedications or improvements to the Public Right of Way as demonstrated by the street designation.

A.3 If **A.2** is yes, is the project making the dedications and improvements as necessary to meet the designated dimensions of the fronting street (Boulevard I, and II, or Avenue I, II, or III)?

Yes No N/A

If the answer is to **A.1 or A.2 is NO, or to A.1, A.2 and A.3. is YES**, then the project does not conflict with the dedication and improvement requirements that are needed to comply with the Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions.

A.4 If the answer to A.3. is NO, is the project applicant asking to waive from the dedication standards?

Lists any streets subject to dedications or voluntary dedications and include existing roadway and sidewalk widths, required roadway and sidewalk widths, and proposed roadway and sidewalk width or waivers.

Bronson Ave - Half ROW Frontage 1 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing	_Required	Proposed
Carlos Ave - Half ROW Frontage 2 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing	_Required	Proposed
Frontage 3 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing	_Required	Proposed
Frontage 4 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing	_Required	Proposed



If the answer to **A.4 is NO**, the project is inconsistent with Mobility Plan 2035 street designations and must file for a waiver of street dedication and improvement.

If the answer to **A.4 is YES**, additional analysis is necessary to determine if the dedication and/or improvements are necessary to meet the City's mobility needs for the next 20 years. The following factors may contribute to determine if the dedication or improvement is necessary:

Is the project site along any of the following networks identified in the City's Mobility Plan?

- Transit Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Lane Network
- Pedestrian Enhanced District Bronson Avenue
- Neighborhood Enhanced Network Carlos Avenue

To see the location of the above networks, see Transportation Assessment Support Map.¹

Is the project within the service area of Metro Bike Share, or is there demonstrated demand for micromobility services?

If the project dedications and improvements asking to be waived are necessary to meet the City's mobility needs, the project may be found to conflict with a plan that is adopted to protect the environment.

B. Mobility Plan 2035 PROW Policy Alignment with Project-Initiated Changes

B.1 Project-Initiated Changes to the PROW Dimensions

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of adequate on and offsite street loading areas.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

¹ LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map <u>https://arcg.is/fubbD</u>



B.1 Does the project physically modify the curb placement or turning radius and/or physically alter the sidewalk and parkways space that changes how people access a property?

Examples of physical changes to the public right-of-way include:

- widening the roadway,
- narrowing the sidewalk,
- adding space for vehicle turn outs or loading areas,
- removing bicycle lanes, bike share stations, or bicycle parking
- modifying existing bus stop, transit shelter, or other street furniture
- paving, narrowing, shifting or removing an existing parkway or tree well

Yes No

B.2 Driveway Access

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of adequate on and offsite street loading areas.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Program PL.1. Driveway Access. Require driveway access to buildings from non-arterial streets or alleys (where feasible) in order to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

Citywide Design Guidelines - Guideline 2: Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.

Site Planning Best Practices:

- Prioritize pedestrian access first and automobile access second. Orient parking and driveways toward the rear or side of buildings and away from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, parking should be oriented as far from the corner as possible.
- Minimize both the number of driveway entrances and overall driveway widths.
- Do not locate drop-off/pick-up areas between principal building entrances and the adjoining sidewalks.
- Orient vehicular access as far from street intersections as possible.
- Place drive-thru elements away from intersections and avoid placing them so that they create a barrier between the sidewalk and building entrance(s).
- Ensure that loading areas do not interfere with on-site pedestrian and vehicular circulation by separating loading areas and larger commercial vehicles from areas that are used for public parking and public entrances.

B.2 Does the project add new driveways along a street designated as an Avenue or a Boulevard that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines (See Sec. 321 in the Manual of Policies and Procedures) by any of the following:

- locating new driveways for residential properties on an Avenue or Boulevard, and access is otherwise possible using an alley or a collector/local street, or
- locating new driveways for industrial or commercial properties on an Avenue or Boulevard and access is possible along a collector/local street, or



- the total number of new driveways exceeds 1 driveway per every 200 feet² along on the Avenue or Boulevard frontage, or
- locating new driveways on an Avenue or Boulevard within 150 feet from the intersecting street, or
- locating new driveways on a collector or local street within 75 feet from the intersecting street, or
- locating new driveways near mid-block crosswalks, requiring relocation of the mid-block crosswalk

Yes	No
-----	----

If the answer to **B.1 and B.2 are both NO**, then the project would not conflict with a plan or policies that govern the PROW as a result of the project-initiated changes to the PROW.

Impact Analysis

If the answer to either **B.1 or B.2 are YES**, City plans and policies should be reviewed in light of the proposed physical changes to determine if the City would be obstructed from carrying out the plans and policies. The analysis should pay special consideration to substantial changes to the Public Right of Way that may either degrade existing facilities for people walking and bicycling (e.g., removing a bicycle lane), or preclude the City from completing complete street infrastructure as identified in the Mobility Plan 2035, especially if the physical changes are along streets that are on the High Injury Network (HIN). The analysis should also consider if the project is in a Transit Oriented Community (TOC) area, and would degrade or inhibit trips made by biking, walking and/ or transit ridership. The streets that need special consideration are those that are included on the following networks identified in the Mobility Plan 2035, or the HIN:

- Transit Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Lane Network
- Pedestrian Enhanced District
- Neighborhood Enhanced Network
- High Injury Network

To see the location of the above networks, see Transportation Assessment Support Map.³

Once the project is reviewed relevant to plans and policies, and existing facilities that may be impacted by the project, the analysis will need to answer the following two questions in concluding if there is an impact due to plan inconsistency.

B.2.1 Would the physical changes in the public right of way or new driveways that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines degrade the experience of vulnerable roadway users such as modify, remove, or otherwise negatively impact existing bicycle, transit, and/or pedestrian infrastructure?



² for a project frontage that exceeds 400 feet along an Avenue or Boulevard, the incremental additional driveway above 2 is more than 1 driveway for every 400 additional feet.

³ LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map <u>https://arcg.is/fubbD</u>



B.2.2 Would the physical modifications or new driveways that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines preclude the City from advancing the safety of vulnerable roadway users?

Yes No N/A

If either of the answers to either **B.2.1 or B.2.2 are YES**, the project may conflict with the Mobility Plan 2035, and therefore conflict with a plan that is adopted to protect the environment. If either of the answers to both **B.2.1. or B.2.2. are NO**, then the project would not be shown to conflict with plans or policies that govern the Public Right-of-Way.

C. Network Access

C. 1 Alley, Street and Stairway Access

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan Policy 3.9 Increased Network Access: Discourage the vacation of public rights-ofway.

C.1.1 Does the project propose to vacate or otherwise restrict public access to a street, alley, or public stairway?

Yes No

C.1.2 If the answer to C.1.1 is Yes, will the project provide or maintain public access to people walking and biking on the street, alley or stairway?

Yes No N/A

C.2 New Cul-de-sacs

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.10 Cul-de-sacs: Discourage the use of cul-de-sacs that do not provide access for active transportation options.

C.2.1 Does the project create a cul-de-sac or is the project located adjacent to an existing cul-de-sac? Yes No

C.2.2 If yes, will the cul-de-sac maintain convenient and direct public access to people walking and biking to the adjoining street network?

Yes No N/A

If the answers to either C.1.2 or C.2.2 are YES, then the project would not conflict with a plan or policies that ensures access for all modes of travel. If the answer to either C.1.2 or C.2.2 are NO, the project may conflict with a plan or policies that governs multimodal access to a property. Further analysis must assess to the degree that pedestrians and bicyclists have sufficient public access to the transportation network.



D. Parking Supply and Transportation Demand Management

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.8 – Bicycle Parking, Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure and well maintained bicycle parking facilities.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 4.8 – Transportation Demand Management Strategies. Encourage greater utilization of Transportation Demand Management Strategies to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 4.13 – Parking and Land Use Management: Balance on-street and offstreet parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.

D.1 Would the project propose a supply of onsite parking that exceeds the baseline amount⁴ as required in the Los Angeles Municipal Code or a Specific plan, whichever requirement prevails?

Yes No

D.2 If the answer to D.1. is YES, would the project propose to actively manage the demand of parking by independently pricing the supply to all users (e.g. parking cash-out), or for residential properties, unbundle the supply from the lease or sale of residential units?

Yes No N/A

If the answer to **D.2.** is **NO** the project may conflict with parking management policies. Further analysis is needed to demonstrate how the supply of parking above city requirements will not result in additional (induced) drive-alone trips as compared to an alternative that provided no more parking than the baseline required by the LAMC or Specific Plan. If there is potential for the supply of parking to result in induced demand for drive-alone trips, the project should further explore transportation demand management (TDM) measures to further off-set the induced demands of driving and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) that may result from higher amounts of on-site parking. The TDM measures should specifically focus on strategies that encourage dynamic and context-sensitive pricing solutions and ensure the parking is efficiently allocated, such as providing real time information. Research has demonstrated that charging a user cost for parking or providing a 'cash-out' option in return for not using it is the most effective strategy to reduce the instances of drive-alone trips and increase non-auto mode share to further reduce VMT. To ensure the parking is efficiently managed and reduce the need to build parking for future uses, further strategies should include sharing parking with other properties and/or the general public.

D.3. Would the project provide the minimum on and off-site bicycle parking spaces as required by Section 12.21 A.16 of the LAMC?

Yes No

⁴ The baseline parking is defined here as the default parking requirements in section 12.21 A.4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code or any applicable Specific Plan, whichever prevails, for each applicable use not taking into consideration other parking incentives to reduce the amount of required parking.



D.4. Does the Project include more than 25,000 square feet of gross floor area construction of new non-residential gross floor?

Yes No

D.5 If the answer to D.4. is YES, does the project comply with the City's TDM Ordinance in Section 12.26 J of the LAMC?

Yes No N/A

If the answer to **D.3. or D.5. is NO** the project conflicts with LAMC code requirements of bicycle parking and TDM measures. If the project includes uses that require bicycle parking (Section 12.21 A.16) or TDM (Section 12.26 J), and the project does not comply with those Sections of the LAMC, further analysis is required to ensure that the project supports the intent of the two LAMC sections. To meet the intent of bicycle parking requirements, the analysis should identify how the project commits to providing safe access to those traveling by bicycle and accommodates storing their bicycle in locations that demonstrates priority over vehicle access.

Similarly, to meet the intent of the TDM requirements of Section 12.26 J of the LAMC, the analysis should identify how the project commits to providing effective strategies in either physical facilities or programs that encourage non-drive alone trips to and from the project site and changes in work schedule that move trips out of the peak period or eliminate them altogether (as in the case in telecommuting or compressed work weeks).

E. Consistency with Regional Plans

This section addresses potential inconsistencies with greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets forecasted in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) / Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

E.1 Does the Project or Plan apply one the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds (i.e. VMT per capita, VMT per employee, or VMT per service population) as discussed in Section 2.2.3 of the TAG?

Yes No

E.2 If the Answer to E.1 is YES, does the Project or Plan result in a significant VMT impact? Yes No N/A

E.3 If the Answer to E.1 is NO, does the Project result in a net increase in VMT?

Yes No N/A

If the Answer to E.2 or E.3 is NO, then the Project or Plan is shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS.

E.4 If the Answer to E.2 or E.3 is YES, then further evaluation would be necessary to determine whether such a project or land use plan would be shown to be consistent with VMT and GHG reduction goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS. For the purpose of making a finding that a project is consistent with the GHG reduction targets forecasted in the SCAG RTP/SCS, the project analyst should consult Section 2.2.4 of the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG). Section 2.2.4 provides the methodology for evaluating a land use project's cumulative impacts to VMT, and the appropriate reliance on SCAG's most recently adopted RTP/SCS in reaching that conclusion.



The analysis methods therein can further support findings that the project is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy for which the State Air Resources Board, pursuant to Section 65080(b)(2)(H) of the Government Code, has accepted a metropolitan planning organization's determination that the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

References

BOE Street Standard Dimensions S-470-1 http://eng2.lacity.org/techdocs/stdplans/s-400/S-470-1 20151021 150849.pdf

LADCP <u>Citywide Design Guidelines</u>. <u>https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/f6608be7-d5fe-4187-bea6-</u>20618eec5049/Citywide Design Guidelines.pdf

LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map https://arcg.is/fubbD

Mobility Plan 2035 <u>https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/523f2a95-9d72-41d7-aba5-1972f84c1d36/Mobility_Plan_2035.pdf</u>

SCAG. Connect SoCal, 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/default.aspx

ATTACHMENT D.1: CITY PLAN, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

<u>The Transportation Element of the City's General Plan, Mobility Plan 2035</u>, established the "Complete Streets Design Guide" as the City's document to guide the operations and design of streets and other public rights-of-way. It lays out a vision for designing safer, more vibrant streets that are accessible to people, no matter what their mode choice. As a living document, it is intended to be frequently updated as City departments identify and implement street standards and experiment with different configurations to promote complete streets. The guide is meant to be a toolkit that provides numerous examples of what is possible in the public right-of-way and that provides guidance on context-sensitive design.

The <u>Plan for A Healthy Los Angeles</u> (March 2015) includes policies directing several City departments to develop plans that promote active transportation and safety.

The <u>City of Los Angeles Community Plans, which make up the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan</u>, guide the physical development of neighborhoods by establishing the goals and policies for land use. The 35 Community Plans provide specific, neighborhood-level detail for land uses and the transportation network, relevant policies, and implementation strategies necessary to achieve General Plan and community-specific objectives.

The stated goal of <u>Vision Zero</u> is to eliminate traffic-related deaths in Los Angeles by 2025 through a number of strategies, including modifying the design of streets to increase the safety of vulnerable road users. Extensive crash data analysis is conducted on an ongoing basis to prioritize intersections and corridors for implementation of projects that will have the greatest effect on overall fatality reduction. The City designs and deploys <u>Vision Zero Corridor Plans</u> as part of the implementation of Vision Zero. If a project is proposed whose site lies on the High Injury Network (HIN), the applicant should consult with LADOT to inform the project's site plan and to determine appropriate improvements, whether by funding their implementation in full or by making a contribution toward their implementation.

The <u>Citywide Design Guidelines</u> (October 24, 2019) includes sections relevant to development projects where improvements are proposed within the public realm. Specifically, Guidelines one through three provide building design strategies that support the pedestrian experience. The Guidelines provide best practices in designing that apply in three spatial categories of site planning, building design and public right of way. The Guidelines should be followed to ensure that the project design supports pedestrian safety, access and comfort as they access to and from the building and the immediate public right of way.

The City's <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance (LA Municipal Code 12.26.J)</u> requires certain projects to incorporate strategies that reduce drive-alone vehicle trips and improve access to destinations and services. The ordinance is revised and updated periodically and should be reviewed for application to specific projects as they are reviewed.

The City's <u>LAMC Section 12.37 (Waivers of Dedication and Improvement)</u> requires certain projects to dedicate and/or implement improvements within the public right-of-way to meet the street designation standards of the Mobility Plan 2035.

The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) <u>Street Standard Dimensions S-470-1</u> provides the specific street widths and public right of way dimensions associated with the City's street standards.

Appendix D

VMT Analysis Worksheets

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

	Project Information	Existing La	and Use		Project Screening Sun	nmary
Project:	J1874 - Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower	Land Use Type	Value	Unit		
Scenario: Address:	1725 N BRONSON AVE, 90028	N Housing Single Family	•	DU 📫	Existing Pro	oposed
					0 Daily Vehicle Trips Daily	502 Vehicle Trips
	TURA TE COCORADO				O Daily VMT	3,157 Daily VMT
					Tier 1 Screening Criter	ia
	The provide the pr	Click here to add a single custom land use	type (will be included i	in the above list)	Project will have less residential units control to existing residential units & is within a mile of a fixed-rail station.	ompared one-half
MONICA	ADATAS	Proposed Projection	ect Land Us	e	Tier 2 Screening Criter	ia
anor ver	RODEO 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Land Use Type Housing Affordable Housing - Family	Value ▼ 12	Unit DU 🛉	The net increase in daily trips < 250 trip	os 502 Net Daily Trips
Is the pr	oject replacing an existing number of	Housing Multi-Family Housing Affordable Housing - Family	116 12	DU DU	The net increase in daily VMT ≤ 0	3,157 Net Daily VMT
resident resident mile of a	ial units with a smaller number of ial units AND is located within one-half i fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit				The proposed project consists of only r land uses ≤ 50,000 square feet total.	etail 0.000 ksf
	● Yes ● No	Click base to add a single system land use	tura (will be included	in the above list)	The proposed project is required VMT analysis.	to perform
		Click here to add a single custom land use	type (will be included i	in the above list)		

Measuring the Miles

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Information



Proposed Project Land Use Type	Value	Unit
Housing Multi-Family	116	DU
Housing Affordable Housing - Family	12	DU

Use I to denote if the TDM s	dividual strategies strategy is part of the p	proposed project or is a	mitigation strate
Max Home Based TD Max Work Based TD	M Achieved? M Achieved?	Proposed Project No No	With Mitigatio No No
A	Parking		
B	Transit		
C Edu	cation & Encou	uragement	
D Co	mmute Trip Re	eductions	
E	Shared Mob	oility	
F	Bicycle Infrastr	ructure	
Implement/Improve On-street Bicycle Facility Proposed Prj Mitigation	Select Proposed Prj o	or Mitigation to include	this strategy
Include Bike Parking Per LAMC Proposed Prj Mitigation	Select Proposed Prj o	or Mitigation to include	this strategy
Include Secure Bike Parking and Showers Proposed Prj Mitigation	Select Proposed Prj o	or Mitigation to include	e this strategy
G Neig	ghborhood Enh	nancement	

TDM Strategies

Analysis Results

egy

Proposed Project	With
491	491
Daily Vehicle Trips	Daily Vehicle Trips
3,094	3,094
Daily VMT	Daily VMT
4.8	4.8
Houseshold VMT per Capita	Houseshold VMT
N/A	N/A
Work VMT	Work VMT
per Employee	per Employee
Significant	VMT Impact?
Household: No	Household: No
Threshold = 6.0	Threshold = 6.0
15% Below APC	15% Below APC
Marile NL/A	Work: N/A
WORK: IN/A	
Threshold = 7.6	Threshold = 7.6



CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR

Date: January 28, 2021

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Project Name: J1874 - Hollywood/Bronson Residential Project Scenario: Project Address: 1725 N BRONSON AVE, 90028



	Project Inform	nation	
Land	Use Type	Value	Units
	Single Family	0	DU
	Multi Family	116	DU
Housing	Townhouse	0	DU
	Hotel	0	Rooms
	Motel	0	Rooms
	Family	12	DU
Affordable Housing	Senior	0	DU
Anoruable nousing	Special Needs	0	DU
	Permanent Supportive	0	DU
	General Retail	0.000	ksf
	Furniture Store	0.000	ksf
	Pharmacy/Drugstore	0.000	ksf
	Supermarket	0.000	ksf
	Bank	0.000	ksf
	Health Club	0.000	ksf
Detail	High-Turnover Sit-Down	0.000	
πειαπ	Restaurant	0.000	KSJ
	Fast-Food Restaurant	0.000	ksf
	Quality Restaurant	0.000	ksf
	Auto Repair	0.000	ksf
	Home Improvement	0.000	ksf
	Free-Standing Discount	0.000	ksf
	Movie Theater	0	Seats
Office	General Office	0.000	ksf
OJJICE	Medical Office	0.000	ksf
	Light Industrial	0.000	ksf
Industrial	Manufacturing	0.000	ksf
	Warehousing/Self-Storage	0.000	ksf
	University	0	Students
	High School	0	Students
School	Middle School	0	Students
	Elementary	0	Students
	Private School (K-12)	0	Students
Other		0	Trips

	Analysis Res	sults	
	Total Employees:	0	
	Total Population:	299	
Propos	ed Project	With Mi	tigation
491	Daily Vehicle Trips	491	Daily Vehicle Trips
3,094	Daily VMT	3,094	Daily VMT
	Household VMT		Household VMT per
4.8	per Capita	4.8	Capita
	Work VMT		Work VMT per
N/A	per Employee	N/A	Employee
	Significant VMT	Impact?	
	APC: Centr	al	
	Impact Threshold: 15% Bel	ow APC Average	
	Household = 6	5.0	
	Work = 7.6		
Propos	ed Project	With Mi	itigation
VMT Threshold	Impact	VMT Threshold	Impact
Household > 6.0	No	Household > 6.0	No
Work > 7.6	N/A	Work > 7.6	N/A

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Report 2: TDM Inputs Date: January 28, 2021 Project Name: 1374 - Hollywood/Bronson Residential Project Scenario: Project Address. 1725 N BRONSON AVE, 90028

6

Index porting apply Constrained Actual parting O O Parking Unboundle parking parting cash-out Actual parking parking (b) 525 525 Parking cash-out Exployee singlete and parking (b) O 0 0 Parking cash-out Exployee singlete and parking (b) O 0 0 Parking cash-out Exployee singlete and out of anomal parking (b) O 0 0 Restances transit and parking parmits Exployee singlete to anced parking (b) O 0 0 Restances transit Accolurges Exployee singlete to anced parking (b) O 0 0 Restances transit Accolurges Exployee singlete to anced parking (b) O 0 0 Transit Restance transit Accolurges Exployee singlete (b) (CO O 0 0 Transit Restance transit Accolurges Exployee singlete (b) (CO O 0 0 Transit Restance transit Accolurges Exployee and casteres eighte (b) O 0 0 Transit Restance transit Accolurges Exployee and caster	Strate	еду Туре	DM Strategy Inpu Description	uts Proposed Project	Mitigations
Supprint Automatic parting provision (species) marking (s) 0 0 Parking cash out Cash operation parking (s) 0.50.00 0.50.00 Parking cash out Cash operation parking (s) 0.50.00 0.50.00 Price workplace parking parents Cash operation parking (s) 0.50.00 0.50.00 Readensitio area parking parents Cash operation parking parents 0.50.00 50.00 Strategy Type Description parking parents Proposed Project Mittigations Mittigations Reduce transit headonsys (formation operation) Reduce transit (for manual parents) 0.50.00 0.50.00 Transit Reduce transit headonsys (formation operation) 0.50.00 0.50.00 0.50.00 Transit Mittigations Cash operation operatioperatioperatioperation operation operation operation operation		Reduce parking	provision (spaces)	0	0
Unboundle parking parking (2) 923 parking (2)			provision (spaces)	0	0
Parking Parking cach-out Comparing charge ON ON ON Processor parking Call granting charge 50.00 50.00 50.00 Residential area parking granting charge Only granting charge 0.05 0.05 0.05 Residential area parking granting Cast of annual parking charge 50 50 50 Icon to notilowing pages Icon to notilowing pages 100 50 50 Residential area parking granting charge Processor Project Mitigations Reduction in notify from the parking granting charge parking granting charge 0.05 0.05 Reduction in notify from the parking granting charge parking granting charge 0.05 0.05 Reduction in notify from the parking parking charge parking parking parking charge parking parking charge parking park		Unbundle parking	parking (\$)	\$25	\$25
Dots parking parking managements Dots parking being space parking parking parmits So. 00	Parking	Parking cash-out	Employees eligible (%)	0%	0%
parking process parking		Price workplace	Daily parking charge (\$)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Residencial area parking permits Dist of annual permits (5) 50 50 (cont: on following page) (cont: on following page) (cont: on following page) Strategy Type TOM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Proposed Project Mitigations Reduce to cont headways (increase of basid day trais) (Cont and taby trais) Reduce to cont headways (increase of basid day trais) (Cont and taby trais) Transit Implement megheborhood shuttle theadwarp (f) tab (Cont on following page) Compare down of transit megheborhood shuttle theadwarp (f) tab propare and readwarp (f) tab propare and readwarp (f) tab propare and readwarp (f) tab propare (f) tab tab tab propare (f) tab propare (f) tab tab propare (parking	Employees subject to priced parking (%)	0%	0%
(cont. on following page) (cont. on following p		Residential area	Cost of annual	\$0	\$0
Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations Reduce transit headways Reduction in headways 0% 0% 0% 0% Reduce transit headways Reduce transit of transit only transit more specific as a percent of transit only transit 0% 0% 0% 0% Transit Implement magineonic shuttle Opered magineonic shuttle Opered magineonic shuttle 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Features transit magineonic shuttle Opered magineonic shuttle Opered magineonic shuttle Opered magineonic shuttle 0% 0% 0% 0% Education & Encouragement Voluntary travel percent shuttle (N) ON ON 0% 0% 0% Education & Encouragement Voluntary travel percent shuttle (N) ON ON 0% 0% Features transit Voluntary travel percent shuttle (N) ON ON 0% 0% Education & Encouragement Voluntary travel percent shuttle (N) ON ON 0% 0% Feducation N Encouragement Voluntary travel percent shuttle (N) ON <td></td> <td>ſ</td> <td>cont. on following page</td> <td>e)</td> <td></td>		ſ	cont. on following page	e)	
Subscription Projected Project Imageneous Reduce transit headways Reduction in Proposed Project ads	Strate	TDM	Strategy Inputs,	Cont.	Mitigations
Image: second	Strate	зутуре	Reduction in	Proposed Project	wiitigations
Anote of gas parcent of bool day briefs (b) 0% 0% Transit Interaction proved (c50%, 			headways (increase in frequency) (%) Existing transit mode	0%	0%
Transit Lines within project seeding 0 0 Transit Implement meighborhood skutte implementsion (bew, meidlub (b) 0 0 0 Transit Implementsion meighborhood skutte implementsion (bew, meighborhood skutte implementsion (bew, meighborhood skutte index selbsite) 0 0% 0% Transit subsities Implementsion meighborhood skutte index selbsite) Implementsion (bew, meighborhood skutte index selbsite) 0% 0% 0% Fducation & Encouragement Voluntary transit behavior: transit program 0% 0% 0% 0% Fducation & program Voluntary transit behavior: transit program 0% 0% 0% 0% Fducation & program Voluntary transit behavior: transit program 0% 0% 0% 0% Fducation & program Voluntary transit program Encourage (ph) program 0% 0% 0% 0% Commute Trip Reductions Figures Commute Trip reductions program Program 0% 0% 0% 0% Alternative Work Scheduck and program Cord statte figures elighte figures elighte figures elighte figures elighte figures elighte figures elighte figures el		Reduce transit headways	share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%)	0%	0%
Transit Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0 0 Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0 0 0 Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0 0 0 Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0 0% 0% Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0% 0% 0% Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0% 0% 0% Implementation (ber, meduum, high) 0% 0% 0% Education & Encouragement Voluntary trovel equivalentity (b) (brow charge program marketing Concourse (brow charge program program marketing 0% 0% 0% Encouragement TDM Strategy Inputs, cont: on following page 0% 0% 0% Strategy Type Description program Propose Project Alteration of trainpages estigate anticipating (f) 0% 0% Commute Trip Reductions Employees consort statecommute bism, medium, high) 0% 0% 0% Commute Trip Reductions Car share bism constraints Car share program bism constraints 0% 0% 0% Shared Mobiliiii wappenetation wappenetation wappenetation wappenetat			Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%)	0	0
Strategy Type Exclusion (Computer single (N)) ans	Transit	Implement neiahborhood shuttle	Degree of Implementation (low, medium, high)	0	0
Education & Education & Education & Encouragement Tomsist subsidies (marketing) Constitution (marketing) Constancopoint (marketing) Constancopoint (m			Employees and residents eligible (%)	0%	0%
Education & Linksky per parsenger (kin)y cqu/when? (5) 50.00 50.00 Education & Encouragement Voluntary trovel behavior change program Campbyees and residents participating (5) ansi 0.55 Encouragement Promotions and marketing Cont. on following page) ansi 0.55 Encouragement Promotions and marketing Cont. on following page) 0.55 0.55 Strategy Type Description Program Onsi 0.56 0.55 Strategy Type Description Program 0.66 0.56 Alternative Work Alternative Alternative Alternative Work Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternative Alternatite Alternatite Alternative Alternatite Alternative Alternative A		Transit subsidies	Employees and residents eligible (%) Amount of transit	0%	0%
Education & behavioury attemp instantion and program ON ON ON Encouragement Promotions and program Encouragement Encouragement ON ON </td <td></td> <td>Valuatani traval</td> <td>subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$)</td> <td>\$0.00</td> <td>\$0.00</td>		Valuatani traval	subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Commute Trip Reductions TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Description Orginal Processing Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations Required commute program production (N) protocomparison (N) protocomparison (N) Orginal O	Education & Encouragement	behavior change program	residents participating (%) Employees and	0%	0%
Regulard commute trip reduction program Employees carlicipating (%) carlicipating (%) ON ON Attendate Work Schedules and relecommute Trip Reductions Employees carlicipating (%) ON ON ON Commute Trip Reductions Employees to price of program O O O Imployees eligible variool or shuttle Degree of implementation (bay, medium, high) O O O Ride-share program D O O O O Ride-share program Car share Employees eligible (bay, medium, high) O O O Shared Mobility Bike share Car share program with Bok share station with Bok share station with Bok share station with Bok share station with Bok share station O O			cont. on following page	2)	
program participating (N)	Strate	TDM	Strategy Inputs, Description	Cont. Proposed Project	Mitigations
Schedules and Telecommute Trype of program Reductions Office (F)	Strate	TDM egy Type Required commute trin reduction	Strategy Inputs, Description	Cont. Proposed Project	Mitigations
Interconnute Pyte to graph of the part	Strate	TDM sy Type Required commute trip reduction program Atternative Work	Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%)	Cont. Proposed Project	Mitigations 0%
Car Shared Mobility Car	Strate	TDM regy Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Takocompute	Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%)	Cont. Proposed Project	Mitigations 0%
Vanpool or shuftle (n) ON ON (n) Carly bloger site (small, Employees site (small, medium, larger) 0 0 Rule-share program (h) Employees site(small, (h) 0 0 Car share Car share project setting (triban, Suburban, Al Other) 0 0 Shared Mobility Bike share station - OR- singlementing new ble share station (re-rel) 0 0 School carpool Level of umplementation 0 0	Strate Commute Trip	TDM By Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute	Cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Type of program Degree of implementation	e) Proposed Project 0% 0% 0 0 0	Mitigations 0% 0% 0
Employee size (small, medum, knop;) 0 0 Ride-share program Employees size (small, medum, knop;) 0% 0% Ride-share program Employees size (small, medum, knop;) 0% 0% 0% Shared Mobility Ear share Car share project setting (trian, R1 Other) 0 0 0 Shared Mobility Bike share Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - 0% 0 0 0 School carpool Level of unplementation 0 0 0	Strate Commute Trip Reductions	TDM sey Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Employer sponsored	cont. on tollowing page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Type of program Degree of implementation (bw, medium, high)	Proposed Project	Mitigations 0% 0% 0
Nide-share program Employee slighte (b) 0% 0% Car share Car share project setting (brban, Suburban, AI Other) 0 0 ihared Mobility Bike share With n60 per of existing bike share station - 0%. 0 0 School carpool Level of unplementation 0 0 0	Strate Commute Trip Reductions	TDM reg Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Employer sponsored wanpool or shuttle	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Type of program participating (%) Type of program (boy, medium, high) Employees eligible (%)	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0 0 0 0% 0 0%	Mitigations 0% 0 0 0 0 0%
Car share Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, AL Other) 0 0 shared Mobility Bile share Within 600 [set of existing biles there station - 001. implementing new bile share station 0 0 School carpool Level of implementation 0 0 0	Strate Commute Trip Reductions	TDM Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Type of program Degree of implementation (bw, medium, high) Employees eligible (%) Employee site (small, medium, lorge)	Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0 0% 0 0%	Mitigations 0% 0% 0 0 0 0% 0 0% 0%
Shared Mobility Elike share School carpool School carpool Elike share Elike share Elike share School carpool Elike share Elike share School carpool Elike share Elike sh	Strate Commute Trip Reductions	TDM Required commete trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle Ride-share program	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees (%) Employees eligible Employees eligible Endown size (smal), medum, largel, Employees eligible Endown size (smal), Employees eligible Endown size (smal), Employees eligible	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0%	Mitigations 0% 0% 0% 0% 0 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%
School carpool Implementation 0 0	Strate Commute Trip Reductions	TDM Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Trelecommute Employer sponsored wanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Type of program Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) Employees eligible (%) Car shore project setting (urban, Suburban, Al Chan-	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0	Mitgations 0% 0 0 0 0% 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
program (Low Medium High)	Commute Trip Reductions	TDM By Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Trelecommute Employer sponsored wanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Page of program Degree of Implementation (%) Employees eligible (%) Car shore project Subarban, All Other) Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - Off- mation - Bits Subarban, All Other)	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0 0% 0 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0	Mitigations 0% 0 0 0 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0 0 0
(Low, Medium, High)	Strate	TDM egy Type Required commute	Strategy Inputs, Description	Cont. Proposed Project	Mitigatio
(cont_on_tollowing nage)	Commute Trip Reductions	TDM Bequired commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share Bike share	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Type of program Degree of Implementation inplementation medium, large) Employees eligible (%) Cor shore project esting ((Urbon, Saburban, All Other) Within SGO Petrol Within SGO Petrol within sGO Petrol within sGO Petrol mighementing new ble shore station (Ves/Vel) Terol Medium, High)	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0 0% 0 0	Mitigations 0% 0 0 0 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0
TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont.	Commute Trip Reductions	TDM By Type By	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Type of program Degree of mightementation (%) Car shore seligible (%) Car shore seligible (%) Car shore seligible (%) Car shore participating subtraft (Mon, Subtran, All Other) Within 600 feet of mightementing new bile shore station (two, Medium, righ) cont. on following page Strategy Inputs,	Cont. 0% </td <td>Mitigations 0% 0% 0 0 0% 0 0% 0 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>	Mitigations 0% 0% 0 0 0% 0 0% 0 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations Gality above the Acide a	Commute Trip Reductions Shared Mobility	TDM By Type Required commute this reduction program Required commute this reduction program Rede-share program Car share Bike share School corpool program Car share Car sh	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Page of program Degree of implementation (bw, medium, high) Employees eligible (%) Employees eligible (%) Employees eligible (%) Cor shore project esting ((1060, Suburbon, All Other) Within SGO (Petro) within SGO (Petro) esting - Cor shore project esting - Cor shore project esting (1060, Suburbon, All Other) Within SGO (Petro) Exployees also the shore statuon (he, Neal (Low, Medium, High) Cort. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Provide Dispeter (City algoss dis-	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0	Mitigations 0% 0
TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Description Proposed Project Mitigations implement/marwing provide brycle 0 <td>Commute Trip Reductions Shared Mobility Strate Bicycle</td> <td>TDM By Type By Type By Type By Type Communication By Type Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share School carpool program Car share Interpret Daylor Down Down Down Down Down Down Down Down</td> <td>cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (k) Employees participating (k) Employees participating (k) Type of program Degree of Imployees eligible (k) Employees eligible (k) Employees eligible (k) Car shore groiget Employees eligible (k) Car shore groiget esting (Urbon, Suburbon, All Other) Within 600 (Pethon, restriction eligible shore ensisting eligible shore ensisted and the shore station (low, Medium, High) Cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Participati</td> <td>Proposed Project 0% 0% 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0</td> <td>Mitigations 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Yes</td>	Commute Trip Reductions Shared Mobility Strate Bicycle	TDM By Type By Type By Type By Type Communication By Type Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share School carpool program Car share Interpret Daylor Down Down Down Down Down Down Down Down	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (k) Employees participating (k) Employees participating (k) Type of program Degree of Imployees eligible (k) Employees eligible (k) Employees eligible (k) Car shore groiget Employees eligible (k) Car shore groiget esting (Urbon, Suburbon, All Other) Within 600 (Pethon, restriction eligible shore ensisting eligible shore ensisted and the shore station (low, Medium, High) Cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Participati	Proposed Project 0% 0% 0% 0 0% 0 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0	Mitigations 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Yes
TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Bicycle Provide Bicycle Of Colspan="2">Mitigations Bicycle Include Bike parking Code 0 0 0 Bicycle Include Bike parking Code Veck/kol Wrest Colspan="2">Veck/kol 0 0 Bicycle Include Bike parking Code Veck/kol Provide Bike parking Code Vec Veck 0	Commute Trip Reductions Shared Mobility Shared Mobility Bicycle Infrestructure	TDM By Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Trelecommute Employer sponsored wanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share Bike share School carpool program Unplement/improve on-street biz/of program Include Bike parking per LANC Include secure bike parking and showers	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees eligible (%) Employees eligible (%) Car share project Existion -OR- mplementation (%) Stategy Inputs, Description Provide bicycle paning Code Yes/No) Includes indoor bile paring/Code	e) Proposed Project 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Mitigations 0% 0 Vitigations 0 Yes 0
TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Processed Project Mitigations Strategy Type Provide Brycke Mitigations Bicycle Provide Brycke O O O O O O O O O O O O% O%	Commute Trip Reductions Shared Mobility Shared Mobility Bicycle Infrastructure	TDM By Type Brownie Trop Provide the Provided Commute the reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Employer sponsored wanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share Bike share School carpool program TDM Include Bike parking per LMAC Include Sizer bike parking and showers Table calculation	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees eligible (%) Employees eligible (%) Carshare gradies Employees Employees Employees Employees Employees Employees Employees Employees Employee Employe	e)	Mitigations 0% 0 Ves 0 0
TDM Strategy Inputs, Cost. Strategy Inputs, Cost. Bicycle Provide Bicycle Of Colspan="2">Of Cost Bicycle Include Bike parking Code Veck (N) Bile Mest (D) Bile	Commute Trip Reductions Shared Mobility Shared Mobility Bicycle Infrastructure Neighborhood	TDM By Type Required commute trip reduction program Alternative Work Schedules and Trelecommute Employer sponsored wanpool or shuttle Ride-share program Car share Bike share Bike share School carpool program Unplement/Improve on-street bic/g focility Include Bike parling per LANC Traffic calming Improvements	cont. on following page Strategy Inputs, Description Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees participating (%) Employees Employee	e) Cont. Proposed Project 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0	Mitigations 0% 0

