

DIR-2012-2767-CLQ
ADDENDUM - ENV-2006-6941-EIR
6230 Yucca Street

FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)

HAVING RECEIVED, REVIEWED, AND CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER INFORMATION IN THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON THIS MATTER, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND DECLARES AS FOLLOWS:

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CEQA PROCESS

A. Approved Project Description, History and CEQA Compliance

The City of Los Angeles previously certified the Environmental Impact Report State Clearinghouse No. 2006101025, dated August 16, 2007 (the “EIR”), for the project described below, finding it in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.

The Yucca Street Condos project as analyzed in the EIR (the “Original Project”) would replace an underutilized 18,614 square-foot office and radio station building and surface parking lot with an approximately 114,252 square-foot mixed-use development at 6230 Yucca Street in Hollywood (the “Project Site”). The Original Project would be approximately 185 feet in height (16 stories), including a mechanical penthouse and emergency helistop on the roof.

The single proposed structure was roughly rectangular in shape and was oriented with the tallest portions of the building towards the center of the Project Site. The Original Project included approximately 13,790 square feet of commercial (office) uses and 95 condominium units, which included 10 live/work units and a mixture of studio, one- and two-bedroom units, and 14,806 square feet of open space. The condominium units ranged in size from approximately 765 square feet to approximately 1,916 square feet. The live/work spaces were three story units, and the condominiums on floors eight through 11 were two-story “townhouse” units. The Original Project provided 242 parking spaces (contained in 2.5 subterranean levels and three levels above grade) as required by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (“LAMC”) and the City’s Parking Policy for condominiums, with access to the building parking provided off Argyle Avenue.

Based on the City’s Environmental Review Committee, the City determined an EIR was necessary to analyze the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for a draft EIR (the “Draft EIR”) was circulated for a 30-day review period starting on October 6, 2006, and ending on November 6, 2006. Based on public comments in response to the NOP and a review of environmental issues by the City, the Draft EIR analyzed the following environmental impact areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources (Historic, Paleontological and Archaeological Resources)
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality

- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

On April 9, 2007, the City released the Draft EIR for public comment. The comment period was 45 calendar days, ending on May 23, 2007. The lead agency also accepted comment letters after the comment period closed. The lead agency received three written comments on the Draft EIR from public agencies, groups and individuals. Responses to all comments received between April 9, 2007 and May 23, 2007 are included in the Final EIR.

The City Planning Commission (“CPC”) held a duly noticed public hearing on December 13, 2007, and issued a February 12, 2008 determination in which the CPC approved some of the Applicant’s requests and denied others. The CPC took the following actions regarding the applications:

- Certified Environmental Impact Report No. 2006-6941-EIR (the “EIR”);
- Approved a Zone Change as follows:
 - Amended the existing [D] Development Limitation (“D Limitation”) to allow a floor area ratio (“FAR”) not to exceed 4.5 to 1 (in lieu of the existing FAR limit of 3 to 1);
 - Approved a (Q) condition to, among other things, adopt the proposed Site Plan, limit FAR at the Site to 4.5 to 1 and require a minimum of 242 on-site parking spaces; and
 - Approved a (T) classification to require consultation with appropriate City agencies regarding any necessary dedication and/or improvements, such as street trees, street lighting, sewers and drainage;
- Approved Site Plan Review findings; and
- Denied without prejudice an Adjustment to permit 0 side yards—ruling that such an adjustment is unnecessary because ground floor uses are commercial.

On March 1, 2008, Maureen B. Schultz, on behalf of EMI Music North America (“EMI”) filed an appeal of the CPC Determination. On or about March 1, 2008, James McQuiston filed an appeal of the CPC determination.

On April 15, 2008, the City Council’s Planning and Land Use Management (“PLUM”) Committee heard and denied the both appeals, and resolved to uphold the CPC determination and recommend approval of the Zone Change to the City Council.

In addition to the analysis of noise and vibration impacts provided in the Final EIR, an EIR Addendum was prepared in June 2008, which provided further analysis of noise and vibration impacts to the Capitol Records site. The 2008 Addendum was prepared in response to EMI’s concerns regarding the construction and operational noise and vibration impacts of the Original Project on EMI’s recording studio echo chambers. In response to EMI’s concerns, additional information was developed from on-site studies, technical and expert noise and vibration

analysis and reports, on-site noise and vibration measurements, and consultation with EMI's noise consultants and recording engineers. The additional information and analysis contained in the 2008 Addendum supports the conclusions of the EIR that (1) the Original Project would cause a temporary significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impact to the Capitol Records site, and (2) impacts to the Capitol Records site due to operation of the Original Project would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant volunteered to comply with additional mitigation measures to further reduce impacts related to the Capitol Records site.

On August 7, 2008, the City Council adopted the PLUM Committee recommendation, recertified the EIR with the 2008 Addendum, and imposed additional conditions of approval intended to provide further protection to EMI during construction. On or about August 11, 2008, a Notice of Determination was filed and posted with the County Clerk. The 30-day statute of limitations for a CEQA challenge ran without such a challenge having been filed.

In 2010, the Applicant began to implement the Original Project by demolishing the existing office/radio station building on the site. However, due to adverse market conditions arising from the recession, the Applicant was unable to proceed further and temporarily placed the Original Project on hold.

B. Revisions to the Original Project

Due to the changing real estate market conditions, the Applicant made minor changes to the Original Project. Specifically, the Applicant proposed 111,558 square feet, with 13,442 square feet of commercial space, and 116 apartment units within a 16-story, 173 foot, 11 inch tall building and 208 spaces in two subterranean and three above grade levels of parking (the "Revised Project").

On October 5, 2012, the Applicant submitted to the City an application for a [Q] Condition Clarification to reflect the change from for sale condominiums to rental apartments, and to reduce the minimum amount of parking to reflect apartment rather than condominium requirements. The Department of City Planning, acting as lead agency, determined that an Addendum to the certified EIR was the appropriate level of CEQA review for the [Q] Condition Clarification request.

On June 21, 2013, the Planning Director approved the March 2013 Addendum ("Addendum"), finding "that the previously certified Environmental Impact Report ENV-2006-6941-EIR, together with the Addendum to the Final Impact Report, dated March 2013, is adequate environmental clearance and complies with the CEQA," and approved the requested [Q] Condition Clarification. On July 10, 2013, George Abrahams, on behalf of the Argyle Civic Association ("Appellant"), appealed the [Q] Condition Clarification (the "Appeal").

During the pendency of the Appeal, the Applicant continued to refine the project to reflect current market conditions. Specifically, the Applicant now proposes 116 apartment units and 2,235 square feet of commercial space within a 17-story building (the "Current Project"). The Current Project has more units than the Original Project, but the same number as the Revised Project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's density remains below the 127 units permitted under the current zoning for the site. The Current Project would have essentially the same floor area (114,136 square feet) as the Original Project (114,252 square feet.) The Current Project's building footprint is also substantially the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

The Current Project would be 17 stories (one more than the Original Project and the Revised Project)

Project) due to a change in the floor to floor heights and modifications to the parking garage. However, the Current Project would only be 174 feet in height, which is less than the Original Project's height of almost 185 feet and essentially the same as the Revised Project. The Current Project would include one subterranean and four above-grade levels, which is 1.5 fewer subterranean levels than the Original Project and one fewer than the Revised Project. The amount of subterranean parking area would be reduced by about 50 percent when compared to the Original Project, so the total amount of grading, excavation, and hauling would be less than the Original Project. It would also be less than the Revised Project.

The number of parking spaces for the Current Project would comply with the parking requirements under the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC"). The Current Project would provide at least 12,200 square feet of open space, consistent with LAMC requirements.

On September 26, 2014, the Planning Director approved the Addendum and Site Plan Review for the Current Project. This action was not appealed.

CAJA, Inc. has prepared a Technical Memorandum dated October 2014 (the "Technical Memorandum") analyzing the environmental impacts of the Current Project and the changes from both the Original Project and the Revised Project.

On December 2, 2014, the City Council PLUM Committee considered the Appeal at a duly noticed public hearing, along with all other public testimony and documentation submitted with regard to the Appeal. The PLUM Committee recommended that the full City Council deny the Appeal in its entirety and uphold approval of the Current Project and the Addendum.

C. Current Environmental Setting and Baseline

The environmental setting in which the Current Project would be built and operated has not substantially changed since October 4, 2006, when the NOP was published for the EIR. The date the NOP is published establishes the date of the environmental baseline for the project analysis. Nevertheless, as set forth below, additional Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Geotechnical, and Traffic analyses have been prepared and are included in the Addendum and the Technical Memorandum.

On June 19, 2012, the City Council approved an update to the Hollywood Community Plan and a related zoning ordinance (the "Community Plan Update). However, the Community Plan Update was subject to a lawsuit and subsequently invalidated by court order. As described in the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would be consistent with the 1988 Hollywood Community Plan (which the City Council reinstated following invalidation of the Community Plan Update), and none of the approvals for the Current Project derive from the Community Plan Update. Therefore, the invalidation of Community Plan Update has no effect on the Current Project and would not change any of the conclusions of the EIR.

On December 29, 2011, the California Supreme Court issued its decision in *California Redevelopment Association v. Matosantos*. The decision upheld recently enacted state law dissolving all California redevelopment agencies, including the CRA/LA, and made the dissolution of the agencies effective February 1, 2012. However, the City has elected to continue CRA/LA land use approval authority through the Designated Local Authority (DLA). The City is currently processing transfer of land use authority from the DLA to the City Planning Department. As described in the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, the dissolution of the CRA/LA has no effect on the Current Project and would not change any of the conclusions of the EIR.

Finding. The surrounding environment, regulatory framework, and land use plans surrounding the Original Project, both with respect to surrounding uses and applicable land use plans, have not changed so fundamentally as to warrant preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR for the Current Project. Neither the invalidation of the Community Plan Update, nor the dissolution of CRA/LA constitutes significant new information warranting preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE CURRENT PROJECT

A. Environmental Impact Findings

1. Aesthetics

The conditions that could affect impacts to aesthetics would remain unchanged. The Current Project's modifications to the Original Project and Revised Project would not change the existing conditions of the Project Site. Therefore, the aesthetic impacts of the Current Project would be the same as the impacts of the Original Project and Revised Project. As set forth below, visual character, views, shade/shadow, and light and glare impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Visual Character

The Current Project would be of the same general size and scale as the Original Project and Revised Project, would be constructed generally within the same building footprint, and proposes the same architectural design and materials as the Original Project and Revised Project. The Current Project is about 11 feet lower in height than the Original Project and, essentially, the same height as the Revised Project. Thus, the Current Project's visual character impacts would be the same as the Original Project's and Revised Project's impacts and less than significant.

Views

As described in the Technical Memorandum, there have been minimal changes to the uses surrounding the Project Site. During most of the time since approval of the Original Project, a significant economic recession discouraged land development. As such, views and viewsheds in the vicinity of the Project Site have not substantially changed. The Current Project would be constructed within the same building footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project, although the Current Project would be shorter than the Original Project by approximately 11 feet. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's slender design and siting as far as possible from the Capitol Records Tower reduce potential impacts to views of that Tower through the Project Site. Moreover, the reduction in massing of the Current Project's podium nearest the Capitol Records Tower, as compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project, would enhance the view corridor to the Capitol Records Tower. Therefore, the Current Project would not be expected to obstruct views of the Capitol Records Tower, with the exception of a momentary view interruption on the northbound Hollywood Freeway near Gower Street (same as the Original Project and the Revised Project). Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project may create a minor diminishment of the view of the Hollywood Hills. However, views of the Hollywood Hills are available in many other locations. Therefore, the Current Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to valued views, same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Signage

The Current Project does not propose a supergraphic sign, and all proposed signage would be

consistent with existing applicable regulations. Therefore, aesthetic impacts related to signage will be the less than the Original Project, which would include a supergraphic sign, and similar to the Revised Project, which would not. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts with respect to signage would also be less than significant.

Shade/Shadow

The Current Project would be generally built within the same footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and would be about 11 feet shorter than the Original Project and essentially the same height as the Revised Project. As described in the Technical Memorandum, there have been minimal changes to the uses surrounding the Project Site, and as a result, the sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project Site have not changed. As such, shadows generated by the Current Project on surrounding sensitive uses are expected to be proportionately reduced when compared to the Original Project and similar to the Revised Project. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts with respect to shade/shadow would also be less than significant.

Light and Glare

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would increase ambient light levels on the Project Site and in the vicinity. However, the increase would be considered nominal, as the Current Project is located in Hollywood—a highly urbanized regional nighttime destination that is already significantly illuminated at night, and the illumination provided by the Current Project would be the same as the illumination provided by the Original Project and the Revised Project. In addition, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would exclude materials that would create glare impacts, and would comply with the City's Lighting Regulations contained in the LAMC. Overall, the Current Project's impacts with respect to light and glare would be less than significant, and the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact would also be the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project, which would be less than significant for visual character, shade/shadow, and light and glare. Cumulative impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project with respect to views of the Capitol Record Tower were conservatively considered to be significant and unavoidable. The Current Project does not substantially increase the severity of this impact. Rather, because the Current Project is approximately 11 feet shorter than the Original Project and would reduce the massing of the podium nearest the Capitol Records Tower, as compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project, cumulative view impacts upon the Capitol Records Building will be reduced.