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: January 28, 2021 Project Name: J1874 - Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower Project Scenario: Project Address: 1725 N BRONSON AVE, 90028

				TDN	1 Adjustm	ents by T	rip Purpo	ose & Stra	ategy					
						Place type	: Compact	Infill						
		Home B Proc Proposed	ased Work duction Mitigated	Home Based Work Attraction Proposed Mitigated		Home Based Other Production Proposed Mitigated		Home Based Other Attraction Proposed Mitigated		Non-Home Based Other Production Proposed Mitigated		Non-Home Based Other Attraction Proposed Mitigated		Source
	Reduce parking supply	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy
	Unbundle parking	3%	3%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Parking	Parking cash-out	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Appendix, Parking
	Price workplace parking	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1 - 5
	Residential area parking permits	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Reduce transit headways	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3
Transit	Implement neighborhood shuttle	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Transit subsidies	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Education &	Voluntary travel behavior change program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Education &
Encouragement	Promotions and marketing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Encouragement sections 1 - 2
	Required commute trip reduction program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Commute Trip Reductions	Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Appendix, Commute Trip Reductions
	Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	sections 1 - 4
	Ride-share program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Car-share	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy
Shared Mobility	Bike share	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Appendix, Shared
	School carpool	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Mobility sections 1 - 3

	TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont.													
	Place type: Compact Infill													
		Ноте Ва	ased Work	Home Bo	ised Other	Ноте Ва	nsed Other	Non-Home	Based Other	Non-Home	Based Other			
	Production		luction	Attro	action	Prod	uction	Attr	action	Prod	uction	Attr	action	Source
		Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	
Bicycle	Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy
Infrastructure	Include Bike parking per LAMC	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	Infrastructure
	Include secure bike parking and showers	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Sections 1 - 5
Neighborhood	Traffic calming improvements	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy Appendix,
Enhancement	Pedestrian network improvements	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Neighborhood Enhancement

	Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect												
	Home Based Work H Production			sed Work Iction	Home Ba Produ	sed Other Iction	Home Bas Attra	sed Other ction	Non-Home I Produ	Based Other Iction	Non-Home I Attra	Based Other ction	
	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	
COMBINED TOTAL	4%	4%	1%	1%	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
MAX. TDM	4%	4%	1%	1%	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	

= Minii	mum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1- where X%=	B)])
PLACE	urban	75%
TYPE MAX:	compact infill suburban center	40% 20%
	suburban	15%

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Project and Analysis Overview 5 of 6



CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: January 28, 2021

Project Name: J1874 - Hollywood/Bronson Residential Project Scenario: Project Address: 1725 N BRONSON AVE, 90028



Version 1.3

MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM											
Unadjusted Trips MXD Adjustment MXD Trips Average Trip Length Unadjusted VMT MXD VM											
Home Based Work Production	114	-26.3%	84	7.9	901	664					
Home Based Other Production	316	-48.4%	163	5.0	1,580	815					
Non-Home Based Other Production	147	-5.4%	139	7.1	1,044	987					
Home-Based Work Attraction	0		0	8.3		0					
Home-Based Other Attraction	151	-45.0%	83	5.9	891	490					
Non-Home Based Other Attraction	36	-8.3%	33	6.1	220	201					

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures

		Proposed Project		Project with Mitigation Measures					
	TDM Adjustment	Project Trips	Project VMT	TDM Adjustment	Mitigated Trips	Mitigated VMT			
Home Based Work Production	-3.6%	81	640	-3.6%	81	640			
Home Based Other Production	-3.6%	157	786	-3.6%	157	786			
Non-Home Based Other Production	-0.6%	138	981	-0.6%	138	981			
Home-Based Work Attraction	-0.6%			-0.6%					
Home-Based Other Attraction	-0.6%	82	487	-0.6%	82	487			
Non-Home Based Other Attraction	-0.6%	33	200	-0.6%	33	200			

MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee										
Total Population: 299										
Total Employees: 0										
APC: Central										
	Proposed Project	Project with Mitigation Measures								
Total Home Based Production VMT	1,426	1,426								
Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT	0	0								
Total Home Based VMT Per Capita	4.8	4.8								
Total Work Based VMT Per Employee	N/A	N/A								

Appendix E

HCM Analysis Worksheets

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary 1: Bronson Ave & Franklin Ave

	≯	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	*	1	Ť	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	≜ 16		۲.	4Î			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	73	789	79	199	1124	41	40	109	114	118	158	99
Future Volume (veh/h)	73	789	79	199	1124	41	40	109	114	118	158	99
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	79	858	86	216	1222	45	43	118	124	128	172	108
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1348	135	201	741	27	133	357	342	258	339	196
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, veh/h	437	3261	327	594	1792	66	182	747	715	429	710	410
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	79	467	477	216	0	1267	285	0	0	408	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	437	1777	1812	594	0	1858	1644	0	0	1549	0	0
Q Serve(q_s), s	0.0	18.8	18.8	18.4	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(q c), s	37.2	18.8	18.8	37.2	0.0	37.2	9.2	0.0	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.18	1.00		0.04	0.15		0.44	0.31		0.26
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	80	734	749	201	0	768	831	0	0	793	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.99	0.64	0.64	1.07	0.00	1.65	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c a), veh/h	80	734	749	201	0	768	831	0	0	793	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	45.0	21.0	21.0	39.5	0.0	26.4	14.7	0.0	0.0	16.1	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	97.2	4.2	4.1	84.6	0.0	298.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	7.0	13.0	13.2	14.8	0.0	122.6	6.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	1											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	142.2	25.2	25.1	124.0	0.0	324.5	15.8	0.0	0.0	18.5	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	С	С	F	А	F	В	А	А	В	А	А
Approach Vol. veh/h		1023			1483			285			408	
Approach Delay, s/veh		34.2			295.3			15.8			18.5	
Approach LOS		С			F			В			В	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax) s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max O Clear Time (q. $c+11$), s		39.2		11.2		39.2		17.5				
Green Ext Time (p. c), s		0.0		2.0		0.0		2.9				
Intersection Summary		5.0		2.0		0.0		2.7				
			151 /									
			101.0 Г									
HUNI OLII LUS			F									

Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

メーション・* * * * * * * * * * *

Movement EB	_ EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	4			4		٦	_ ≜ î≽			đ þ		
Traffic Volume (veh/h) 1	4 4	29	36	5	31	18	333	18	13	898	30	
Future Volume (veh/h) 1	4 4	29	36	5	31	18	333	18	13	898	30	
Initial Q (Qb), veh) 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.0)	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj 1.0) 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approach	No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 187) 1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 1	5 4	32	39	5	34	20	362	20	14	976	33	
Peak Hour Factor 0.9	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h 8) 35	107	124	29	72	448	2595	143	54	2580	86	
Arrive On Green 0.1	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h 26	3 326	1001	604	274	678	559	3425	189	18	3405	114	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h 5	0	0	78	0	0	20	187	195	537	0	486	
Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln159	5 0	0	1555	0	0	559	1777	1836	1855	0	1681	
Q Serve(g_s), s 0.	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	8.9	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 2.	5 0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	2.6	2.6	8.8	0.0	8.9	
Prop In Lane 0.2)	0.63	0.50		0.44	1.00		0.10	0.03		0.07	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 22	2 0	0	226	0	0	448	1346	1392	1447	0	1274	
V/C Ratio(X) 0.2	3 0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.14	0.14	0.37	0.00	0.38	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 79	7 0	0	783	0	0	448	1346	1392	1447	0	1274	
HCM Platoon Ratio 1.0) 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I) 1.0	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 37.	0.0	0.0	37.6	0.0	0.0	5.4	3.0	3.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.	5 0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.9	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In1.	9 0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.3	1.4	4.9	0.0	4.5	
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/v	eh											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 37.	6.0	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	5.6	3.2	3.2	4.4	0.0	4.6	
LnGrp LOS I) A	А	D	А	А	A	А	А	А	А	А	
Approach Vol, veh/h	51			78			402			1023		
Approach Delay, s/veh	37.6			38.5			3.3			4.5		
Approach LOS	D			D			А			А		
Timer - Assigned Phs	2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	73.8		16.2		73.8		16.2					
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gmax),	s * 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1),	s 12.0		6.0		10.9		4.5					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	6.2		0.4		16.2		0.3					
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay		7.0										

Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.
1

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	Y			- स ी	- Þ	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	18	18	30	268	386	43
Future Vol, veh/h	18	18	30	268	386	43
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	20	20	33	291	420	47

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Ma	jor2		
Conflicting Flow All	801	444	467	0	-	0	
Stage 1	444	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	357	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	354	614	1094	-	-	-	
Stage 1	646	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	708	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	341	614	1094	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	341	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	623	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	708	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	14		0.8		0		
HCM LOS	В						

 Minor Lane/Major Mvmt
 NBL
 NBT EBLn1
 SBT
 SBR

 Capacity (veh/h)
 1094
 438

 HCM Lane V/C Ratio
 0.03
 0.089

 HCM Control Delay (s)
 8.4
 0
 14

-

А

0.1

А

В

0.3

HCM Lane LOS

HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)

	≯	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	*	•	1	۲	1	ţ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۴.	4		5	∱1 }		7	4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	67	478	36	168	948	64	29	163	152	118	285	133
Future Volume (veh/h)	67	478	36	168	948	64	29	163	152	118	285	133
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	73	520	39	183	1030	70	32	177	165	128	310	145
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	164	720	54	222	1414	96	301	416	387	161	348	152
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	513	1718	129	850	3376	229	936	891	830	241	745	326
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	73	0	559	183	542	558	32	0	342	583	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	513	0	1847	850	1777	1829	936	0	1721	1312	0	0
Q Serve(q s), s	12.5	0.0	22.7	15.0	23.0	23.0	0.0	0.0	11.9	27.3	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(q c), s	35.5	0.0	22.7	37.7	23.0	23.0	3.8	0.0	11.9	39.2	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.07	1.00		0.13	1.00		0.48	0.22		0.25
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	164	0	774	222	744	766	301	0	803	661	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.45	0.00	0.72	0.83	0.73	0.73	0.11	0.00	0.43	0.88	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	164	0	774	222	744	766	301	0	803	661	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	36.7	0.0	21.8	39.2	21.9	21.9	13.8	0.0	16.0	25.1	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	8.5	0.0	5.8	28.2	6.2	6.0	0.7	0.0	1.7	15.7	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	3.5	0.0	15.9	9.7	15.6	16.0	0.8	0.0	8.4	20.5	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	45.2	0.0	27.6	67.4	28.0	27.9	14.5	0.0	17.6	40.7	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	D	А	С	E	С	С	В	А	В	D	А	А
Approach Vol, veh/h		632			1283			374			583	
Approach Delay, s/veh		29.6			33.6			17.4			40.7	
Approach LOS		С			С			В			D	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		42.8		47.2		42.8		47.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		5.1		* 5.2		5.1		* 5.2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		37.7		* 42		37.7		* 42				
Max Q Clear Time (g c+l1), s		39.7		41.2		37.5		13.9				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		0.3		0.2		2.5				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			32.0									
HCM 6th LOS			С									

Notes

	≯	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	5	≜1 ≽		5	ĥ			4			4.	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	98	1313	68	88	900	62	45	150	300	117	110	87
Future Volume (veh/h)	98	1313	68	88	900	62	45	150	300	117	110	87
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	107	1427	74	96	978	67	49	163	326	127	120	95
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1421	73	80	715	49	92	264	481	233	217	152
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, veh/h	540	3437	178	350	1730	119	101	554	1006	372	453	318
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	107	736	765	96	0	1045	538	0	0	342	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	540	1777	1838	350	0	1849	1660	0	0	1143	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	37.2	37.2	0.0	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	0.0	37.2	21.7	0.0	0.0	23.7	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.10	1.00		0.06	0.09		0.61	0.37		0.28
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	80	734	760	80	0	764	837	0	0	601	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	1.34	1.00	1.01	1.20	0.00	1.37	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	80	734	760	80	0	764	837	0	0	601	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	45.0	26.4	26.4	45.0	0.0	26.4	18.0	0.0	0.0	17.7	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	214.9	33.7	34.4	164.1	0.0	173.6	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	11.8	29.3	30.4	9.7	0.0	77.7	13.8	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/vel	ו											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	259.9	60.1	60.8	209.1	0.0	200.0	21.8	0.0	0.0	21.6	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	F	F	F	A	F	С	A	A	С	A	<u> </u>
Approach Vol, veh/h		1608			1141			538			342	
Approach Delay, s/veh		73.7			200.8			21.8			21.6	
Approach LOS		E			F			С			С	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (q_c+l1), s		39.2		23.7		39.2		25.7				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		3.8		0.0		2.3				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			101.1									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

メッシュ キャント インシナイ

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations		\$			\$		1	∱î ≽			đ ĥ		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	8	0	16	39	1	38	24	737	37	24	540	15	
Future Volume (veh/h)	8	0	16	39	1	38	24	737	37	24	540	15	
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approach	h	No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	9	0	17	42	1	41	26	801	40	26	587	16	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h	91	21	109	122	20	78	657	2619	131	113	2440	66	
Arrive On Green	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h	354	202	1050	596	189	748	816	3444	172	92	3208	87	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	26	0	0	84	0	0	26	413	428	318	0	311	
Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/In	1607	0	0	1533	0	0	816	1777	1839	1700	0	1686	
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.9	6.5	6.5	0.0	0.0	4.9	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	1.3	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	5.7	6.5	6.5	4.4	0.0	4.9	
Prop In Lane	0.35		0.65	0.50		0.49	1.00		0.09	0.08		0.05	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	221	0	0	219	0	0	657	1351	1399	1336	0	1282	
V/C Ratio(X)	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.31	0.31	0.24	0.00	0.24	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	789	0	0	782	0	0	657	1351	1399	1336	0	1282	
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	n 36.7	0.0	0.0	38.1	0.0	0.0	4.0	3.4	3.4	3.1	0.0	3.2	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.4	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh	n/In1.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.4	3.5	2.4	0.0	2.4	
Unsig. Movement Delay	, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	36.9	0.0	0.0	39.2	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.5	0.0	3.6	
LnGrp LOS	D	A	A	D	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Approach Vol, veh/h		26			84			867			629		
Approach Delay, s/veh		36.9			39.2			3.9			3.6		
Approach LOS		D			D			А			А		
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc)	, S	74.0		16.0		74.0		16.0					
Change Period (Y+Rc),	S	* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gma	ax), s	* 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+	+l1), s	8.5		6.5		6.9		3.3					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		14.7		0.5		11.2		0.1					
Intersection Summary													
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			6.2										
HCM 6th LOS			A										

Notes

02/16/2021

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.5					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	Y			ŧ	et	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	31	31	30	268	346	38
Future Vol, veh/h	31	31	30	268	346	38
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	34	34	33	291	376	41

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Ma	ajor2					
Conflicting Flow All	754	397	417	0	-	0				
Stage 1	397	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 2	357	-	-	-	-	-				
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-				
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-				
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-				
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-				
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	377	652	1142	-	-	-				
Stage 1	679	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 2	708	-	-	-	-	-				
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-				
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	364	652	1142	-	-	-				
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	364	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 1	656	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 2	708	-	-	-	-	-				
Approach	FB		NB		SB					
HCM Control Delay s	14		0.8		0					

HCM LOS B

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT E	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1142	-	467	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.029	-	0.144	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.2	0	14	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	А	А	В	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	0.5	-	-

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	*	1	Ť	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦	eî 🕺		۲	A		۲	el el			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	136	768	58	86	773	88	54	314	169	86	184	55
Future Volume (veh/h)	136	768	58	86	773	88	54	314	169	86	184	55
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	148	835	63	93	840	96	59	341	184	93	200	60
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	208	719	54	80	1346	154	379	533	288	139	285	77
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	598	1717	130	620	3214	367	1119	1143	617	191	610	164
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	148	0	898	93	464	472	59	0	525	353	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	598	0	1847	620	1777	1804	1119	0	1759	965	0	0
Q Serve(q_s), s	19.2	0.0	37.7	0.0	18.5	18.5	0.0	0.0	20.4	13.3	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(q_c), s	37.7	0.0	37.7	37.7	18.5	18.5	6.1	0.0	20.4	33.7	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.07	1.00		0.20	1.00		0.35	0.26		0.17
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	208	0	774	80	744	756	379	0	821	501	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.71	0.00	1.16	1.16	0.62	0.62	0.16	0.00	0.64	0.70	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c a), veh/h	208	0	774	80	744	756	379	0	821	501	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	36.7	0.0	26.2	45.0	20.6	20.6	14.4	0.0	18.2	23.3	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	18.8	0.0	86.4	151.0	3.9	3.9	0.9	0.0	3.8	8.1	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	7.8	0.0	48.4	9.2	12.8	12.9	1.4	0.0	13.5	12.4	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	55.5	0.0	112.5	196.0	24.5	24.4	15.3	0.0	22.0	31.4	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	E	А	F	F	С	С	В	А	С	С	А	А
Approach Vol. veh/h		1046			1029			584			353	
Approach Delay, s/veh		104.5			40.0			21.4			31.4	
Approach LOS		F			D			С			С	
Timor Assigned Dbs		2		Λ		6		Q				
Physical Ph		42.8		4		42.8		47.2				
Change Period $(Y+Rc)$ s		5.1		* 5 2		5 1		* 5 2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax) s		37.7		* 12		37.7		* 12				
Max O Clear Time (q_{c+11}) s		39.7		35.7		39.7		22 4				
Green Ext Time (n_c) s		0.0		1.2		0.0		22.7				
		0.0		1.2		0.0		0.1				
Intersection Summary			57.0									
HCIVI 6th Ctri Delay			57.8									
HUIVI 6IN LUS			E									

Notes

	≯	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	•	٠	Ť	1	5	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	5	≜1 ≽		5	ĥ			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	73	789	79	200	1124	41	41	111	116	118	159	99
Future Volume (veh/h)	73	789	79	200	1124	41	41	111	116	118	159	99
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	79	858	86	217	1222	45	45	121	126	128	173	108
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1348	135	201	741	27	135	357	338	256	340	195
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, veh/h	437	3261	327	594	1792	66	186	746	708	427	711	408
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	79	467	477	217	0	1267	292	0	0	409	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	437	1777	1812	594	0	1858	1641	0	0	1546	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	18.8	18.8	18.4	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	37.2	18.8	18.8	37.2	0.0	37.2	9.5	0.0	0.0	15.7	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.18	1.00		0.04	0.15		0.43	0.31		0.26
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	80	734	749	201	0	768	830	0	0	791	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.99	0.64	0.64	1.08	0.00	1.65	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	80	734	749	201	0	768	830	0	0	791	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	45.0	21.0	21.0	39.5	0.0	26.4	14.8	0.0	0.0	16.1	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	97.2	4.2	4.1	86.1	0.0	298.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	1.0	13.0	13.2	14.9	0.0	122.6	6.9	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	140.0	05.0		105 (0.0	0045	15.0	0.0	0.0	10 (0.0	0.0
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	142.2	25.2	25.1	125.6	0.0	324.5	15.9	0.0	0.0	18.6	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LUS	F	0	C	F	A	F	В	A	A	В	A	<u> </u>
Approach Vol, veh/h		1023			1484			292			409	
Approach Delay, s/veh		34.2			295.4			15.9			18.6	
Approach LOS		C			F			В			В	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.2		11.5		39.2		17.7				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		2.0		0.0		2.9				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			151.4									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

メッシュ キャント インシナイ

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations		4			- 44		<u>۲</u>	_ ≜ î≽			đÞ.		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	14	4	29	41	5	33	18	333	20	14	898	30	
Future Volume (veh/h)	14	4	29	41	5	33	18	333	20	14	898	30	
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approac	h	No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	15	4	32	45	5	36	20	362	22	15	976	33	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h	81	35	109	130	28	70	447	2577	156	56	2575	86	
Arrive On Green	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h	273	326	1009	646	257	650	559	3404	206	20	3401	114	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	51	0	0	86	0	0	20	188	196	537	0	487	
Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/lr	1609	0	0	1552	0	0	559	1777	1833	1853	0	1682	
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	8.9	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.5	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.1	2.6	2.6	8.8	0.0	8.9	
Prop In Lane	0.29		0.63	0.52		0.42	1.00		0.11	0.03		0.07	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	225	0	0	228	0	0	447	1345	1388	1444	0	1273	
V/C Ratio(X)	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.14	0.14	0.37	0.00	0.38	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	798	0	0	782	0	0	447	1345	1388	1444	0	1273	
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/ver	37.0 r	0.0	0.0	37.7	0.0	0.0	5.5	3.0	3.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.9	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	n 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh	n/In1.9	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.4	1.4	4.9	0.0	4.5	
Unsig. Movement Delay	, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	37.5	0.0	0.0	38.8	0.0	0.0	5.7	3.2	3.2	4.5	0.0	4.6	
LnGrp LOS	D	A	A	D	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Approach Vol, veh/h		51			86			404			1024		
Approach Delay, s/veh		37.5			38.8			3.3			4.5		
Approach LOS		D			D			A			A		
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc)	, S	73.7		16.3		73.7		16.3					
Change Period (Y+Rc),	S	* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gm	ax), s	* 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c-	+I1), s	12.1		6.4		10.9		4.5					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	5	6.2		0.5		16.2		0.3					
Intersection Summary													
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			7.2										
HCM 6th LOS			A										

Notes

Intersection						
Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.2					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	Y			ب	et P	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	21	29	34	270	387	44
Future Vol, veh/h	21	29	34	270	387	44
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	23	32	37	293	421	48

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Ma	jor2				
Conflicting Flow All	812	445	469	0	-	0			
Stage 1	445	-	-	-	-	-			
Stage 2	367	-	-	-	-	-			
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-			
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-			
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-			
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-			
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	348	613	1093	-	-	-			
Stage 1	646	-	-	-	-	-			
Stage 2	701	-	-	-	-	-			
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-			
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	334	613	1093	-	-	-			
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	334	-	-	-	-	-			
Stage 1	620	-	-	-	-	-			
Stage 2	701	-	-	-	-	-			
Approach	EB		NB		SB				
HCM Control Delay, s	14		0.9		0				
HCM LOS	В								

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT E	BLn1	SBT	SBR	
Capacity (veh/h)	1093	-	454	-	-	
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.034	-	0.12	-	-	
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.4	0	14	-	-	
HCM Lane LOS	A	А	В	-	-	
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	0.4	-	-	

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	•	1	1	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	î,		5	4 16		ሻ	f,			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	67	478	36	168	948	68	29	165	152	130	289	134
Future Volume (veh/h)	67	478	36	168	948	68	29	165	152	130	289	134
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	73	520	39	183	1030	74	32	179	165	141	314	146
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	163	720	54	222	1408	101	294	418	385	168	329	144
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	511	1718	129	850	3362	242	932	896	826	254	705	308
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	73	0	559	183	544	560	32	0	344	601	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	511	0	1847	850	1777	1827	932	0	1722	1267	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	12.6	0.0	22.7	15.0	23.1	23.1	0.0	0.0	12.0	30.0	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	35.7	0.0	22.7	37.7	23.1	23.1	3.6	0.0	12.0	42.0	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.07	1.00		0.13	1.00		0.48	0.23		0.24
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	163	0	774	222	744	765	294	0	803	641	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.45	0.00	0.72	0.83	0.73	0.73	0.11	0.00	0.43	0.94	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	163	0	774	222	744	765	294	0	803	641	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	36.9	0.0	21.8	39.2	21.9	21.9	13.8	0.0	16.0	26.7	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	8.7	0.0	5.8	28.2	6.3	6.1	0.7	0.0	1.7	23.2	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	3.5	0.0	15.9	9.7	15.7	16.1	0.8	0.0	8.5	23.1	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	45.5	0.0	27.6	67.4	28.2	28.0	14.5	0.0	17.7	49.9	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	D	А	С	E	С	С	В	А	В	D	А	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		632			1287			376			601	
Approach Delay, s/veh		29.7			33.7			17.4			49.9	
Approach LOS		С			С			В			D	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		42.8		47.2		42.8		47.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		5.1		* 5.2		5.1		* 5.2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		37.7		* 42		37.7		* 42				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.7		44.0		37.7		14.0				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		0.0		0.0		2.5				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			34.0									
HCM 6th LOS			С									

Notes

	≯	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	•	1	Ť	۲	5	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	≜1 ≽		5	f,			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	98	1313	69	90	900	62	45	151	301	117	112	87
Future Volume (veh/h)	98	1313	69	90	900	62	45	151	301	117	112	87
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	107	1427	75	98	978	67	49	164	327	127	122	95
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1420	74	80	715	49	91	265	480	231	219	151
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, veh/h	540	3435	180	349	1730	119	100	555	1005	370	458	316
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	107	736	766	98	0	1045	540	0	0	344	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	540	1777	1838	349	0	1849	1660	0	0	1143	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	37.2	37.2	0.0	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	0.0	37.2	21.9	0.0	0.0	23.9	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.10	1.00		0.06	0.09		0.61	0.37		0.28
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	80	734	760	80	0	764	837	0	0	601	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	1.34	1.00	1.01	1.22	0.00	1.37	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	80	734	760	80	0	764	837	0	0	601	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	45.0	26.4	26.4	45.0	0.0	26.4	18.0	0.0	0.0	17.8	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	214.9	33.9	34.6	173.0	0.0	173.6	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	11.8	29.3	30.5	10.1	0.0	77.7	13.8	0.0	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/vel	۱											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	259.9	60.3	61.0	218.0	0.0	200.0	21.9	0.0	0.0	21.7	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	F	F	F	A	F	С	A	A	С	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1609			1143			540			344	
Approach Delay, s/veh		73.9			201.6			21.9			21.7	
Approach LOS		E			F			С			С	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s		39.2		23.9		39.2		25.9				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		3.8		0.0		2.3				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			101.4									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

メッシュ キャメイ インシナイ

Movement EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	4			4		٦	≜ †⊅			đ þ		
Traffic Volume (veh/h) 8	0	16	42	1	39	24	737	41	26	540	15	
Future Volume (veh/h) 8	0	16	42	1	39	24	737	41	26	540	15	
Initial Q (Qb), veh 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approach	No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 9	0	17	46	1	42	26	801	45	28	587	16	
Peak Hour Factor 0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, % 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h 91	21	111	127	19	76	655	2598	146	120	2417	65	
Arrive On Green 0.10	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h 359	201	1057	630	177	720	816	3420	192	101	3182	86	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h 26	0	0	89	0	0	26	416	430	317	0	314	
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1617	0	0	1527	0	0	816	1777	1836	1682	0	1687	
Q Serve(g_s), s 0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	6.6	6.6	0.0	0.0	4.9	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 1.3	0.0	0.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	5.8	6.6	6.6	4.4	0.0	4.9	
Prop In Lane 0.35		0.65	0.52		0.47	1.00		0.10	0.09		0.05	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 223	0	0	221	0	0	655	1350	1394	1321	0	1281	
V/C Ratio(X) 0.12	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.31	0.31	0.24	0.00	0.24	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 790	0	0	781	0	0	655	1350	1394	1321	0	1281	
HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I) 1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 36.6	0.0	0.0	38.1	0.0	0.0	4.1	3.4	3.4	3.1	0.0	3.2	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.5	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In1.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.5	3.6	2.4	0.0	2.5	
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	l											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 36.9	0.0	0.0	39.3	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	3.7	
LnGrp LOS D	А	А	D	A	А	А	А	А	А	А	A	
Approach Vol, veh/h	26			89			872			631		
Approach Delay, s/veh	36.9			39.3			4.0			3.6		
Approach LOS	D			D			А			А		
Timer - Assigned Phs	2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	74.0		16.0		74.0		16.0					
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	* 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s	8.6		6.9		6.9		3.3					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	14.8		0.5		11.2		0.1					
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay												
		6.3										

Notes

02/16/2021

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.8					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	Y			÷	et	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	33	38	40	269	348	41
Future Vol, veh/h	33	38	40	269	348	41
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	36	41	43	292	378	45

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Maj	or2		
Conflicting Flow All	779	401	423	0	-	0	
Stage 1	401	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	378	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	364	649	1136	-	-	-	
Stage 1	676	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	693	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	348	649	1136	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	348	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	646	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	693	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	14.3		1.1		0		
HCM LOS	В						

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR	
Capacity (veh/h)	1136	- 463	-	-	
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.038	- 0.167	-	-	
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.3	0 14.3	-	-	
HCM Lane LOS	A	A B	-	-	
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	- 0.6	-	-	

	≯	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	1	+	*	1	t	۲	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ĥ		5	4 12		ሻ	4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	137	768	58	86	773	99	54	318	169	93	187	55
Future Volume (veh/h)	137	768	58	86	773	99	54	318	169	93	187	55
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	149	835	63	93	840	108	59	346	184	101	203	60
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	204	719	54	80	1327	171	372	536	285	142	271	72
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	592	1717	130	620	3167	407	1116	1149	611	196	581	153
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	149	0	898	93	471	477	59	0	530	364	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	592	0	1847	620	1777	1797	1116	0	1760	930	0	0
Q Serve(q_s), s	18.8	0.0	37.7	0.0	18.9	18.9	0.0	0.0	20.7	15.2	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(q_c), s	37.7	0.0	37.7	37.7	18.9	18.9	5.9	0.0	20.7	35.8	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.07	1.00		0.23	1.00		0.35	0.28		0.16
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	204	0	774	80	744	753	372	0	821	485	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.73	0.00	1.16	1.16	0.63	0.63	0.16	0.00	0.65	0.75	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	204	0	774	80	744	753	372	0	821	485	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	37.2	0.0	26.2	45.0	20.7	20.7	14.4	0.0	18.3	24.6	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	20.6	0.0	86.4	151.0	4.1	4.0	0.9	0.0	3.9	10.2	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	7.9	0.0	48.4	9.2	13.0	13.1	1.4	0.0	13.7	13.2	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	57.8	0.0	112.5	196.0	24.8	24.7	15.3	0.0	22.2	34.8	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	E	А	F	F	С	С	В	А	С	С	А	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1047			1041			589			364	
Approach Delay, s/veh		104.7			40.0			21.5			34.8	
Approach LOS		F			D			С			С	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		42.8		47.2		42.8		47.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		5.1		* 5.2		5.1		* 5.2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		37.7		* 42		37.7		* 42				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.7		37.8		39.7		22.7				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		0.9		0.0		3.8				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			58.1									
HCM 6th LOS			E									

Notes

	≯	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	¥	+	•	٩	Ť	۲	5	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	≜ 16		ሻ	4Î			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	75	839	81	210	1181	42	41	117	118	122	188	102
Future Volume (veh/h)	75	839	81	210	1181	42	41	117	118	122	188	102
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	82	912	88	228	1284	46	45	127	128	133	204	111
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1353	131	185	/42	27	131	363	333	245	367	185
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, ven/n	412	3274	316	563	1/94	64	1/9	/59	698	404	/68	386
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	82	495	505	228	0	1330	300	0	0	448	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s), ven/n/ln	412	1///	1813	563	0	1859	1635	0	0	1559	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	20.4	20.4	16.8	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear (g_c) , S	37.2	20.4	20.4	37.2	0.0	37.2	9.8	0.0	0.0	17.8	0.0	0.0
Plup III Lalle	1.00	704	750	1.00	0	0.03	0.15	0	0.43	0.30	0	0.25
	1 02	0.67	0.67	1 22	0.00	1 72	027	0 00	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.00
$V \subset Rallo(\Lambda)$ Avail Can(c, a), veh/h	80	0.07	750	1.25	0.00	768	827	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HCM Platoon Ratio	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00
Instream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d) s/veh	45.0	21.5	21.5	40.2	0.00	26.4	14.8	0.0	0.00	16.7	0.00	0.00
Incr Delay (d2) s/veh	107.7	4.9	4.8	141.8	0.0	334.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	29	0.0	0.0
Initial O Delay(d3), s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	7.5	14.0	14.2	19.0	0.0	135.7	7.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	1											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	152.7	26.4	26.3	182.0	0.0	360.9	16.1	0.0	0.0	19.5	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	С	С	F	А	F	В	А	А	В	А	А
Approach Vol, veh/h		1082			1558			300			448	
Approach Delay, s/veh		35.9			334.7			16.1			19.5	
Approach LOS		D			F			В			В	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.2		11.8		39.2		19.8				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		2.1		0.0		3.2				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			169.4									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

メッシュ キャント インシナイ

Movement EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBL SBT SBR	
Lane Configurations 🚓 🗘 🏠	
Traffic Volume (veh/h) 14 4 30 37 5 32 19 386 19 13 991 31	
Future Volume (veh/h) 14 4 30 37 5 32 19 386 19 13 991 31	
Initial Q (Qb), veh 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	
Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	
Work Zone On Approach No No No No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1870 1870 1870 1870 1870 1870 1870 1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 15 4 33 40 5 35 21 420 21 14 1077 34	
Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, % 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
Cap, veh/h 79 35 108 125 29 73 407 2609 130 53 2586 81	
Arrive On Green 0.11 0.11 0.11 0.11 0.11 0.11 0.76 0.76 0.76 0.76 0.76 0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h 261 323 1013 604 271 681 507 3444 172 16 3415 107	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h 52 0 0 80 0 0 21 216 225 590 0 535	
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1596 0 0 1556 0 0 507 1777 1839 1855 0 1683	
Q Serve(q_s), s 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 0.0 1.4 3.0 3.0 0.0 0.0 10.2	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 2.6 0.0 0.0 4.1 0.0 0.0 11.6 3.0 3.0 10.1 0.0 10.2	
Prop In Lane 0.29 0.63 0.50 0.44 1.00 0.09 0.02 0.06	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 222 0 0 227 0 0 407 1346 1393 1446 0 1275	
V/C Ratio(X) 0.23 0.00 0.00 0.35 0.00 0.00 0.05 0.16 0.16 0.41 0.00 0.42	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 797 0 0 783 0 0 407 1346 1393 1446 0 1275	
HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	
Upstream Filter(I) 1.00 0.00 0.00 1.00 0.00 0.00 1.00 1.0	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 37.0 0.0 0.0 37.6 0.0 0.0 5.9 3.0 3.0 3.9 0.0 3.9	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.5 0.0 0.0 0.9 0.0 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.2 0.9 0.0 1.0	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln1.9 0.0 0.0 3.0 0.0 0.0 0.3 1.6 1.6 5.5 0.0 5.1	
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 37.6 0.0 0.0 38.6 0.0 0.0 6.2 3.3 3.3 4.7 0.0 4.9	
LnGrp LOS D A A D A A A A A A A	
Approach Vol, veh/h 52 80 462 1125	
Approach Delay, s/veh 37.6 38.6 3.4 4.8	
Approach LOS D D A A	
Timer - Assigned Phs 2 4 6 8	
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s 73.8 16.2 73.8 16.2	
Change Period (Y+Rc), s * 5.6 6.6 * 5.6 6.6	
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s * 34 43.4 * 34 43.4	
Max Q Clear Time (g c+l1), s 13.6 6.1 12.2 4.6	
Green Ext Time (p_c), s 6.9 0.5 16.7 0.3	
Intersection Summary	
LICM 4th Ctrl Doloy 7.0	

Notes

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh

Int Delay, s/veh	1					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	Y			- 4	4	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	19	19	31	282	427	44
Future Vol, veh/h	19	19	31	282	427	44
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage	,# 0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	21	21	34	307	464	48

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Maj	or2		
Conflicting Flow All	863	488	512	0	-	0	
Stage 1	488	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	375	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	325	580	1053	-	-	-	
Stage 1	617	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	695	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	312	580	1053	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	312	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	593	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	695	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	14.9		0.8		0		

В HCM LOS

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR	
Capacity (veh/h)	1053	- 406	-	-	
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.032	- 0.102	-	-	
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	0 14.9	-	-	
HCM Lane LOS	A	A B	-	-	
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	- 0.3	-	-	

	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	∢	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	5	î,		ሻ	≜t ≽		ሻ	f,			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	69	627	63	356	1187	66	34	174	223	122	323	137
Future Volume (veh/h)	69	627	63	356	1187	66	34	174	223	122	323	137
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	75	682	68	387	1290	72	37	189	242	133	351	149
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	107	701	70	94	1434	80	276	348	445	139	310	123
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	399	1673	167	712	3422	191	898	745	954	193	665	264
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	75	0	750	387	669	693	37	0	431	633	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	399	0	1840	712	1777	1836	898	0	1699	1122	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	6.0	0.0	36.0	1.7	31.6	31.7	0.0	0.0	16.3	25.7	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	37.7	0.0	36.0	37.7	31.6	31.7	4.6	0.0	16.3	42.0	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.09	1.00		0.10	1.00		0.56	0.21		0.24
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	107	0	771	94	744	769	276	0	793	572	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.70	0.00	0.97	4.13	0.90	0.90	0.13	0.00	0.54	1.11	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	107	0	771	94	744	769	276	0	793	572	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	43.9	0.0	25.6	44.9	24.4	24.4	14.0	0.0	17.2	28.8	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	32.3	0.0	26.5	1434.6	15.9	15.8	1.0	0.0	2.7	70.2	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	4.7	0.0	27.8	69.6	22.3	23.0	0.9	0.0	10.8	33.9	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	76.3	0.0	52.1	1479.5	40.3	40.2	15.0	0.0	19.8	99.0	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	E	А	D	F	D	D	В	А	В	F	А	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		825			1749			468			633	
Approach Delay, s/veh		54.3			358.7			19.4			99.0	
Approach LOS		D			F			В			F	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		42.8		47.2		42.8		47.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		5.1		* 5.2		5.1		* 5.2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		37.7		* 42		37.7		* 42				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s		39.7		44.0		39.7		18.3				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		0.0		0.0		3.2				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			202.4									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

	≯	→	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦	A12		۲	eî 👘			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	101	1377	70	92	960	64	46	178	314	121	120	90
Future Volume (veh/h)	101	1377	70	92	960	64	46	178	314	121	120	90
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	110	1497	/6	100	1043	/0	50	193	341	132	130	98
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Ven, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	120
Cap, ven/n	80	1423	0.41	0.41	/10	48	89	285	464	217	209	139
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
	110	3442	002	320	1/33	1110	90	097	9/1	339	430	291
GIP VOIUMe(V), Ven/M	506	170	803	226	0	1040	584 1664	0	0	300	0	0
GIP Sat Flow(S), ven/11/11	0.0	27.0	27.0	320	0.0	1849	1004	0.0	0.0	1009	0.0	0.0
Q Serve(\underline{y}_{S}), S	27.2	37.2	37.2	27.2	0.0	37.2	24.8	0.0	0.0	ა.ა 201	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lang	1 00	J1.Z	0.00	1 00	0.0	0.06	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.37	0.0	0.0
Lane Grn Can(c), veh/h	1.00	734	760	1.00	0	764	838	0	0.50	565	0	0.27
V/C Ratio(X)	1 37	1 05	1.06	1 25	0.00	1 46	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a)_veh/h	80	734	760	80	0.00	764	838	0.00	0.00	565	0.00	0.00
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	45.0	26.4	26.4	45.0	0.0	26.4	18.7	0.0	0.0	18.9	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	229.4	46.8	48.4	182.0	0.0	212.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	12.4	33.5	35.1	10.5	0.0	91.4	15.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	ו											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	274.4	73.2	74.8	227.0	0.0	238.9	23.5	0.0	0.0	24.3	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	F	F	F	А	F	С	А	A	С	А	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1683			1213			584			360	
Approach Delay, s/veh		87.1			237.9			23.5			24.3	
Approach LOS		F			F			С			С	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.2		26.8		39.2		30.1				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		3.9		0.0		2.2				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			119.2									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

クラッマーベイ イントレイ

Movement EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	4			- 44		۳.	_ ≜ î≽			đ þ		
Traffic Volume (veh/h) 8	0	16	40	1	39	25	813	38	25	615	15	
Future Volume (veh/h) 8	0	16	40	1	39	25	813	38	25	615	15	
Initial Q (Qb), veh 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approach	No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 9	0	17	43	1	42	27	884	41	27	668	16	
Peak Hour Factor 0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, % 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h 91	21	110	123	19	78	608	2628	122	105	2456	58	
Arrive On Green 0.10	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h 356	201	1053	600	184	748	757	3458	160	81	3231	77	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h 26	0	0	86	0	0	27	454	471	358	0	353	
Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln1610	0	0	1532	0	0	757	1777	1841	1701	0	1688	
Q Serve(g_s), s 0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	1.0	7.4	7.4	0.0	0.0	5.7	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 1.3	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	6.7	7.4	7.4	5.1	0.0	5.7	
Prop In Lane 0.35		0.65	0.50		0.49	1.00		0.09	0.08		0.05	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 222	0	0	220	0	0	608	1351	1400	1336	0	1283	
V/C Ratio(X) 0.12	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.34	0.34	0.27	0.00	0.27	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 789	0	0	782	0	0	608	1351	1400	1336	0	1283	
HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I) 1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 36.7	0.0	0.0	38.1	0.0	0.0	4.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	0.0	3.3	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.5	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In1.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.9	4.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/vel	۱											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 36.9	0.0	0.0	39.2	0.0	0.0	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.7	0.0	3.8	
LnGrp LOS D	A	A	D	A	A	A	A	A	А	А	А	
Approach Vol, veh/h	26			86			952			711		
Approach Delay, s/veh	36.9			39.2			4.1			3.8		
Approach LOS	D			D			А			А		
Timer - Assigned Phs	2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	74.0		16.0		74.0		16.0					
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	* 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s	9.4		6.6		7.7		3.3					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	15.8		0.5		12.5		0.1					
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay		6.2										
HCM 6th LOS		А										

Notes

Intersection

7

Int Delay, s/veh	1.5						
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	Y			÷.	et 👘		
Traffic Vol, veh/h	32	32	31	304	365	39	
Future Vol, veh/h	32	32	31	304	365	39	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None	
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-	
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Mvmt Flow	35	35	34	330	397	42	

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Ma	jor2					
Conflicting Flow All	816	418	439	0	-	0				
Stage 1	418	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 2	398	-	-	-	-	-				
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-				
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-				
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-				
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-				
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	347	635	1121	-	-	-				
Stage 1	664	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 2	678	-	-	-	-	-				
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-				
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	334	635	1121	-	-	-				
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	334	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 1	639	-	-	-	-	-				
Stage 2	678	-	-	-	-	-				
Approach	EB		NB		SB					
HCM Control Delay, s	14.8		0.8		0					
HCMLOS	В									

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR	
Capacity (veh/h)	1121	- 438	-	-	
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.03	- 0.159	-	-	
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.3	0 14.8	-	-	
HCM Lane LOS	А	A B	-	-	
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	- 0.6	-	-	

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	1	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲.	ĥ		ሻ	4 12		ሻ	4			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	140	1096	67	172	953	91	81	352	357	89	199	57
Future Volume (veh/h)	140	1096	67	172	953	91	81	352	357	89	199	57
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	152	1191	73	187	1036	99	88	383	388	97	216	62
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	154	731	45	80	1373	131	313	398	403	61	119	26
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	496	1744	107	439	3278	313	1101	852	863	22	256	55
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	152	0	1264	187	561	574	88	0	771	375	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	496	0	1851	439	1777	1814	1101	0	1715	333	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	13.5	0.0	37.7	0.0	24.2	24.2	0.0	0.0	39.2	2.8	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	37.7	0.0	37.7	37.7	24.2	24.2	10.3	0.0	39.2	42.0	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.17	1.00		0.50	0.26		0.17
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	154	0	775	80	744	760	313	0	800	206	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.98	0.00	1.63	2.34	0.75	0.75	0.28	0.00	0.96	1.82	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	154	0	775	80	744	760	313	0	800	206	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	41.7	0.0	26.2	45.0	22.2	22.2	15.5	0.0	23.3	22.7	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	68.4	0.0	289.4	638.9	7.0	6.9	2.2	0.0	24.0	389.6	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	10.4	0.0	120.6	28.7	16.4	16.7	2.4	0.0	27.3	43.3	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	110.0	0.0	315.6	683.9	29.2	29.1	17.8	0.0	47.3	412.3	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	А	F	F	С	С	В	A	D	F	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1416			1322			859			375	
Approach Delay, s/veh		293.5			121.8			44.3			412.3	
Approach LOS		F			F			D			F	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		42.8		47.2		42.8		47.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		5.1		* 5.2		5.1		* 5.2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		37.7		* 42		37.7		* 42				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.7		44.0		39.7		41.2				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.5				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			193.7									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

	۶	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	•	٠	Ť	1	5	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	≜1 ≽		5	f,			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	75	839	81	211	1181	42	42	119	120	122	189	102
Future Volume (veh/h)	75	839	81	211	1181	42	42	119	120	122	189	102
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	82	912	88	229	1284	46	46	129	130	133	205	111
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1353	131	185	742	27	132	362	333	244	368	184
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, veh/h	412	3274	316	563	1794	64	180	758	696	402	769	385
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	82	495	505	229	0	1330	305	0	0	449	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	412	1777	1813	563	0	1859	1634	0	0	1557	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	20.4	20.4	16.8	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	37.2	20.4	20.4	37.2	0.0	37.2	10.0	0.0	0.0	17.9	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.17	1.00		0.03	0.15		0.43	0.30		0.25
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	80	734	750	185	0	768	827	0	0	796	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	1.02	0.67	0.67	1.24	0.00	1.73	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	80	734	750	185	0	768	827	0	0	796	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	45.0	21.5	21.5	40.2	0.0	26.4	14.9	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	107.7	4.9	4.8	143.8	0.0	334.5	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In	1.5	14.0	14.2	19.2	0.0	135.7	7.3	0.0	0.0	11.2	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	1507	0/ /	04.0	1011	0.0	0(0.0	1/0	0.0	0.0	10 (0.0	0.0
LnGrp Delay(d),s/ven	152.7	26.4	26.3	184.1	0.0	360.9	16.2	0.0	0.0	19.6	0.0	0.0
LNGrp LUS	F		C	F	A	F	В	A	A	В	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1082			1559			305			449	
Approach Delay, s/veh		35.9			334.9			16.2			19.6	
Approach LUS		D			F			В			В	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		39.2		12.0		39.2		19.9				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		2.1		0.0		3.2				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			169.3									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

メッシュ キャント インシナイ

Movement E	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations		4			4		٦	_ ≜ î≽			đ þ		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	14	4	30	42	5	34	19	386	21	14	991	31	
Future Volume (veh/h)	14	4	30	42	5	34	19	386	21	14	991	31	
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj 1	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1	870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	15	4	33	46	5	37	21	420	23	15	1077	34	
Peak Hour Factor (0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h	80	35	110	130	27	70	406	2593	142	54	2581	81	
Arrive On Green (0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h	266	323	1022	646	255	653	507	3426	187	18	3411	107	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	52	0	0	88	0	0	21	217	226	590	0	536	
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1	610	0	0	1553	0	0	507	1777	1837	1853	0	1683	
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.0	10.2	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.6	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	11.6	3.1	3.1	10.1	0.0	10.2	
Prop In Lane (0.29		0.63	0.52		0.42	1.00		0.10	0.03		0.06	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	225	0	0	228	0	0	406	1345	1390	1443	0	1273	
V/C Ratio(X) (0.23	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.16	0.16	0.41	0.00	0.42	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	799	0	0	781	0	0	406	1345	1390	1443	0	1273	
HCM Platoon Ratio 1	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I) 1	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 3	37.0	0.0	0.0	37.8	0.0	0.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	3.9	0.0	3.9	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.0	1.0	
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/l	ln1.9	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.6	1.7	5.6	0.0	5.2	
Unsig. Movement Delay,	s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 3	37.5	0.0	0.0	38.8	0.0	0.0	6.2	3.3	3.3	4.8	0.0	4.9	
LnGrp LOS	D	A	А	D	А	А	А	А	А	А	А	А	
Approach Vol, veh/h		52			88			464			1126		
Approach Delay, s/veh		37.5			38.8			3.4			4.8		
Approach LOS		D			D			А			А		
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	S	73.7		16.3		73.7		16.3					
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gmax	x), s	* 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l	1), s	13.6		6.6		12.2		4.6					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		6.9		0.5		16.7		0.3					
Intersection Summary													
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			7.2										
HCM 6th LOS			A										

Notes

1	
Intorcoction	
ILLEISEUTOT	

1.3						
EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	
Y			÷	ef 👘		
22	30	35	284	428	45	
22	30	35	284	428	45	
0	0	0	0	0	0	
Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	
-	None	-	None	-	None	
0	-	-	-	-	-	
,# 0	-	-	0	0	-	
0	-	-	0	0	-	
92	92	92	92	92	92	
2	2	2	2	2	2	
24	33	38	309	465	49	
	1.3 EBL 22 22 0 Stop - 0 , # 0 0 92 2 24	1.3 EBL EBR 22 300 22 300 22 300 0 0 500 Stop 500 Stop 0 0 100 - 100	1.3 EBL EBR NBL ¥ 22 30 35 22 30 35 22 30 35 0 0 0 Stop Stop Free None - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 92 92 92 22 2 2 24 33 38	1.3 EBL EBR NBL NBT Y · · · 22 30 35 284 22 30 35 284 22 30 35 284 0 0 0 0 Stop Stop Free Free None - None 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 <td>1.3 NBL NBT SBT EBL EBR NBL NBT SBT Y · · · · · 22 30 35 284 428 22 30 35 284 428 0 0 0 0 0 Stop Stop Free Free Free · None · None · 0 · · None · · 0 · · None · · · 0 · · · · · · · 0 ·</td> <td>1.3 EBL EBR NBL NBT SBT SBR Y ···· ···· ···· ···· ···· 22 30 35 284 428 45 22 30 35 284 428 45 22 30 35 284 428 45 0 0 0 0 0 0 Stop Stop Free Free Free Free None - None - None 0 - - 0 0 - y# 0 - 2 2 2</td>	1.3 NBL NBT SBT EBL EBR NBL NBT SBT Y · · · · · 22 30 35 284 428 22 30 35 284 428 0 0 0 0 0 Stop Stop Free Free Free · None · None · 0 · · None · · 0 · · None · · · 0 · · · · · · · 0 ·	1.3 EBL EBR NBL NBT SBT SBR Y ···· ···· ···· ···· ···· 22 30 35 284 428 45 22 30 35 284 428 45 22 30 35 284 428 45 0 0 0 0 0 0 Stop Stop Free Free Free Free None - None - None 0 - - 0 0 - y# 0 - 2 2 2

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	Ma	jor2		
Conflicting Flow All	875	490	514	0	-	0	
Stage 1	490	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	320	578	1052	-	-	-	
Stage 1	616	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	688	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	306	578	1052	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	306	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	589	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	688	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	14.9		0.9		0		

HCM LOS В

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1052	- 420	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.036	- 0.135	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.6	0 14.9	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	А	A B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	- 0.5	-	-

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	Ť	۲	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	1		ሻ	≜ †Ъ		ሻ	ţ,			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	69	627	63	356	1187	70	34	176	223	134	327	138
Future Volume (veh/h)	69	627	63	356	1187	70	34	176	223	134	327	138
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	75	682	68	387	1290	76	37	191	242	146	355	150
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	106	701	70	94	1429	84	286	350	443	144	293	116
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	398	1673	167	712	3410	201	894	750	950	203	627	249
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	75	0	750	387	671	695	37	0	433	651	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	398	0	1840	712	1777	1834	894	0	1699	1079	0	0
Q Serve(q s), s	5.8	0.0	36.0	1.7	31.7	31.9	0.0	0.0	16.4	25.6	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(q c), s	37.7	0.0	36.0	37.7	31.7	31.9	4.4	0.0	16.4	42.0	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.09	1.00		0.11	1.00		0.56	0.22		0.23
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	106	0	771	94	744	768	286	0	793	553	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	0.71	0.00	0.97	4.13	0.90	0.90	0.13	0.00	0.55	1.18	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c a), veh/h	106	0	771	94	744	768	286	0	793	553	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	44.0	0.0	25.6	44.9	24.4	24.5	14.0	0.0	17.2	29.4	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	33.2	0.0	26.5	1434.6	16.2	16.1	0.9	0.0	2.7	97.8	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	4.7	0.0	27.8	69.6	22.4	23.1	0.9	0.0	10.9	39.8	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	77.2	0.0	52.1	1479.5	40.6	40.6	14.9	0.0	19.9	127.2	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	E	А	D	F	D	D	В	А	В	F	А	А
Approach Vol. veh/h		825			1753			470			651	
Approach Delay, s/veh		54.4			358.3			19.5			127.2	
Approach LOS		D			F			В			F	
Timor Assigned Dbs		C		1		6		0				
Physical Ph		/2.8		4		12.8		47.2				
Change Period $(Y+Rc)$ s		5 1		* 5 2		5 1		* 5 2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax) s		3.1		* 12		3.1		* 12				
Max O Clear Time $(q, c+11)$ s		30.7		11.0		30.7		18 /				
Green Ext Time (n c) s		0.0		0.0		0.0		2.2				
		0.0		0.0		0.0		J.Z				
Intersection Summary			001.0									
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			206.8									
HUM 6th LUS			F									

Notes

	≯	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	1	Ť	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	4 12		5	f,			4			\$	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	101	1377	71	94	960	64	46	179	315	121	122	90
Future Volume (veh/h)	101	1377	71	94	960	64	46	179	315	121	122	90
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	110	1497	77	102	1043	70	50	195	342	132	133	98
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	80	1422	/3	80	/16	48	89	286	463	215	212	138
Arrive On Green	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Sat Flow, ven/n	506	3439	1/6	320	1/33	110	95	599	969	335	444	288
Grp Volume(v), ven/h	110	1//	803	102	0	1040	587	0	0	363	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s), ven/n/in	506	1///	1839	326	0	1849	1663	0	0	1068	0	0
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	37.2	37.2	0.0	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4 20 E	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Cledi (\underline{y}_{c}), S	37.2	31.Z	37.Z	37.Z	0.0	37.2	25.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
	1.00	724	760	1.00	0	764	0.09	0	0.00	0.30	0	0.27
$V/C \operatorname{Patio}(X)$	1 37	1.05	1.06	1 27	0.00	1 /6	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.64	0 00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a) veh/h	80	73/	760	80	0.00	764	838	0.00	0.00	565	0.00	0.00
HCM Platoon Ratio	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1.00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00
Unstream Filter(I)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d) s/veh	45.0	26.4	26.4	45.0	0.00	26.4	18.8	0.0	0.0	19.0	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	229.4	47.0	48.6	191.2	0.0	212.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delav(d3), s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	12.4	33.6	35.2	10.8	0.0	91.4	15.5	0.0	0.0	11.2	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh	ו											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	274.4	73.4	75.0	236.2	0.0	238.9	23.6	0.0	0.0	24.6	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	F	F	F	А	F	С	А	А	С	А	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1684			1215			587			363	
Approach Delay, s/veh		87.3			238.6			23.6			24.6	
Approach LOS		F			F			С			С	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		41.9		48.1		41.9		48.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		* 4.7		5.1		* 4.7		5.1				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		* 37		43.0		* 37		43.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s		39.2		27.0		39.2		30.5				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		3.9		0.0		2.2				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			119.5									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