2. Agricultural Resources

The Project Site is located in a heavily urbanized area in the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles and does not include any state designated agricultural lands. The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the Project Site is not included in the Important Farmland Category and the Project Site and adjacent properties are not utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, neither the Original Project nor the Current Project would involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use and the Project Site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

The Current Project would be developed on the same site as the Original Project and the Revised

Project. The conditions that could affect impacts to agricultural resources remain unchanged compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project. The Current Project's impacts with respect to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

None of the related projects would involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use or develop land under a Williamson Act contract. The cumulative impact would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project.

3. Air Quality

As set forth in the Technical Memorandum and below, the air quality impacts of the Current Project would be the similar to those of the Original Project and the Revised Project and would also be less than significant.

Construction

Regional Impacts

The existing uses on the Project Site have been demolished. The Current Project proposes a building in the same general footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project. The Current Project would be slightly larger than the Revised Project (by approximately 2,554 square feet) and would have essentially the same square footage as the Original Project. In addition, the Current Project would have one fewer level of subterranean parking when compared to the Revised Project and 1.5 levels when compared to the Original Project. As set forth in the Technical Memorandum, construction impacts associated with Current Project's demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, asphalt, and architectural coatings will be similar to the less than significant impacts documented for both the Original Project and the Revised Project. As such, the Current Project's construction impact on regional air quality would be less than significant. All construction-related mitigation measures identified in the EIR are still applicable and will be implemented.

Localized Impacts

As discussed above, on-site construction impacts associated with demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, asphalt, and architectural coatings would be similar to the impacts documented for both the Original Project and the Revised Project. As a result, the Current Project's construction impact on localized air quality will be less than significant. All construction-related mitigation measures identified in the EIR are still applicable and will be implemented.

Operation

Regional Impacts

As the Current Project proposes the same number of residential units as the Revised Project, as well as a reduction in commercial space, the Current Project would be expected to result in similar stationary emissions of criteria pollutants during its daily operation. This includes emissions from landscape maintenance equipment, water and space heating, and consumer products. In addition, as described below under Transportation/Traffic, the Current Project would result in the same number of traffic trips per day and, therefore, would also result in the

same amount of emissions from motor vehicles as the Revised Project. As set forth in the Addendum, the Revised Project's operational impact on regional air quality would be less than significant. Therefore, the Current Project's operational impact on regional air quality would also be less than significant.

Localized On-Site Impacts

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would generate long-term, on-site emissions of criteria pollutants from heating and cooling of living spaces, water, cooking appliances, and use of landscape equipment. As the Current Project would have the same number of dwelling units and a reduced commercial component as compared to the Revised Project, it would generate a similar amount of localized on-site emissions of NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The Addendum concluded that the Revised Project's operational impacts with respect to localized emissions would be less than significant. Therefore, the Current Project's operational impacts with respect to localized emissions would also be less than significant.

Localized Off-Site Impacts

The South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD") recommends an evaluation of potential localized CO impacts when a project increases the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio at any intersection rated D or worse by 2 percent or more during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. As detailed in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the EIR, the Original Project's traffic volumes would not meet these criteria at any intersections under Existing with Project or Future with Project conditions. As the Current Project would generate 13 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and 2 fewer p.m. peak hour trips, than the Original Project, it would also not meet these criteria. The June 14, 2012 Technical Memorandum by Fehr & Peers (see Appendix B of this Addendum) found that the Revised Project would have negligible impacts on local congestion and would not meet these criteria at any intersections under Existing with Project or Future with Project conditions. As the Current Project would generate 20 fewer a.m. and 8 fewer p.m. trips than the Revised Project, the conclusions in the July 14, 2012 Memorandum also apply to the Current Project. Based on the Final EIR, the updated traffic impact analysis, and the ambient CO concentrations in the vicinity of the Project Site, CO concentrations at these intersections would fall far below the state and federal standards. As a result, the Current Project's off-site operational impact on regional air quality is expected to be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The Current Project would include 21 more residential units than the Original Project and the same number as the Revised Project. Like the Revised Project, this increase would result in an incremental increase in residents that would be offset in part by the inclusion of a higher percentage of singles and one-bedroom units and reduced commercial component in the Current Project (see Technical Letter Population and Housing analysis). Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the added population to the South Coast Air Basin would be consistent with growth forecasts for residential development in the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan through 2025. As a result, the Current Project's cumulative impact on regional air quality is expected to be less than significant.

4. Biological Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to biological resources remain unchanged with the Current Project. There are no site changes that include any areas of significant biological value. Therefore, the biological impacts of the Current Project are the same as the impacts of the

Original Project and Revised Project, and there would be no impact with respect to biological resources.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project, as there are no biological resources onsite or in the vicinity.

5. Cultural Resources

There are no historic resources on the Project site. The previously existing building on the project site did not qualify as an historic resource and has been demolished. The conditions that could affect impacts to cultural resources would remain unchanged with the Current Project. The Current Project's changes would be largely internal and would involve a different interior allocation of space within the Project. As such, the New Project would not be expected to impact any neighboring historic resources (such as the Pantages Theater or the Capitol Records Tower). Therefore, impacts with respect to historic resources as a result of the New Project would be less than significant, same as for both the Original Project and the Revised Project.

The Current New Project proposes one subterranean parking level, compared to the two subterranean parking levels proposed for the Revised Project and 2.5 levels for the Original Project. As less excavation would be required for the Current Project's subterranean parking, the Current Project would be less likely to encounter archaeological/paleontological resources or human remains when compared to either the Original Project or the Revised Project. Nevertheless, the Current Project would implement standard City mitigation measures during the earthwork and excavation phase. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts to archaeological/paleontological resources and human remains would be less than significant, same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project.

6. Geology and Soils

At the time the City certified the Final EIR, the Project Site was not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known faults were mapped as crossing the Project Site or projecting towards the project site. The closest known active fault at that time was the Hollywood Fault, which is located at a distance of about 0.3 miles from the project site. Although the Project Site was located within 0.3 miles of the active Hollywood Fault, and by other faults on a regional level, the potential seismic hazard to the Project Site was not considered to be higher than in most areas of the City of Los Angeles or elsewhere in the region. As the entire Southern California area is considered a seismically active region, every building in the region is susceptible to ground shaking and earthquakes. The City of Los Angeles Building Code includes regulations and requirements designed to reduce risks to life and property to the maximum extent feasible.

The Hollywood Quadrangle Earthquake Fault Zone Map (the "Preliminary Map") was initially released for public review on January 8, 2014. The Preliminary Map does not delineate the location of verified faults and traces. Rather, the Preliminary Map delineates the location of suspected faults and traces subject to on-site verification as required by the Act. The 90-day

public comment period required under Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (the “Act”) Section 2622(c) was extended to allow for relevant site-trenching data from the Project Site to be submitted and made publicly available.

According to the Act, before a project can be permitted, cities and counties must require a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed buildings will not be constructed across active faults. An evaluation and written report of a specific site must be prepared by a licensed geologist. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back from the fault (generally 50 feet).

Any structure with human occupancy restrictions under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) shall not be granted a new building permit that allows an increase in human occupancy unless a geologic report, prepared pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 3603 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations in effect on January 1, 1994, demonstrates that the structure is not on the trace of an active fault, or the requirement of a geologic report has been waived pursuant to Section 2623. (Act §2627.1(e)(2)(C)(3).) The State Geologist shall continually review new geologic and seismic data and shall revise the earthquake fault zones or delineate additional earthquake fault zones when warranted by new information. The State Geologist shall submit all revised maps and additional maps to all affected cities, counties, and state agencies for their review and comment. Concerned jurisdictions and agencies shall submit all comments to the State Mining and Geology Board for review and consideration within 90 days. Within 90 days of that review, the State Geologist shall provide copies of the revised and additional official maps to concerned state agencies and to each city or county having jurisdiction over lands lying within the earthquake fault zone. (Act §2622(c).)

The Applicant coordinated on-site trenching (100 feet in length and 35 feet in depth), sonic testing, radiocarbon dating, and core sampling of the subject property by state-certified professional geologist Steven Kolthoff and Registered Professional Engineer Michael Reader of Group Delta. Trenching was completed on the Property and all data collected. On April 7, 2014, inspectors from the City and State of California inspected the trench and reviewed the raw data collected. The raw data and preliminary review by City and State inspectors indicates that no active fault or trace is located on the property.

On September 3, 2014, Group Delta issued a Revised Fault Activity Report (the “Fault Analysis”). The Fault Analysis documents the trenching, radiocarbon dating, soil core sampling, soil aging, and cone penetration tests that were performed on-site. The Fault Analysis concludes:

A previously inferred “Argyle Strand” of the Hollywood Fault does not exist; rather the inferred groundwater offsets are now shown to be local perched levels on interbedded clay beds....

Based on site specific investigation, we therefore find that no active fault exist within, nor within 50 feet north and south of the subject site. The investigation meets current professional standard of practice for assessment of sites in an [Alquist-Priolo] A-P zone.

In a letter dated October 30, 2014, the City Department of Building & Safety issued a Geology Report Approval Letter affirming the conclusions of the Fault Analysis. The final Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the State Geologist in November 2014 shows that there is no active earthquake fault through, under or within 50 feet of the Project site.

Findings.

- a) State-certified professional geologist Steven Kolthoff and Registered Professional Engineer Michael Reader of Group Delta are experts in the field of earthquake fault activity analysis, and the Fault Analysis documents expert findings with regard to whether any active earthquake fault or trace is located on the subject property.
- b) The Fault Analysis provides substantial evidence that no active fault exists within or within 50 feet, of the subject site. Therefore, the site is safe for development with respect to Earthquake Zones of required investigation as defined in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act.
- c) The Appeal contains no expert analysis or other substantial evidence that an active fault exists within or within 50 feet, of the subject site, but rather consists entirely of speculation and opinion unsupported by fact.

The conditions that could affect impacts to geology and soils remain unchanged with the Current Project. The modifications proposed as part of the Current Project do not change the existing geologic conditions of the Project Site or the engineering and excavation plans for the project, although the Current Project would provide 1.5 levels less of subterranean parking than the Original Project and one level less than the Revised Project. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts of the Current Project will be the same as for the Original Project and the Revised Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and design standards recommended in the geotechnical report, impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Geology and soils impacts are generally site specific and, like the Current Project, each of the related projects would meet current seismic safety standards. Therefore, cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Analysis of Greenhouse Gas (“GHG”) emissions was not required at the time of preparation of the EIR for the Original Project. A Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis was prepared for the Current Project and is included in the Technical Memorandum. This analysis is consistent with March 2010 amendments to the CEQA Guidelines and the AB32 Scoping Plan.

Given the evolving nature of analyzing climate change, there are no applicable quantitative standards for judging the significance of a single project’s impacts on climate change in the South Coast Air Basin. To that end, the AB 32 Scoping Plan represents the most significant plan for reducing GHG emissions. In calling for a return to 1990 levels of GHG emissions by 2020, the Scoping Plan contains strategies targeting direct regulations, market-based incentives, voluntary actions, and other strategies that were publicly vetted before ARB’s approval in December 2008.

Consequently, the Current Project’s impact on climate change would be significant if the Current Project impacts conflict with or obstructs implementation of the AB 32 Scoping Plan.

Construction

Construction of the Current Project would emit GHG emissions through the combustion of fossil fuels by heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers traveling to and from the project site. These impacts would vary day to day over the duration of the 18 months of construction activities. As illustrated in Table 2 to the Technical Memorandum, construction emissions of CO₂e would peak in 2014, when up to 9,946 pounds of CO₂e per day are anticipated. Over 18 months of construction, this would amount to a total of approximately 780 metric tons of CO₂e. In accordance with the SCAQMD's guidance, GHG emissions from construction should be amortized over the presumed 30-year lifetime of the project. Therefore, total construction GHG emissions should be divided by 30, which results in 26 metric tons of CO₂e per year, to determine an annual construction emissions estimate comparable to operational emissions.

Operation

Greenhouse gas emissions were calculated for long-term area source and motor vehicle operations. As shown in Table 3 to the Technical Memorandum, the Current New Project would emit 1,343 metric tons of CO₂e per year during typical operations, including the amortized construction emissions.

Consistent with the Revised AB 32 Scoping Plan, the Technical Memorandum compared the Current Project's emissions as proposed to the Current Project's emissions if the Current Project were built using a Business-As-Usual (BAU) (or No Action Taken, NAT) approach in terms of design, methodology, and technology. This means the Current Project's emissions were calculated as if the Current Project was constructed before AB 32 compared to the Current Project as constructed with project design features to reduce GHG and with several regulatory measures adopted in furtherance of AB 32.

Both one-time emissions and indirect emissions are expected to occur each year after build-out of the Current Project. As noted, one-time emissions from construction were amortized over a 30-year period. The emissions for the Current Project and its associated CARB 2020 NAT scenario are estimated to be 1,343 and 1,742 MT CO₂e per year, respectively, which demonstrates that the Current Project would reduce emissions by 23 percent from the CARB 2020 NAT scenario. Based on these results, the Current Project exceeds or meets the reduction target as a numeric threshold (16.7 percent) set forth in the Revised AB 32 Scoping Plan. As a result, the Current Project's contribution to global climate change is not cumulatively considerable and is considered less than significant.

There is no adopted quantitative GHG significance threshold applicable to the Project. The SCAQMD has formed a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group ("Working Group") to provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents. As of the last Working Group meeting (Meeting No. 15) held in September 2010, the SCAQMD is proposing to adopt a tiered approach for evaluating GHG emissions for development projects where SCAQMD is not the lead agency. With the tiered approach, the project is compared with the requirements of each tier sequentially and would not result in a significant impact, if it complies with any tier. Tier 3 excludes projects with annual emissions lower than a screening threshold. For all non-industrial projects, the SCAQMD is considering a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂eq per year. SCAQMD concluded that projects with emissions less than the screening threshold would not result in a significant cumulative impact. As noted, the Current Project would generate 1343 metric tons of

CO₂e per year, which is well below the proposed screening threshold. While this screening threshold is not a formally adopted significance threshold, it supports the conclusion that the Current Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions and global climate change. Moreover, as set forth in Table 4 to the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would be consistent with all feasible and applicable strategies recommended in the Scoping Plan.

Cumulative Impacts

The CO₂ estimates from mobile sources (particularly CO₂, CH₄, and NO₂ emissions) are likely much greater than the emissions that would actually occur. The methodology used assumes that all emissions sources are new sources and that emissions from these sources are 100 percent additive to existing conditions. This is a standard approach taken for air quality analyses. In many cases, such an assumption is appropriate because it is impossible to determine whether emissions sources associated with a project move from outside the air basin and are, in effect, new emissions sources, or whether they are sources that were already in the air basin and just shifted to a new location. However, because the effects of GHGs are global, a project that shifts the location of a GHG-emitting activity (e.g., where people live, where vehicles drive, or where companies conduct business) would result in no net change in global GHG emissions levels.

Much of the vehicle-generated CO₂ emissions attributed to the Current Project could simply be from vehicles at an existing location moving to the Project Site, and not from new vehicle emissions sources relative to global climate change. Therefore, although it is not possible to calculate the net contribution of vehicle-generated CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O₂ emissions from the Current Project (i.e., Project generated emissions minus current emissions from vehicles that would move to the Project Site), the net contribution would likely be much less than the estimated emissions.

For the foregoing reasons, the Current Project's cumulative impact on climate change is considered less than significant.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The previously existing office/radio station structure on-site has been demolished. Prior to such demolition, the structure was surveyed for hazardous materials and any such materials (including PCBs, ACM, LBP, and USTs) would have been abated in accordance with applicable laws. Therefore, the Current Project does not involve the demolition of existing structures that would have an impact related to the upset or release of materials during demolition.

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would use, at most, minimal amounts of hazardous materials for routine cleaning that would not pose any health risk and would not include elements or other aspects that would create any health hazard or produce hazardous emissions. Therefore, hazardous waste impacts during operation of the Current Project would be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project and also less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Hazardous materials and risk of upset conditions are largely site-specific, and, therefore, each related project would require evaluation for potential threats to public safety. Further, local municipalities are required to follow local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials. Therefore, cumulative hazardous waste impacts under the Current Project would be the same as

those under the Original Project and the Revised Project and also less than significant.

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

The conditions that could affect Current Project impacts to hydrology and water quality remain unchanged compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project. These conditions include the location of the Project Site, the construction plan, and the Project's compliance with all water quality and waste discharge requirements.

The Current Project's surface water quality impacts during construction will be similar to or less than those of the Original Project and the Revised Project. While the same amount of land will be graded and the construction area would be the same, the Current Project would have one to 1.5 fewer levels of subterranean parking.

The Current Project's water quality impacts during operation will be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and the Current Project also proposes multi-family residential uses with ground-floor commercial space, within the same building footprint. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will comply with the requirements of NPDES Permit No. CA0061654. Further, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will not result in a change in the Project Site coverage from existing setting conditions and would include approximately the same impervious and permeable surface ratios, and would not contribute to groundwater depletion or interfere with groundwater recharge to an environmentally significant degree.

Finally, as the Current Project will be located on the same site as the Original Project and the Revised Project, it would result in a less than significant impact with respect to flooding.

For the foregoing reasons, hydrology and water quality impacts of the Current Project will be the same as or less than the impacts for the Original Project and the Revised Project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will have a less than significant impact associated with groundwater supplies, drainage patterns, water quality, stormwater drainage, and flooding. Also like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will have a less than significant impact associated with water quality, with the incorporation of the EIR's mitigation measures to ensure compliance with water quality requirements.

Cumulative Impacts

Little, if any, additional cumulative runoff would be expected from the Project Site and the related project sites since this part of the City is already fully developed with impervious surfaces. Therefore, cumulative impacts to the existing or planned stormwater drainage system would be less than significant. In addition, development on each site would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards that are designed to ensure water quality and hydrological conditions are not adversely affected. All of the related projects would be required to implement BMPs and to conform to the existing NPDES water quality program. Therefore, cumulative water quality impacts would be the same for the Current Project as the Original Project and the Revised Project and less than significant.

10. Land Use

As the Current Project is located on the same site as the Original Project and the Revised Project, it would not physically divide an established community, nor would it conflict with a habitat or

community conservation plan.

The Current Project proposes a similar building with a similar footprint to the Revised Project, with eight apartment units in lieu of the eight live/work units proposed for the Revised Project. The Current Project also replaces the Revised Project's 13,442 square feet of office space with 2,325 square feet of restaurant/retail space. Therefore, the Current Project is also consistent with the land use designations for the Project Site contained in the General Plan Framework, the currently applicable 1988 Hollywood Community Plan, and the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan.

The City Council approved a Zone/Height District Change for the Original Project from C4-2D-SN to (T)(Q)C4-2-SN pursuant to LAMC Section 12.32F and included a Q Condition that permits a maximum FAR on the project site of 4.5:1, or 114,642 square feet. The Current Project proposes slightly less floor area of 114,311 square feet, which is consistent with the Q Condition and zoning. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts with respect to height and FAR would be less than significant, and the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

The Current Project's signage is consistent with the current requirements of the Hollywood Signage Supplemental Use District ("SUD"). Subsequent to certification of the Final EIR, the Hollywood SUD was amended and now prohibits new supergraphic signs in Hollywood. Any new signage, such as building identification signage, would be required to comply with the LAMC and Hollywood SUD. The Current Project does not propose a supergraphic sign, and all signage will comply with the Hollywood SUD. Therefore, impacts related to signage for the Current Project would be less than significant.

In accordance with Section 12.22.A.18 of the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code, the Current Project's residential density is governed by the R5 standards. Per Section 12.12 C 4 (c), the R5 zone permits one dwelling unit per 200 square feet of lot area. Based on the Project Site total area of 25,476 square feet, a maximum total of 127 residential units are permitted on the project site. The Current Project proposes a total of 116 apartment units, which is below the maximum density permitted for the site. Therefore, the Current Project is consistent with residential zoning density requirements, and, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, impacts would remain less than significant.

The Current Project provides LAMC required parking for the proposed apartment and commercial uses. As part of the project approvals, Q Condition A.5 requires a minimum of 242 parking spaces for the project. However, this Q condition is based on the condominium uses that were part of the Original Project and reflected the Applicant's desire to provide more parking spaces for the for-sale units. Therefore, the Applicant has requested clarification of this Q condition as the Current Project meets Code requirements for apartment uses. With the Q condition clarification, the Current Project is consistent with the parking requirements of the Q conditions.

All other aspects of the Current Project that would have the potential to result in a land use impact remain unchanged from the Original Project and the Revised Project. As the entitlements requested for the Original Project were granted upon project EIR certification and project approval, the Current Project would be consistent with the existing zoning and all other development limitations of the site. Therefore, the land use and planning impacts of the Current Project would be less than significant, like the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of the related projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and
Page 15

regulations. As with the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project in conjunction with the related projects would result in an intensification of existing prevailing land uses in the project area. In addition, based upon the information available regarding the related projects, it is reasonable to assume that the projects under consideration in the surrounding area would implement and support important local and regional planning goals and policies. Therefore, cumulative land use impacts would be the same for the Current Project as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and less than significant.

11. Mineral Resources

The conditions that could affect mineral resources would remain unchanged with the Current Project because the Project Site does not include any areas of mineral resource value. The mineral resource impacts of the Current Project would be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project; there would continue to be no impact to mineral resources.

Cumulative Impacts

As with the Original Project, the Current Project would result in no impact with respect to mineral resources and would not combine with any other project to result in a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts to mineral resources would be the same for the Current Project as the Original Project and less than significant.

12. Noise

Potential noise impacts of the Original Project are set forth in the EIR and the 2008 Addendum. The 2008 Addendum was prepared in response to EMI's concerns regarding the construction and operational noise and vibration impacts of the Original Project on EMI's recording studio echo chambers. The 2008 Addendum included additional information developed from on-site studies, technical and expert noise and vibration analysis and reports, on-site noise and vibration measurements, and consultation with EMI's noise consultants and recording engineers. The additional information and analysis contained in the 2008 Addendum supports the conclusions of the EIR that (1) the Original Project would cause a temporary significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impact to the Capitol Records site, and (2) impacts to the Capitol Records site due to operation of the Original Project would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant volunteered to comply with additional mitigation measures to further reduce impacts related to the Capitol Records site.

Construction Noise

The Current Project proposes a building in the same general footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project, although the Current Project would be slightly larger than the Revised Project (by approximately 2,729 square feet) and slightly smaller (by approximately 331 square feet) than the Original Project. In addition, the Current Project would remove a level of subterranean parking when compared to the Revised Project and 1.5 levels when compared to the Original Project. Construction noise levels will be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project, but the duration of constructing a smaller subterranean parking structure will be shorter than the Original Project and the Revised Project. Nevertheless, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the Capitol Records Tower during project construction, but the impacts would be slightly less severe due to the reduction in the amount of subterranean parking and the previous demolition of the on-site uses.

Construction Vibration

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, construction activities for the Current Project have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration at the multi-family residential units and the Capitol Records Tower. However, the Current Project's construction activities are reduced compared to the Original Project and Revised Project because on-site structures have already been demolished and the subterranean parking has been reduced—thereby reducing the duration of construction impacts. The Capitol Records Tower contains active recording studios that are located in subterranean spaces approximately 30 to 40 feet from the western project site boundary. Therefore, vibration sensitive activities at the Capitol Records Tower may be temporarily and intermittently impacted during various phases of Current Project construction, thus, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact, which is slightly less than the Original Project and the Revised Project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will implement the supplemental mitigation measures proposed in the 2008 Addendum to reduce such impacts to the extent feasible.

Operational Noise – Vehicular

The traffic impact memorandum prepared by traffic experts Fehr & Peers for the Current Project concluded that the Current Project would result in the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project and more daily trips per day when compared to the Original Project. Typically, it takes a doubling of traffic to increase roadway noise by 3 dBA CNEL, which is the City's most stringent threshold for a significant impact. While the Current Project would generate 109 more daily trips than the Original Project's 364 daily trips, this modest increase does not represent a doubling of traffic on any roadways in the vicinity of the Project Site. As set forth in the EIR, traffic generated by the Original Project would only increase local noise levels by a maximum of 0.1 dBA CNEL for the roadway segments of Yucca Street (from Argyle Avenue to Gower Street) and Gower Street (north of Yucca Street), when compared with the future traffic volumes without the project, which is well below the significance threshold of 3.0 dBA. Therefore, the additional trips generated by the Current Project would not result in any significant impact. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and similar to the impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Operational Noise – Stationary

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project would contribute to an overall increase in ambient noise levels in the project area. However, the Current Project is of the same size and scale as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and would develop the same uses on the Project Site. Therefore, impacts associated with noise generated as a result of the operation of the Current Project upon the adjacent multi-family uses and Capitol Records Tower will be less than significant, and the same as the impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

Each of the related projects would be subject to the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331, which reduces construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible by prohibiting loud, unnecessary, and unusual construction noise within 500 feet from any residential zone, and LAMC Section 41.40, which limits the hours of allowable construction activities. Conformance with these City policies would reduce construction-related noise for the related projects. However, due to the close proximity of the related projects on the Project Site block, as well as additional related projects located along Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street,

under a worst case scenario, all of these projects (including the Current Project) could be developed simultaneously. Therefore, noise generated during the construction phase of these projects is conservatively considered to be a significant temporary cumulative impact, and, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution would be considerable.

With respect to operational noise, all related projects would require exterior walls to be constructed to provide a Sound Transmission Class of 50 or greater as defined in UBC No. 35-1, 1979 edition or any amendment thereto, or to mitigate interior noise levels below a CNEL of 45 dBA in any habitable room. Conformance with these requirements would reduce operational-related noise. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable operational noise impact, and cumulative noise impacts due to operation would be less than significant. In addition, the cumulative increase in roadway noise would be below the significance threshold. Therefore, as with the Original Project and the Revised Project, roadway noise impacts under the Current Project would not be cumulatively considerable. In addition, as with the Original Project and Revised Project, with Noise Ordinance compliance, the combined impact of the operational noise levels from the Current Project and existing noise levels on interior and exterior noise levels on adjacent properties would be less than significant and, therefore, not cumulatively considerable.

13. Population and Housing

For purposes of impact analysis, the Technical Memorandum calculated that approximately 269 people would occupy the proposed residential units in the Current Project—which is higher than the 219 people estimated to occupy the Original Project. This estimate is based on an average household size of 2.3 persons in the Hollywood Community Plan Area (“HCPA”) provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”). However, this estimate is conservative and likely overstates the actual population of the Current Project because it does not account for common household size relative to unit type. The Current Project proposes 15 studios, 77 one-bedroom units, and 24 two-bedroom units. Typically studio units are occupied by one occupant, reducing the Current Project's population to 247.