クラッマーベイ イントレイ

Movement EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	4			- 44		۳.	_ ≜ î≽			đ þ		
Traffic Volume (veh/h) 8	0	16	43	1	40	25	813	42	27	615	15	
Future Volume (veh/h) 8	0	16	43	1	40	25	813	42	27	615	15	
Initial Q (Qb), veh 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Parking Bus, Adj 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Work Zone On Approach	No			No			No			No		
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 9	0	17	47	1	43	27	884	46	29	668	16	
Peak Hour Factor 0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Percent Heavy Veh, % 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Cap, veh/h 92	21	111	127	18	76	606	2609	136	111	2434	58	
Arrive On Green 0.11	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	
Sat Flow, veh/h 361	200	1060	632	172	721	757	3436	179	89	3206	76	
Grp Volume(v), veh/h 26	0	0	91	0	0	27	457	473	358	0	355	
Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln1621	0	0	1526	0	0	757	1777	1838	1683	0	1688	
Q Serve(g_s), s 0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	7.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	5.8	
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 1.3	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	7.5	7.5	5.1	0.0	5.8	
Prop In Lane 0.35		0.65	0.52		0.47	1.00		0.10	0.08		0.05	
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 224	0	0	221	0	0	606	1349	1396	1321	0	1282	
V/C Ratio(X) 0.12	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.34	0.34	0.27	0.00	0.28	
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 790	0	0	781	0	0	606	1349	1396	1321	0	1282	
HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Upstream Filter(I) 1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 36.6	0.0	0.0	38.2	0.0	0.0	4.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	0.0	3.3	
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.5	
Initial Q Delay(d3), s/veh 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/In1.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.9	4.1	2.8	0.0	2.9	
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/ve	h											
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 36.8	0.0	0.0	39.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.7	0.0	3.8	
LnGrp LOS D	A	A	D	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Approach Vol, veh/h	26			91			957			713		
Approach Delay, s/veh	36.8			39.4			4.2			3.8		
Approach LOS	D			D			A			А		
Timer - Assigned Phs	2		4		6		8					
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	73.9		16.1		73.9		16.1					
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	* 5.6		6.6		* 5.6		6.6					
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	* 34		43.4		* 34		43.4					
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s	9.5		7.0		7.8		3.3					
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	15.8		0.5		12.6		0.1					
Intersection Summary												
LICNA (the Ctrl Dalay												
HCIVI OLITI Delay		6.3										

Notes

02/16/2021

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.8					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	Y			र्च	ef 👘	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	34	39	41	305	367	42
Future Vol, veh/h	34	39	41	305	367	42
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	37	42	45	332	399	46

Major/Minor	Minor2	I	Major1	Ma	ajor2		
Conflicting Flow All	844	422	445	0	-	0	
Stage 1	422	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	422	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.12	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.218	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	334	632	1115	-	-	-	
Stage 1	662	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	662	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	318	632	1115	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	318	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	630	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	662	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	15.2		1		0		

)		
HCM	105		С	

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1115	- 433	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.04	- 0.183	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.4	0 15.2	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	А	A C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	- 0.7	-	-

	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	1	Ť	۲	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲.	4Î		ሻ	A		ሻ	4Î			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	141	1096	67	172	953	102	81	356	357	96	202	57
Future Volume (veh/h)	141	1096	67	172	953	102	81	356	357	96	202	57
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	153	1191	73	187	1036	111	88	387	388	104	220	62
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	151	731	45	80	1356	145	321	400	401	60	111	23
Arrive On Green	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
Sat Flow, veh/h	490	1744	107	439	3238	347	1097	857	859	20	239	49
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	153	0	1264	187	568	579	88	0	775	386	0	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	490	0	1851	439	1777	1808	1097	0	1716	308	0	0
Q Serve(q_s), s	13.1	0.0	37.7	0.0	24.6	24.6	0.0	0.0	39.5	2.5	0.0	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(q_c), s	37.7	0.0	37.7	37.7	24.6	24.6	9.8	0.0	39.5	42.0	0.0	0.0
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.19	1.00		0.50	0.27		0.16
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	151	0	775	80	744	757	321	0	801	195	0	0
V/C Ratio(X)	1.01	0.00	1.63	2.34	0.76	0.76	0.27	0.00	0.97	1.98	0.00	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	151	0	775	80	744	757	321	0	801	195	0	0
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	41.9	0.0	26.2	45.0	22.3	22.4	15.4	0.0	23.3	22.7	0.0	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	76.3	0.0	289.4	638.9	7.3	7.2	2.1	0.0	24.9	460.7	0.0	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(95%),veh/ln	10.8	0.0	120.6	28.7	16.7	17.0	2.3	0.0	27.7	48.0	0.0	0.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	118.3	0.0	315.6	683.9	29.6	29.6	17.5	0.0	48.2	483.4	0.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS	F	А	F	F	С	С	В	А	D	F	А	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		1417			1334			863			386	
Approach Delay, s/veh		294.3			121.3			45.1			483.4	
Approach LOS		F			F			D			F	
Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4		6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		42.8		47.2		42.8		47.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		5.1		* 5.2		5.1		* 5.2				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		37.7		* 42		37.7		* 42				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s		39.7		44.0		39.7		41.5				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.3				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			201.1									
HCM 6th LOS			F									

Notes

APPENDIX C – NOISE MODELING RESULTS



DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

AMBIENT NOISE MEASUREMENTS





DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

Figure 1 Noise Monitoring Locations

#1 6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S018_BIJ050019_02062021_122422
Start Time	6/2/2021 10:11:43 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 10:26:
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Value</u>	Description	Meter	Value
Leq	1	62.2 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	С
Response	2	FAST			

Statistics Table

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
58:	0.00	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.29	0.26	0.22	0.26	0.29	0.30	2.05
59:	0.34	0.38	0.48	0.67	0.73	0.63	0.76	0.82	0.93	0.73	6.46
60:	1.00	0.90	1.25	1.24	1.51	2.07	2.15	2.32	2.63	3.56	18.64
61:	4.07	3.67	3.68	2.12	3.41	3.14	3.47	3.39	2.74	2.99	32.68
62:	2.76	2.75	2.60	3.10	2.59	2.42	1.89	1.77	1.79	1.29	22.97
63:	1.41	1.44	1.38	1.25	0.94	0.80	0.87	0.90	0.65	0.50	10.14
64:	0.56	0.52	0.28	0.15	0.26	0.23	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.19	2.68
65:	0.15	0.15	0.08	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.08	0.17	1.31
66:	0.12	0.16	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.16	0.86
67:	0.16	0.10	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.94
68:	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.14	0.80
69:	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.24
70:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.09
71:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.10

72:	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04

Statistics Chart

S018_BIJ050019_02062021_122422: Statistics Chart



Exceedance Table

	0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	%7	%8	%9
0%:		68.2	67.0	65.9	65.2	64.5	64.0	63.9	63.7	63.6
10%:	63.4	63.3	63.2	63.1	63.1	63.0	62.9	62.9	62.8	62.7
20%:	62.7	62.6	62.6	62.5	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.3	62.3	62.2
30%:	62.2	62.2	62.2	62.1	62.1	62.0	62.0	62.0	61.9	61.9
40%:	61.9	61.8	61.8	61.8	61.7	61.7	61.6	61.6	61.6	61.6
50%:	61.5	61.5	61.5	61.4	61.4	61.4	61.3	61.3	61.3	61.3
60%:	61.2	61.2	61.1	61.1	61.1	61.1	61.0	61.0	61.0	60.9
70%:	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.8	60.8	60.8	60.8	60.7	60.7	60.7
80%:	60.6	60.6	60.5	60.5	60.4	60.4	60.3	60.3	60.2	60.1
90%:	60.0	59.9	59.8	59.7	59.5	59.4	59.3	59.1	58.8	58.5
100%:	58.0									

Exceedance Chart

S018_BIJ050019_02062021_122422: Exceedance Chart



Logged Data Chart

S018_BIJ050019_02062021_122422: Logged Data Chart


#2 6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S019_BIJ050019_02062021_122423
Start Time	6/2/2021 10:35:11 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 10:50:11 AM
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Value</u>	Description	<u>Meter</u>	Value
Leq	1	65.7 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	С
Response	2	FAST			

Statistics Table

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
62:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.10	0.13	0.43	0.29	0.37	1.39
63:	0.27	0.21	0.33	0.53	0.53	0.67	0.95	1.28	2.42	2.34	9.54
64:	2.34	2.61	3.11	2.14	3.69	3.30	3.16	3.13	3.38	3.83	30.68
65:	3.66	3.49	3.38	3.18	2.85	3.02	2.81	2.61	2.37	2.50	29.85
66:	2.23	2.19	2.03	2.03	1.77	1.46	1.71	1.56	1.62	1.39	17.99
67:	0.97	0.92	0.93	0.50	0.61	0.49	0.26	0.22	0.28	0.31	5.50
68:	0.31	0.17	0.27	0.14	0.13	0.21	0.18	0.12	0.12	0.15	1.79
69:	0.08	0.04	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.94
70:	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.20	0.14	0.08	0.09	1.34
71:	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.68
72:	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.23
73:	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06

Statistics Chart

S019_BIJ050019_02062021_122423: Statistics Chart



Exceedance Table

	0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	%7	%8	%9
0%:		70.8	70.1	69.2	68.4	67.9	67.5	67.3	67.1	67.0
10%:	66.9	66.8	66.7	66.7	66.6	66.6	66.5	66.4	66.4	66.3
20%:	66.3	66.2	66.2	66.1	66.1	66.0	66.0	65.9	65.9	65.8
30%:	65.8	65.8	65.7	65.7	65.6	65.6	65.6	65.5	65.5	65.4
40%:	65.4	65.4	65.3	65.3	65.3	65.2	65.2	65.2	65.1	65.1
50%:	65.1	65.1	65.0	65.0	65.0	64.9	64.9	64.9	64.9	64.8
60%:	64.8	64.8	64.8	64.7	64.7	64.7	64.6	64.6	64.6	64.5
70%:	64.5	64.5	64.4	64.4	64.4	64.4	64.3	64.3	64.3	64.2
80%:	64.2	64.2	64.1	64.1	64.1	64.0	64.0	63.9	63.9	63.9
90%:	63.8	63.8	63.7	63.7	63.6	63.6	63.5	63.3	63.1	62.7
100%:	62.3									

Exceedance Chart

S019_BIJ050019_02062021_122423: Exceedance Chart



Logged Data Chart

S019_BIJ050019_02062021_122423: Logged Data Chart



#3 6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S020_BIJ050019_02062021_122423
Start Time	6/2/2021 10:59:27 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 11:14:27 AM
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	Meter	Value	Description	Meter	Value
Leq	1	63.7 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	C
Response	2	FAST			

Statistics Table

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
49:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.17	0.02	0.13	0.40
50:	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.13	0.03	0.03	0.71
51:	0.22	0.35	0.18	0.24	0.35	0.52	0.36	0.59	0.84	0.67	4.32
52:	0.64	0.62	0.58	0.40	0.85	1.01	0.91	0.85	0.84	0.89	7.59
53:	0.84	0.59	0.52	0.60	0.79	0.55	0.66	0.63	0.73	0.73	6.64
54:	0.81	0.90	0.91	0.86	0.92	0.88	0.90	0.73	0.81	0.78	8.49
55:	0.78	0.82	0.90	0.48	0.51	0.55	0.64	0.82	0.82	0.76	7.06
56:	0.94	0.78	0.74	0.76	0.58	0.67	0.62	0.59	0.57	0.63	6.88
57:	0.58	0.48	0.52	0.51	0.63	0.64	0.56	0.63	0.57	0.48	5.59
58:	0.52	0.52	0.53	0.44	0.55	0.59	0.66	0.56	0.54	0.58	5.49
59:	0.81	0.77	0.63	0.51	0.49	0.46	0.49	0.52	0.55	0.51	5.74
60:	0.64	0.64	0.57	0.51	0.58	0.50	0.46	0.53	0.51	0.56	5.51
61:	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.38	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.45	0.43	0.52	4.74
62:	0.52	0.52	0.50	0.51	0.61	0.53	0.66	0.48	0.44	0.42	5.18

63:	0.37	0.43	0.48	0.43	0.43	0.40	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.45	4.42
64:	0.47	0.50	0.39	0.25	0.37	0.36	0.38	0.44	0.47	0.36	3.98
65:	0.36	0.35	0.36	0.43	0.31	0.35	0.32	0.34	0.37	0.31	3.51
66:	0.33	0.35	0.37	0.38	0.37	0.36	0.33	0.27	0.39	0.29	3.44
67:	0.27	0.30	0.27	0.18	0.21	0.26	0.23	0.30	0.24	0.23	2.48
68:	0.24	0.25	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.12	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.12	1.92
69:	0.12	0.12	0.17	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.17	0.23	0.21	1.53
70:	0.14	0.22	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.12	1.23
71:	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.80
72:	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.46
73:	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.60
74:	0.07	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.43
75:	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.36
76:	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.15
77:	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.15
78:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.05
79:	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.06
80:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.07

Statistics Chart

S020_BIJ050019_02062021_122423: Statistics Chart



Exceedance Table

	0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	%7	%8	%9
0%:		74.3	72.6	71.0	70.1	69.5	68.8	68.2	67.8	67.4
10%:	67.0	66.6	66.3	66.1	65.8	65.5	65.2	64.9	64.7	64.4
20%:	64.1	63.9	63.7	63.5	63.2	63.0	62.8	62.5	62.4	62.2
30%:	62.0	61.8	61.6	61.4	61.2	61.0	60.8	60.6	60.4	60.2
40%:	60.0	59.9	59.7	59.5	59.3	59.1	59.0	58.8	58.6	58.5
50%:	58.3	58.1	57.9	57.7	57.5	57.4	57.2	57.0	56.8	56.7
60%:	56.5	56.3	56.2	56.1	55.9	55.8	55.7	55.6	55.4	55.2
70%:	55.1	55.0	54.8	54.7	54.6	54.5	54.3	54.2	54.1	54.0
80%:	53.9	53.8	53.6	53.5	53.3	53.2	53.0	52.8	52.7	52.6
90%:	52.5	52.4	52.3	52.1	51.9	51.8	51.7	51.5	51.2	50.6
100%:	49.5									

Exceedance Chart

S020_BIJ050019_02062021_122423: Exceedance Chart



Logged Data Chart

S020_BIJ050019_02062021_122423: Logged Data Chart



#4

6/2/2021

Information Panel

Name	S021_BIJ050019_02062021_122424
Start Time	6/2/2021 11:21:10 AM
Stop Time	6/2/2021 11:36:10 AM
Device Name	BIJ050019
Model Type	SoundPro DL
Device Firmware Rev	R.13H
Comments	

Summary Data Panel

Description	Meter	Value	Description	Meter	Value
Leq	1	67.1 dB			
Exchange Rate	1	3 dB	Weighting	1	А
Response	1	SLOW	Bandwidth	1	OFF
Exchange Rate	2	5 dB	Weighting	2	C
Response	2	FAST			

Statistics Table

dB:	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	%
62:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.20
63:	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.32	0.36	0.44	0.77	2.79
64:	0.67	0.77	0.91	0.73	0.90	0.86	0.87	0.96	0.93	1.07	8.68
65:	0.92	1.07	1.12	1.50	1.75	2.04	1.97	1.99	2.15	2.34	16.85
66:	2.30	2.34	2.12	2.65	2.73	2.77	2.95	3.24	3.22	3.02	27.32
67:	3.57	3.45	3.44	2.38	2.82	2.20	1.90	1.76	1.72	1.65	24.89
68:	1.49	1.20	1.13	1.18	1.45	1.26	0.96	0.93	0.79	0.74	11.14
69:	0.75	0.69	0.65	0.56	0.67	0.47	0.37	0.33	0.40	0.34	5.24
70:	0.26	0.24	0.19	0.11	0.12	0.14	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.10	1.42
71:	0.14	0.15	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.73
72:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.25
73:	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.23
74:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08
75:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.07

76:	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.10
70.	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.10

Statistics Chart





Exceedance Table

	0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	%7	%8	%9
0%:		71.3	70.3	69.8	69.5	69.3	69.2	69.0	68.9	68.7
10%:	68.6	68.5	68.4	68.3	68.3	68.2	68.1	68.0	67.9	67.9
20%:	67.8	67.7	67.7	67.6	67.6	67.5	67.5	67.4	67.4	67.3
30%:	67.3	67.3	67.2	67.2	67.1	67.1	67.1	67.1	67.0	67.0
40%:	67.0	66.9	66.9	66.9	66.9	66.8	66.8	66.8	66.7	66.7
50%:	66.7	66.6	66.6	66.6	66.5	66.5	66.5	66.4	66.4	66.4
60%:	66.3	66.3	66.3	66.2	66.2	66.1	66.1	66.0	66.0	66.0
70%:	65.9	65.9	65.8	65.8	65.7	65.7	65.6	65.6	65.5	65.5
80%:	65.4	65.4	65.3	65.3	65.2	65.2	65.1	65.0	64.9	64.8
90%:	64.7	64.6	64.5	64.4	64.2	64.1	64.0	63.9	63.7	63.4
100%:	62.8									

Exceedance Chart

S021_BIJ050019_02062021_122424: Exceedance Chart



Logged Data Chart

S021_BIJ050019_02062021_122424: Logged Data Chart





DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

CONSTRUCTION NOISE CALCULATIONS

Noise emissions of industry sources

			Leve	el	Corre	ctions
Source name	Size	Reference	Day	Night	Cwall	CI CT
Construction Site	m/m ²	Lw/upit	dB(A)	dB(A)	dВ	an an
Construction Site	1910111	Lw/unit	109.7	-	-	

Receiver list

											-	
		Coord	inates	Building		Height	Li	mit	Le	vel	Cor	nflict
No.	Receiver name	X	Y	side	Floor	abv.grd.	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night
		in meter				m	dB	(A)	dB	(A)	d	В
1	Banana Bungalow Hollywood	11378333.6	3774201.06	North	GF	122.24	-	-	47.3	0.0	-	-
2	Residences - 1661-1673 Bror	11378406.3	3774136.24	North	GF	120.90	-	-	35.2	0.0	-	-
3	Residences - 1720 Bronson A	11378437.3	3774280.39	West	GF	124.61	-	-	63.5	0.0	-	-
4	Residences - 1834 Bronson A	11378441.4	3774438.90	West	GF	129.62	-	-	55.9	0.0	-	-
5	Residences - 5855 Carlton W	11378437.8	3774142.22	North	GF	120.76	-	-	47.4	0.0	-	-
6	Residences - 5919 Carlos Ave	11378362.1	3774369.75	South	GF	127.21	-	-	63.5	0.0	-	-
7	Residences - 5940 Carlos Ave	11378321.1	3774340.28	East	GF	126.01	-	-	60.3	0.0	-	-
8	The Lombardi House	11378391.2	3774287.23	North	GF	125.31	-	-	71.9	0.0	-	-

Douglas Kim & Associates LLC 808 Holly Road Belmont, CA 94002

Contribution levels of the receivers

		Le	vel
Source name		Dav	Night
		, dB	(A)
		UD	(A)
Banana Bungalow Hollywood Hotel	GF	47.3	0.0
Construction Site		47.3	-
Residences - 1661-1673 Bronson Avenue	GF	35.2	0.0
Construction Site		35.2	-
Residences - 1720 Bronson Avenue	GF	63.5	0.0
Construction Site		63.5	-
Residences - 1834 Bronson Avenue	GF	55.9	0.0
Construction Site		55.9	-
Residences - 5855 Carlton Way	GF	47.4	0.0
Construction Site		47.4	-
Residences - 5919 Carlos Avenue	GF	63.5	0.0
Construction Site		63.5	-
Residences - 5940 Carlos Avenue	GF	60.3	0.0
Construction Site		60.3	-
The Lombardi House	GF	71.9	0.0
Construction Site		71.9	-

Contribution levels of the receivers

		Le	evel
Source name		Day	Night
		dE	3(A)
Banana Bungalow Hollywood Hotel	GF	47.7	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		47.3 37.5	-
Residences - 1661-1673 Bronson Avenue	GF	37.9	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		35.2 34.6	-
Residences - 1720 Bronson Avenue	GF	63.6	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		63.5 47.2	-
Residences - 1834 Bronson Avenue	GF	57.2	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		55.9 51.2	-
Residences - 5855 Carlton Way	GF	47.9	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		47.4 38.3	-
Residences - 5919 Carlos Avenue	GF	63.6	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		63.5 47.6	-
Residences - 5940 Carlos Avenue	GF	60.4	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		60.3 43.8	-
The Lombardi House	GF	71.9	0.0
Construction Site Hollywood Central Park Construction Site		71.9 48.0	-





Construction Noise Impacts (without Mitigation)



Reference	15.24	meter
Sound Pressure Level (Lp)	75.0	dBA
Sound Power Level (Lw)	109.7	dB

Receptor	Existing Leq	Noise	New Leq	Difference Leq	Significant?
Banana Bungalow Hollywood Hostel	65.7	47.3	65.8	0.1	No
Residences - 1661-1673 Bronson Ave.	63.7	35.2	63.7	0.0	No
Residences -1720 Bronson Ave.	62.2	63.5	65.9	3.7	No
Hallmart Apartments - 1810 Bronson Ave.	65.7	55.9	66.1	0.4	No
Residences - 5855 Carlton Wy	63.7	47.4	63.8	0.1	No
Residences - 5919 Carlos Ave.	67.1	63.5	68.7	1.6	No
Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments - 5940 Carlos Ave.	67.1	60.3	67.9	0.8	No

OFF-SITE CONSTRUCTION-RELATED TRAVEL VOLUMES

Construction Phase	Worker Trips	Vendor Trips	Haul Trips	Total	% of Traffic Volumes
Demolition	10	0	9.0	19	1.0%
Grading	10	0	212.7	223	12.3%
Building Construction	115	60.0		175	9.7%
Architectural Coatings	23	0		23	1.3%
Vendor and Haul trips represent hea	avy-duty truck trips w	vith a 19.1 Passenge	er Car Equivalent	applied	



DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

OPERATIONS NOISE CALCULATIONS

Federal Transit Administration Noise Impact Assessment Spreadsheet

version: 1/29/2019

Project 1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue celver Parameters Receiver: Residences North Side of Carlos Avenu Land Use Category: 2. Residential Existing Noise (Measured or Generic Valus): 67 dBA R

	Existing Ldn: 67 dBA
	Total Project Ldn: 31 dBA
То	al Noise Exposure: 67 dBA
	Increase: 0 dB
istance	Impact?: None
istance	Impact?: None
istance Dist to N	Impact?: None to Impact Contours lod. Impact Contour (Source 1): 6 ft
listance Dist to M Dist to S	Impact?: None to Impact Contours Iod. Impact Contour (Source 1): 6 ft iev. Impact Contour

			Noise (FTA N	Impact Ianual,	Criteri Fig 4-2	a)		
85	E							
80								
75								
70	L						\sim	
65					-			
60				_				
55				_				
50	_						Moderat	e Impact
46	[-	Severe	impact
40								1
40	10 4	15 5	55	60	6	5 70	75	5 8
			Existing	Noise E:	cposure (o	IBA)		





	Number of Noise Sources:	1
Noise Source P	Parameters	Source 1
	Source Type: Specific Source	Stationary Source Parking Garage
Daytime hrs	Avg. Number of Autos/hr	7
		}
Nighttime bre	Avg Number of Autor/br	3
Nightaine nis	Avg. Kunder of Autoshi	
		}
Distance	Distance from Source to Receiver (ft)	100
Adjustments	Number of Intervening Rows of Buildings Noise Barrier?	No
		(
	÷	
		}
	l	
	Noise Barrier?	No
	Joint Track/Crossover?	No No
	Aerial Structure?	No
		2
		{
	÷	
	·····	
	Noise Barrier?	}
	1	
		}
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		}
		{
	L	
	Noise Barrier?	
	1	
	1	
		}
		}
	Noise Barrier?	
	*	
	Ş	
		{
		}
	Noise Barrier?	
	· >	

Project: 1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue **Receiver:** Residences North Side of Carlos Avenue

				Noise C	Criteria	
Source	Distance	Project Ldn	Existing Ldn	Mod. Impact	Sev. Impact	Impact?
1 Parking Garage	100 ft	30.8 dBA	67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	None
2	50 ft		67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	
3	50 ft		67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	
4	70 ft		67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	
5	ft		67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	
6	ft		67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	
Combined Sources		31 dBA	67 dBA	62 dBA	67 dBA	None



Federal Transit Administration Noise Impact Assessment Spreadsheet

version: 1/29/2019

Project: 1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue

L	Existing Ldn: 62 dBA
1	Total Project Ldn: 36 dBA
	Total Noise Exposure: 62 dBA
	Increase: 0 dB
Diet	Impact?: None
Dist	Impact?: None
Dist Dis	Impact?: None ance to Impact Contours t to Mod. Impact Contour (Source 1): 11 ft
Dist Dis Dis	Impact?: None ance to Impact Contours t to Mod. Impact Contour (Source 1): 11 ft it to Sev. Impact Contour

85 -	 						
80	 						
75	 						_
70	 				\rightarrow	_	
65	 		-				_
60	-	-		-			
55		-	-				
50						accerate im	paret -
45	 					severe Impa	a -
40 E.	 						





	number of Noise Sources:	
Noise Source P	arameters	Source 1
	Source Type:	Stationary Source
Davtime hrs	Ava, Number of Autos/hr	Parking Garage 22
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
lighttime hrs	Avg. Number of Autos/hr	8
Distance	Distance from Source to Receiver (ft)	90
Adjustments	Noise Barrier?	No
	1	
		•••••
	1	
	(
	· {	
	L	
	Noire Barrier2	No
	Joint Track/Crossover?	No
	Embedded Track? Aerial Structure?	No No
		•••••
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	+	
	Noise Barrier?	
	÷	
	·	
	}	
		•••••
	L	
	Noise Barrier?	
	1	
	<u>,</u>	
	1	
	·	
	1	
	·	
	Noise Barrier?	
	2	
	·	
	+ +	
	· ;}	
	Noire Barrier?	
	· >	

Project: 1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue **Receiver:** Residences East Side of Bronson Ave.

			Noise Criteria						
Source	Distance	Project Ldn	Existing Ldn	Mod. Impact	Sev. Impact	Impact?			
1 Parking Garage	90 ft	36.4 dBA	62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA	None			
2	50 ft		62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA				
3	50 ft		62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA				
4	70 ft		62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA				
5	ft		62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA				
6	ft		62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA				
Combined Sources		36 dBA	62 dBA	59 dBA	64 dBA	None			



Hourly Distribution of Entering and Exiting Vehicle Trips by Land Use

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual , 10th Edition

Land Use Code				221			
Setting Time Devied	Conserval Links	an /Culhumhan	Multifamily H	ousing (Mid-Rise)	Conton City	Cana	
Trie Terro	General Orba	an/Suburban	Dense Iviu	iti-Use Urban	Center City	Core	
Irip Type	Wee	каау	We	екбау	Weekda	ау	
# Data Sites	Ven	icle	Ve	enicle	Vehicle	e	
		8		4	3		
	% of 24-H	our Traffic	% of 24-	Hour Traffic	% of 24-Hour Traffic		
Time	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	
12-1 AM	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.2	2.6	0	
1-2 AM	0.3	0.2	1.3	0.1	0.4	0	
2-3 AM	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.9	
3-4 AM	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.4	0	
4-5 AM	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.4	1.8	
5-6 AM	0.6	2.7	2.3	1.6	0.4	3.1	
6-7 AM	1.5	6.5	4.1	4.1	1.8	8.0	
7-8 AM	2.8	12.1	4.2	17.7	5.3	12.0	
8-9 AM	3.5	8.8	5.1	9.2	4.8	10.2	
9-10 AM	2.9	5.7	2.5	5.6	5.7	4.9	
10-11 AM	2.7	4.7	4.4	3.8	2.2	4.9	
11-12 PM	4.5	4.5	3.1	5.7	3.9	2.7	
12-1 PM	4.8	4.6	4.7	5.2	4.4	2.7	
1-2 PM	4.1	4.8	5.3	3.7	3.9	6.7	
2-3 PM	5.8	5.0	5.9	3.3	3.9	4.9	
3-4 PM	6.7	4.9	6.2	4.4	6.1	4.0	
4-5 PM	10.6	6.2	10.0	4.7	4.8	5.8	
5-6 PM	12.6	7.7	8.7	4.1	8.3	7.6	
6-7 PM	9.3	6.6	6.7	8.6	8.8	4.0	
7-8 PM	7.8	4.8	6.7	4.4	7.9	4.4	
8-9 PM	7.0	3.3	5.1	4.3	7.0	2.2	
9-10 PM	5.5	2.2	4.6	3.1	5.3	4.9	
10-11 PM	3.6	1.9	4.4	2.8	7.0	3.1	
11-12 AM	2.0	1.1	1.9	2.8	3.5	1.3	
			Hourly Tring	Average Davtime	Avorago Nighttimo		

				Hourly Trips	Average Daytime	Average Nighttime
	12-1 AM	1.0	0.5	2		2
	1-2 AM	0.5	0.25	1		1
	2-3 AM	0.4	0.2	1		1
	3-4 AM	0.7	0.35	2		2
	4-5 AM	1.1	0.55	3		3
	5-6 AM	3.3	1.65	8		8
	6-7 AM	8.0	4	20		20
	7-8 AM	14.9	7.45	37	37	
	8-9 AM	12.3	6.15	30	30	
	9-10 AM	8.6	4.3	21	21	
	10-11 AM	7.4	3.7	18	18	
	11-12 PM	9.0	4.5	22	22	
	12-1 PM	9.4	4.7	23	23	
	1-2 PM	8.9	4.45	22	22	
	2-3 PM	10.8	5.4	27	27	
	3-4 PM	11.6	5.8	28	28	
	4-5 PM	16.8	8.4	41	41	
	5-6 PM	20.3	10.15	50	50	
	6-7 PM	15.9	7.95	39	39	
	7-8 PM	12.6	6.3	31		31
	8-9 PM	10.3	5.15	25		25
	9-10 PM	7.7	3.85	19		19
	10-11 PM	5.5	2.75	14		14
	11-12 AM	3.1	1.55	8		8
ADT				491		
					30	11

National Data & Surveying Services **Intersection Turning Movement Count**

Location: N Bronson Ave & Hollywood Blvd City: Hollywood

PEAK HR VOL : PEAK HR FACTOR :