In April 2012, SCAG adopted the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012-2035 RTP/SCS) based, in part, on data from the 2010 U.S. Census. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS provides population estimates for the City of Los Angeles in both 2020 and 2035. The 2020 population is estimated to be 3,991,700 persons, and the 2035 population is estimated to be 4,320,600 persons. The Current Project's population growth would therefore represent a negligible portion of the City's estimated population growth. In addition, as of the 2010 U.S. Census, the Project Site's Census Tract (1910.00) had a population of 3,228 persons. Therefore, the Current Project represents approximately 7.7 percent of the Census Tract population. Overall, the Current Project does not represent a substantial or significant growth as compared to the existing characteristics. The 116 housing units added by the Revised Project would represent approximately 0.88 percent of the anticipated new housing units between 2005 and 2030 in the Hollywood community. As such, the Current Project would not directly induce substantial housing growth, and impacts related to housing would be less than significant.

The Current Project also results in the generation of job opportunities for approximately five new employees. To provide a conservative analysis, the Technical Memorandum assumed that the majority of jobs created by the Current Project would be filled by individuals with families. Therefore, each employee would represent one family household, assuming that only one person per family would be employed by the Current Project. The Technical Memorandum also

conservatively assumes that each family would move to the project area as a result of the job in the Current Project. In fact, the Current Project would have a large local pool of potential employees from which to draw. Based on a ratio of approximately 2.3 persons per household, the five new jobs generated by the Current Project would generate an additional 12 new residents under the conservative assumptions.

The total project population, including the residential component combined with the commercial uses (247 + 12 = 259 people), would constitute approximately 1.3 percent of the Hollywood population growth expected by 2030. This is not considered to be a substantial increase, as the project's contribution to the growth does not exceed the population estimate for the Hollywood community by 2030. As such, the population growth associated with the Current Project has already been anticipated and planned for in the area, and impacts would be less than significant.

Overall, the population and housing impacts of the Current Project would be similar to the Original Project and the Revised Project, and impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The number of people that would be generated by the Original Project in combination with the related projects would potentially exceed the projected population increase for the Hollywood Community Plan Area. However, this overall growth has been anticipated by SCAG, City, and CRA regional forecasts. Moreover, recent census data shows that actual population growth in Hollywood through 2010 was slower than anticipated, thereby making it unlikely that growth will exceed the projections. In addition, concentration of population and employment growth in a highly urbanized area such as Hollywood, with excellent access to the regional transportation system, is promoted in numerous regional and local land use plans and policies. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution to cumulative population and housing growth would not be considerable.

14. Public Services

Demand for public services depends on the type and intensity of land uses. A change in a project's operational land uses, a substantial increase in floor area, or a substantial increase in the number of dwelling units could have the potential to increase the demand for police, fire, school, parks, and other public facilities, thereby changing the impacts to public services.

The Current Project is the same size and scale as the Original Project and the Revised Project. While the Current Project proposes incrementally more residential units than the Original Project, there is no change of use or substantial change in use intensity compared to the Original Project or the Revised Project. Moreover, as set forth in Section 13, Population and Housing of the Technical Memorandum, the total onsite population (residents plus employees) would be somewhat less under the Current Project (259), than under the Original Project (290) or the Revised Project (305). Consequently, there is no potential to increase substantially impacts or demands on public services as set forth in the EIR and Addendum.

The Current Project would utilize the same public services infrastructure as the Original Project and the Revised Project because all proposed changes are generally internal and overall project intensity and size is not increasing. The analysis in the EIR concluded that the existing public services infrastructure could sufficiently accommodate the Original Project. The changes of the Current Project with respect to public services would not increase substantially the demand for public services to the extent that the Current Project's demand for services could not be met.

As such, the public services impacts of the Current Project would be comparable to the Original Project and the Approved Project. Impacts would remain less than significant with the implementation of the EIR's mitigation measures.

Cumulative Impacts

Each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAFD review and would be required to comply with all applicable construction-related and operational fire safety requirements of the LAFD and the City in order to adequately mitigate fire protection impacts.

Any new or expanded police station would be funded via existing mechanisms (i.e., sales taxes, government funding) to which the Current Project and related projects would contribute. Furthermore, similar to the Current Project, each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAPD review, and would be required to comply with all applicable safety requirements of the LAPD and the City in order to adequately address police protection service demands.

The applicants of the related projects would be required to pay required developer school fees to the LAUSD (pursuant to SB 50) to help reduce any impacts they may have on school services. The provisions of SB 50 are deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. The payment of these fees by the related projects would ensure that cumulative impacts upon school services remain less than significant.

The increase in the residential population by cumulative growth in the HCPA and project area would, in the absence of mitigation, lower the City's existing parkland to population ratio, which is below their preferred standard. Impacts associated with cumulative growth would be reduced through developer fees, conditions of approval, and environmental review procedures. However, there is no certainty that conditions of approval or Quimby fees would be effective in addressing cumulative impacts, due to the limited number of existing parks and lack of available sites on which new parks could be developed. Further, the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment EIR concluded that cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation would be cumulatively significant. Therefore, it is conservatively assumed that, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution would be considerable and impacts would be cumulatively significant.

The cumulative demand of the Current Project and the related projects may present a potentially significant impact on library facilities. However, with payment of the library mitigation fees recommended in Mitigation Measure K.5-1, the potentially significant cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than significant. As such, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project and the related projects would result in a less than significant impact with respect to library services. Therefore, like the Original Project, the Current Project's impact on libraries would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

15. Traffic/Transportation/Parking

Fehr & Peers prepared the Revised Project Traffic Analysis Validation & Update, dated June 14, 2012 (the "Traffic Study Update"), which updated the traffic analysis that was prepared for the Original Project. The Traffic Study Update is set forth in Appendix B to the Addendum.

The Traffic Study Update analyzed: (1) whether the original traffic study baseline (traffic counts and cumulative analysis) in the EIR remains sufficient or needs updating for the Revised

Project; (2) whether the Revised Project description with increased residential density could potentially create new significant traffic impacts not previously identified; and (3) an “existing plus project” approach consistent with recent case law decisions.

LADOT reviewed and approved the Traffic Study Update by letter to the Department of City Planning on January 11, 2013 (included as Appendix C to the Addendum). This letter stated that the Traffic Study Update adequately evaluated and determined that the Revised Project would not result in new or more severe traffic impacts.

Baseline Validation

Base Year

The Traffic Study Update shows that existing traffic volumes at the intersections in the vicinity of the Revised Project are measurably lower than traffic volumes identified in the EIR.

Baseline traffic counts for the original traffic study for the Original Project were collected primarily in 2005 to 2006. To determine whether the counts adequately represent current conditions, new traffic counts were collected at four of the 10 study intersections and on the one study roadway segment identified in the EIR to determine whether traffic volumes have increased since the original traffic study was prepared. Intersections that were shown in the 2007 traffic study to have the worst level of service and highest project incremental increase in volume to capacity (V/C) ratio were selected to this comparison, because they would have the highest potential for a project traffic impact to be triggered if baseline traffic volumes had grown since the original traffic study was prepared.

New traffic volumes were collected in May 2012, during a non-holiday week when schools were in session. Addendum Table IV-4 lists the study intersections that were counted in 2012, and compares the total a.m. and p.m. peak hour turning movement volumes between 2006 and 2012. As shown in this table, traffic volumes at the four comparison study intersections in 2012 are the same or less than the traffic volumes at the same study intersections in 2006, ranging from approximately 100% to 86% of the 2006 traffic volumes (0% to 14% less).

During the same day that the peak period intersection turning movement counts were collected, a 24-hour roadway segment count was conducted on Yucca Street. The 2012 count showed 2,157 daily trips on Yucca Street during the 24-hour period, compared to 2,440 trips during a 24-hour period in 2006. Thus, the 2012 count is approximately 88% of the 2012 count (12% less).

Because the 2012 peak hour intersection counts and the 24-hour count are the same or less than the baseline 2006 traffic volumes in the original traffic study, the base year traffic analysis contained in the original traffic study remains representative of existing conditions set forth in the Addendum. For several intersections, use of the base year analysis for the original traffic study is a conservative assessment of existing conditions because traffic volumes have declined at some intersections relative to 2006 traffic volumes.

Cumulative Baseline

As required by LADOT, the potential for Revised Project impacts was assessed against a future cumulative baseline, which accounted for growth in regional traffic (ambient growth), as well as traffic from known development projects in the study area (related projects).

Following common practice at the time, the original traffic study added an ambient growth factor

of 1% per year to the 2006 base year traffic (4% total growth). Addendum Table IV-4 shows that this level of expected ambient growth in traffic has not occurred; 2012 traffic volumes are the same or less than the 2006 traffic volumes. Thus, the use of the Cumulative Base scenario from the original traffic study would result in a conservative assessment of regional traffic growth, and so can be considered an adequate baseline to assess the potential for project related impacts for a new future base year that reflects the delayed implementation of the project.

To determine the adequacy of the analysis of related projects in the original traffic study, a new related project list was obtained from LADOT in May 2012 for related projects located within a two-mile radius of the Current Project. Some projects that were analyzed in the original traffic study are still on the list, but many new projects have been added, and old projects have been removed. Traffic Study Update Table 2 details the current related project list, as well as LADOT's estimates for daily, a.m., and p.m. peak hour trips generated for each related project. This table compares the total daily, a.m., and p.m. peak hour trip generation for all related projects against the totals for the related projects on the list from the original traffic study.

Table 2 to Traffic Study Update shows that cumulative trips from the 2012 related projects list are lower than the cumulative trips from the original related projects list. Projects on the 2012 related project list are estimated to generate approximately 102,980 daily, 6,722 a.m. peak hour, and 9,668 p.m. peak hour trips, approximately 10% fewer daily trips, 12% fewer a.m. peak hour trips, and 11% fewer p.m. peak hour trips than the related projects list from the original traffic study. Because the related projects from the original traffic study generated more trips than the current list, the use of the original Cumulative Base scenario would thus result in a more conservative baseline to assess potential Revised Project impacts.

Because both the ambient growth rate and related project trip generation for the original Cumulative Base scenario would result in a more conservative baseline for assessing the potential for Revised Project impacts, the baseline from the original traffic study has been retained for the updated analysis detailed in the Traffic Study Update to provide a more conservative analysis.

Updated Trip Generation Analysis

Addendum Table IV-5 shows that the Revised Project is expected to generate 473 daily trips, 32 a.m. peak hour trips, and 38 p.m. peak hour trips, which are approximately 109 additional daily trips, 7 additional a.m. peak hour trips, and 6 additional p.m. peak hour trips compared to the Original Project.

Intersection and Street Segment Analysis

The Revised Project trips were distributed to the street network using the trip distribution pattern specified in the 2007 traffic study. Project trips were assigned to the Cumulative Base traffic volumes from the original traffic study to develop Cumulative plus Project traffic volumes reflecting the updated project description. Addendum Table IV-6 shows that the Revised Project would not result in any significant project-related traffic impacts.

As set forth in Table 10 to the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project, but 20 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and eight fewer p.m. peak hour trips. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the Addendum regarding Cumulative plus Project traffic impacts also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plus Project Traffic Impact Analysis

The original traffic study for the Original Project was prepared in accordance with the methodology prescribed in LADOT's Traffic Study Guidelines applicable at the time the study was prepared. Consistent with LADOT's methodology, the study evaluated the potential for project-related intersection traffic impacts against a future baseline condition at the date of anticipated project build out (then 2010).

In December 2010, the California Court of Appeal for the Sixth District issued an opinion on the case *Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Association v. City of Sunnyvale City Council* ("*Sunnyvale*"), pertaining to the environmental baselines used in an EIR for a long-range transportation improvement. The *Sunnyvale* decision interprets CEQA to require that project-specific impacts should be analyzed based upon adding a project's impacts to existing conditions.

Consistent with *Sunnyvale*, the Revised Project was analyzed using existing conditions as the baseline to assess the potential for Revised Project impacts, including lane configurations and the 2006 existing traffic volumes. Project-only trips reflecting the Revised Project were assigned to existing traffic volumes using the same procedure as described above for the Cumulative plus Project scenario to develop Existing plus Project traffic volumes. Addendum Table IV-7 shows that the Revised Project does not result in a significant impact at any study intersection under an Existing-plus-Project scenario, as the increase in traffic from the Revised Project would not exceed any LADOT thresholds of significance.

As noted, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips than the Revised Project, but 20 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and eight fewer p.m. peak hour trips. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the Addendum regarding Existing plus Project traffic impacts also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant.

2013 Additional Update

In response to the Appeal, Fehr & Peers further updated the Traffic Study Update by Memorandum dated October 7, 2013 (the "2013 Traffic Memo"). The 2013 Traffic Memo addressed whether adding the recently approved Millennium Hollywood Project to the related projects list would change the Revised Project's cumulative impact analysis.

Like the Traffic Study Update, the 2013 Traffic Memo also shows that the EIR's cumulative traffic analysis was more conservative and had greater impacts than would occur under present conditions.

"[T]he related project list used in the [original] 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base scenario has ***higher trip generation, and thus is more conservative, than the 2012 related project list, with the addition of the Millennium Hollywood Project trips.*** The second comparison reviewed the Millennium Hollywood Project Future + Project V/C ratios and LOS, compared with the 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base Scenario. We found that the [original] 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base Scenario ***was more conservative*** at most intersections and most peak hours." (2013 Traffic Memo, p. 6 [emphasis added].)

Similarly, adding the Millennium Hollywood Project trips to the cumulative analysis did not result in a significant increase in cumulative traffic impacts under current conditions.

"We found that the 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base Scenario was more conservative at

most intersections and most peak hours. The two intersections where the Millennium Hollywood Project estimated level of service falls an LOS letter grade, and which would result in a stricter traffic impact criteria, are locations where the 6230 Yucca Project related V/C increase is well below the strictest traffic impact criteria. Thus **the inclusion of the Millennium Hollywood Project in the analysis for the 6230 Yucca Project does not alter the conclusions of the prior analysis: that there are no expected significant project-related traffic impacts.**

As noted, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project, but 20 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and eight fewer p.m. peak hour trips. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the 2013 Traffic Memo also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant even with the inclusion of the Millennium Hollywood Project in the analysis.

Residential Street Segment Analysis

The residential street segment analysis from the traffic study for the Original Project was updated based on the revised trip generation estimates. Addendum Table IV-8 shows that the Revised Project would be expected to generate 198 daily trips on the segment (compared with 152 trips for the Original Project as analyzed in 2007). While this represents an increase of 46 daily trips, the Revised Project generated traffic would still be below the impact threshold, so this increase would not cause a new significant impact.

As noted, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the Addendum regarding residential street impacts also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant.

Parking

The Current Project would provide a sufficient number of parking spaces to meet the LAMC requirements for the proposed apartment and commercial uses. The City's guidelines for determining CEQA impacts set forth significance thresholds for parking impacts. Under the guidelines, a project that provides all the vehicle parking required by City regulations and policies is deemed to have a less than significant parking impact. The Current Project parking meets the LAMC requirements. Therefore, the Current Project results in a less than significant impact with respect to parking, same as the Original Project.

Freeway Impacts

In October 2013, the City and Caltrans District 7 entered into an Agreement Between City of Los Angeles and Caltrans District 7 On Freeway Impact Analysis Procedures. The purpose of this agreement was to develop a screening methodology to determine when a proposed project within the City should work with Caltrans to prepare a Freeway Impact Analysis, utilizing Caltrans' "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" ("TIS Guide"). Based on the agreement, this coordination and analysis would be required for projects that meet any of the following criteria:

- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 1-percent or more increase to the freeway mainline capacity of a freeway segment operating at level-of-service (LOS) E or F (based on an assumed capacity of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane);

- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 2-percent or more increase to the freeway mainline capacity of a freeway segment operating at LOS D (based on an assumed capacity of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane); or
- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 1-percent or more increase to the capacity of a freeway off-ramp operating at LOS E or F (based on an assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane); or
- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 2-percent or more increase to the capacity of a freeway off-ramp operating at LOS D (based on an assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane).

Projects that do not exceed any of the above thresholds are deemed to have a less than significant impact on Caltrans' facilities.

Fehr & Peers prepared a memorandum entitled "6230 Yucca Street Project Caltrans Freeway Screening," dated October 13, 2014 (included as Attachment C to the Technical Memorandum), in order to determine whether the Current Project exceed any of the above thresholds. The memorandum concluded that the Current Project would not exceed any of the thresholds. Therefore, no Freeway Impact Analysis is warranted, and the Current Project's freeway impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The analysis described above includes an analysis of cumulative impacts. As set forth above, cumulative impacts for the Current Project would be similar to the Original Project and the Revised Project and also less than significant.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

The Current Project would utilize the same utilities infrastructure as the Original Project and the Revised Project. The analysis in the EIR and Addendum respectively concluded that the existing infrastructure had capacity to accommodate the Original Project and the Revised Project, and that utility impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project would be less than significant. As set forth in the Technical Memorandum, the minor changes of the Current Project would not increase the demand for public utilities to the extent where the Current Project's utilities demand would exceed the infrastructure capacity.

With respect to wastewater generation, the Current Project would generate approximately 14,978 gallons per day, which represents a decrease of 478 gallons per day when compared to the Revised Project. With respect to water consumption, the Current Project would consume approximately 17,973 gallons per day, which represents a decrease of 575 gallons per day when compared to the Revised Project. The Current Project would generate approximately 1,431 pounds of solid waste per day, which is a decrease of 69 pounds per day when compared to the Revised Project. Implementation of the Current Project would consume approximately 15,736 cubic feet of natural gas per day, which is a decrease of approximately 1,074 cubic feet per day when compared to the Revised Project. The Current Project would consume approximately 2,090 kilowatt hours of electricity per day, which is a decrease of approximately 175 kilowatt hours per day when compared to the Revised Project.

The Addendum concluded that the Revised Project's impacts on utilities and service systems would be similar to the Approved Project and less than significant. The Current Project's

impacts on water, wastewater, solid waste, natural gas, and electricity would be less than those of the Revised Project and thus also less than significant. Overall, the changes proposed by the Current Project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts upon public utilities or result in a substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Based on the service area reliability assessment conducted by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (“LADWP”) in its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, LADWP determined that it will be able to reliably provide water to its customers through the year 2035, as well as the intervening years (e.g., the year that the Current Project will become operational). Additionally, under the provisions of Senate Bill 610, LADWP is required to prepare a comprehensive water supply assessment for every new development “project” (as defined by Section 10912 of the Water Code) within its service area that reaches certain thresholds. The types of projects that are subject to the requirements of Senate Bill 610 tend to be larger projects that may or may not have been included within the growth projections of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. The water supply assessment for such projects would evaluate the quality and reliability of existing and projected water supplies, as well as alternative sources of water supply and measures to secure alternative sources if needed. Furthermore, through LADWP’s Urban Water Management Plan process and the City’s Securing L.A.’s Water Supply, the City will meet all new demand for water due to projected population growth through a combination of water conservation and water recycling. These plans outline the creation of sustainable sources of water for the City to reduce dependence on imported supplies. LADWP is planning to achieve these goals by expanding its water conservation efforts through public education, installing high efficient water fixtures, providing incentives, and expanding the City’s outdoor water conservation program. To increase recycled water use, LADWP is expanding the recycled water distribution system to provide water for irrigation, industrial use, and groundwater recharge.

Compliance of the Current Project and future development projects with regulatory requirements that promote water conservation such as the LAMC, including the City’s Green Building Code, as well as AB 32, would also assist in assuring that adequate water supply is available on a cumulative basis. Based on the above, it is anticipated that LADWP would be able to supply the demands of the Current Project, as well as future growth. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project’s impacts on water supply would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts on water supply would be less than significant.

As with the Current Project, new development projects occurring in the project vicinity would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation via a sewer capacity availability request to determine adequate sewer capacity. In addition, new development projects would also be subject to LAMC Sections 64.11 and 64.12, which require approval of a sewer permit prior to connection to the sewer system. Additionally, in order to connect to the sewer system, related projects in the City of Los Angeles would be subject to payment of the City’s Sewerage Facilities Charge. Payment of such fees would help to offset the costs associated with infrastructure improvements that would be needed to accommodate wastewater generated by overall future growth. If system upgrades are required as a result of a given project’s additional flow, arrangements would be made between the related project and the Bureau of Sanitation to construct the necessary improvements. Furthermore, similar to the Current Project, each related project would be required to comply with applicable water conservation programs, including the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Related Project’s impacts on the City’s wastewater infrastructure would not be

cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

The City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation's Integrated Resources Plan ("IRP") projects wastewater flows and wastewater treatment capacity through 2020. Therefore, cumulative impacts on wastewater facilities were analyzed relative to future growth projected in the Hyperion Service Area. The Hyperion Service Area's total treatment capacity would be approximately 550 mgd in 2020, which is the same as its existing capacity. As set forth in the Addendum, the cumulative wastewater generation would represent only approximately two percent of remaining capacity. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts on wastewater treatment would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Operation of the Current Project in conjunction with forecasted growth in the County (inclusive of the related projects) would generate municipal solid waste and result in a cumulative increase in the demand for waste disposal capacity at Class III landfills. The Countywide demand for landfill capacity is continually evaluated by the County through preparation of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Reports ("Annual Reports"). Each Annual Report assesses future landfill disposal needs over a 15-year planning horizon. As such, 2012 Annual Report projects waste generation and available landfill capacity through 2027. The Annual Report assumes a 60 percent diversion rate. Given the recent approval of the City's Exclusive Franchise System, which the City expects to start implementing in 2017, waste diversion from City sources will likely be higher than the assumed 60 percent (based on the City's current diversion rate of 72 percent). Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the estimated Current Project's generation of waste per year would represent only a fraction of the cumulative waste generation. Thus, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution to the County's estimated cumulative waste stream in the Project buildout year would not be cumulatively considerable.

Furthermore, the 2012 Annual Report demonstrates that future disposal needs can be adequately met through the planning period (i.e., 2027) without disposal capacity shortages via a multi-pronged approach that includes successfully permitting and developing proposed in-County landfill expansions, utilizing available or planned out-of-County disposal capacity, developing necessary infrastructure to facilitate exportation of waste to out-of-County landfills, and developing conversion and other alternative technologies. Jurisdictions in the County of Los Angeles continue to implement and enhance the waste reduction, recycling, special waste, and public education programs identified in their respective planning directives. These efforts, together with Countywide and regional programs implemented by the County and the cities, acting in concert or independently, have achieved significant, measurable results, as documented in the 2012 Annual Report. Based on this trend, and because solid waste disposal is an essential public service that must be provided without interruption in order to protect public health and safety, as well as the environment, it is reasonable to assume that concerted actions will continue to be taken by jurisdictions towards expanding and enhancing waste reduction and recycling programs, and implementing prudent solid waste management strategies in response to the strategies identified in the 2012 Annual Report. With respect to regulatory consistency, it is anticipated that, similar to the Current Project, the related projects would not conflict with and instead would promote source reduction and recycling, consistent with AB 939 and the City's Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan, City's General Plan Framework Element, RENEW LA Plan, and Green LA Plan. Thus, overall, as with the Original Project and the Revised Project, cumulative impacts with regard to solid waste under the Current Project would be less than significant.

Like the Current Project, the related projects would be required to comply with Title 24 energy conservation standards. The Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment 2003 Final EIR documented that natural gas supply and infrastructure capacity would be sufficient to accommodate natural gas consumption associated with the buildout of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area to 2026, including the cumulative effects of other growth anticipated to occur within the Redevelopment Project Area (i.e., growth projected to occur under the No Project scenario). The Gas Company undertakes expansion or modification of natural gas service infrastructure to serve future growth in the within its service area as required in the normal process of providing service. Cumulative impacts related to natural gas service would be addressed through this process. As such, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable effects on natural gas supplies and infrastructure.

The Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment 2003 Final EIR documented that electrical generation and infrastructure capacity would be sufficient to accommodate electricity consumption associated with the buildout of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area to 2026, including the cumulative effects of other growth anticipated to occur within the Redevelopment Project Area (i.e., growth projected to occur under the No Project scenario). As with the Current Project, LADWP undertakes expansion or modification of electrical service infrastructure and distribution systems to serve future growth in the City as required in the normal process of providing electrical service. Cumulative impacts related to electric power service would be addressed through this process. As such, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable effect on electricity generation or infrastructure and impacts would be less than significant.

B. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the types and level of development associated with the Current Project would slowly consume renewable and non-renewable resources over the project's operational lifetime. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project would require a commitment of resources that would include (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site. Also like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project will require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics) and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development will limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during the operation of the proposed project. However, this resource consumption of the Current Project would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the Los Angeles region and is not a substantial change from the resource consumption of the Original Project and the Revised Project.

C. Growth Inducing Impacts

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project could foster economic growth in the Project area by increasing the number of residents at the project site who could patronize local business and services in the area. In addition, employment

opportunities would be provided during the construction and operation of the proposed project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, growth induced by development of the Current Project would be consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts. Also, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the roadways and other infrastructure (e.g., water facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) associated with the Current Project would not induce growth because they are existing and would only serve project residents and businesses.

D. Alternatives

The EIR considered the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1: No Build/No Project Alternative and Adaptive Re-Use/No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Density Alternative
- Alternative 3: Office Development Alternative
- Alternative 4: Mixed-Use Alternative

The Current Project constitutes a minor alteration to the Original Project, and does not create new significant impacts or increase the severity of the Original Project's significant impacts. Furthermore, no alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previously certified EIR have been identified that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

E. Statement of Overriding Considerations

The EIR identified unavoidable significant impacts that will result from implementation of the Original Project. The Current Project would result in the same significant and unavoidable impacts—albeit the severity of some of those impacts will be reduced. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decisions of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts identified in the EIR that are not substantially lessened or avoided, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. Article I of the City's CEQA Guidelines incorporates all of the State CEQA Guidelines contained in Title 15, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 *et seq.* and thereby requires, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, that the decision maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. These Addendum findings incorporate and re-state the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the Original Project.

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts with respect to construction noise and vibration and would considerably contribute to significant cumulative impacts with respect to views of the Capitol Records Tower and parks and recreational facilities, and it is not feasible to mitigate such impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City re-adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the project, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced

the benefits of the Current Project against the Current Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that the each of the project's benefits, as listed below, outweighs and overrides the significant unavoidable impacts of the project's noise and vibration during construction, as well as its contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to views of the Capitol Records Tower and parks and recreational facilities.