66 0.825

296 0.881

0.917

177 0.962

0 0.000 74 0.617

199 0.829

0.955

90 0.625

0

0.000

121 0.864

732 0.855

0.899

60 0.833

٥

0.000

91 0.875

806 0.937

98 0.790

0.935

0

0.000

2810

0.964

Project ID: 18-05272-036 Control: Signalized Date: 5/15/2018 Total NS/EW Streets: N Bronson Ave N Bronson Ave Hollywood Blvd Hollywood Blvd NORTHBOUND SOUTHBOUND EASTBOUND WESTBOUND AM 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 TOTAL 371 435 507 NI NT NR NU SI ST SR SU ΕI ΕT ER EU WL 12 22 29 WT WR WU 7:00 AM 7:15 AM 7:30 AM 13 20 23 18 15 15 14 23 21 60 73 102 192 216 10 10 14 19 30 30 5 9 0 15 0 Ō 0 25 2 0 231 0 563 647 658 7:45 AM 8:00 AM 83 120 117 239 244 242 23 30 43 31 4(53 69 62 58 58 58 47 42 47 31 20 11 14 16 28 16 16 32 42 32 9 15 8 35 42 0 0 0 0 17 8 9 10 0 0 1 0 8:15 AM 8:30 AM 42 0 0 16 123 8 242 0 624 241 206 8:45 AM 9:00 AM <u>39</u> 27 <u>35</u> 46 0 21 35 41 21 0 <u>16</u> 21 103 101 10 11 639 590 43 39 30 39 30 25 19 10 9:15 AM 9:30 AM 4 11 9 31 38 48 43 42 36 31 31 31 30 38 56 47 18 25 26 11 10 10 211 196 12 15 15 21 560 564 581 0 122 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 87 117 14 12 0 0 õ 195 9:45 AM 0 ST ER WR TOTAL NL NT NR NU SL SR SU EL ET EU WL WT WU TOTAL VOLUMES : APPROACH %'s : 408 45.139 0 269 23.58% 0 136 9.44% 2655 81.59% 98 398 553 319 1208 95 6.60% 411 187 1 0.039 6739 1 0.079 10.849 44.039 27.96% 83.89% 5 75% 48.47% 12.63% TOTAL 2568 PEAK HR : 00 41 247 0.895 0 <u>0.921</u> PEAK HR VOL 81 147 0.875 0 0.000 57 0.838 463 37 163 969 139 66 39 158 0 1 1 PEAK HR FACTOR : 0.000 0.723 0.250 0.993 0.660 0.650 0.940 0.808 0.941 0.925 0.867 0.250 0.976 0.943 0.840 0.970 NORTHBOUND EASTBOUND SOUTHBOUND WESTBOUND ΡM 0 SR 13 1 NT 0 0 1 34 46 55 44 0 0 ER 0 2 WT 0 0 ET 138 183 173 NR SU WR TOTAL 598 NL 24 12 14 17 NU EU wu SL 15 17 19 WL 23 27 12 13 20 19 21 EL 37 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 60 72 71 26 19 16 166 162 168 43 0 0 19 24 22 18 20 26 31 0 641 615 35 31 0 0 0 25 18 19 15 0 0 0 186 160 209 209 36 48 36 43 69 0 19 10 0 40 160 20 632 23 19 9 191 193 214 680 690 729 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 95 73 70 21 20 17 39 33 52 10 14 23 41 34 26 12 13 0 0 0 0 5:30 PM 0 14 0 0 0 203 152 163 197 187 704 679 698 5:45 PM 6:00 PM 84 67 75 83 70 41 20 182 20 20 10 12 42 46 36 44 18 30 15 22 60 46 43 45 35 25 32 25 26 24 23 26 24 27 18 17 17 18 200 215 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6:15 PM 14 13 0 0 6:30 PM 6:45 PM 12 17 18 13 0 0 200 203 0 0 687 681 NU 0 SR 200 NT 889 NR ST 538 WL 254 WT WR WU 0 TOTAL 8034 NL 197 SL 222 SU 0 EL 373 ET ER EU 2 TOTAL VOLUMES 2154 486 197 2260 262 56.55% 30.929 0.00 23.139 56.04% 20.83% 0.00% 13.68% 79.02% 0.079 9.15% 81.41% 9.44% 0.00% APPROACH %'s 2.539 7.239 PEAK HR : 30 PM 06:30 F TOTAL

National Data & Surveying Services **Intersection Turning Movement Count**

Location: N Bronson Ave & Hollywood Blvd City: Hollywood Control: Signalized

Project ID: 18-05272-036 Date: 5/15/2018 Bikes NS/EW Streets: N Bronson Ave N Bronson Ave Hollywood Blvd Hollywood Blvd NORTHBOUND SOUTHBOUND EASTBOUND WESTBOUND AM 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 NI NT NR NU SI ST SR SU FT ER FU wi wт WR WU TOTAL 7:00 AM 7:15 AM 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7:30 AM 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 7:45 AM 8:00 AM 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 8:00 AM 8:15 AM 8:30 AM 8:45 AM 9:00 AM 9:15 AM 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 n 0 4 2 ō ŏ 0 0 0 0 0 ſ 8 5 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 Ō Ö 0 0 9:30 AM 9:45 AM 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ō 1 Ō NL 0 NT 2 NR 0 NU 0 SL 3 ST 10 SR 1 SU 0 EL 1 ET 9 ER 0 EU 0 WL 2 WT 23 WR 2 WU 0 TOTAL 53 TOTAL VOLUMES 0.009 APPROACH %'s : PEAK HR : 0.009 0.00 0.00% 10.00% 90.00% 0.00 0.00 100.009 21.43 71.43% 7.149 7.41 85.19% 7.419 0.00 TOTAL :00 AM - 09:00 A PEAK HR VOL 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 1 0 21 0.750 0.000 0.500 0 0.000 0.250 0.375 0.000 0.375 8 0.250 0.650 PEAK HR FACTOR : 0.000 0.250 0.000 0.250 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.250 0.688 0.000 0.656 NORTHBOUND SOUTHBOUND EASTBOUND WESTBOUND ΡM 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 SR 0 1 0 0 1 2 0 0 NR SU ΕT ER EU WТ WR WU TOTAL NU ST NL NT SL EL WL 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 6 4 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 n 0 0 n 0 õ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ſ 0 11 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 00 0 000 0 0 1 0 000 2 5 0 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 6:00 PM 0 14 0 0 0 2 0 5 1 0 6:15 PM 6:30 PM 6:45 PM 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5 8 3 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 04 0 0 0 4 1 0 TOTAL SR SU 0 ET 25 NT 9 NR NU SL 1 ST 8 ER EU 0 WL 0 WT WR WU NL EL 3 1 9.099 1 9.09 28 1 3.33% TOTAL VOLUMES 0 1 3 1 82 APPROACH %'s : PEAK HR : 81.829 10.00% 80.00% 10.00% 0.00% 9.68% 0.00 0.00 9.68% 80.65% 0.00% 93.33% 3.33% TOTAL PEAK HR VOL : PEAK HR FACTOR : 0 0.000 0 0.000 11 0.458 33 0 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0.00 1 0.250 0.500 0.667 0.000 0.250 0.250 0.250 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.250 0.589 0.500 0.563 0.667 0.500

National Data & Surveying Services Intersection Turning Movement Count

Location: N Bronson Ave & Hollywood Blvd City: Hollywood Project ID: 18-05272-036 Date: 5/15/2018

Pedestrians (Crosswalks)

NS/EW Streets:	N Brons	son Ave	N Brons	son Ave	Hollywo	ood Blvd	Hollywo	od Blvd	
A N A	NORT	h leg	SOUT	h leg	EAST	T LEG	WES	T LEG	
Alvi	EB	WB	EB	WB	NB	SB	NB	SB	TOTAL
7:00 AM	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	15
7:15 AM	3	1	2	2	1	3	0	2	14
7:30 AM	2	3	4	1	11	1	1	3	26
7:45 AM	2	3	8	2	1	3	5	4	28
8:00 AM	3	4	3	9	3	6	3	5	36
8:15 AM	4	5	4	6	2	4	1	3	29
8:30 AM	4	9	7	0	1	1	0	3	25
8:45 AM	5	5	5	10	3	9	3	3	43
9:00 AM	5	2	7	6	1	8	9	7	45
9:15 AM	7	8	1	4	7	7	1	3	38
9:30 AM	4	10	4	4	6	4	2	5	39
9:45 AM	10	4	10	14	0	12	4	6	60
	EB	WB	EB	WB	NB	SB	NB	SB	TOTAL
TOTAL VOLUMES :	50	56	57	61	39	59	30	46	398
APPROACH %'s :	47.17%	52.83%	48.31%	51.69%	39.80%	60.20%	39.47%	60.53%	
PEAK HR :	08:00 AM	- 09:00 AM							TOTAL
PEAK HR VOL :	16	23	19	25	9	20	7	14	133
PEAK HR FACTOR :	0.800	0.639	0.679	0.625	0.750	0.556	0.583	0.700	0 773
	0.7	750	0.7	'33	0.6	504	0.6	556	0.775

	NORT	'H LEG	SOUT	'H LEG	EAST	r leg	WEST	Г LEG	
PIVI	EB	WB	EB	WB	NB	SB	NB	SB	TOTAL
4:00 PM	4	6	3	9	4	3	7	7	43
4:15 PM	2	8	3	8	3	2	6	8	40
4:30 PM	4	10	6	7	2	2	9	5	45
4:45 PM	11	12	10	11	4	5	7	4	64
5:00 PM	10	12	7	9	4	6	8	5	61
5:15 PM	12	13	8	10	3	5	10	4	65
5:30 PM	9	15	6	13	5	9	5	14	76
5:45 PM	5	9	10	5	5	0	3	12	49
6:00 PM	11	9	2	5	6	6	8	5	52
6:15 PM	7	7	9	8	7	2	7	5	52
6:30 PM	17	12	16	9	7	5	2	6	74
6:45 PM	9	14	10	11	5	1	10	11	71
	EB	WB	EB	WB	NB	SB	NB	SB	TOTAL
TOTAL VOLUMES :	101	127	90	105	55	46	82	86	692
APPROACH %'s :	44.30%	55.70%	46.15%	53.85%	54.46%	45.54%	48.81%	51.19%	
PEAK HR :	05:30 PM	- 06:30 PM	051301994						TOTAL
PEAK HR VOL :	32	40	27	31	23	17	23	36	229
PEAK HR FACTOR :	0.727	0.667	0.675	0.596	0.821	0.472	0.719	0.643	0.752
	0.7	750	0.7	763	0.7	714	0.7	76	0.755

N Bronson Ave & Hollywood Blvd

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



TRAFFIC VOLUME ADJUSTMENTS



Bronson Avenue	e	DouglasKim+Associa	tes,LLC			
Hollywood Boul	evard					
2018						
7-8 AM						
https://navigat	ela.lacity.org/do	ot/traffic_data/m	anual counts/BR	ONSON.N.HOLL	YWOOD.180515.	MAN.pdf
NB Approach	SB Approach	EB Approach	WB Approach			
39	81	57	163			
158	247	463	969			
139	147	37	66			
336	475	557	1198			
336	475	557	1,198			
339	480	563	1,210			
343	485	568	1,222			
346	489	574	1,234	1,808		
NB Approach	SB Approach	EB Approach	WB Approach			
291	412	483	1,038	6,048,810	82.5%	
45	64	75	161	940,092	12.8%	
1	2	2	4	25,348	0.3%	
0	1	1	2	9,386	0.1%	
8	11	13	29	167,287	2.3%	
7	10	11	25	142,856	1.9%	
353	499	585	1,259	7,333,779	100.0%	
	Bronson Avenu Hollywood Boul 2018 7-8 AM https://navigat NB Approach 336 336 339 343 346 NB Approach 291 45 1 0 8 7 353	Bronson Avenue Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dd NB Approach 39 81 158 247 139 147 336 475 339 480 343 485 346 489 NB Approach 343 485 346 489 NB Approach 291 412 45 64 1 2 0 1 8 11 7 10 353 499	Bronson Avenue DouctasKint-Association Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/m NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach 39 81 57 158 247 463 139 147 37 336 475 557 339 480 563 343 485 568 346 489 574 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach 8 11 13 1 2 2 0 1 1 8 11 13 7 10 11 353 499 585	Bronson Avenue DouctasKini-Associates, LUC Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic data/manual counts/BR NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 39 81 57 163 158 247 463 969 139 147 37 66 336 475 557 1,198 339 480 563 1,210 343 485 568 1,222 346 489 574 1,234 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 11 2 2 4 1,038 45 64 75 161 1 2 2 4 0 1 1 2 8 11 13 29 7 10 11 25 353 499 585 1,259 <td>Bronson Avenue Docustion-Associates,LLC Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/manual_counts/BRONSON.N.HOLL NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 39 81 57 163 158 247 463 969 139 147 37 66 336 475 557 1,198 336 475 563 1,210 343 485 568 1,222 346 489 574 1,234 1,808 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 1,808 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 291 4,803 1 1 2 9,386 1,038 6,048,810 45 64 75 161 940,092 1 2 9,386 20 1 1 2 9,386 8 11 13 29<</td> <td>Bronson Avenue Douclaikus Association LLC Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/manual_counts/BRONSON.N.HOLLYWOOD.180515. NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 39 81 57 163 158 247 463 969 139 147 37 66 336 475 557 1198 336 475 563 1,210 343 485 568 1,222 346 489 574 1,234 1,808 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 82.5% 45 64 75 161 940,092 12.8% 1 2 2 4 25,348 0.3% 0 1 1 2 9,386 0.1% 45 64 75 161 940,092 12.8% 1 2 2 4 25,348</td>	Bronson Avenue Docustion-Associates,LLC Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/manual_counts/BRONSON.N.HOLL NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 39 81 57 163 158 247 463 969 139 147 37 66 336 475 557 1,198 336 475 563 1,210 343 485 568 1,222 346 489 574 1,234 1,808 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 1,808 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 291 4,803 1 1 2 9,386 1,038 6,048,810 45 64 75 161 940,092 1 2 9,386 20 1 1 2 9,386 8 11 13 29<	Bronson Avenue Douclaikus Association LLC Hollywood Boulevard 2018 7-8 AM https://navigatela.lacity.org/dot/traffic_data/manual_counts/BRONSON.N.HOLLYWOOD.180515. NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 39 81 57 163 158 247 463 969 139 147 37 66 336 475 557 1198 336 475 563 1,210 343 485 568 1,222 346 489 574 1,234 1,808 NB Approach SB Approach EB Approach WB Approach 82.5% 45 64 75 161 940,092 12.8% 1 2 2 4 25,348 0.3% 0 1 1 2 9,386 0.1% 45 64 75 161 940,092 12.8% 1 2 2 4 25,348



DouglasKim+Associates,LLC

CUMULATIVE CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS

Noise emissions of industry sources

				ual .	Corrections		
Source name	Size	Reference	Dav	/ei Niaht	Con		СТ
	m/m²		dB(Å)	dB(A)	dB	dB	dB
1725 Bronson Avenue Construction Site	1918 m² 24753 m²	Lw/unit	109.7 109.7	-	-	-	-
	21100111	Linjanit	100.1				

Douglas Kim & Associates LLC 808 Holly Road Belmont, CA 94002

Receiver list

											-	
		Coord	inates	Building		Height	Li	mit	Le	vel	Cor	iflict
No.	Receiver name	X	Y	side	Floor	abv.grd.	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night
		in m	eter			m	dB	(A)	dB	(A)	d	В
1	Banana Bungalow Hollywood	11378333.6	3774201.06	North	GF	122.24	-	-	47.7	0.0	-	-
2	Residences - 1661-1673 Bron	11378406.3	3774136.24	North	GF	120.90	-	-	37.9	0.0	-	-
3	Residences - 1720 Bronson A	11378437.3	3774280.39	West	GF	124.61	-	-	63.6	0.0	-	-
4	Residences - 1834 Bronson A	11378441.4	3774438.90	West	GF	129.62	-	-	57.2	0.0	-	-
5	Residences - 5855 Carlton W	11378437.8	3774142.22	North	GF	120.76	-	-	47.9	0.0	-	-
6	Residences - 5919 Carlos Ave	11378362.1	3774369.75	South	GF	127.21	-	-	63.6	0.0	-	-
7	Residences - 5940 Carlos Ave	11378321.1	3774340.28	East	GF	126.01	-	-	60.4	0.0	-	-
8	The Lombardi House	11378391.2	3774287.23	North	GF	125.31	-	-	71.9	0.0	-	-

Douglas Kim & Associates LLC 808 Holly Road Belmont, CA 94002




Cumulative Construction Noise Impacts (without Mitigation)



Reference	15.24	meter
Sound Pressure Level (Lp)	75.0	dBA
Sound Power Level (Lw)	109.7	dB

Receptor	Existing Leq	Noise	New Leq	Difference Leq	Significant?
Banana Bungalow Hollywood Hostel	65.7	47.7	65.8	0.1	No
Residences - 1661-1673 Bronson Ave.	63.7	37.9	63.7	0.0	No
Residences -1720 Bronson Ave.	62.2	63.6	66.0	3.8	No
Hallmart Apartments - 1810 Bronson Ave.	65.7	57.2	66.3	0.6	No
Residences - 5855 Carlton Wy	63.7	47.9	63.8	0.1	No
Residences - 5919 Carlos Ave.	67.1	63.6	68.7	1.6	No
Hollywood Silvercrest Apartments - 5940 Carlos Ave.	67.1	60.4	67.9	0.8	No

Note: Sound Power Level (Lw) assumes full sphere propagation



FUTURE EMISSIONS

Page 1 of 1

1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue Future - Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer

1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue Future

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Apartments High Rise	128.00	Dwelling Unit	0.86	234,745.00	299
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	134.00	Space	0.00	53,600.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Days)	33
Climate Zone	11			Operational Year	2024
Utility Company	Los Angeles Department of W	ater & Power			
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	1227.89	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity ((Ib/MWhr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

- Project Characteristics -
- Land Use Developer information

Construction Phase - Developer information

Grading - Developer information

Vehicle Trips - Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc. Transportation Assessment for the Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower Projet; May 2021

Woodstoves - Conservatively assumes fireplaces for units and/or common spaces

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Assumes SCAQMD Rule 403 control efficiencies

Demolition - Assumes 20,426 sq ft of asphalt/concrete removed (souce: project survey, assumes parcesl 5545-003-014 and 5545-003-023) @ 6" depth= 583

Trips and VMT - Assumes 14 CY per haul truck, 30-mile one-way distance to landfill

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	CleanPavedRoadPercentReduction	0	46
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	217.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	478.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	21.00
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	108.80	128.00
tblFireplaces	NumberNoFireplace	12.80	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	6.40	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	1.60
tblGrading	MaterialExported	0.00	12,000.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	128,000.00	234,745.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	2.06	0.86
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	1.21	0.00
tblLandUse	Population	366.00	299.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripLength	20.00	30.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripLength	20.00	30.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	1,500.00	1,715.00
tblVehicleTrips	HO_TL	8.70	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HO_TTP	40.60	41.00
tblVehicleTrips	HS_TL	5.90	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HS_TTP	19.20	19.00
tblVehicleTrips	HW_TL	14.70	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HW_TTP	40.20	40.00
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	4.98	3.84
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	4.20	3.84
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	6.40	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	6.40	0.00

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
2022	1.6607	33.2806	15.0132	0.1031	3.1512	0.4248	3.5760	1.0488	0.4060	1.4549	0.0000	11,041.076 5	11,041.076 5	0.8481	0.0000	11,062.278 5
2023	1.1124	8.2368	11.5096	0.0290	1.4263	0.3318	1.7581	0.3815	0.3053	0.6868	0.0000	2,902.4595	2,902.4595	0.4192	0.0000	2,912.9390
2024	8.1511	9.0311	13.7428	0.0340	1.6834	0.3566	2.0400	0.4496	0.3330	0.7827	0.0000	3,380.1076	3,380.1076	0.4379	0.0000	3,391.0548
Maximum	8.1511	33.2806	15.0132	0.1031	3.1512	0.4248	3.5760	1.0488	0.4060	1.4549	0.0000	11,041.076 5	11,041.076 5	0.8481	0.0000	11,062.278 5

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/c	lay				•		•	lb/c	lay		
2022	1.6607	33.2806	15.0132	0.1031	1.7960	0.4248	2.2209	0.5828	0.4060	0.9889	0.0000	11,041.076 5	11,041.076 5	0.8481	0.0000	11,062.278 5
2023	1.1124	8.2368	11.5096	0.0290	0.8661	0.3318	1.1979	0.2439	0.3053	0.5493	0.0000	2,902.4595	2,902.4595	0.4192	0.0000	2,912.9390
2024	8.1511	9.0311	13.7428	0.0340	1.0203	0.3566	1.3770	0.2869	0.3330	0.6199	0.0000	3,380.1076	3,380.1076	0.4379	0.0000	3,391.0548
Maximum	8.1511	33.2806	15.0132	0.1031	1.7960	0.4248	2.2209	0.5828	0.4060	0.9889	0.0000	11,041.076 5	11,041.076 5	0.8481	0.0000	11,062.278 5
	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e

Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.18	0.00	34.97	40.76	0.00	26.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Area	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980
Energy	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e- 003		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e- 003	6.9700e- 003	382.5235
Mobile	0.6273	2.5737	6.8407	0.0256	2.1281	0.0192	2.1474	0.5695	0.0179	0.5873		2,610.1540	2,610.1540	0.1265		2,613.3166
Total	6.3028	5.1166	18.4404	0.0416	2.1281	0.2735	2.4017	0.5695	0.2722	0.8416	0.0000	5,720.0500	5,720.0500	0.2041	0.0567	5,742.0380

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/e	lay		
Area	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980
Energy	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e- 003		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e- 003	6.9700e- 003	382.5235
Mobile	0.6273	2.5737	6.8407	0.0256	2.1281	0.0192	2.1474	0.5695	0.0179	0.5873		2,610.1540	2,610.1540	0.1265		2,613.3166
Total	6.3028	5.1166	18.4404	0.0416	2.1281	0.2735	2.4017	0.5695	0.2722	0.8416	0.0000	5,720.0500	5,720.0500	0.2041	0.0567	5,742.0380
	ROG		NOx	CO S	O2 Fug PI	jitive Ex M10 P	haust PM1 M10	0 Total Fu P	gitive Ex M2.5 P	haust PM M2.5 To	2.5 Bio- tal	CO2 NBio	o-CO2 Total	CO2 CI	14 N2	20 CO26

Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days	Num Days	Phase Description
Number					Week		
1	Grading	Grading	1/3/2022	1/31/2022	5	21	
2	Demolition	Demolition	12/1/2022	12/30/2022	5	22	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	2/1/2023	11/29/2024	5	478	
4	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	2/1/2024	11/29/2024	5	217	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 1.6

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 475,359; Residential Outdoor: 158,453; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 3,216

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Grading	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Building Construction	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	1.00	247	0.40
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	1.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	4	10.00	0.00	69.00	14.70	6.90	30.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	4	10.00	0.00	1,715.00	14.70	6.90	30.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	5	115.00	22.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	23.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Replace Ground Cover

Water Exposed Area

Clean Paved Roads

3.2 Grading - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
		1	<u> </u>		FINITO	FIVITO		F 1V12.5	F IVIZ.J							
Category					lb/d	lay							lb/d	ay		
Fugitive Dust				,	0.8982	0.0000	0.8982	0.4323	0.0000	0.4323			0.0000			0.0000
																ļ
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.8982	0.3375	1.2357	0.4323	0.3225	0.7548		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119	· · · · ·	1,153.2001
1 1				1 '	1 '							ľ			ľ	ſ

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		

Hauling	0.9112	26.8401	7.1723	0.0900	2.1412	0.0864	2.2276	0.5869	0.0827	0.6696	9,783.3028	9,783.3028	0.6331	9,799.1314
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0402	0.0266	0.3716	1.1000e- 003	0.1118	8.7000e- 004	0.1127	0.0296	8.1000e- 004	0.0305	109.8712	109.8712	3.0300e- 003	109.9470
Total	0.9513	26.8668	7.5439	0.0911	2.2530	0.0873	2.3403	0.6165	0.0835	0.7000	9,893.1740	9,893.1740	0.6362	9,909.0784

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Fugitive Dust					0.3328	0.0000	0.3328	0.1602	0.0000	0.1602			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.3328	0.3375	0.6703	0.1602	0.3225	0.4827	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.9112	26.8401	7.1723	0.0900	1.3962	0.0864	1.4826	0.4040	0.0827	0.4867		9,783.3028	9,783.3028	0.6331		9,799.1314
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0402	0.0266	0.3716	1.1000e- 003	0.0671	8.7000e- 004	0.0680	0.0187	8.1000e- 004	0.0195		109.8712	109.8712	3.0300e- 003		109.9470
Total	0.9513	26.8668	7.5439	0.0911	1.4633	0.0873	1.5506	0.4227	0.0835	0.5062		9,893.1740	9,893.1740	0.6362		9,909.0784

3.3 Demolition - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					Ib/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Fugitive Dust					0.6809	0.0000	0.6809	0.1031	0.0000	0.1031			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.6809	0.3375	1.0184	0.1031	0.3225	0.4256		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	ay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0350	1.0308	0.2755	3.4600e- 003	0.0822	3.3200e- 003	0.0856	0.0225	3.1800e- 003	0.0257		375.7224	375.7224	0.0243		376.3303
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0402	0.0266	0.3716	1.1000e- 003	0.1118	8.7000e- 004	0.1127	0.0296	8.1000e- 004	0.0305		109.8712	109.8712	3.0300e- 003		109.9470
Total	0.0751	1.0574	0.6471	4.5600e- 003	0.1940	4.1900e- 003	0.1982	0.0522	3.9900e- 003	0.0562		485.5936	485.5936	0.0274		486.2773

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Fugitive Dust					0.2523	0.0000	0.2523	0.0382	0.0000	0.0382			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.2523	0.3375	0.5898	0.0382	0.3225	0.3607	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0350	1.0308	0.2755	3.4600e-	0.0536	3.3200e-	0.0569	0.0155	3.1800e-	0.0187		375.7224	375.7224	0.0243		376.3303
				003	<u>.</u>	003			003							
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
					:											
Worker	0.0402	0.0266	0.3716	1.1000e-	0.0671	8.7000e-	0.0680	0.0187	8.1000e-	0.0195		109.8712	109.8712	3.0300e-		109.9470
				003		004			004					003		
Total	0.0751	1.0574	0.6471	4.5600e-	0.1207	4.1900e-	0.1249	0.0342	3.9900e-	0.0382		485.5936	485.5936	0.0274		486.2773
i I	l I			003	1 '	003			003							

3.4 Building Construction - 2023

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114		0.3203	0.3203		0.2946	0.2946		1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573		1,113.5402

Total	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114	0.3203	0.3203	0.2946	0.2946	1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573	1,113.5402

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	ау		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0466	1.5413	0.4771	5.4200e- 003	0.1409	1.7800e- 003	0.1426	0.0406	1.7000e- 003	0.0423		580.5963	580.5963	0.0305		581.3585
Worker	0.4336	0.2769	3.9355	0.0122	1.2854	9.7800e- 003	1.2952	0.3409	9.0000e- 003	0.3499		1,217.2543	1,217.2543	0.0314		1,218.0404
Total	0.4802	1.8182	4.4126	0.0176	1.4263	0.0116	1.4378	0.3815	0.0107	0.3922		1,797.8506	1,797.8506	0.0619		1,799.3988

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ау							Ib/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114		0.3203	0.3203		0.2946	0.2946	0.0000	1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573		1,113.5402
Total	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114		0.3203	0.3203		0.2946	0.2946	0.0000	1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573		1,113.5402

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0466	1.5413	0.4771	5.4200e- 003	0.0947	1.7800e- 003	0.0965	0.0292	1.7000e- 003	0.0309		580.5963	580.5963	0.0305		581.3585
Worker	0.4336	0.2769	3.9355	0.0122	0.7714	9.7800e- 003	0.7812	0.2147	9.0000e- 003	0.2237		1,217.2543	1,217.2543	0.0314		1,218.0404
Total	0.4802	1.8182	4.4126	0.0176	0.8661	0.0116	0.8776	0.2439	0.0107	0.2547		1,797.8506	1,797.8506	0.0619		1,799.3988

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598		1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177
Total	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598		1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		

Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0454	1.5354	0.4626	5.3900e- 003	0.1409	1.7600e- 003	0.1426	0.0406	1.6800e- 003	0.0422	578.2402	578.2402	0.0301	578.9914
Worker	0.4102	0.2525	3.6688	0.0118	1.2854	9.6300e- 003	1.2951	0.3409	8.8700e- 003	0.3498	1,179.5300	1,179.5300	0.0289	1,180.2512
Total	0.4556	1.7879	4.1314	0.0172	1.4263	0.0114	1.4377	0.3815	0.0106	0.3920	1,757.7702	1,757.7702	0.0589	1,759.2426

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598	0.0000	1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177
Total	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598	0.0000	1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	ay							lb/d	ау		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0454	1.5354	0.4626	5.3900e- 003	0.0947	1.7600e- 003	0.0965	0.0292	1.6800e- 003	0.0309		578.2402	578.2402	0.0301		578.9914
Worker	0.4102	0.2525	3.6688	0.0118	0.7714	9.6300e- 003	0.7810	0.2147	8.8700e- 003	0.2236		1,179.5300	1,179.5300	0.0289		1,180.2512
Total	0.4556	1.7879	4.1314	0.0172	0.8661	0.0114	0.8775	0.2440	0.0106	0.2545		1,757.7702	1,757.7702	0.0589		1,759.2426

3.5 Architectural Coating - 2024 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Archit. Coating	6.8376					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1808	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609		281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443
Total	7.0184	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609		281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0820	0.0505	0.7338	2.3700e- 003	0.2571	1.9300e- 003	0.2590	0.0682	1.7700e- 003	0.0700		235.9060	235.9060	5.7700e- 003		236.0502
Total	0.0820	0.0505	0.7338	2.3700e- 003	0.2571	1.9300e- 003	0.2590	0.0682	1.7700e- 003	0.0700		235.9060	235.9060	5.7700e- 003		236.0502

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Archit. Coating	6.8376					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1808	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443
Total	7.0184	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2 5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
								1 1112-12								
Category					lb/d	ау							lb/d	ау		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0820	0.0505	0.7338	2.3700e-	0.1543	1.9300e-	0.1562	0.0429	1.7700e-	0.0447		235.9060	235.9060	5.7700e-		236.0502
				003		003			003					003		
Total	0.0820	0.0505	0.7338	2.3700e-	0.1543	1.9300e-	0.1562	0.0429	1.7700e-	0.0447		235.9060	235.9060	5.7700e-		236.0502
				003		003			003					003		
4							1 6									

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
				PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							

Category					lb/c	lay						Ib/d	ay	
Mitigated	0.6273	2.5737	6.8407	0.0256	2.1281	0.0192	0.5873	2,610.1540	2,610.1540	0.1265	2,613.3166			
Unmitigated	0.6273	2.5737	6.8407	0.0256	2.1281	0.0192	2.1474	0.5695	0.0179	0.5873	2,610.1540	2,610.1540	0.1265	2,613.3166

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Ave	rage Daily Trip R	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Apartments High Rise	491.52	491.52	467.20	993,811	993,811
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	491.52	491.52	467.20	993,811	993,811

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Apartments High Rise	6.30	6.30	6.30	40.00	19.00	41.00	86	11	3
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Apartments High Rise	0.545348	0.044620	0.206559	0.118451	0.015002	0.006253	0.020617	0.031756	0.002560	0.002071	0.005217	0.000696	0.000850
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0.545348	0.044620	0.206559	0.118451	0.015002	0.006253	0.020617	0.031756	0.002560	0.002071	0.005217	0.000696	0.000850

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	lay		
NaturalGas	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Mitigated				003										003	003	
NaturalGas	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Unmitigated				003										003	003	

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	NaturalGas	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	Use					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/c	lay							lb/o	lay		
Apartments High	3232.24	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Rise					003										003	003	
Enclosed Parking	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator																	
Total		0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
					003										003	003	

Mitigated

	NaturalGas	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	Use					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/o	day				lb/c	lay					
Apartments High	3.23224	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Rise					003										003	003	

Enclosed Parking	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator														
Total		0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-	0.0241	0.0241	0.0241	0.0241	380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
					003							003	003	

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Mitigated	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980
Unmitigated	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980

6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Architectural	0.4065				1	0.0000	0.0000	1	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Coating		:	<u>;</u>	;	:	<u>.</u>	;	:	<u>.</u>		;	;		į		<u> </u>
Consumer	4.6669	:		;	:	0.0000	0.0000	:	0.0000	0.0000	:		0.0000			0.0000
Products			<u>i</u>	<u>.</u>			[1								<u> </u>
Hearth	0.2485	2.1233	0.9035	0.0136		0.1717	0.1717		0.1717	0.1717	0.0000	2,710.5882	2,710.5882	0.0520	0.0497	2,726.6959