Summarized below are the benefits of the Original Project, which remain benefits of the Current Project. These provided the rationale for approval of the Original Project as the provide rationale for approval of the Current Project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the significant unavoidable impacts and justify the approval, adoption or issuance of all of the required permits, approvals and other entitlements for the Current Project. Despite the unavoidable impacts regarding construction noise and vibration and a contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to views of the Capitol Records Tower and parks and recreational facilities, the City approves the Current Project based on the following contributions of the Current Project to the community:

1. The project will reuse and redevelop the currently underutilized project site to provide housing and commercial office space and live/work units to serve the local community.
2. The project will provide a well-designed development that is compatible and complementary with surrounding land uses and enhances pedestrian circulation in the area.
3. In addition to providing adequate parking facilities to serve the project residents and employees, and any surplus parking would be made available to the public in the evening to for night-time parking in Hollywood.
4. The project will generate employment opportunities for the local area.
5. The project will reactivate and revitalize an under-utilized parcel of land.
6. The project will mitigate, to the extent feasible, the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.
7. The project will provide development that is financially viable.
8. The Applicant has agreed to contribute to the rehabilitation of the triangle parcel across from the Project.

F. Mitigation Monitoring Program

In accordance with the Requirements of Public Resources Code § 21081.6, the previously-adopted Mitigation Monitoring Program, which is described in full in Section IV of the Final EIR, is incorporated herein by reference and shall apply to the Current Project. The City Council reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of mitigation measures if the City Council or their designee determines that the amended or substituted mitigation measure will mitigate the identified potential environmental impacts to at least the same degree as the original mitigation measure, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

G. Independent Judgment

The Applicant's consultants prepared the screencheck versions of the Addendum, Technical Memorandum and related technical reports and memoranda. All such materials and all other materials related to the Addendum and Technical Memorandum were extensively reviewed and, where appropriate, modified by the Planning Department or other City representatives. As such, the Addendum, Technical Memorandum and all other related materials reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the Lead Agency.

H. Substantial Evidence

The City Council finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Final EIR, the Addendum, Technical Memorandum and related technical reports and memoranda referenced therein and herein, and other related materials, each of which are incorporated herein by this reference. Moreover, the City Council finds that where more than one reason exists for any finding, the City Council finds that each reason independently supports such finding, and that any reason in support of a given finding individually constitutes a sufficient basis for that finding.

I. Relationship of Findings to EIR, Addendum and Technical Memorandum

These Findings are based on the most current information available. Accordingly, to the extent there are any apparent conflicts or inconsistencies between the EIR, Addendum and/or Technical Memorandum, on the one hand, and these Findings, on the other, these Findings shall control and the EIR and Addendum or both, as the case may be, are hereby amended as set forth in these Findings.

J. Project Conditions of Approval

The mitigation measures set forth in the EIR and which are incorporated into the Original Project conditions of approval shall also be incorporated into and made conditions of the Current Project to be monitored and enforced by the City pursuant to the building permit process and the Mitigation Monitoring Program. To the extent feasible, each of the other findings and conditions of approval made by or adopted by the City Council in connection with the Current Project are also incorporated herein by this reference.

K. Custodian of Documents

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitutes the record of proceedings upon which the Director's decision is based is the City of Los Angeles, Planning Department, located at 200 North Spring Street, Room 750, Los Angeles, California 90012.

III. ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

Findings. On September 26, 2014, the Planning Director approved the Addendum in connection with approving Site Plan Review for the Current Project, finding that the EIR, along with the Addendum adequately serve as environmental clearance under CEQA for the Current Project. The City Council is relying on the Director's approval and findings in connection with the subject Q Clarification. The City Council finds that there are no changes to the Current Project, no changes in the circumstances under which the Current Project is being undertaken, and no significant new information regarding the Current Project since the Director's September 26, 2014 action.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163 and 15164, as well as CEQA Section 21166, and based upon the substantial evidence set forth in the administrative record and summarized herein the City Council further finds:

- A. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows the Current Project necessitates minor technical changes or additions to the previously-certified EIR, but that none of the conditions described CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 or 15163 calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred;
- B. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that no substantial changes are proposed in the project, including but not limited to the changes reflected in the Revised Project and the Current Project, which will require major revisions of the EIR;
- C. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that no substantial changes will occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the EIR;
- D. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that no new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete, has become available;
 - i. The project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - ii. Significant effects previously examined in EIR will not be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - iii. No mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible have been identified as now in fact to be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project;
 - iv. No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR have been identified that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment;
- E. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that although an addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the EIR, the public nevertheless had opportunities to review and comment upon the Addendum, the Technical Memorandum, and supporting analyses ;
- F. None of the public comments in the administrative record, and none of the claims or allegations set forth in the Appeal, constitute substantial evidence that would require preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR or that would require substantial revision of the previously-certified Final EIR.
 - a. The Appeal contains no expert analysis or other substantial evidence that the Current Project will result in significant impact related to geology or traffic, including impacts on local freeways, but rather consists entirely of speculation and opinion unsupported by fact.
 - b. The expert analysis set forth in the Group Delta Fault Activity Report directly refutes speculation in the Appeal that an active fault exists on the project site;

- c. The traffic analysis prepared for the Addendum, the Technical Memorandum, and supported analyses prepared in response to the Appeal provide expert analysis that directly contradicts speculation in the Appeal that the traffic trips from the recently-approved Millennium Hollywood Project would cause a new significant cumulative traffic impact.
- d. The analysis in the 6230 Yucca Street Project Caltrans Freeway Screening, provides expert analysis that directly contradicts speculation the Appeal that traffic from the Current Project would result in significant impacts on area freeways.

As summarized in Addendum and the Technical Memorandum, the changes proposed to the Original Project reduce the intensity of development in many ways and are minor. The changes would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the intensity of the severity of previously identified significant effects. The analysis contained in the Addendum and the Technical Memorandum demonstrates that the Current Project is consistent with the size, scale, and massing of the Original Project and the impact issues previously examined in the EIR would remain unchanged with the proposed minor modifications.

ARMBRUSTER GOLDSMITH & DELVAC LLP

LAND USE ENTITLEMENTS □ LITIGATION □ MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY

DALE J. GOLDSMITH
DIRECT DIAL: (310) 254-9054

11611 SAN VICENTE BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

Tel: (310) 209-8800
Fax: (310) 209-8801

E-MAIL: Dale@AGD-LandUse.com

WEB: www.AGD-LandUse.com

November 10, 2014

BY EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Planning and Land Use Management
Committee of the Los Angeles City Council
Room 395 City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attn: Sharon Gin, Sharon.gin@lacity.org

Re: 6230 Yucca Street/DIR-2012-2767-CLQ

Dear Committee Members:

We represent 6230 Yucca, LLC, the owner of the above-referenced property. In August, 2008, the City Council certified an environmental impact report (the "EIR") and approved Site Plan Review and a Zone/Height District Change for the development of an 114,252 square foot mixed-use, transit-oriented project with 13,790 square feet of commercial creative office space and 95 condominium units within a 16-story building on the Property (the "Original Project"). The Applicant subsequently made minor changes to the Original Project. As currently proposed, the project includes 116 apartment units and 2,235 square feet of commercial space within a 17-story building that includes 201 parking spaces in one subterranean and four above-grade levels (the "Current Project").

On June 21, 2013, the Planning Director approved the March 2013 Addendum to the EIR and a Q Condition Clarification to reflect the change from for sale condominiums to rental apartments, and to reduce the minimum amount of parking to reflect apartment rather than condominium requirements. On July 10, 2013, George Abrahams on behalf of the Argyle Civic Association ("ACA") appealed the Q Condition Clarification.

For the reasons set forth below, ACA's appeal is without merit. Therefore, we respectfully request that you deny the appeal and uphold the Director's approval of the Q Condition clarification.

The Honorable Planning and Land Use Committee
of the Los Angeles City Council
November 10, 2014
Page 2

A. There is No Significant New Geological Data That Contradict the Conclusions of the EIR's Geology Analysis.

ACA claims that test borings conducted on the adjacent Millennium Project site constitute significant new information requiring recirculation of the EIR. Specifically, ACA alleges that this information shows that the Current Project is within 50 feet of an active earthquake fault. In fact, test borings of another property, which actually indicate that there is no fault under the Millennium Project site, are of no relevance to the Project site. Moreover, the September 3, 2014 Fault Activity Report by Group Delta, which was based on trenching, radiocarbon dating, soil core sampling, soil aging, and cone penetration tests, concludes that there is no active fault underlying the Project site. In a letter dated October 30, 2014, the City Department of Building & Safety issued a Geology Report Approval Letter affirming the conclusions of the Fault Activity Report. Moreover, the final Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map by the State Geologist shows that there is no active earthquake fault within 50 feet of the Project site. Therefore, there is no significant new geological data that contradict the conclusions of the EIR's geology analysis.

B. The EIR Does Not Need to be Recirculated to Include a New Traffic Analysis Based on Caltrans' Protocols.

ACA asserts that the impact from growth in traffic from the Hollywood Community Plan update is new information requiring recirculation of the EIR. However, the Superior Court invalidated the Hollywood Community Plan update, so it cannot induce traffic growth.

Citing letters from Caltrans regarding the EIR for the Hollywood Community Plan update, ACC maintains that a new traffic analysis based on Caltrans' protocols must be prepared for the Project. Letters by Caltrans regarding a different, now invalidated project have no bearing on the Current Project. Caltrans did not make similar comments regarding the Project.

Moreover, in October 2013, the City and Caltrans District 7 entered into an Agreement Between City of Los Angeles and Caltrans District 7 On Freeway Impact Analysis Procedures. This agreement established thresholds for determining when an analysis of freeways impacts is required. Fehr & Peers prepared a memorandum entitled "6230 Yucca Street Project Caltrans Freeway Screening," dated October 13, 2014, which concluded that the Current Project would not exceed any of the established thresholds. Therefore, no Freeway Impact Analysis is warranted, and the Current Project's freeway impacts would be less than significant.

ACA also alleges that traffic from the Millennium Project constitutes significant new information that requires recirculation of the EIR. In response to this allegation, Fehr & Peers prepared a Traffic Study Update dated October 7, 2013, that considered the potential cumulative impacts from the Millennium Project based on current traffic conditions. This update concluded that the inclusion of the Millennium Project in the analysis would not result in any significant project-specific or cumulative traffic impacts.

The Honorable Planning and Land Use Committee
of the Los Angeles City Council
November 10, 2014
Page 3

C. There is No Other Significant New Information Requiring Recirculation of the EIR.

In response to the Appeal, CAJA, Inc. prepared a Technical Memorandum dated October 2014 (copy attached) analyzing whether the minor changes to the Original Project since certification of the EIR would result in any new or increased significant impacts. The Technical Memorandum concluded that (a) the conclusions of the EIR and Addendum are applicable to the Current Project, (b) the Current Project would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified significant effect, or otherwise require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR, (c) the Current Project is consistent with the size, scale, and massing of the Original Project, and (d) the issues previously examined in the EIR and Addendum would remain unchanged with the proposed modifications.

D. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, ACA's appeal should be denied. Please feel free to contact us if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,



Dale J. Goldsmith

cc: Councilman Mitch O'Farrell's Office
Department of City Planning
City Attorney

ARMBRUSTER GOLDSMITH & DELVAC LLP

LAND USE ENTITLEMENTS □ LITIGATION □ MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY

DALE J. GOLDSMITH
DIRECT DIAL: (310) 254-9054

11611 SAN VICENTE BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

Tel: (310) 209-8800
Fax: (310) 209-8801

E-MAIL: Dale@AGD-LandUse.com

WEB: www.AGD-LandUse.com

December 1, 2014

BY EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Planning and Land Use
Committee of the Los Angeles City Council
Room 395 City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: 6230 Yucca Street/DIR-2012-2767-CLQ

Dear Committee Members:

We represent 6230 Yucca, LLC, the owner of the above-referenced property. For the reasons set forth in our November 10, 2014 letter, we respectfully request that you:

1. Grant in part and deny in part the appeal by George Abrahams on behalf of the Argyle Civic Association of the Planning Director's June 21, 2013 "Q" Condition Clarification;
2. Sustain the Planning Director's (a) approval of the "Q" Condition Clarification, as modified below; (b) determination that the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) ENV-2006-6941-EIR, together with the March 2013 Addendum to the Final Impact Report, is adequate environmental clearance for the Director's Determination and complies with CEQA; and (c) adoption of CEQA findings under State CEQA Guidelines 15162, 15163, and 15164 that no further environmental review is required for the project.
3. Further clarify the Q Conditions to reflect the Director's Site Plan Review approval dated September 26, 2014:
 - a. Delete "Q" Condition No. 3 in its entirety;
 - b. Revise "Q" Condition No. 4 as follows:
 4. **Site Plan.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, detailed development plans, including a complete landscape and irrigation plan and a parking area and driveway plan, shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and sign-off clearance. These plans shall be in substantial conformance with the plot

The Honorable Planning and Land Use Committee
of the Los Angeles City Council
December 1, 2014
Page 2

plan, elevations and landscape plans ~~dated December 13, 2007, attached to the administrative file approved by the Director in the September 26, 2014 Site Plan Review approval.~~ The plans shall comply with applicable provisions of the Municipal Code, the subject conditions herein and the intent of the subject permit authorization.

- c. Revise the first two sentences of “Q” Condition No. 5 as follows:

5. Parking. The project shall provide at a minimum the number of spaces required under LAMC Sections 12.21-A.4(a) and 12.21-A.4(x). ~~A minimum of 242 parking spaces shall be provided.~~ The number of spaces provided, their location and access shall be in substantial conformance with the project plans approved by the Director in the September 26, 2014 Site Plan Review approval, marked Exhibit B1-5 and attached to the administrative file. ~~Parking designated for office use shall be made available after hours to support reductions in "over-flow" parking into residential areas.~~

- d. Revise the first sentence of “Q” Condition No. 10 as follows:

10. The design of the project shall be in substantial conformance with the site plans and elevations approved by the Director in the September 26, 2014 Site Plan Review approval ~~dated November 9, 2007 attached to the administrative file.~~

4. Adopt the attached CEQA findings.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any additional information.

Very truly yours,



Dale J. Goldsmith

cc: Councilman Mitch O’Farrell’s Office
Department of City Planning
City Attorney
6230 Yucca, LLC

DIR-2012-2767-CLQ
ADDENDUM - ENV-2006-6941-EIR
6230 Yucca Street

FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)

HAVING RECEIVED, REVIEWED, AND CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER INFORMATION IN THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON THIS MATTER, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND DECLARES AS FOLLOWS:

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CEQA PROCESS

A. Approved Project Description, History and CEQA Compliance

The City of Los Angeles previously certified the Environmental Impact Report State Clearinghouse No. 2006101025, dated August 16, 2007 (the “EIR”), for the project described below, finding it in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.

The Yucca Street Condos project as analyzed in the EIR (the “Original Project”) would replace an underutilized 18,614 square-foot office and radio station building and surface parking lot with an approximately 114,252 square-foot mixed-use development at 6230 Yucca Street in Hollywood (the “Project Site”). The Original Project would be approximately 185 feet in height (16 stories), including a mechanical penthouse and emergency helistop on the roof.

The single proposed structure was roughly rectangular in shape and was oriented with the tallest portions of the building towards the center of the Project Site. The Original Project included approximately 13,790 square feet of commercial (office) uses and 95 condominium units, which included 10 live/work units and a mixture of studio, one- and two-bedroom units, and 14,806 square feet of open space. The condominium units ranged in size from approximately 765 square feet to approximately 1,916 square feet. The live/work spaces were three story units, and the condominiums on floors eight through 11 were two-story “townhouse” units. The Original Project provided 242 parking spaces (contained in 2.5 subterranean levels and three levels above grade) as required by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (“LAMC”) and the City’s Parking Policy for condominiums, with access to the building parking provided off Argyle Avenue.

Based on the City’s Environmental Review Committee, the City determined an EIR was necessary to analyze the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for a draft EIR (the “Draft EIR”) was circulated for a 30-day review period starting on October 6, 2006, and ending on November 6, 2006. Based on public comments in response to the NOP and a review of environmental issues by the City, the Draft EIR analyzed the following environmental impact areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources (Historic, Paleontological and Archaeological Resources)
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality

- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

On April 9, 2007, the City released the Draft EIR for public comment. The comment period was 45 calendar days, ending on May 23, 2007. The lead agency also accepted comment letters after the comment period closed. The lead agency received three written comments on the Draft EIR from public agencies, groups and individuals. Responses to all comments received between April 9, 2007 and May 23, 2007 are included in the Final EIR.

The City Planning Commission (“CPC”) held a duly noticed public hearing on December 13, 2007, and issued a February 12, 2008 determination in which the CPC approved some of the Applicant’s requests and denied others. The CPC took the following actions regarding the applications:

- Certified Environmental Impact Report No. 2006-6941-EIR (the “EIR”);
- Approved a Zone Change as follows:
 - Amended the existing [D] Development Limitation (“D Limitation”) to allow a floor area ratio (“FAR”) not to exceed 4.5 to 1 (in lieu of the existing FAR limit of 3 to 1);
 - Approved a (Q) condition to, among other things, adopt the proposed Site Plan, limit FAR at the Site to 4.5 to 1 and require a minimum of 242 on-site parking spaces; and
 - Approved a (T) classification to require consultation with appropriate City agencies regarding any necessary dedication and/or improvements, such as street trees, street lighting, sewers and drainage;
- Approved Site Plan Review findings; and
- Denied without prejudice an Adjustment to permit 0 side yards—ruling that such an adjustment is unnecessary because ground floor uses are commercial.

On March 1, 2008, Maureen B. Schultz, on behalf of EMI Music North America (“EMI”) filed an appeal of the CPC Determination. On or about March 1, 2008, James McQuiston filed an appeal of the CPC determination.

On April 15, 2008, the City Council’s Planning and Land Use Management (“PLUM”) Committee heard and denied the both appeals, and resolved to uphold the CPC determination and recommend approval of the Zone Change to the City Council.

In addition to the analysis of noise and vibration impacts provided in the Final EIR, an EIR Addendum was prepared in June 2008, which provided further analysis of noise and vibration impacts to the Capitol Records site. The 2008 Addendum was prepared in response to EMI’s concerns regarding the construction and operational noise and vibration impacts of the Original Project on EMI’s recording studio echo chambers. In response to EMI’s concerns, additional information was developed from on-site studies, technical and expert noise and vibration

analysis and reports, on-site noise and vibration measurements, and consultation with EMI's noise consultants and recording engineers. The additional information and analysis contained in the 2008 Addendum supports the conclusions of the EIR that (1) the Original Project would cause a temporary significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impact to the Capitol Records site, and (2) impacts to the Capitol Records site due to operation of the Original Project would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant volunteered to comply with additional mitigation measures to further reduce impacts related to the Capitol Records site.

On August 7, 2008, the City Council adopted the PLUM Committee recommendation, recertified the EIR with the 2008 Addendum, and imposed additional conditions of approval intended to provide further protection to EMI during construction. On or about August 11, 2008, a Notice of Determination was filed and posted with the County Clerk. The 30-day statute of limitations for a CEQA challenge ran without such a challenge having been filed.

In 2010, the Applicant began to implement the Original Project by demolishing the existing office/radio station building on the site. However, due to adverse market conditions arising from the recession, the Applicant was unable to proceed further and temporarily placed the Original Project on hold.

B. Revisions to the Original Project

Due to the changing real estate market conditions, the Applicant made minor changes to the Original Project. Specifically, the Applicant proposed 111,558 square feet, with 13,442 square feet of commercial space, and 116 apartment units within a 16-story, 173 foot, 11 inch tall building and 208 spaces in two subterranean and three above grade levels of parking (the "Revised Project").

On October 5, 2012, the Applicant submitted to the City an application for a [Q] Condition Clarification to reflect the change from for sale condominiums to rental apartments, and to reduce the minimum amount of parking to reflect apartment rather than condominium requirements. The Department of City Planning, acting as lead agency, determined that an Addendum to the certified EIR was the appropriate level of CEQA review for the [Q] Condition Clarification request.

On June 21, 2013, the Planning Director approved the March 2013 Addendum ("Addendum"), finding "that the previously certified Environmental Impact Report ENV-2006-6941-EIR, together with the Addendum to the Final Impact Report, dated March 2013, is adequate environmental clearance and complies with the CEQA," and approved the requested [Q] Condition Clarification. On July 10, 2013, George Abrahams, on behalf of the Argyle Civic Association ("Appellant"), appealed the [Q] Condition Clarification (the "Appeal").

During the pendency of the Appeal, the Applicant continued to refine the project to reflect current market conditions. Specifically, the Applicant now proposes 116 apartment units and 2,235 square feet of commercial space within a 17-story building (the "Current Project"). The Current Project has more units than the Original Project, but the same number as the Revised Project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's density remains below the 127 units permitted under the current zoning for the site. The Current Project would have essentially the same floor area (114,136 square feet) as the Original Project (114,252 square feet.) The Current Project's building footprint is also substantially the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

The Current Project would be 17 stories (one more than the Original Project and the Revised Project)

Project) due to a change in the floor to floor heights and modifications to the parking garage. However, the Current Project would only be 174 feet in height, which is less than the Original Project's height of almost 185 feet and essentially the same as the Revised Project. The Current Project would include one subterranean and four above-grade levels, which is 1.5 fewer subterranean levels than the Original Project and one fewer than the Revised Project. The amount of subterranean parking area would be reduced by about 50 percent when compared to the Original Project, so the total amount of grading, excavation, and hauling would be less than the Original Project. It would also be less than the Revised Project.

The number of parking spaces for the Current Project would comply with the parking requirements under the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC"). The Current Project would provide at least 12,200 square feet of open space, consistent with LAMC requirements.

On September 26, 2014, the Planning Director approved the Addendum and Site Plan Review for the Current Project. This action was not appealed.

CAJA, Inc. has prepared a Technical Memorandum dated October 2014 (the "Technical Memorandum") analyzing the environmental impacts of the Current Project and the changes from both the Original Project and the Revised Project.

On December 2, 2014, the City Council PLUM Committee considered the Appeal at a duly noticed public hearing, along with all other public testimony and documentation submitted with regard to the Appeal. The PLUM Committee recommended that the full City Council deny the Appeal in its entirety and uphold approval of the Current Project and the Addendum.

C. Current Environmental Setting and Baseline

The environmental setting in which the Current Project would be built and operated has not substantially changed since October 4, 2006, when the NOP was published for the EIR. The date the NOP is published establishes the date of the environmental baseline for the project analysis. Nevertheless, as set forth below, additional Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Geotechnical, and Traffic analyses have been prepared and are included in the Addendum and the Technical Memorandum.

On June 19, 2012, the City Council approved an update to the Hollywood Community Plan and a related zoning ordinance (the "Community Plan Update). However, the Community Plan Update was subject to a lawsuit and subsequently invalidated by court order. As described in the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would be consistent with the 1988 Hollywood Community Plan (which the City Council reinstated following invalidation of the Community Plan Update), and none of the approvals for the Current Project derive from the Community Plan Update. Therefore, the invalidation of Community Plan Update has no effect on the Current Project and would not change any of the conclusions of the EIR.

On December 29, 2011, the California Supreme Court issued its decision in *California Redevelopment Association v. Matosantos*. The decision upheld recently enacted state law dissolving all California redevelopment agencies, including the CRA/LA, and made the dissolution of the agencies effective February 1, 2012. However, the City has elected to continue CRA/LA land use approval authority through the Designated Local Authority (DLA). The City is currently processing transfer of land use authority from the DLA to the City Planning Department. As described in the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, the dissolution of the CRA/LA has no effect on the Current Project and would not change any of the conclusions of the EIR.

Finding. The surrounding environment, regulatory framework, and land use plans surrounding the Original Project, both with respect to surrounding uses and applicable land use plans, have not changed so fundamentally as to warrant preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR for the Current Project. Neither the invalidation of the Community Plan Update, nor the dissolution of CRA/LA constitutes significant new information warranting preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE CURRENT PROJECT

A. Environmental Impact Findings

1. Aesthetics

The conditions that could affect impacts to aesthetics would remain unchanged. The Current Project's modifications to the Original Project and Revised Project would not change the existing conditions of the Project Site. Therefore, the aesthetic impacts of the Current Project would be the same as the impacts of the Original Project and Revised Project. As set forth below, visual character, views, shade/shadow, and light and glare impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Visual Character

The Current Project would be of the same general size and scale as the Original Project and Revised Project, would be constructed generally within the same building footprint, and proposes the same architectural design and materials as the Original Project and Revised Project. The Current Project is about 11 feet lower in height than the Original Project and, essentially, the same height as the Revised Project. Thus, the Current Project's visual character impacts would be the same as the Original Project's and Revised Project's impacts and less than significant.

Views

As described in the Technical Memorandum, there have been minimal changes to the uses surrounding the Project Site. During most of the time since approval of the Original Project, a significant economic recession discouraged land development. As such, views and viewsheds in the vicinity of the Project Site have not substantially changed. The Current Project would be constructed within the same building footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project, although the Current Project would be shorter than the Original Project by approximately 11 feet. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's slender design and siting as far as possible from the Capitol Records Tower reduce potential impacts to views of that Tower through the Project Site. Moreover, the reduction in massing of the Current Project's podium nearest the Capitol Records Tower, as compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project, would enhance the view corridor to the Capitol Records Tower. Therefore, the Current Project would not be expected to obstruct views of the Capitol Records Tower, with the exception of a momentary view interruption on the northbound Hollywood Freeway near Gower Street (same as the Original Project and the Revised Project). Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project may create a minor diminishment of the view of the Hollywood Hills. However, views of the Hollywood Hills are available in many other locations. Therefore, the Current Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to valued views, same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Signage

The Current Project does not propose a supergraphic sign, and all proposed signage would be

consistent with existing applicable regulations. Therefore, aesthetic impacts related to signage will be the less than the Original Project, which would include a supergraphic sign, and similar to the Revised Project, which would not. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts with respect to signage would also be less than significant.

Shade/Shadow

The Current Project would be generally built within the same footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and would be about 11 feet shorter than the Original Project and essentially the same height as the Revised Project. As described in the Technical Memorandum, there have been minimal changes to the uses surrounding the Project Site, and as a result, the sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project Site have not changed. As such, shadows generated by the Current Project on surrounding sensitive uses are expected to be proportionately reduced when compared to the Original Project and similar to the Revised Project. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts with respect to shade/shadow would also be less than significant.