Landscaping	0.3187	0.1217	10.5694	5.6000e-	0.0586	0.0586	0.0586	0.0586		19.0440	19.0440	0.0183		19.5021
				004										
Total	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141	0.2302	0.2302	0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Architectural Coating	0.4065					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	4.6669					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	0.2485	2.1233	0.9035	0.0136		0.1717	0.1717		0.1717	0.1717	0.0000	2,710.5882	2,710.5882	0.0520	0.0497	2,726.6959
Landscaping	0.3187	0.1217	10.5694	5.6000e- 004		0.0586	0.0586		0.0586	0.0586		19.0440	19.0440	0.0183		19.5021
Total	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
<u>Boilers</u>						
Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type	
User Defined Equipment						
Equipment Type	Number					
11.0 Vegetation		-				

Page 1 of 1

1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue Future - Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue Future

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Apartments High Rise	128.00	Dwelling Unit	0.86	234,745.00	299
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	134.00	Space	0.00	53,600.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Days)	33
Climate Zone	11			Operational Year	2024
Utility Company	Los Angeles Department of W	ater & Power			
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	1227.89	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity ((Ib/MWhr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

- Project Characteristics -
- Land Use Developer information

Construction Phase - Developer information

Grading - Developer information

Vehicle Trips - Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc. Transportation Assessment for the Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower Projet; May 2021

Woodstoves - Conservatively assumes fireplaces for units and/or common spaces

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Assumes SCAQMD Rule 403 control efficiencies

Demolition - Assumes 20,426 sq ft of asphalt/concrete removed (souce: project survey, assumes parcesl 5545-003-014 and 5545-003-023) @ 6" depth= 583

Trips and VMT - Assumes 14 CY per haul truck, 30-mile one-way distance to landfill

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	CleanPavedRoadPercentReduction	0	46
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	217.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	478.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	21.00
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	108.80	128.00
tblFireplaces	NumberNoFireplace	12.80	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	6.40	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	1.60
tblGrading	MaterialExported	0.00	12,000.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	128,000.00	234,745.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	2.06	0.86
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	1.21	0.00
tblLandUse	Population	366.00	299.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripLength	20.00	30.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripLength	20.00	30.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	1,500.00	1,715.00
tblVehicleTrips	HO_TL	8.70	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HO_TTP	40.60	41.00
tblVehicleTrips	HS_TL	5.90	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HS_TTP	19.20	19.00
tblVehicleTrips	HW_TL	14.70	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HW_TTP	40.20	40.00
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	4.98	3.84
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	4.20	3.84
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	6.40	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	6.40	0.00

2.0	Em	iss	ions	Summary	1
-----	----	-----	------	---------	---

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					tons	s/yr							MT	yr		
2022	0.0261	0.4427	0.2477	1.2600e- 003	0.0423	8.2200e- 003	0.0505	0.0126	7.8600e- 003	0.0205	0.0000	120.8835	120.8835	0.0105	0.0000	121.1467
2023	0.1328	0.9867	1.3425	3.3900e- 003	0.1665	0.0395	0.2059	0.0446	0.0363	0.0809	0.0000	307.0094	307.0094	0.0452	0.0000	308.1390
2024	0.8970	1.0761	1.5888	3.9400e- 003	0.1952	0.0421	0.2373	0.0522	0.0393	0.0915	0.0000	355.3791	355.3791	0.0474	0.0000	356.5629
Maximum	0.8970	1.0761	1.5888	3.9400e- 003	0.1952	0.0421	0.2373	0.0522	0.0393	0.0915	0.0000	355.3791	355.3791	0.0474	0.0000	356.5629

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
2022	0.0261	0.4427	0.2477	1.2600e- 003	0.0227	8.2200e- 003	0.0309	6.8600e- 003	7.8600e- 003	0.0147	0.0000	120.8834	120.8834	0.0105	0.0000	121.1467
2023	0.1328	0.9867	1.3425	3.3900e- 003	0.1013	0.0395	0.1408	0.0286	0.0363	0.0649	0.0000	307.0093	307.0093	0.0452	0.0000	308.1388
2024	0.8970	1.0761	1.5888	3.9400e- 003	0.1186	0.0421	0.1607	0.0334	0.0393	0.0727	0.0000	355.3789	355.3789	0.0474	0.0000	356.5627
Maximum	0.8970	1.0761	1.5888	3.9400e- 003	0.1186	0.0421	0.1607	0.0334	0.0393	0.0727	0.0000	355.3789	355.3789	0.0474	0.0000	356.5627
	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e

Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.94	0.00	32.68	37.06	0.00	21.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Quarter	S	tart Date	En	d Date	Maxir	num Unmitig	gated ROG +	NOX (tons/q	uarter)	Max	ximum Mitig	ated ROG + N	IOX (tons/qu	arter)	1			
1	12	2-1-2021	2-2	8-2022			0.3672					0.3672			1			
5	12	2-1-2022	2-2	8-2023			0.1830					0.1830						
6	3	-1-2023	5-3	1-2023			0.3080					0.3080						
7	6	-1-2023	8-3	1-2023			0.3072					0.3072						
8	9	-1-2023	11-3	30-2023	-2023 0.3055							0.3055						
9	1:	2-1-2023	2-2	9-2024			0.3816					0.3816						
10	3	-1-2024	5-3	5-31-2024			0.5655			0.5655								
11	6	-1-2024	8-3	1-2024	24 0.5646					0.5646								
12	9	-1-2024	9-3	0-2024	0.1841					0.1841								
			Hi	ghest 0.5655 0.5655								1						

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT/	/yr		
Area	0.9688	0.0418	1.3325	2.4000e-		9.4700e-	9.4700e-		9.4700e-	9.4700e-	0.0000	32.8971	32.8971	2.6700e-	5.6000e-	33.1317
				004		003	003		003	003				003	004	
Energy	6.3600e-	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-	0.0000	520.2147	520.2147	0.0120	3.3900e-	521.5246
	003			004		003	003		003	003					003	
Mobile	0.1064	0.4791	1.2062	4.4600e-	0.3772	3.4800e-	0.3806	0.1011	3.2300e-	0.1043	0.0000	413.1124	413.1124	0.0207	0.0000	413.6304
				003		003			003	•						
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	11.9521	0.0000	11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	2.6458	93.0147	95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e-	104.5568
															003	
Total	1.0816	0.5753	2.5618	5.0500e-	0.3772	0.0174	0.3945	0.1011	0.0171	0.1182	14.5979	1,059.2390	1,073.8369	1.0157	0.0108	1,102.4543
				003												

	ROG	NOx	(co	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaus PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	e Exha PM2	ust P 2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- C	O2 NBio	o- CO2	Total CO2	2 Cł	-14	N2O	CO2e	9
Category						t	ons/yr									N	1T/yr				
Area	0.9688	0.041	8 1.3	325	2.4000e- 004		9.4700e 003	- 9.4700e- 003		9.470 00	00e- 3	9.4700e- 003	0.000	0 32.	8971	32.8971	2.67 00	00e-)3	5.6000e- 004	33.131	17
Energy	6.3600e- 003	0.0544	4 0.0	231	3.5000e- 004		4.4000e 003	- 4.4000e- 003		4.400 00	00e- 3	4.4000e- 003	0.000	0 520	.2147	520.2147	0.0	120	3.3900e- 003	521.52	:46
Mobile	0.1064	0.479	1 1.2	062	4.4600e- 003	0.3772	3.4800e 003	- 0.3806	0.1011	3.230 00	00e- 3	0.1043	0.000	0 413	.1124	413.1124	0.0	207	0.0000	413.63	04
Waste							0.0000	0.0000		0.00	000	0.0000	11.95	21 0.(0000	11.9521	0.7	064	0.0000	29.610	38
Water							0.0000	0.0000		0.00	000	0.0000	2.645	8 93.	0147	95.6606	0.2	740	6.8700e- 003	104.55	68
Total	1.0816	0.5753	3 2.5	618	5.0500e- 003	0.3772	0.0174	0.3945	0.1011	0.01	71	0.1182	14.59	79 1,05	9.2390	1,073.836	9 1.0	157	0.0108	1,102.4	543
	ROG		NOx	C	0 S	O2 F	ugitive E PM10	xhaust Pl PM10 T	VI10 F otal I	ugitive PM2.5	Exhau PM2.	ust PM2 .5 Tot	2.5 E tal	Bio- CO2	NBio-	CO2 Tota	al CO2	CH4	l N	20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00		0.00	0.0	0 0	.00	0.00	0.00 0	.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	00	0.00	0.0	0 0	.00	0.00) 0.	00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days	Num Days	Phase Description
Number					Week		
1	Grading	Grading	1/3/2022	1/31/2022	5	21	
2	Demolition	Demolition	12/1/2022	12/30/2022	5	22	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	2/1/2023	11/29/2024	5	478	
4	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	2/1/2024	11/29/2024	5	217	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 1.6

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 475,359; Residential Outdoor: 158,453; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 3,216

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Grading	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Building Construction	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	1.00	247	0.40
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	1.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	4	10.00	0.00	69.00	14.70	6.90	30.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	4	10.00	0.00	1,715.00	14.70	6.90	30.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	5	115.00	22.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	23.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Replace Ground Cover

Water Exposed Area

Clean Paved Roads

3.2 Grading - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					9.4300e- 003	0.0000	9.4300e- 003	4.5400e- 003	0.0000	4.5400e- 003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	7.4500e- 003	0.0674	0.0784	1.3000e- 004		3.5400e- 003	3.5400e- 003		3.3900e- 003	3.3900e- 003	0.0000	10.9343	10.9343	2.0200e- 003	0.0000	10.9847
Total	7.4500e- 003	0.0674	0.0784	1.3000e- 004	9.4300e- 003	3.5400e- 003	0.0130	4.5400e- 003	3.3900e- 003	7.9300e- 003	0.0000	10.9343	10.9343	2.0200e- 003	0.0000	10.9847

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	9.6400e-	0.2924	0.0765	9.4000e-	0.0221	9.1000e-	0.0230	6.0700e-	8.7000e-	6.9400e-	0.0000	92.7127	92.7127	6.1000e-	0.0000	92.8650
	003			004		004		003	004	003				003		
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.2000e-	3.2000e-	3.6600e-	1.0000e-	1.1500e-	1.0000e-	1.1600e-	3.1000e-	1.0000e-	3.1000e-	0.0000	1.0019	1.0019	3.0000e-	0.0000	1.0026
	004	004	003	005	003	005	003	004	005	004				005		
Total	0.0101	0.2927	0.0802	9.5000e-	0.0233	9.2000e-	0.0242	6.3800e-	8.8000e-	7.2500e-	0.0000	93.7145	93.7145	6.1300e-	0.0000	93.8676
				004		004		003	004	003				003		

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		

Fugitive Dust					3.4900e-	0.0000	3.4900e-	1.6800e-	0.0000	1.6800e-	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
					003		003	003		003						
Off-Road	7.4500e-	0.0674	0.0784	1.3000e-		3.5400e-	3.5400e-		3.3900e-	3.3900e-	0.0000	10.9343	10.9343	2.0200e-	0.0000	10.9847
	003			004		003	003		003	003				003		
Total	7.4500e-	0.0674	0.0784	1.3000e-	3.4900e-	3.5400e-	7.0300e-	1.6800e-	3.3900e-	5.0700e-	0.0000	10.9343	10.9343	2.0200e-	0.0000	10.9847
	003			004	003	003	003	003	003	003				003		

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	\$/yr							MT/	/yr		
Hauling	9.6400e- 003	0.2924	0.0765	9.4000e- 004	0.0145	9.1000e- 004	0.0154	4.1900e- 003	8.7000e- 004	5.0600e- 003	0.0000	92.7127	92.7127	6.1000e- 003	0.0000	92.8650
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.2000e- 004	3.2000e- 004	3.6600e- 003	1.0000e- 005	6.9000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	7.0000e- 004	1.9000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 004	0.0000	1.0019	1.0019	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.0026
Total	0.0101	0.2927	0.0802	9.5000e- 004	0.0151	9.2000e- 004	0.0161	4.3800e- 003	8.8000e- 004	5.2600e- 003	0.0000	93.7145	93.7145	6.1300e- 003	0.0000	93.8676

3.3 Demolition - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					7.4900e- 003	0.0000	7.4900e- 003	1.1300e- 003	0.0000	1.1300e- 003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	7.8000e- 003	0.0706	0.0822	1.3000e- 004		3.7100e- 003	3.7100e- 003		3.5500e- 003	3.5500e- 003	0.0000	11.4550	11.4550	2.1100e- 003	0.0000	11.5078
Total	7.8000e- 003	0.0706	0.0822	1.3000e- 004	7.4900e- 003	3.7100e- 003	0.0112	1.1300e- 003	3.5500e- 003	4.6800e- 003	0.0000	11.4550	11.4550	2.1100e- 003	0.0000	11.5078

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	3.9000e- 004	0.0118	3.0800e- 003	4.0000e- 005	8.9000e- 004	4.0000e- 005	9.3000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	4.0000e- 005	2.8000e- 004	0.0000	3.7301	3.7301	2.5000e- 004	0.0000	3.7363
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	3.8300e- 003	1.0000e- 005	1.2100e- 003	1.0000e- 005	1.2200e- 003	3.2000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	3.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.0496	1.0496	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.0503
Total	8.3000e- 004	0.0121	6.9100e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.1000e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.1500e- 003	5.6000e- 004	5.0000e- 005	6.1000e- 004	0.0000	4.7797	4.7797	2.8000e- 004	0.0000	4.7866

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					2.7700e- 003	0.0000	2.7700e- 003	4.2000e- 004	0.0000	4.2000e- 004	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	7.8000e- 003	0.0706	0.0822	1.3000e- 004		3.7100e- 003	3.7100e- 003		3.5500e- 003	3.5500e- 003	0.0000	11.4549	11.4549	2.1100e- 003	0.0000	11.5078
Total	7.8000e- 003	0.0706	0.0822	1.3000e- 004	2.7700e- 003	3.7100e- 003	6.4800e- 003	4.2000e- 004	3.5500e- 003	3.9700e- 003	0.0000	11.4549	11.4549	2.1100e- 003	0.0000	11.5078

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
				PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							

Category					tons	/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	3.9000e-	0.0118	3.0800e-	4.0000e-	5.8000e-	4.0000e-	6.2000e-	1.7000e-	4.0000e-	2.0000e-	0.0000	3.7301	3.7301	2.5000e-	0.0000	3.7363
l Ť	004	÷	003	005	004	005	004	004	005	004	1	ł	1	004		÷ !
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
/	<u>/</u>	: :			; 							; 			<u>.</u>	Í
Worker	4.4000e-	3.3000e-	3.8300e-	1.0000e-	7.2000e-	1.0000e-	7.3000e-	2.0000e-	1.0000e-	2.1000e-	0.0000	1.0496	1.0496	3.0000e-	0.0000	1.0503
<u> </u>	004	004	003	005	004	005	004	004	005	004	<u> </u>	<u>. </u>	<u> </u>	005	<u> </u>	<u>i </u>
Total	8.3000e-	0.0121	6.9100e-	5.0000e-	1.3000e-	5.0000e-	1.3500e-	3.7000e-	5.0000e-	4.1000e-	0.0000	4.7797	4.7797	2.8000e-	0.0000	4.7866
1 7	004	1	003	005	003	005	003	004	005	004	/ ·	· '	1 '	004	1 1	1

3.4 Building Construction - 2023

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0752	0.7638	0.8446	1.3600e- 003		0.0381	0.0381		0.0351	0.0351	0.0000	119.2480	119.2480	0.0386	0.0000	120.2122
Total	0.0752	0.7638	0.8446	1.3600e- 003		0.0381	0.0381		0.0351	0.0351	0.0000	119.2480	119.2480	0.0386	0.0000	120.2122

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	5.6700e- 003	0.1855	0.0595	6.4000e- 004	0.0165	2.2000e- 004	0.0167	4.7600e- 003	2.1000e- 004	4.9700e- 003	0.0000	61.9635	61.9635	3.3800e- 003	0.0000	62.0479
Worker	0.0519	0.0375	0.4385	1.3900e- 003	0.1500	1.1600e- 003	0.1511	0.0398	1.0700e- 003	0.0409	0.0000	125.7979	125.7979	3.2400e- 003	0.0000	125.8789

Total	0.0576	0.2229	0.4979	2.0300e-	0.1665	1.3800e-	0.1678	0.0446	1.2800e-	0.0459	0.0000	187.7614	187.7614	6.6200e-	0.0000	187.9268
				003		003			003					003		

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		-	<u>.</u>	-	tons	s/yr		-	-			- -	MT	/yr	-	
Off-Road	0.0752	0.7638	0.8446	1.3600e- 003		0.0381	0.0381		0.0351	0.0351	0.0000	119.2479	119.2479	0.0386	0.0000	120.2121
Total	0.0752	0.7638	0.8446	1.3600e- 003		0.0381	0.0381		0.0351	0.0351	0.0000	119.2479	119.2479	0.0386	0.0000	120.2121

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	5.6700e- 003	0.1855	0.0595	6.4000e- 004	0.0111	2.2000e- 004	0.0113	3.4400e- 003	2.1000e- 004	3.6500e- 003	0.0000	61.9635	61.9635	3.3800e- 003	0.0000	62.0479
Worker	0.0519	0.0375	0.4385	1.3900e- 003	0.0902	1.1600e- 003	0.0913	0.0252	1.0700e- 003	0.0262	0.0000	125.7979	125.7979	3.2400e- 003	0.0000	125.8789
Total	0.0576	0.2229	0.4979	2.0300e- 003	0.1013	1.3800e- 003	0.1027	0.0286	1.2800e- 003	0.0299	0.0000	187.7614	187.7614	6.6200e- 003	0.0000	187.9268

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0714	0.7169	0.8481	1.3700e- 003		0.0339	0.0339		0.0312	0.0312	0.0000	120.2909	120.2909	0.0389	0.0000	121.2635
Total	0.0714	0.7169	0.8481	1.3700e- 003		0.0339	0.0339		0.0312	0.0312	0.0000	120.2909	120.2909	0.0389	0.0000	121.2635

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category			<u> </u>		tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	5.5700e- 003	0.1863	0.0581	6.4000e- 004	0.0166	2.2000e- 004	0.0169	4.8000e- 003	2.1000e- 004	5.0100e- 003	0.0000	62.2352	62.2352	3.3500e- 003	0.0000	62.3191
Worker	0.0496	0.0344	0.4118	1.3600e- 003	0.1512	1.1600e- 003	0.1524	0.0402	1.0600e- 003	0.0412	0.0000	122.9218	122.9218	2.9900e- 003	0.0000	122.9966
Total	0.0552	0.2208	0.4699	2.0000e- 003	0.1679	1.3800e- 003	0.1692	0.0450	1.2700e- 003	0.0462	0.0000	185.1570	185.1570	6.3400e- 003	0.0000	185.3157

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		

Off-Road	0.0714	0.7169	0.8481	1.3700e-	0.0339	0.0339	0.0312	0.0312	0.0000	120.2908	120.2908	0.0389	0.0000	121.2634
				003										
Total	0.0714	0.7169	0.8481	1.3700e-	0.0339	0.0339	0.0312	0.0312	0.0000	120.2908	120.2908	0.0389	0.0000	121.2634
				003										

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
		'		'			<u>' </u>	1 11/2.13	1 1112.0							
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
									_						_	
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
			-	1	;	1										
Vendor	5.5700e-	0.1863	0.0581	6.4000e-	0.0112	2.2000e-	0.0114	3.4700e-	2.1000e-	3.6800e-	0.0000	62.2352	62.2352	3.3500e-	0.0000	62.3191
	003	1		004	-	004		003	004	003				003		
NA/ and same	0.0400	0.0044	0.4440	4.0000-	0.0000	4.4000-	0.0004	0.0054	4.0000-	0.0004	0.0000	400.0040	400.0040	0.0000-	0.0000	400.0000
vvorker	0.0496	0.0344	0.4118	1.3600e-	0.0909	1.1600e-	0.0921	0.0254	1.0600e-	0.0264	0.0000	122.9218	122.9218	2.9900e-	0.0000	122.9966
				003	<u> </u>	003			003					003		
Total	0.0552	0.2208	0.4699	2.0000e-	0.1022	1.3800e-	0.1035	0.0288	1.2700e-	0.0301	0.0000	185.1570	185.1570	6.3400e-	0.0000	185.3157
1		1 '	1 '	003	1 '	003	'		003					003		
4 7			1 7	1 '	1 7	1	1 '	1		1 7					1 '	

3.5 Architectural Coating - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.7419					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0196	0.1322	0.1964	3.2000e- 004		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003	0.0000	27.7028	27.7028	1.5600e- 003	0.0000	27.7418
Total	0.7615	0.1322	0.1964	3.2000e- 004		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003	0.0000	27.7028	27.7028	1.5600e- 003	0.0000	27.7418
Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	8.9700e- 003	6.2300e- 003	0.0745	2.5000e- 004	0.0274	2.1000e- 004	0.0276	7.2600e- 003	1.9000e- 004	7.4600e- 003	0.0000	22.2284	22.2284	5.4000e- 004	0.0000	22.2419
Total	8.9700e-	6.2300e-	0.0745	2.5000e-	0.0274	2.1000e-	0.0276	7.2600e-	1.9000e-	7.4600e-	0.0000	22.2284	22.2284	5.4000e-	0.0000	22.2419
	003	003		004		004		003	004	003				004		

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		<u>.</u>			tons	s/yr	<u> </u>					<u> </u>	MT.	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.7419					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0196	0.1322	0.1964	3.2000e- 004		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003	0.0000	27.7028	27.7028	1.5600e- 003	0.0000	27.7418
Total	0.7615	0.1322	0.1964	3.2000e- 004		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003		6.6100e- 003	6.6100e- 003	0.0000	27.7028	27.7028	1.5600e- 003	0.0000	27.7418

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
				PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							

Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	8.9700e- 003	6.2300e- 003	0.0745	2.5000e- 004	0.0164	2.1000e- 004	0.0167	4.5900e- 003	1.9000e- 004	4.7800e- 003	0.0000	22.2284	22.2284	5.4000e- 004	0.0000	22.2419
Total	8.9700e- 003	6.2300e- 003	0.0745	2.5000e- 004	0.0164	2.1000e- 004	0.0167	4.5900e- 003	1.9000e- 004	4.7800e- 003	0.0000	22.2284	22.2284	5.4000e- 004	0.0000	22.2419

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Mitigated	0.1064	0.4791	1.2062	4.4600e- 003	0.3772	3.4800e- 003	0.3806	0.1011	3.2300e- 003	0.1043	0.0000	413.1124	413.1124	0.0207	0.0000	413.6304
Unmitigated	0.1064	0.4791	1.2062	4.4600e- 003	0.3772	3.4800e- 003	0.3806	0.1011	3.2300e- 003	0.1043	0.0000	413.1124	413.1124	0.0207	0.0000	413.6304

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Aver	age Daily Trip R	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Apartments High Rise	491.52	491.52	467.20	993,811	993,811
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	491.52	491.52	467.20	993,811	993,811

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Apartments High Rise	6.30	6.30	6.30	40.00	19.00	41.00	86	11	3
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Apartments High Rise	0.545348	0.044620	0.206559	0.118451	0.015002	0.006253	0.020617	0.031756	0.002560	0.002071	0.005217	0.000696	0.000850
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0.545348	0.044620	0.206559	0.118451	0.015002	0.006253	0.020617	0.031756	0.002560	0.002071	0.005217	0.000696	0.000850

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Electricity						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	457.2578	457.2578	0.0108	2.2300e-	458,1936
Mitigated						0.0011	010111		0.0111	010111	0.0111	10712212	10112212	010111	003	10011111
Electricity)	:		,	,	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	457.2578	457.2578	0.0108	2.2300e-	458.1936
Unmitigated															003	
NaturalGas	6.3600e-	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-	0.0000	62.9569	62.9569	1.2100e-	1.1500e-	63.3311
Mitigated	003			004		003	003		003	003				003	003	
NaturalGas	6.3600e-	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-	0.0000	62.9569	62.9569	1.2100e-	1.1500e-	63.3311
Unmitigated	003			004		003	003		003	003				003	003	

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					ton	s/yr							MT	ſ/yr		
Apartments High	1.17977e+0	6.3600e-	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-003	0.0000	62.9569	62.9569	1.2100e-	1.1500e-	63.3311
Rise	06	003			004		003	003		003					003	003	
Enclosed Parking	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator																	
Total		6.3600e-	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-003	0.0000	62.9569	62.9569	1.2100e-	1.1500e-	63.3311
		003			004		003	003		003					003	003	

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Apartments High	1.17977e+0	6.3600e-	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-		4.4000e-	4.4000e-003	0.0000	62.9569	62.9569	1.2100e-	1.1500e-	63.3311
Rise	06	003			004		003	003		003					003	003	
Enclosed Parking	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator																	
Total		6.3600e- 003	0.0544	0.0231	3.5000e- 004		4.4000e- 003	4.4000e- 003		4.4000e- 003	4.4000e-003	0.0000	62.9569	62.9569	1.2100e- 003	1.1500e- 003	63.3311

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr		M	T/yr	
Apartments High Rise	506890	282.3184	6.6700e- 003	1.3800e- 003	282.8962
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	314096	174.9394	4.1300e- 003	8.5000e- 004	175.2974

Total	457.2578	0.0108	2.2300e-	458.1936
			003	

Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr		M	T/yr	
Apartments High Rise	506890	282.3184	6.6700e- 003	1.3800e- 003	282.8962
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	314096	174.9394	4.1300e- 003	8.5000e- 004	175.2974
Total		457.2578	0.0108	2.2300e- 003	458.1936

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Mitigated	0.9688	0.0418	1.3325	2.4000e- 004		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003	0.0000	32.8971	32.8971	2.6700e- 003	5.6000e- 004	33.1317
Unmitigated	0.9688	0.0418	1.3325	2.4000e- 004		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003	0.0000	32.8971	32.8971	2.6700e- 003	5.6000e- 004	33.1317

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Architectural Coating	0.0742					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.8517					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	3.1100e- 003	0.0265	0.0113	1.7000e- 004		2.1500e- 003	2.1500e- 003		2.1500e- 003	2.1500e- 003	0.0000	30.7376	30.7376	5.9000e- 004	5.6000e- 004	30.9202
Landscaping	0.0398	0.0152	1.3212	7.0000e- 005		7.3200e- 003	7.3200e- 003		7.3200e- 003	7.3200e- 003	0.0000	2.1596	2.1596	2.0800e- 003	0.0000	2.2115
Total	0.9689	0.0418	1.3325	2.4000e- 004		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003	0.0000	32.8971	32.8971	2.6700e- 003	5.6000e- 004	33.1317

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Architectural Coating	0.0742					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.8517					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	3.1100e- 003	0.0265	0.0113	1.7000e- 004		2.1500e- 003	2.1500e- 003		2.1500e- 003	2.1500e- 003	0.0000	30.7376	30.7376	5.9000e- 004	5.6000e- 004	30.9202
Landscaping	0.0398	0.0152	1.3212	7.0000e- 005		7.3200e- 003	7.3200e- 003		7.3200e- 003	7.3200e- 003	0.0000	2.1596	2.1596	2.0800e- 003	0.0000	2.2115
Total	0.9689	0.0418	1.3325	2.4000e- 004		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003		9.4700e- 003	9.4700e- 003	0.0000	32.8971	32.8971	2.6700e- 003	5.6000e- 004	33.1317

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		MT	/yr	
Mitigated	95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e- 003	104.5568
Unmitigated	95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e- 003	104.5568

7.2 Water by Land Use

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Indoor/Outd oor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal		M	T/yr	
Apartments High Rise	8.33972 / 5.25765	95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e- 003	104.5568
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0/0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e- 003	104.5568

Mitigated

	Indoor/Outd oor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal		M	T/yr	

Apartments High	8.33972 /	95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e-	104.5568
Rise	5.25765			003	
Enclosed Parking	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator					
Total		95.6606	0.2740	6.8700e-	104.5568
				003	

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

Category/Year

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
		MT	/yr	
Mitigated	11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108
Unmitigated	11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108

8.2 Waste by Land Use

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons		M	T/yr	
Apartments High Rise	58.88	11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Total	11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108

Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons		M	Г/yr	
Apartments High Rise	58.88	11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		11.9521	0.7064	0.0000	29.6108

9.0 Operational Offroad

enerators					
Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type	
					•
Number					
	nerators Number Number Number	Important of the second sec	Image: International System Number Hours/Day Hours/Year Number Heat Input/Day Heat Input/Year Number Heat Input/Day Heat Input/Year	Image: Interactors Number Hours/Day Hours/Year Horse Power Number Heat Input/Day Heat Input/Year Boiler Rating Number Number Heat Input/Day Heat Input/Year	Image: Provide with the second state with the second stat

11.0 Vegetation

Page 1 of 1

1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue Future - Los Angeles-South Coast County, Winter

1725-1739 North Bronson Avenue Future

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Winter

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Apartments High Rise	128.00	Dwelling Unit	0.86	234,745.00	299
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	134.00	Space	0.00	53,600.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Days)	33
Climate Zone	11			Operational Year	2024
Utility Company	Los Angeles Department of W	ater & Power			
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	1227.89	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity ((Ib/MWhr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

- Project Characteristics -
- Land Use Developer information

Construction Phase - Developer information

Grading - Developer information

Vehicle Trips - Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc. Transportation Assessment for the Hollywood/Bronson Residential Tower Projet; May 2021

Woodstoves - Conservatively assumes fireplaces for units and/or common spaces

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Assumes SCAQMD Rule 403 control efficiencies

Demolition - Assumes 20,426 sq ft of asphalt/concrete removed (souce: project survey, assumes parcesl 5545-003-014 and 5545-003-023) @ 6" depth= 583

Trips and VMT - Assumes 14 CY per haul truck, 30-mile one-way distance to landfill

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	CleanPavedRoadPercentReduction	0	46
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	217.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	478.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	21.00
tblFireplaces	NumberGas	108.80	128.00
tblFireplaces	NumberNoFireplace	12.80	0.00
tblFireplaces	NumberWood	6.40	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	1.60
tblGrading	MaterialExported	0.00	12,000.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	128,000.00	234,745.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	2.06	0.86
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	1.21	0.00
tblLandUse	Population	366.00	299.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripLength	20.00	30.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripLength	20.00	30.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	1,500.00	1,715.00
tblVehicleTrips	HO_TL	8.70	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HO_TTP	40.60	41.00
tblVehicleTrips	HS_TL	5.90	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HS_TTP	19.20	19.00
tblVehicleTrips	HW_TL	14.70	6.30
tblVehicleTrips	HW_TTP	40.20	40.00
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	4.98	3.84
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	4.20	3.84
tblWoodstoves	NumberCatalytic	6.40	0.00
tblWoodstoves	NumberNoncatalytic	6.40	0.00

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
2022	1.6809	33.7700	15.2619	0.1020	3.1512	0.4258	3.5769	1.0488	0.4069	1.4557	0.0000	10,915.280 0	10,915.280 0	0.8636	0.0000	10,936.869 5
2023	1.1664	8.2592	11.2019	0.0282	1.4263	0.3319	1.7582	0.3815	0.3054	0.6869	0.0000	2,815.6684	2,815.6684	0.4190	0.0000	2,826.1435
2024	8.2137	9.0567	13.3868	0.0330	1.6834	0.3567	2.0401	0.4496	0.3331	0.7827	0.0000	3,281.8809	3,281.8809	0.4374	0.0000	3,292.8164
Maximum	8.2137	33.7700	15.2619	0.1020	3.1512	0.4258	3.5769	1.0488	0.4069	1.4557	0.0000	10,915.280 0	10,915.280 0	0.8636	0.0000	10,936.869 5

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/c	lay							lb/c	lay		
2022	1.6809	33.7700	15.2619	0.1020	1.7960	0.4258	2.2218	0.5828	0.4069	0.9898	0.0000	10,915.280 0	10,915.280 0	0.8636	0.0000	10,936.869 5
2023	1.1664	8.2592	11.2019	0.0282	0.8661	0.3319	1.1980	0.2439	0.3054	0.5494	0.0000	2,815.6684	2,815.6684	0.4190	0.0000	2,826.1435
2024	8.2137	9.0567	13.3868	0.0330	1.0203	0.3567	1.3770	0.2869	0.3331	0.6200	0.0000	3,281.8809	3,281.8809	0.4374	0.0000	3,292.8164
Maximum	8.2137	33.7700	15.2619	0.1020	1.7960	0.4258	2.2218	0.5828	0.4069	0.9898	0.0000	10,915.280 0	10,915.280 0	0.8636	0.0000	10,936.869 5
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e

Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.18	0.00	34.96	40.76	0.00	26.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ау							lb/d	ay		
Area	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980
Energy	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e- 003		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e- 003	6.9700e- 003	382.5235
Mobile	0.6065	2.6095	6.6098	0.0243	2.1281	0.0193	2.1475	0.5695	0.0180	0.5874		2,481.5150	2,481.5150	0.1274		2,484.6994
Total	6.2819	5.1524	18.2094	0.0403	2.1281	0.2736	2.4018	0.5695	0.2723	0.8417	0.0000	5,591.4111	5,591.4111	0.2049	0.0567	5,613.4208

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					Ib/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	5.6406	2.2450	11.472	9 0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980
Energy	0.0349	0.2979	0.126	3 1.9000e- 003		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e- 003	6.9700e- 003	382.5235
Mobile	0.6065	2.6095	6.609	3 0.0243	2.1281	0.0193	2.1475	0.5695	0.0180	0.5874		2,481.5150	2,481.5150	0.1274		2,484.6994
Total	6.2819	5.1524	18.209	4 0.0403	2.1281	0.2736	2.4018	0.5695	0.2723	0.8417	0.0000	5,591.4111	5,591.4111	0.2049	0.0567	5,613.4208
	ROG		NOx	co s	O2 Fug Pl	itive Ex M10 P	haust PM1 M10	0 Total Fug Pl	gitive Ex M2.5 P	haust PM M2.5 To	2.5 Bio- tal	CO2 NBic	-CO2 Total	CO2 CH	14 N	20 CO2

Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days	Num Days	Phase Description
Number					Week		
1	Grading	Grading	1/3/2022	1/31/2022	5	21	
2	Demolition	Demolition	12/1/2022	12/30/2022	5	22	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	2/1/2023	11/29/2024	5	478	
4	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	2/1/2024	11/29/2024	5	217	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 1.6

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 475,359; Residential Outdoor: 158,453; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 3,216

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Grading	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Building Construction	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	1.00	247	0.40
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	1.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	4	10.00	0.00	69.00	14.70	6.90	30.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	4	10.00	0.00	1,715.00	14.70	6.90	30.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	5	115.00	22.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	23.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Replace Ground Cover

Water Exposed Area

Clean Paved Roads

3.2 Grading - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
		1	<u> </u>		FINITO	FIVITO		F 1V12.5	F IVIZ.J							
Category					lb/d	lay							lb/d	ay		
Fugitive Dust				,	0.8982	0.0000	0.8982	0.4323	0.0000	0.4323			0.0000			0.0000
																ļ
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.8982	0.3375	1.2357	0.4323	0.3225	0.7548		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119	· · · · ·	1,153.2001
1 1				1	1 '							ſ			ľ	ſ

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		

Hauling	0.9267	27.3267	7.4534	0.0889	2.1412	0.0874	2.2285	0.5869	0.0836	0.6704	9,663.9206	9,663.9206	0.6488	9,680.1413
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	 0.0000
Worker	0.0448	0.0295	0.3392	1.0400e- 003	0.1118	8.7000e- 004	0.1127	0.0296	8.1000e- 004	0.0305	103.4570	103.4570	2.8500e- 003	103.5282
Total	0.9715	27.3561	7.7926	0.0900	2.2530	0.0882	2.3412	0.6165	0.0844	0.7009	9,767.3776	9,767.3776	0.6517	9,783.6694

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Fugitive Dust					0.3328	0.0000	0.3328	0.1602	0.0000	0.1602			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.3328	0.3375	0.6703	0.1602	0.3225	0.4827	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.9267	27.3267	7.4534	0.0889	1.3962	0.0874	1.4835	0.4040	0.0836	0.4876		9,663.9206	9,663.9206	0.6488		9,680.1413
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0448	0.0295	0.3392	1.0400e- 003	0.0671	8.7000e- 004	0.0680	0.0187	8.1000e- 004	0.0195		103.4570	103.4570	2.8500e- 003		103.5282
Total	0.9715	27.3561	7.7926	0.0900	1.4633	0.0882	1.5515	0.4227	0.0844	0.5071		9,767.3776	9,767.3776	0.6517		9,783.6694

3.3 Demolition - 2022 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					Ib/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Fugitive Dust					0.6809	0.0000	0.6809	0.1031	0.0000	0.1031			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.6809	0.3375	1.0184	0.1031	0.3225	0.4256		1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0356	1.0495	0.2862	3.4200e- 003	0.0822	3.3500e- 003	0.0856	0.0225	3.2100e- 003	0.0258		371.1376	371.1376	0.0249		371.7605
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0448	0.0295	0.3392	1.0400e- 003	0.1118	8.7000e- 004	0.1127	0.0296	8.1000e- 004	0.0305		103.4570	103.4570	2.8500e- 003		103.5282
Total	0.0804	1.0789	0.6254	4.4600e- 003	0.1940	4.2200e- 003	0.1982	0.0522	4.0200e- 003	0.0562		474.5945	474.5945	0.0278		475.2887

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Fugitive Dust					0.2523	0.0000	0.2523	0.0382	0.0000	0.0382			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120		0.3375	0.3375		0.3225	0.3225	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001
Total	0.7094	6.4138	7.4693	0.0120	0.2523	0.3375	0.5898	0.0382	0.3225	0.3607	0.0000	1,147.9025	1,147.9025	0.2119		1,153.2001

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d/	ay		
Hauling	0.0356	1.0495	0.2862	3.4200e- 003	0.0536	3.3500e- 003	0.0570	0.0155	3.2100e- 003	0.0187		371.1376	371.1376	0.0249		371.7605
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0448	0.0295	0.3392	1.0400e- 003	0.0671	8.7000e- 004	0.0680	0.0187	8.1000e- 004	0.0195		103.4570	103.4570	2.8500e- 003		103.5282
Total	0.0804	1.0789	0.6254	4.4600e- 003	0.1207	4.2200e- 003	0.1249	0.0342	4.0200e- 003	0.0382		474.5945	474.5945	0.0278		475.2887

3.4 Building Construction - 2023

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114		0.3203	0.3203		0.2946	0.2946		1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573		1,113.5402

Total	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114	0.3203	0.3203	0.2946	0.2946	1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573	1,113.5402

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ау							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0490	1.5343	0.5196	5.2700e- 003	0.1409	1.8700e- 003	0.1427	0.0406	1.7900e- 003	0.0423		564.8309	564.8309	0.0323		565.6372
Worker	0.4852	0.3064	3.5853	0.0115	1.2854	9.7800e- 003	1.2952	0.3409	9.0000e- 003	0.3499		1,146.2287	1,146.2287	0.0295		1,146.9661
Total	0.5342	1.8406	4.1049	0.0168	1.4263	0.0117	1.4379	0.3815	0.0108	0.3922		1,711.0595	1,711.0595	0.0618		1,712.6033

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							Ib/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114		0.3203	0.3203		0.2946	0.2946	0.0000	1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573		1,113.5402
Total	0.6322	6.4186	7.0970	0.0114		0.3203	0.3203		0.2946	0.2946	0.0000	1,104.6089	1,104.6089	0.3573		1,113.5402

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0490	1.5343	0.5196	5.2700e- 003	0.0947	1.8700e- 003	0.0966	0.0292	1.7900e- 003	0.0310		564.8309	564.8309	0.0323		565.6372
Worker	0.4852	0.3064	3.5853	0.0115	0.7714	9.7800e- 003	0.7812	0.2147	9.0000e- 003	0.2237		1,146.2287	1,146.2287	0.0295		1,146.9661
Total	0.5342	1.8406	4.1049	0.0168	0.8661	0.0117	0.8777	0.2439	0.0108	0.2547		1,711.0595	1,711.0595	0.0618		1,712.6033

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598		1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177
Total	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598		1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		

Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0478	1.5288	0.5038	5.2500e- 003	0.1409	1.8400e- 003	0.1427	0.0406	1.7600e- 003	0.0423	562.6403	562.6403	0.0318	563.4343
Worker	0.4604	0.2793	3.3378	0.0111	1.2854	9.6300e- 003	1.2951	0.3409	8.8700e- 003	0.3498	1,110.6743	1,110.6743	0.0270	1,111.3501
Total	0.5082	1.8081	3.8416	0.0164	1.4263	0.0115	1.4378	0.3815	0.0106	0.3921	1,673.3146	1,673.3146	0.0588	1,674.7844

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Off-Road	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598	0.0000	1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177
Total	0.5950	5.9739	7.0675	0.0114		0.2824	0.2824		0.2598	0.2598	0.0000	1,104.9834	1,104.9834	0.3574		1,113.9177

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0478	1.5288	0.5038	5.2500e- 003	0.0947	1.8400e- 003	0.0965	0.0292	1.7600e- 003	0.0310		562.6403	562.6403	0.0318		563.4343
Worker	0.4604	0.2793	3.3378	0.0111	0.7714	9.6300e- 003	0.7810	0.2147	8.8700e- 003	0.2236		1,110.6743	1,110.6743	0.0270		1,111.3501
Total	0.5082	1.8081	3.8416	0.0164	0.8661	0.0115	0.8776	0.2440	0.0106	0.2546		1,673.3146	1,673.3146	0.0588		1,674.7844

3.5 Architectural Coating - 2024 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Archit. Coating	6.8376					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1808	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609		281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443
Total	7.0184	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609		281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0921	0.0559	0.6676	2.2300e- 003	0.2571	1.9300e- 003	0.2590	0.0682	1.7700e- 003	0.0700		222.1349	222.1349	5.4100e- 003		222.2700
Total	0.0921	0.0559	0.6676	2.2300e- 003	0.2571	1.9300e- 003	0.2590	0.0682	1.7700e- 003	0.0700		222.1349	222.1349	5.4100e- 003		222.2700

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Archit. Coating	6.8376					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1808	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443
Total	7.0184	1.2188	1.8101	2.9700e- 003		0.0609	0.0609		0.0609	0.0609	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0159		281.8443

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
					FIVITO	FINITO		FIVIZ.J	FIVIZ.J							
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
 																
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0921	0.0559	0.6676	2.2300e-	0.1543	1.9300e-	0.1562	0.0429	1.7700e-	0.0447		222.1349	222.1349	5.4100e-		222.2700
				003		003			003					003		
Total	0.0921	0.0559	0.6676	2.2300e-	0.1543	1.9300e-	0.1562	0.0429	1.7700e-	0.0447		222.1349	222.1349	5.4100e-		222.2700
				003		003			003					003	ľ	

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
				PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							

Category					lb/c	lay						lb/d	ay	
Mitigated	0.6065	2.6095	6.6098	0.0243	2.1281	0.0193	0.5874	2,481.5150	2,481.5150	0.1274	2,484.6994			
Unmitigated	0.6065	2.6095	6.6098	0.0243	2.1281	0.0193	2.1475	0.5695	0.0180	0.5874	2,481.5150	2,481.5150	0.1274	2,484.6994

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Ave	rage Daily Trip R	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Apartments High Rise	491.52	491.52	467.20	993,811	993,811
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	491.52	491.52	467.20	993,811	993,811

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Apartments High Rise	6.30	6.30	6.30	40.00	19.00	41.00	86	11	3
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	16.60	8.40	6.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Apartments High Rise	0.545348	0.044620	0.206559	0.118451	0.015002	0.006253	0.020617	0.031756	0.002560	0.002071	0.005217	0.000696	0.000850
Enclosed Parking with Elevator	0.545348	0.044620	0.206559	0.118451	0.015002	0.006253	0.020617	0.031756	0.002560	0.002071	0.005217	0.000696	0.000850

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	lay							lb/d	lay		
NaturalGas	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Mitigated				003										003	003	
NaturalGas	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Unmitigated				003										003	003	

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	NaturalGas	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	Use					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/c	lay							lb/o	lay		
Apartments High	3232.24	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Rise					003										003	003	
Enclosed Parking	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator																	
Total		0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
					003										003	003	

Mitigated

	NaturalGas	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM10 Total	Fugitive	Exhaust	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	Use					PM10	PM10		PM2.5	PM2.5							
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/o	day				lb/c	lay					
Apartments High	3.23224	0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-		0.0241	0.0241		0.0241	0.0241		380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
Rise					003										003	003	

Enclosed Parking	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
with Elevator														
Total		0.0349	0.2979	0.1268	1.9000e-	0.0241	0.0241	0.0241	0.0241	380.2638	380.2638	7.2900e-	6.9700e-	382.5235
					003							003	003	

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Mitigated	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980
Unmitigated	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980

6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Architectural	0.4065				1	0.0000	0.0000	1	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Coating		;	<u>;</u>	;	:	<u>.</u>	;	:	<u>.</u>		;	;		į		<u> </u>
Consumer	4.6669	:		;	:	0.0000	0.0000	:	0.0000	0.0000	:		0.0000			0.0000
Products			<u>i</u>	<u>.</u>			[1								<u> </u>
Hearth	0.2485	2.1233	0.9035	0.0136		0.1717	0.1717		0.1717	0.1717	0.0000	2,710.5882	2,710.5882	0.0520	0.0497	2,726.6959

Landscaping	0.3187	0.1217	10.5694	5.6000e-	0.0586	0.0586	0.0586	0.0586		19.0440	19.0440	0.0183		19.5021
				004										
Total	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141	0.2302	0.2302	0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ау		
Architectural Coating	0.4065					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	4.6669					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	0.2485	2.1233	0.9035	0.0136		0.1717	0.1717		0.1717	0.1717	0.0000	2,710.5882	2,710.5882	0.0520	0.0497	2,726.6959
Landscaping	0.3187	0.1217	10.5694	5.6000e- 004		0.0586	0.0586		0.0586	0.0586		19.0440	19.0440	0.0183		19.5021
Total	5.6406	2.2450	11.4729	0.0141		0.2302	0.2302		0.2302	0.2302	0.0000	2,729.6323	2,729.6323	0.0703	0.0497	2,746.1980

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
<u>Boilers</u>						
Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type	
User Defined Equipment						
Equipment Type	Number					
11.0 Vegetation		-				



DOUGLASKIM+ASSOCIATES,LLC

MATES IV TOXIC EMISSIONS OVERVIEW





DOUGLASKIM+ASSOCIATES,LLC

CALENVIROSCREEN 3.0 OUTPUT

CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Results (June 2018 Update)





APPENDIX E – HISTORICAL RESOURCES MEMO



626 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 1100 Los Angeles, CA 90017 213.599.4300 phone 213.599.4301 fax

January 5, 2022

Mr. Michael Gonzales, Shareholder Gonzales Law Group APC 800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 860 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Subject: Plan Review and Impacts Analysis for 1715 – 1739 Bronson Avenue

Dear Michael,

Environmental Science Associates (ESA) appreciates the opportunity to submit this letter report (Report) which summarizes and documents the results of a Historic Resources Impacts Analysis for the proposed construction of a residential tower at 1715 – 1739 N Bronson Avenue in the community of Hollywood, Los Angeles, California. The proposed construction could result in potential adverse impacts to historical resources within as well as adjacent to the Project Site, and the Project must be designed to conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards) for compliance with CEQA.

1. Methods

This analysis in this letter report was conducted by ESA personnel who meet and exceed the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in history and architectural history. The key steps taken in completing this assessment and impact analysis are listed below.

The historical resources evaluation involved a review of the National Register and its annual updates, the California Register, the Statewide Historical Resources Inventory database maintained by the State Office of Historic Preservation ("OHP") and the California Historical Resources Information System ("CHRIS"), and the City of Los Angeles's inventory of historic properties to identify any previously recorded properties within or near the Project Site, as well as environmental review assessments for other projects in the vicinity. In addition, the following tasks were performed for the study:

- Searched records of the National Register, California Register, California Historic Resources Inventory Database, and City of Los Angeles City Historic-Cultural Monuments designations.
- Examined other properties in the area that exhibited potential architectural and/or historical associations. Conducted site-specific research on the properties utilizing building permits, assessor's records, Sanborn fire insurance maps, and previous survey information.



- Evaluated potential historic resources based upon criteria used by the National Register, California Register, and City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance.
- Assessed the Project against the CEQA thresholds for determining the significance of impacts to historical resources.

2. Project Site

The Project Site is located at the northeast corner of North Bronson Avenue and Carlos Avenue, on a developed block bounded to the south by Hollywood Boulevard, North Bronson Avenue to the east, North Gower Street to the west, and Carlos Avenue to the north. The block is developed primarily with commercial/industrial buildings along Hollywood Boulevard with a few multi-family residential buildings on the north half. The Project Site fronts on the west side of Bronson Avenue, and consists of three parcels: APN 5545-003-029, which currently is improved by 1717 Bronson Avenue (Lombardi House) a two-story building that dates to 1905, and APN 5545-003-023 and 5545-003-014, which constitute a large parking lot with multiple legal addresses between 1725 – 1739 Bronson Avenue. The Hollywood Freeway (101) is immediately north of Carlos Avenue and is directly visible from the Project Site. The closest parcel to the north is 5917-5919 Carlos Avenue, a multi-family residence built in 1941 located approximately 100 feet to the west. 5901 Hollywood Boulevard (APN 5545-003-016) sits immediately south of the Project Site and is improved with a one-story commercial structure that contains Atomic Tattoo & Body Piercing and other retail. Directly to the west is 12 Carlos Way, which is also a parking lot, and to the west of 12 Carlos Way is Hollywood Silvercrest, a seven-story residential building owned by the Housing Authority. To the southwest is 5925 Hollywood Boulevard, the Hollywood branch of the Los Angeles Superior Court

3. Project Description

The proposed Project is a twenty-four-story residential tower with 128 dwelling units, three levels of above-ground parking and one level of subterranean parking. The proposed building is 275 feet high, with a four-story podium and nineteen floors above, and will contain 229,015 square feet. The roof deck will contain a common open space that includes a pool and deck, an outdoor lounge, and a recreation room/clubhouse. HVAC and other mechanical equipment on the roof will be covered by a screen. No specific Project design features are proposed with regards to cultural resources. The direct viewshed from Lombardi House will be of the building's podium, which will be clad in smooth-finish plaster and 20 new trees will be planted as part of the Project.

The Project Site is located within the Hollywood Redevelopment Area, located approximately six miles northwest of the Los Angeles Civic Center at the foot of the Hollywood Hills, and generally bounded by


Franklin Avenue on the north, Serrano Avenue on the east, Santa Monica Boulevard and Fountain Avenue on the south and La Brea Avenue on the west. The Redevelopment Plan for the area sets forth an array of goals that include encouraging economic development; promoting and retaining the entertainment industry; revitalizing the historic core; preserving and expanding housing for all income groups; meeting social needs of area residents; providing urban design guidelines; and preserving historically significant structures.

4. Regulatory Setting

Numerous laws and regulations require federal, State, and local agencies to consider the effects a project may have on cultural resources. These laws and regulations stipulate a process for compliance, define the responsibilities of the various agencies proposing the action, and prescribe the relationship among other involved agencies.

A. Historical Architectural and Archaeological Resources

Historic and archaeological resources are governed by federal, State, and local (i.e., City of Los Angeles) regulations that provide the framework for the identification and protection of these resources. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are the primary regulations governing historic and archaeological resources in California. Regulations governing historic resources are also applicable to archaeological resources since the latter are also considered historic resources. Regulations applicable to historic and archaeological resources are discussed below.

I. Federal

1) National Historic Preservation Act

The principal federal law addressing historic properties is the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended,¹ and its implementing regulations.² The term "historic properties" refers to "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register".³

2) National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) was established by the NHPA of 1966, as "an authoritative guide to be used by federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation's historic resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment"^{4,5} The National Register recognizes a broad range of cultural

¹ 54 United States Code of Laws [USC] 300101 et seq.

² 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800

³ 36 CFR Part 800.16(l)(1)

⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1997, pp. 7 and 8.

⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Park Service, Washington, D.C, 1997, pp. 7 and 8.



resources that are significant at the national, State, and local levels and can include districts, buildings, structures, objects, prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-period archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and cultural landscapes.

a) Criteria

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Properties of potential significance must meet one or more of the following four established criteria:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

b) Context

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant within a historic context. National Register Bulletin #15 states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated within its historic context. Historic contexts are "those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific...property or site is understood and its meaning...is made clear."⁶ A property must represent an important aspect of the area's history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity to qualify for the National Register.

c) Integrity

In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the ability of a property to convey its significance".⁷ The National Register recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. Thus, the retention of the specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Park Service, Washington, D.C, 1997, pp. 7 and 8.

⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 2002, p. 44.

d) Criteria Considerations

Certain types of properties, including religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces or graves, cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not considered eligible for the National Register unless they meet one of the seven categories of Criteria Consideration A through G, in addition to meeting at least one of the four significance criteria discussed above, and possess integrity as defined above.⁸ Criteria Consideration G states that "a property achieving significance within the last 50 years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance". This is intended to prevent the listing of properties for which insufficient time may have passed to allow the proper evaluation of its historical importance.⁹

II. State

1) California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA is the principal statute governing environmental review of projects occurring in the state and is codified at Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq. CEQA requires lead agencies to determine if a proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, including significant effects on historical or unique archaeological resources. Under PRC Section 21084.1, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

The CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15064.5) recognize that historical resources include: (1) a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) a resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); and (3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California by the lead agency, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. The fact that a resource does not meet the three criteria outlined above does not preclude the lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1, provided the determination is supported by substantial evidence.

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for a historical resource contained in the CEQA Guidelines, then the site may be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083, which is as a unique archaeological resource. As defined in PRC Section 21083.2 a "unique" archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object,

⁸ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 2002, p. 25.

 ⁹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, 1997, p. 41.



or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or,
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If an archaeological site meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC Section 21083.2, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2, which state that if the lead agency determines that a project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place (PRC Section 21083.1(a)). If preservation in place is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be required. The CEQA Guidelines note that if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4)).

A significant effect under CEQA would occur if a project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). Substantial adverse change 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)). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2), the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that:

- Convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
- Account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- Convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA.

In general, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Standards) or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Guidelines) shall be considered to have mitigated its impacts to historical resources to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(3)). Both



Secretary of the Interior Standards were codified in the Federal Register in 1995. The Standards and Guidelines are a series of concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations.¹⁰ The Standards comprise four different treatment approaches— preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction—each with their own set of standards (ranging from six to ten standards). Depending on the project, either preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or a combination of the above may be required to mitigate a project under CEQA. The Standards for Rehabilitation are applicable to most rehabilitation and adaptive reuse projects involving continuation of existing use or changes in use. Standards 1 through 7 govern the use, repair and preservation of historic properties. Standard 8 is for significant archaeological resources. Standard 9 governs new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, and requires that the new work be differentiated from the old, and that it shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. Standard 10 governs new additions and adjacent or related new construction and requires that new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

2) California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register is "an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the State and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change" (PRC Section 5024.1[a]). The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria (PRC Section 5024.1[b]). Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register.

To be eligible for the California Register, a prehistoric or historic-period property must be significant at the federal, state, and/or local level under one or more of the following four criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A resource eligible for the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance (integrity) to be recognizable as a

¹⁰ U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service – Technical Preservation Services, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings,* 2017, p. 2.



historical resource and to convey the reason for its significance. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but it may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.

Additionally, the California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the National Register and those formally determined eligible for the National Register;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward; and
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

Other resources that may be nominated to the California Register include:

- Historical resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through 5 (those properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, and/or a local jurisdiction register);
- Individual historical resources;
- Historical resources contributing to historic districts; and
- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as an historic preservation overlay zone.

3) California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event human remains are discovered, the County Coroner be contacted to determine the nature of the remains. In the event the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, the Coroner is required to contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours to relinquish jurisdiction.

4) Public Resources Code Section 5097.98

PRC Section 5097.98, as amended by Assembly Bill (AB) 2641, provides procedures in the event human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project implementation. PRC Section 5097.98 requires that no further disturbances occur in the immediate vicinity of the discovery, that the discovery is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural and archaeological standards, and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials. PRC Section 5097.98 further requires the NAHC, upon notification by a County Coroner, designate and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) regarding the discovery of Native American human remains. Once the MLD has been granted access to the site by the landowner and has inspected the discovery, the MLD has 48 hours to provide

recommendations to the landowner for the treatment of the human remains and any associated grave goods.

In the event that no descendant is identified, or the descendant fails to make a recommendation for disposition, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendant, the landowner may, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains and burial items on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance.

III. Local

1. Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance

In addition to the National Register and the California Register, two additional types of historic designations may apply at a local level, including designation of a Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) and classification of an Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). Of these, the designation of an HCM is relevant to this Project and is discussed below.

The Los Angeles City Council adopted the Cultural Heritage Ordinance in 1962 and amended it in 2007 (Los Angeles Administrative Code, Chapter 9, Division 22, Article 1, Section 22.171.7). The Cultural Heritage Ordinance was revised in 2018 (Ordinance No. 185472, amending Section 22.171 of Article 1, Chapter 9, Division 22 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code).¹¹ The Cultural Heritage Ordinance establishes criteria for designating a local historical resource as an HCM. According to the Cultural Heritage Ordinance, an HCM is any site (including significant trees or other plant life located on the site), building, or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City. HCMs are regulated by the City's Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council.

The Cultural Heritage Ordinance states that a Historic-Cultural Monument designation is reserved for those resources that have a special aesthetic, architectural, or engineering interest or value of a historic nature and meet one of the criteria that follows:

- [It] is identified with important events of national, state, or local history, or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic or social history of the nation, state, city or community;
- [It] is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
- [It] embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.¹²

Designation recognizes the unique architectural value of certain structures and helps to protect their distinctive qualities. Any interested individual or group may submit nominations for HCM status. Buildings

¹¹ City of Los Angeles, Office of Historic Resources, Cultural Heritage No. 185472, 2018, p. 1.

¹² City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources, "What Makes a Resource Historically Significant?" 2009, https://preservation.lacity.org/commission/what-makes-resource-historically-significant, accessed January 14, 2019.

may be eligible for HCM status if they retain their historic design and materials. Those that are intact examples of past architectural styles or that have historic associations may meet the criteria listed in the Cultural Heritage Ordinance.

The Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance provides that compliance with the Standards is part of the process for review and approval by the Cultural Heritage Commission of proposed alterations to HCMs (see Los Angeles Administrative Code Section 22.171.14.a.1). Therefore, the Standards are used for regulatory approvals for designated resources but not for resource evaluations.

2. Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.106.4.5 (Permits for Historical and Cultural Buildings)

In addition, Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 91.106.4, which deals with permits, contains a provision for permits for historical and cultural buildings. This subsection states Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Department (LADBS) "shall not issue a permit to demolish, alter or remove a building or structure of historical, archaeological or architectural consequence if such building or structure has been officially designated, or has been determined by state or federal action to be eligible for designation, on the National Register of Historic Places, or has been included on the City of Los Angeles list of Historic-Cultural monuments, without the department having first determined whether the demolition, alteration or removal may result in the loss of or serious damage to a significant historical or cultural asset." Furthermore, pursuant to LAMC Section 91.106.4.5.1, LADBS "shall not issue a building permit for demolition of a building or structure for which the original building permit was issued more than 45 years prior to the date of submittal of the application for demolition pre-inspection, or where information submitted with the application indicates that the building or structure is more than 45 years old based on the date the application is submitted," without having first provided the required notice and taken the required actions at least 30 days prior to issuance of the demolition of building or structure permit. The required notice involves the department sending written notice of the demolition preinspection application via U.S. mail to the abutting property owners and occupants, as well as the Council District Office and Certified Neighborhood Council Office representing the site, for which a demolition pre-inspection has been proposed for a building or structure.

Additionally, any interested individual may apply for a proposed designation of a Historic Cultural Monument. Upon the determination by the Planning Director that the application is complete—or upon initiation by City Council, Cultural Heritage Commission, or Planning Director—no permit for the demolition substantial alteration, or removal shall be issued. The site, building, or structure, regardless of whether a permit exits, shall not be demolished, pending final determination by the Commission and City Council whether the proposed site, building, or object or structure shall be designated a Historic-Cultural Monument, pursuant to Cultural Heritage Ordinance No. 185472, amending Section 22.171 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code. Also, if the property has been previously identified in a survey or has been nominated for designation and it is determined by the City that a project is subject to CEQA review, the City may require preparation of a historical resource assessment report and CEQA impacts analysis, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, prior to issuance of a demolition permit. Once



the process pursuant to LAMC Section 91.106.4.5.1 is completed, the LADBS will then be able to issue the applicable permits.

5. Identification of Historic Properties Affected

A. Historic Properties on Project Site

For the purposes of CEQA, there is one previously identified eligible historical resource recorded within the Project Site, Lombardi House, which could be directly impacted by the Project as the result of alteration to its immediate surroundings. Lombardi House, located at 1717 Bronson Avenue, is a two-story, multi-family residential property. The residence was originally built as a single-family dwelling circa 1904 – 1905, in the Shingle style with deep gables, steeply pitched roof, and a wrap-around porch. It was later modified into the Colonial Revival style c. 1930 and reoriented to face east onto Bronson Avenue. The building was extensively renovated in 2012, with many architectural details reconstructed at this time.

The wood-frame residence is set back from the east property line by an extensive front lawn with tall, mature trees enclosed by a tall hedge. There are smaller fruit trees and bushes scattered around the property. The building has an asymmetrical footprint, with a cross-gabled roof covered in asphalt shingles and exteriors clad in beveled wood clapboard siding. The main entry is at the north end of the east façade, under a two-story portico with thin, square columns supporting a full-length widow's walk at the attic level, in front of the east-facing gable. Underneath the widow's walk at the second level is a partial-length balcony supported by carved brackets, accessible through a pair of French doors with sidelights at the second level. Below the balcony is a single-leaf, wood-paneled entry door with 4-pane vertical sidelights and a fanlight transom.

The southern end of the front elevation has a gable at the second level with a bay window of three 1/1 wood sash with a pent roof, and a small 1:1 clerestory window with a fanlight at the attic level. Below are three casement windows with sidelights, separated by engaged columns, and an attached wooden railing that mimics the original wrap-around porch that previously existed in this location. The faux porch railing continues around the southwest corner and along the southern elevation, interrupted only by a large half-moon porch with brick stairs that radiate outward in a matching semi-circular pattern. The two-story, partial-length porch is off-center to the west, with a second-floor balcony supported by four Doric columns. The balcony has a simple wood railing and is accessible through a single-leaf door on the second level. A classical pediment above the balcony is supported by Doric columns that match the first level colonnade, with a carved wood, clover-shape vent at the attic level. Pedimented roof dormers on either side of the balcony have matching clover wood carvings and 2-pane casement windows. The entry at the first level has a single-leaf glazed door with two sets of 10-pane sidelights on either side, and above the door are three small rectangular clerestory windows. This portico faces south towards Hollywood Boulevard and was the original entry for the building. Both corners of this elevation have an engaged column at the corner, as well as multiple tripartite casement windows.

The west elevation has a projecting entry bay with a shed roof and a single-leaf door at its center, with multiple 2-pane casement windows in a variety of sizes on either side. The eastern half has a recessed gable at the second level, with exposed rafter tails from the rear-facing gable along the western half.



The north elevation has two projecting gabled bays with multiple two-pane casement windows. The wider of the bays is at the center of the elevation and recessed from the first; it has a large modern metal staircase to the second floor and a balcony attached to its front façade. The first and second levels of the house are separated by wide, enclosed eaves that give the appearance of a skirted roof, except for the second, more recessed bay on the north elevation.

The accessory building on the property is a reconstruction that was erected in 2012. It is not a historical resource, nor does it contribute to the significance of the subject property.

According to a 2010 survey report, the subject property was previously surveyed four times by the City of Los Angeles. The first historic resource survey was completed in 1986; a second historic resource survey took place in 1997, which updated findings of the earlier survey; a third historic resource survey took place in 2003 and a fourth in 2010. Both the 1997 and 2003 surveys were reconnaissance level surveys, in contrast to the 1986 and the 2010 surveys which were intensive surveys. Additionally, in the City of Los Angeles's inventory of historic resources, a DPR form from 2002, using a previous Historic Resources Inventory form from 1979 to supplement its findings,¹³ stated the house was deemed significant mainly for its architecture as it was one of the "rare pre-1905 houses of Hollywood." An inventory form from 1979 also highlighted that this home survived the commercial development of the neighborhood, and its particular architecture combines the verticality of the Victorian era with that of the newer more simplified Colonial Style.¹⁴ A DPR report from 2009 only states that the property retained integrity and was currently undergoing renovations.¹⁵ A detailed integrity analysis was not included with any of the previous documentation.

It currently has status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation). The building has had significant alterations, including additions, window replacements, and porch infill and does not retain enough integrity for listing in the National Register.

After evaluation under the following contexts and themes, it is eligible under criteria A/1/1 as a rare example of residential development that pre-dates Hollywood's consolidation with the City of Los Angeles in 1910. 16

Context:	Pre-Consolidation Communities of Los Angeles, 1850-1932
Theme:	Hollywood, 1850-1910
Sub-theme:	Important Events in Hollywood History, 1850-1910

Additionally, it is eligible under criteria C/3/3 as an excellent example of American Colonial revival architecture in Hollywood.

Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980

¹³ Myra L. Frank and Associates, *Hollywood Redevelopment Area Historic Resources Update Survey Report*, Prepared for Christopher A. Joseph and Associates, October 2002, 51-53.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Chattel Architecture, Planning & Preservation, Inc. *Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Area*, Prepared for the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles in collaboration with PCR Services Corporation and LSA Associates, Inc., March 2009, 20-21.

¹⁶ "Individual Resources," *Historic Resources Survey, Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area, January 28, 2020, 7.*



Theme:American Colonial Revival, 1895-1960Sub-theme:American Colonial Revival, Early, 1895-1940

The existence of character-defining features of Lombardi House was confirmed in 2021 by an architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History. The current condition of the character-defining features listed below was not assessed because the Project does not propose any physical alterations to Lombardi House. The character-defining features include the following:

- Setback from Bronson Avenue (east property line) that creates a front lawn
- Cross-gabled shingled roof (originally wood, now asphalt)
- Beveled wood clapboard siding
- Location of main entrance at north end of east elevation (paneled door with sidelights and fanlight above). Style and location are not original, but location is historic.
- Wooden railing that runs along south end of east (front) elevation as well as the south elevation (possibly original material but likely designed to mimic original wrap-around porch no longer extant)
- Eave overhang along south side of east (front) elevation that extends to the south facade as well
- Front-facing gable at south end of front (east) elevation with small clerestory window at top
- Balcony at second level above front entrance
- Wood shingles/wood clapboard siding
- Deep gables
- Remnants of wrap-around porch
- Porch addition on east façade (1949)
- Steeply pitched gable on west elevation
- Wide, overhanging eave that runs the length of the rear (west) elevation
- Sem-circular portico on south elevation
- Pair of gabled roof dormers on south roof slope (but not their windows)
- Projecting pediment centered on south elevation above portico with clover-shaped detailing

B. Historic Properties Adjacent to Project Site

I. 5941 West Hollywood Boulevard (Salvation Army Tabernacle Church/former Hawaii Theater)

5941 West Hollywood Boulevard is a one-story commercial building in the Streamline Moderne style, designed by architect Carl Moeller, and constructed in 1939. It is located mid-block on the north side of Hollywood Boulevard. There is a wide driveway that runs directly east of the building, forming an alley that provides access to additional buildings at the rear. The building originally opened on May 6, 1940, as the Hawaii Theatre, and later became the Hawaii Music Hall in 1945. The theatre had round glass

walls overlooking the sidewalk on either side of the front entrance, with a tropical mural over the box marquee. Inside, there was a single level of seating and décor that included tropical jungle murals.

The theatre was closed in July 1963 and the building was gutted in 1965 to be converted into the Salvation Army Tabernacle. It remains their Hollywood headquarters to this day. Additional renovations were carried out to the building in 2015, resulting in the appearance we see today. Currently, the building has a rectangular footprint and horizontal massing with exteriors clad in smooth stucco. The front façade is divided into three bays with a centered entrance, echoing its former use as a movie theater. The building's elevations are divided into two levels with a decorative painted belt course dividing them. The lower level is rounded at the southeast and southwest corners overlooking Hollywood Boulevard, and a single ribbon of glass block. The second level of the elevations has a blocky, square style, and serves as a parapet or an arched roof that is hidden behind.

In 1994, the building was given a status of 2S2, which determined it eligible for National Register by consensus through the Section 106 process and listed in the California Register. It does not appear to have been evaluated since, and it is unlikely that the status is still applicable. While the footprint and general massing of the building have remained the same, all decorative details from its previous life as a theater have been removed. The rounded edges of the second level of the front façade have been altered to be straight ninety-degree corners, and the multiple decorative neon lights have been removed from the building, including two large columns that original were atop the building. Additionally, the former cantilevered marquee has been removed. For purposes of this report, the building has been evaluated as a historic resource, but it is unlikely that status would remain if challenged.

II. 5951 West Hollywood Boulevard (Florentine Gardens)

5951 West Hollywood Boulevard, commonly known as Florentine Gardens, is a significant example of a commercial property associated with the entertainment industry. Between the 1930s and 1950s, Florentine Gardens was one of Hollywood's most popular dinner theaters and nightclubs, known for its celebrity-studded lineups and risqué performances. It is located on the north side of Hollywood Boulevard, mid-block between Branson and Gower.

When it opened in 1938, Florentine Gardens was a dinner theater. For \$1.50, the audience would be treated to some Italian food, partially nude girls, an emcee, dancers, a singer and more. Whereas the Sunset Strip featured many upscale nightspots, Hollywood Boulevard had more of the working-class nightspots, including Florentine Gardens. Various performers made appearances at the Florentine Gardens, including such big acts as the Mills Brothers and Sophie Tucker, and Marilyn Monroe (then Norma Jean Baker) celebrated her first marriage to Jim Dougherty with as reception at the club.

Florentine Gardens was a popular nightspot for servicemen during World War II, but the business went bankrupt shortly afterwards in 1948. It later reopened as the Cotton Club, a venue for black performers, although its successful run was short lived. Today the building still stands and is an event space, a filming location, and an occasionally nightclub with DJs and performers.

The building was evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (Individual Resources – 1/28/20) and was given the status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register individually through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation) with eligibility criteria of A/1/1. It was evaluated under the following contexts and themes:



Context:Entertainment Industry, 1908 – 1980Theme:Commercial Properties Associated with the Entertainment Industry, 1908 - 1980Sub-theme:Social Scene Associated with the Entertainment Industry, 1908 – 1980

The building has undergone significant alterations including door and window replacement, and its original Moorish decorative elements have been removed, rendering it not eligible for the National Register. More research on the original appearance of the building is needed to confirm the status of its architectural integrity.

III. 1740 Gower Street (First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood)

The First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood is part of a church campus located at 1740 North Gower Street, a large site that encompasses the entire city block bounded by Yucca Street on the north, Carlos Avenue on the south, La Baig Avenue on the east, and Gower Street on the west. The historic core of the campus is located in the southwest corner and consists of two historic buildings: a large, four-story church at the corner of Gower Street and Carlos Avenue and a smaller, two-story chapel building (Wylie Chapel) to its immediate east. The church and chapel are connected by a cloister. Both were constructed in 1923 and designed by architect H.M. Patterson in the Late Gothic Revival style. The church is anchored by a five-story buttressed tower that culminates in a vented belfry. The chapel is capped by a large central lantern, and its façade is pierced by a rose window. The buildings are setback from Carlos Avenue, forming a small yard planted with groundcover, manicured shrubs, and mature Canary Island pine trees.

The First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood was organized in 1903, and shortly thereafter acquired the parcel at the northeast corner of Gower Street and Carlos Avenue for \$300. By 1909, the congregation had erected a small building on the property, but as the population of Hollywood grew in subsequent years the congregation outgrew its modest quarters. In 1922, H.M. Patterson was hired to design a new church on the Gower Street site. Patterson was a noted ecclesiastical architect, best known for designing landmark churches in the Late Gothic Revival style, and the First

Presbyterian Church of Hollywood is generally considered to be one of his most significant commissions. The church building as well as the adjoining chapel were completed in 1923, and the campus included offices, a cafeteria, study and lecture

rooms, and Sunday school classrooms. The main church building was constructed and furnished at a cost of \$475,000, with an interior finished with mahogany, and seated 1,800 people. Over time, as the congregation continued to grow, it acquired additional lots until it came to own the entire block bounded by Gower and Yucca streets and Carlos and La Baig avenues. The small, single-family homes that historically occupied these lots were demolished to make way for additional buildings to serve the church and its affiliated school. While these later buildings, which post-date World War II, feature brick exterior walls and are generally compatible with the 1923 church and chapel, they clearly read as modern additions to the historic campus.

The buildings were evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (*Historic Districts, Planning Districts, and Multi-Property Resources – 1/28/20*), and was given the status codes of 3S (appears individually eligible for the



National Register through survey evaluation), 3CS (appears individually eligible for the California Register through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation). The survey found it eligible as a potential district under criteria C/3/3, as an excellent example of Late Gothic Revival institutional architecture in Hollywood, as well as a work of noted ecclesiasiastical architect H.M. Patterson.

Context:Architecture and Engineering 1850 - 1980Theme:Period Revival, 1919 - 1950Sub-theme:Late Gothic Revival, 1919 - 1939

The buildings appear to have had few, if any alterations, and retain a high level of architectural and historic integrity.

IV. 5939 West Hollywood Boulevard

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard is a one-story commercial building in the Streamline Moderne style. designed by noted Los Angeles architect Gordon Kaufmann and constructed in 1936. It is located midblock on the north side of Hollywood Boulevard. There is a wide driveway that runs directly west of the building, forming an alley that provides access to a large structure to the rear. The buildings appear to share a party wall, but it is unclear whether they are two separate structures or one unified building. 5939 Hollywood Boulevard originally housed the "Palms Grill", and currently is used as the Salvation Army's Youth Shelter. It is constructed of brick with an asymmetrical rectangular footprint and an asymmetrical curved façade. While windows on the front façade have been infilled or boarded over, a ribbon of eight 1/1/1 fixed-pane windows with a continuous concrete sill is still evident. It runs the partial length of the front facade, around the corner and north along the west elevation. A single-leaf door on the front elevation is off-center to the west. A second entrance to the building along the west elevation is currently boarded up but appears to contain a single-leaf glass and metal door. There are four additional 1/1 plate glass, fixed-pane windows on the west elevation, as well as a 3:3 display window set into a slightly projecting bay. The building has scalloped coping at the cornice line and three concrete string courses that run along the lower parts of the elevation at the southwest corner, underneath the ribbon of windows.

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard is an excellent example of the Streamline Moderne commercial architecture in Hollywood and designed by a noted Los Angeles architect. It was evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (*Individual Resources – 1/28/20*), and was given the status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register indivudally through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation) with eligibility criteria of C/3/3. It was evaluated under the following contexts and themes:

Context:	Architecture and Engineering, 1850 – 1980
Sub-context:	L.A. Modernism, 1919 – 1980
Theme:	Related Responses to Modernism, 1926 – 1970
Sub-theme:	Streamline Moderne, 1934 – 1945



With alterations that include door and window replacement, the building may not retain sufficient integrity for listing in the National Register, although some of the changes to the windows appear to be reversible. More research is needed to confirm the original appearance of the building, especially its windows and doors, before it status as a historical resource can be confirmed.

V. 1756 North Tamarind Avenue

1756 North Tamarind Avenue is a three-story apartment building constructed in 1929. It is three bays wide, with rectangular massing, a symmetrical façade, a flat roof and a unique Mediterranean Revival style highlighted by carved Churrigueresque low-relief ornamentation around the entry and at the upper levels of the front façade. It is constructed of brick with a concrete façade and faces west onto Tamarind Avenue. Windows are almost exclusively 8-paned casements in a variety of configurations. Details include a quoined door surround, faux balconies of concrete relief, a small ornamental grille centered on the front elevation at the third level, and exteriors clad in vines. The building is setback from Tamarind Avenue with a grassy lawn in front, as well as a small rear yard to the north of Carlos Avenue.

The building was evaluated in January of 2020, as part of the Historic Resources Survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (*Individual Resources – 1/28/20*), and was given the status codes of 3CS (appears eligible for California Register inidivudally through survey evaluation) and 5S3 (appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation). After evaluation under the following contexts and themes, it is eligible under criteria A/1/1 as a rare remaining example of an intact 1920s multi-family residence in Hollywood. The 1920s represented a significant period of growth in Hollywood, and intact examples of multi-family residences dating to this era are increasingly rare.

Context:	Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850 – 1980
Theme:	Early Residential Development, 1880 – 1930
Sub-theme:	Early Multi-Family Residential Development, 1880 – 1930

Additionally, it is eligible under criteria C/3/3 as an excellent example of a 1920s apartment house in Hollywood, exhibiting the distinctive features of the property type. Designed to maximize lot coverage, apartment houses were an important type of multi-family property in Los Angeles during the early decades of the 20th century, and 1756 North Tamarind is an intact and important remnant from this period of residential development.

Context:	Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850 - 1980
Sub-context:	Multi-Family Residential Development, 1910 – 1980
Theme:	Multi-Family Residential, 1910 – 1980
Sub-theme:	Apartment Houses, 1910 - 1980

While the building has had alterations, including the likely replacement of its original windows, overall, it retains a high level of architectural and historical integrity and likely would be eligible for the California Register and status as a Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument.

6. CEQA Impacts Analysis

Identified below are the thresholds for determining the significance of environmental effects on historical resources are derived from the CEQA Guidelines as defined in §15064.5 and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. Pursuant to this guidance, a project that would physically detract, either directly or indirectly, from the integrity and significance of the historical resource such that its eligibility for listing in the National Register, California Register, or as a City Historic Cultural Monument (LAHCM) would no longer be maintained, is considered a project that would result in a significant impact on the historical resource. Adverse impacts, that may or may not rise to a level of significance, result when one or more of the following occurs to a historical resource: demolition, relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration, or new construction on the site or in the vicinity.17

Threshold (a): Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;

Adverse impacts, that may or may not rise to a level of significance, result when one or more of the following occurs to a historical resource:

- Demolition of a significant resource;
- Relocation that does not maintain the integrity and significance of a significant resource;
- Conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a significant resource which does not conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings; or
- Construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on the site or in the vicinity

A. Direct Impacts

Despite the shared site, the Project would have no direct adverse impact to Lombardi House. The building would remain intact in its current location and would not be materially altered by the new construction on the Project Site. The project does not include the demolition, relocation, rehabilitation, alteration, or conversion of the Lombardi House. The building's existing massing, form, and architectural features would remain intact and unchanged. The Project is designed in a modern style that will be easily differentiated from Lombardi House. The Lombardi House would remain unchanged and in its original location after implementation of the Project. All of its exterior character-defining features, as well as its interior spaces, would remain unaltered and continue to convey its historical

¹⁷ L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, Section D.3. Historical Resources, City of Los Angeles, 2006, p. D.3-1



significance. The Project would not affect the integrity of location, design, materials, or workmanship of the Lombardi House. Accordingly, because all the existing physical elements that characterize the Lombardi House would continue to convey the property's historic significance, integrity of feeling would also remain unaffected. The construction of the Project does nothing to alter the building's history as one of the few remaining early residences along Hollywood Boulevard. Therefore, integrity of association would also remain unaffected by the Project. While there would be alterations to the setting with the removal of trees, the landscaping is not historical nor is it a character defining feature of the Lombardi House, would remain intact. They include the main public entrance and primary façade of Lombardi House, both of which would continue to face and be accessible via the sidewalk off Bronson Avenue to the east.

Therefore, direct impacts to Lombardi House would be less than significant, and, in this regard, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.

B. Indirect Impacts

I. Historical Resources Within Project Site

As discussed above, the historical resource Lombardi House (1717 Bronson Avenue) is part of the Project Site and will be immediately adjacent to the construction site. Although direct impacts on the building associated with the new construction are considered less than significant, the Project has the potential for other indirect impacts associated with construction to occur. The new building will be substantially taller than Lombardi House, and there is potential for substantial adverse effects associated with the setting of the historical resource. Because the Project would construct a 24-story residential tower immediately to the north of Lombardi House, thereby adding considerable height and mass to the parcel, the immediate surroundings of the Lombardi House would be altered.

However, the broader setting of Lombardi House (Hollywood) as well as its immediate block, have continued to change since its original construction. With a location immediately adjacent to Hollywood Boulevard, what was originally a quiet residential and somewhat bucolic setting in the early 20th century has become a nexus of dense commercial development that continues to this day. Following World War II, density, and the scale of development in Hollywood increased substantially. With the opening of the US-101 in 1954, the area became even more accessible, spurring further development. When Los Angeles voters rescinded the 150-foot height limit in 1957, Hollywood became an epicenter for the development and construction of larger and taller buildings, both commercia and residential. Hollywood's first post-height limit "skyscraper" was the 20-story Sunset and Vine Tower constructed at the southeast corner of Sunset and Vine in 1963. Rising over 290 feet in height, the Sunset and Vine Tower was almost twice the height of any height-limit era building in Hollywood. Designed in a Corporate Modern style, the rectangular steel-frame and glass curtain wall building presented a stark silhouette that radically altered the Hollywood skyline. Additional high-rises on Sunset soon followed

including a 185-foot office building constructed in 1968 at the southwest corner of Sunset Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard, and a 22-story office tower constructed in 1971 at the northwest corner of Sunset and Argyle.

In the 1960s and 1970s Hollywood's population became more ethnically diverse, as new immigrant groups began settling in the area. Community and residential densities continued to increase, as original single-family homes, bungalow courts, and smaller apartment buildings were replaced with larger multi-family residential complexes. By the 1980s the Hollywood community was in a state of economic decline as commercial development became focused more intensely elsewhere in the City. The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles established the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area in 1986 to encourage development in the area, and the Project Site lies within its boundaries. Towards the end of the 1990s, Hollywood began to experience a resurgence in development, and the increase in density and scale of that development that continues today. Recent development in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site includes 1150 N El Centro, a 20-story building of 230 feet (approximately .75 from project site) as well as 1755 Argyle Avenue, an 18-story residential tower (approximately.40 away from project site). Additionally, plans have been approved for a 22-story residential tower at the southwest corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Gower Street, only .25 miles away from the Project Site.

The construction of a residential tower immediately to the north of Lombardi House is simply the continued evolution of a neighborhood that has been transformed over the last century and it will have no effect on the significance of the Lombardi House. After construction of the Project, the Lombardi House would remain intact and in its original location. All of its character-defining features would remain unchanged and continue to be viewable and discernable by the public. The building would continue to convey its historic significance and maintain its eligibility for listing as a historical resource. The building's eligibility for the California Register or potential designation as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument would not be threatened. The Project does not involve alteration that would result in a change in status for the Lombardi House. In summary, the Project would not materially impair the historic setting of the Lombardi House. Therefore, the direct impacts on the historical resources would be less than significant in regard to the historic setting.

II. Historical Resources Adjacent to Project Site

Indirect impacts were analyzed to determine if the Project would result in a substantial material change to the integrity and significance of historical resources adjacent to the Project Site, which are identified and described below. Four of the resources have been determined eligible for listing in the California Register or for local designation; one resource is currently listed in the California Register. None of the resources are currently considered eligible for the National Register. These resources were recently identified through a survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area conducted in January of 2020.

The following historical resources are physically separated from the Project Site by other buildings and streets, at distances that range from 150 feet to 750 feet, and the Project would not result in any direct or



physical impact to these resources. There are no historical resources directly adjacent to the Project Site other than Lombardi House, which is contained within the Project Site as detailed above. The only potential indirect impact to historical resources adjacent to the Project Site regards changes in views due to implementation of the Project and potential effects on the setting, feeling, and association of these adjacent historical resources. For purposes of CEQA, a direct view of the Project Site is defined as an unobstructed view from the front elevation of a historic building at ground level toward the Project Site. A primary view of a historical resource is defined as the primary public view of the front elevation of a historical resource from the public right-of-way. As discussed below, project impacts to all these possible views from historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site would be either "no impact" or "less than significant."

The Project would have no impact on the following historical resources as they generally do not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair any of these resources or interrupt primary views of these resources in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of these historical resources to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of these historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site would remain intact.

5941 West Hollywood Boulevard (Salvation Army Tabernacle Church/former Hawaii Theater)

The building is approximately 250 feet to the west/southwest of the Project Site and has no direct views. It is oriented to the south, towards Hollywood Boulevard, and is separated from the Project Site by multiple intervening buildings. Addditionally, the historical resource's immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. The Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

5951 West Hollywood Boulevard (Florentine Gardens)

The building is approximately 325 feet to the west/southwest of the Project Site and has no direct views. It is oriented to the west, towards Gower, and to the south, towards Hollywood Boulevard. It is separated from the Project Site by multiple intervening buildings. Additionally, the historical resource's immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. The Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely

affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

1740 Gower Street (First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood)

The buildings are located approximately 750 feet to the west/northwest of the Project Site and have limited, direct views of the Project Site. While they face south towards along Carlos Avenue, they are separated from the Project Site by a full block and multiple intervening buildings. Addditionally, the historical resources' immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. For these reasons, the Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource to the Project Site would remain intact.

5939 West Hollywood Boulevard

The Project would be northeast of this historical resource by approximately 150 feet. The building is oriented to the south onto Hollywood Boulevard and is built directly up the property line on the east side and there are no windows or doors on the eastern elevation. A direct view is defined as an unobstructed view of the Project Site from the front elevation of the resource at ground level from the public right-of-way; therefore, this would be considered an indirect view. The view would not adversely affect the resource, especially as its immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was removed. Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

1756 North Tamarind Avenue

The Project would be southeast of this historical resource by approximately 150 feet and there is a direct line of sight from the rear yard of 1756 Tamarind Avenue onto the Project Site. However, the building's primary façade faces west onto Tamarind Avenue and the Project Site is not visible from the front yard. There is an indirect view of the resource from Bronson Avenue that is currently interrupted by existing buildings, and that would not change with project completion. Additionally, the historical resource's immediate setting is characterized by contrasting building heights in the surrounding area that have been in existence since the late 1950s, when the prevailing height limit of 150 feet was



removed and this block of Tamarind Avenue is a dead end cul de sac that directly overlooks the Hollywood Freeway. For these reasons, the Project would have no impact on this historical resource as it generally does not have views of the Project: Therefore, indirect impacts are less than significant because the Project would not materially impair this resource or interrupt primary views in a manner that would adversely affect the ability of this historical resource to convey their significance. At the conclusion of the Project, the significance and integrity of this historical resource adjacent to the Project Site would remain intact.

C. Cumulative Impacts

A significant cumulative impact associated with the Project and related projects would occur if the impact would render a historical resource or district as no longer eligible for listing, and the Project's contribution to the impact would be cumulatively considerable. Related projects that have the potential to result in combined or cumulative impacts in association with the impacts of the Project are listed below. In assessing cumulative impacts on historical resources, the focus is on related projects that are in the immediate vicinity of the Project (.25 mile) that have the potential to contribute to changes in the setting of identified historical resources on the Project Site and in the vicinity, including historic districts. These related projects include:

5757 Hollywood Boulevard

Construction is currently underway at 5757 Hollywood Boulevard, for a six-story residential building, and will be completed by the time ground is broken at 1715 – 1739 Bronson Avenue. Therefore, there will be no cumulative impacts.

7. Secretary of the Interior's Standards Review

New proximate construction on the Project Site could alter the character of the historic setting associated with Lombardi House. In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. New construction should be differentiated from the old and compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property to avoid impacts to the historic integrity of the property and its environment. New additions and adjacent or related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.



The Project does not include any alterations to Lombardi House, and it would retain all the exterior and important character defining features. Because the exterior integrity of the building would be retained, the change in use would not detract from the significance of the building's primary distinctive materials and features. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 1.**

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The project would retain and preserve the historic character of the building. No materials would be removed, nor would there be any alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships. **Therefore, Project conforms to Standard 2.**

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

The Project recognizes the distinctive historic and architectural character of the Lombardi House and retains all the character-defining features and materials that cause the property to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. No conjectural features would be added and there would be no changes that create a false sense of historical development. Additionally, the Project is designed in a modern style that clearly differentiates it from the Lombardi House. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 3.**

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The Project would retain and preserve primary character-defining features of the Lombardi House, including alterations to the building that have acquired significance in their own right. Lombardi House will not be physically altered in any way. While no changes or alterations to accessory buildings are currently planned, they were built outside of the period of significance and have not attained additional significance. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 4.**

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The Project retains all the distinctive exterior character-defining materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the Lombardi House. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 5.**

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design,



color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Lombardi House remains in good condition and while it shares a site with the planned construction, it is not a part of the Project. The Project will not alter its character-defining features.. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 6**.

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Lombardi House will not be subjected to any chemical or physical treatments in the course or as a result of the Project. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 7.**

Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Any potential to encounter archaeological or Native American resources is considered remote, in the unlikely event resources are encountered during Project implementation, those resources would be documented, protected, and preserved in place in accordance with the Standards. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 8.**

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The Project does not include any new additions or exterior alterations to the Lombardi House itself, rather it consists solely of a new adjacent structure. The new work is in a contemporary modern style that will be easily and significantly differentiated from the old. Lombardi House is separated from the Project by approximately 13 feet, and it will remain protected in its own setting, environment and surroundings, protected by current landscaping features that prevent views into the property from the public right of way or out of the property onto the public right of way. When standing in the public right-of-way on Bronson Avenue, the view of Lombardi House is limited, and the resource is mostly hidden from view. Additionally, there are no public views of the resource from the north or the south. The Project will do nothing to change this setting.

Additionally, it is important to note that the environment of the historical resource has continually been evolving over the last 120 years. With a location immediately adjacent to Hollywood Boulevard, what was originally a quiet residential and somewhat bucolic setting in the early 20th century has become a nexus of commercial development that continues to this day. Following World War II, density, and the scale of development in Hollywood increased substantially. With the opening of the US-101 in 1954, the area became even more accessible, spurring further development. When Los Angeles voters rescinded the 150-foot height limit in 1957, Hollywood became an epicenter for the development and construction of



larger and taller buildings, both commercial and residential. Hollywood's first post-height limit "skyscraper" was the 20-story Sunset and Vine Tower constructed at the southeast corner of Sunset and Vine in 1963. Rising over 290 feet in height, the Sunset and Vine Tower was almost twice the height of any height-limit era building in Hollywood. Designed in a Corporate Modern style, the rectangular steel-frame and glass curtain wall building presented a stark silhouette that radically altered the Hollywood skyline. Additional high-rises on Sunset soon followed including a 185-foot office building constructed in 1968 at the southwest corner of Sunset Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard, and a 22-story office tower constructed in 1971 at the northwest corner of Sunset and Argyle.

In the 1960s and 1970s Hollywood's population became more ethnically diverse, as new immigrant groups began settling in the area. Community and residential densities continued to increase, as original single-family homes, bungalow courts, and smaller apartment buildings were replaced with larger multi-family residential complexes. By the 1980s the Hollywood community was in a state of economic decline as commercial development became focused more intensely elsewhere in the City. The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles established the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area in 1986 to encourage development in the area, and the Project Site lies within its boundaries. Towards the end of the 1990s, Hollywood began to experience a resurgence in development, and the increase in density and scale of that development that continues today. Recent development in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site includes 1150 N El Centro, a 20-story building of 230 feet (approximately .75 from project site) as well as 1755 Argyle Avenue, an 18-story residential tower (approximately.40 away from project site). Additionally, plans have been approved for a 22-story residential tower at the southwest corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Gower Street, only .25 miles away from the Project Site.

The construction of a residential tower immediately to the north of Lombardi House is simply the continued evolution of a neighborhood that has been transformed over the last century and it will have no effect on the significance of the Lombardi House. After construction of the Project, the Lombardi House would remain intact and in its original location. All of its character-defining features would remain unchanged and continue to be viewable and discernable by the public. The building would maintain its historic integrity and maintain its eligibility for listing as a historical resource.

Standard 10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The Project will be constructed adjacent to the resource and if the new construction were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the Lombardi House and other historical resources in the Project vicinity would be unaffected and unimpaired. **Therefore, the Project conforms to Standard 10.**

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

ESA found that the Project as proposed would not materially impair the Lombardi House or the characterdefining features that contribute to its significance as a historical resource. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact to historical resources under CEQA because the integrity of the Lombardi House would be retained. Furthermore, the Project would be in overall compliance with the Standards. The Project would also be Categorically Exempt under Class 31, Section 15331, Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation of CEQA because it would conform to the Standards and not materially impair Lombardi House and would retain all the character-defining features that contribute to the property's significance as a historical resource.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at mjerabek@esassoc.com, (310) 924-7462.

Sincerely,

Margante Juaber

Margarita Jerabek-Bray, Ph.D. Historic Resources Director

Lan Dais

Shannon L. Papin, M.A. Senior Architectural Historian