Light and Glare

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would increase ambient light levels on the Project Site and in the vicinity. However, the increase would be considered nominal, as the Current Project is located in Hollywood—a highly urbanized regional nighttime destination that is already significantly illuminated at night, and the illumination provided by the Current Project would be the same as the illumination provided by the Original Project and the Revised Project. In addition, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would exclude materials that would create glare impacts, and would comply with the City's Lighting Regulations contained in the LAMC. Overall, the Current Project's impacts with respect to light and glare would be less than significant, and the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact would also be the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project, which would be less than significant for visual character, shade/shadow, and light and glare. Cumulative impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project with respect to views of the Capitol Record Tower were conservatively considered to be significant and unavoidable. The Current Project does not substantially increase the severity of this impact. Rather, because the Current Project is approximately 11 feet shorter than the Original Project and would reduce the massing of the podium nearest the Capitol Records Tower, as compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project, cumulative view impacts upon the Capitol Records Building will be reduced.

2. Agricultural Resources

The Project Site is located in a heavily urbanized area in the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles and does not include any state designated agricultural lands. The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the Project Site is not included in the Important Farmland Category and the Project Site and adjacent properties are not utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, neither the Original Project nor the Current Project would involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use and the Project Site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

The Current Project would be developed on the same site as the Original Project and the Revised

Project. The conditions that could affect impacts to agricultural resources remain unchanged compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project. The Current Project's impacts with respect to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

None of the related projects would involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use or develop land under a Williamson Act contract. The cumulative impact would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project.

3. Air Quality

As set forth in the Technical Memorandum and below, the air quality impacts of the Current Project would be the similar to those of the Original Project and the Revised Project and would also be less than significant.

Construction

Regional Impacts

The existing uses on the Project Site have been demolished. The Current Project proposes a building in the same general footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project. The Current Project would be slightly larger than the Revised Project (by approximately 2,554 square feet) and would have essentially the same square footage as the Original Project. In addition, the Current Project would have one fewer level of subterranean parking when compared to the Revised Project and 1.5 levels when compared to the Original Project. As set forth in the Technical Memorandum, construction impacts associated with Current Project's demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, asphalt, and architectural coatings will be similar to the less than significant impacts documented for both the Original Project and the Revised Project. As such, the Current Project's construction impact on regional air quality would be less than significant. All construction-related mitigation measures identified in the EIR are still applicable and will be implemented.

Localized Impacts

As discussed above, on-site construction impacts associated with demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, asphalt, and architectural coatings would be similar to the impacts documented for both the Original Project and the Revised Project. As a result, the Current Project's construction impact on localized air quality will be less than significant. All construction-related mitigation measures identified in the EIR are still applicable and will be implemented.

Operation

Regional Impacts

As the Current Project proposes the same number of residential units as the Revised Project, as well as a reduction in commercial space, the Current Project would be expected to result in similar stationary emissions of criteria pollutants during its daily operation. This includes emissions from landscape maintenance equipment, water and space heating, and consumer products. In addition, as described below under Transportation/Traffic, the Current Project would result in the same number of traffic trips per day and, therefore, would also result in the

same amount of emissions from motor vehicles as the Revised Project. As set forth in the Addendum, the Revised Project's operational impact on regional air quality would be less than significant. Therefore, the Current Project's operational impact on regional air quality would also be less than significant.

Localized On-Site Impacts

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would generate long-term, on-site emissions of criteria pollutants from heating and cooling of living spaces, water, cooking appliances, and use of landscape equipment. As the Current Project would have the same number of dwelling units and a reduced commercial component as compared to the Revised Project, it would generate a similar amount of localized on-site emissions of NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The Addendum concluded that the Revised Project's operational impacts with respect to localized emissions would be less than significant. Therefore, the Current Project's operational impacts with respect to localized emissions would also be less than significant.

Localized Off-Site Impacts

The South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD") recommends an evaluation of potential localized CO impacts when a project increases the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio at any intersection rated D or worse by 2 percent or more during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. As detailed in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the EIR, the Original Project's traffic volumes would not meet these criteria at any intersections under Existing with Project or Future with Project conditions. As the Current Project would generate 13 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and 2 fewer p.m. peak hour trips, than the Original Project, it would also not meet these criteria. The June 14, 2012 Technical Memorandum by Fehr & Peers (see Appendix B of this Addendum) found that the Revised Project would have negligible impacts on local congestion and would not meet these criteria at any intersections under Existing with Project or Future with Project conditions. As the Current Project would generate 20 fewer a.m. and 8 fewer p.m. trips than the Revised Project, the conclusions in the July 14, 2012 Memorandum also apply to the Current Project. Based on the Final EIR, the updated traffic impact analysis, and the ambient CO concentrations in the vicinity of the Project Site, CO concentrations at these intersections would fall far below the state and federal standards. As a result, the Current Project's off-site operational impact on regional air quality is expected to be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The Current Project would include 21 more residential units than the Original Project and the same number as the Revised Project. Like the Revised Project, this increase would result in an incremental increase in residents that would be offset in part by the inclusion of a higher percentage of singles and one-bedroom units and reduced commercial component in the Current Project (see Technical Letter Population and Housing analysis). Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the added population to the South Coast Air Basin would be consistent with growth forecasts for residential development in the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan through 2025. As a result, the Current Project's cumulative impact on regional air quality is expected to be less than significant.

4. Biological Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to biological resources remain unchanged with the Current Project. There are no site changes that include any areas of significant biological value. Therefore, the biological impacts of the Current Project are the same as the impacts of the

Original Project and Revised Project, and there would be no impact with respect to biological resources.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project, as there are no biological resources onsite or in the vicinity.

5. Cultural Resources

There are no historic resources on the Project site. The previously existing building on the project site did not qualify as an historic resource and has been demolished. The conditions that could affect impacts to cultural resources would remain unchanged with the Current Project. The Current Project's changes would be largely internal and would involve a different interior allocation of space within the Project. As such, the New Project would not be expected to impact any neighboring historic resources (such as the Pantages Theater or the Capitol Records Tower). Therefore, impacts with respect to historic resources as a result of the New Project would be less than significant, same as for both the Original Project and the Revised Project.

The Current New Project proposes one subterranean parking level, compared to the two subterranean parking levels proposed for the Revised Project and 2.5 levels for the Original Project. As less excavation would be required for the Current Project's subterranean parking, the Current Project would be less likely to encounter archaeological/paleontological resources or human remains when compared to either the Original Project or the Revised Project. Nevertheless, the Current Project would implement standard City mitigation measures during the earthwork and excavation phase. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts to archaeological/paleontological resources and human remains would be less than significant, same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project.

6. Geology and Soils

At the time the City certified the Final EIR, the Project Site was not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known faults were mapped as crossing the Project Site or projecting towards the project site. The closest known active fault at that time was the Hollywood Fault, which is located at a distance of about 0.3 miles from the project site. Although the Project Site was located within 0.3 miles of the active Hollywood Fault, and by other faults on a regional level, the potential seismic hazard to the Project Site was not considered to be higher than in most areas of the City of Los Angeles or elsewhere in the region. As the entire Southern California area is considered a seismically active region, every building in the region is susceptible to ground shaking and earthquakes. The City of Los Angeles Building Code includes regulations and requirements designed to reduce risks to life and property to the maximum extent feasible.

The Hollywood Quadrangle Earthquake Fault Zone Map (the "Preliminary Map") was initially released for public review on January 8, 2014. The Preliminary Map does not delineate the location of verified faults and traces. Rather, the Preliminary Map delineates the location of suspected faults and traces subject to on-site verification as required by the Act. The 90-day

public comment period required under Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (the “Act”) Section 2622(c) was extended to allow for relevant site-trenching data from the Project Site to be submitted and made publicly available.

According to the Act, before a project can be permitted, cities and counties must require a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed buildings will not be constructed across active faults. An evaluation and written report of a specific site must be prepared by a licensed geologist. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back from the fault (generally 50 feet).

Any structure with human occupancy restrictions under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) shall not be granted a new building permit that allows an increase in human occupancy unless a geologic report, prepared pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 3603 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations in effect on January 1, 1994, demonstrates that the structure is not on the trace of an active fault, or the requirement of a geologic report has been waived pursuant to Section 2623. (Act §2627.1(e)(2)(C)(3).) The State Geologist shall continually review new geologic and seismic data and shall revise the earthquake fault zones or delineate additional earthquake fault zones when warranted by new information. The State Geologist shall submit all revised maps and additional maps to all affected cities, counties, and state agencies for their review and comment. Concerned jurisdictions and agencies shall submit all comments to the State Mining and Geology Board for review and consideration within 90 days. Within 90 days of that review, the State Geologist shall provide copies of the revised and additional official maps to concerned state agencies and to each city or county having jurisdiction over lands lying within the earthquake fault zone. (Act §2622(c).)

The Applicant coordinated on-site trenching (100 feet in length and 35 feet in depth), sonic testing, radiocarbon dating, and core sampling of the subject property by state-certified professional geologist Steven Kolthoff and Registered Professional Engineer Michael Reader of Group Delta. Trenching was completed on the Property and all data collected. On April 7, 2014, inspectors from the City and State of California inspected the trench and reviewed the raw data collected. The raw data and preliminary review by City and State inspectors indicates that no active fault or trace is located on the property.

On September 3, 2014, Group Delta issued a Revised Fault Activity Report (the “Fault Analysis”). The Fault Analysis documents the trenching, radiocarbon dating, soil core sampling, soil aging, and cone penetration tests that were performed on-site. The Fault Analysis concludes:

A previously inferred “Argyle Strand” of the Hollywood Fault does not exist; rather the inferred groundwater offsets are now shown to be local perched levels on interbedded clay beds....

Based on site specific investigation, we therefore find that no active fault exist within, nor within 50 feet north and south of the subject site. The investigation meets current professional standard of practice for assessment of sites in an [Alquist-Priolo] A-P zone.

In a letter dated October 30, 2014, the City Department of Building & Safety issued a Geology Report Approval Letter affirming the conclusions of the Fault Analysis. The final Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the State Geologist in November 2014 shows that there is no active earthquake fault through, under or within 50 feet of the Project site.

Findings.

- a) State-certified professional geologist Steven Kolthoff and Registered Professional Engineer Michael Reader of Group Delta are experts in the field of earthquake fault activity analysis, and the Fault Analysis documents expert findings with regard to whether any active earthquake fault or trace is located on the subject property.
- b) The Fault Analysis provides substantial evidence that no active fault exists within or within 50 feet, of the subject site. Therefore, the site is safe for development with respect to Earthquake Zones of required investigation as defined in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act.
- c) The Appeal contains no expert analysis or other substantial evidence that an active fault exists within or within 50 feet, of the subject site, but rather consists entirely of speculation and opinion unsupported by fact.

The conditions that could affect impacts to geology and soils remain unchanged with the Current Project. The modifications proposed as part of the Current Project do not change the existing geologic conditions of the Project Site or the engineering and excavation plans for the project, although the Current Project would provide 1.5 levels less of subterranean parking than the Original Project and one level less than the Revised Project. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts of the Current Project will be the same as for the Original Project and the Revised Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and design standards recommended in the geotechnical report, impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Geology and soils impacts are generally site specific and, like the Current Project, each of the related projects would meet current seismic safety standards. Therefore, cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils would also be exactly the same for the Current Project as for the Original Project and the Revised Project.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Analysis of Greenhouse Gas (“GHG”) emissions was not required at the time of preparation of the EIR for the Original Project. A Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis was prepared for the Current Project and is included in the Technical Memorandum. This analysis is consistent with March 2010 amendments to the CEQA Guidelines and the AB32 Scoping Plan.

Given the evolving nature of analyzing climate change, there are no applicable quantitative standards for judging the significance of a single project’s impacts on climate change in the South Coast Air Basin. To that end, the AB 32 Scoping Plan represents the most significant plan for reducing GHG emissions. In calling for a return to 1990 levels of GHG emissions by 2020, the Scoping Plan contains strategies targeting direct regulations, market-based incentives, voluntary actions, and other strategies that were publicly vetted before ARB’s approval in December 2008.

Consequently, the Current Project’s impact on climate change would be significant if the Current Project impacts conflict with or obstructs implementation of the AB 32 Scoping Plan.

Construction

Construction of the Current Project would emit GHG emissions through the combustion of fossil fuels by heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers traveling to and from the project site. These impacts would vary day to day over the duration of the 18 months of construction activities. As illustrated in Table 2 to the Technical Memorandum, construction emissions of CO₂e would peak in 2014, when up to 9,946 pounds of CO₂e per day are anticipated. Over 18 months of construction, this would amount to a total of approximately 780 metric tons of CO₂e. In accordance with the SCAQMD's guidance, GHG emissions from construction should be amortized over the presumed 30-year lifetime of the project. Therefore, total construction GHG emissions should be divided by 30, which results in 26 metric tons of CO₂e per year, to determine an annual construction emissions estimate comparable to operational emissions.

Operation

Greenhouse gas emissions were calculated for long-term area source and motor vehicle operations. As shown in Table 3 to the Technical Memorandum, the Current New Project would emit 1,343 metric tons of CO₂e per year during typical operations, including the amortized construction emissions.

Consistent with the Revised AB 32 Scoping Plan, the Technical Memorandum compared the Current Project's emissions as proposed to the Current Project's emissions if the Current Project were built using a Business-As-Usual (BAU) (or No Action Taken, NAT) approach in terms of design, methodology, and technology. This means the Current Project's emissions were calculated as if the Current Project was constructed before AB 32 compared to the Current Project as constructed with project design features to reduce GHG and with several regulatory measures adopted in furtherance of AB 32.

Both one-time emissions and indirect emissions are expected to occur each year after build-out of the Current Project. As noted, one-time emissions from construction were amortized over a 30-year period. The emissions for the Current Project and its associated CARB 2020 NAT scenario are estimated to be 1,343 and 1,742 MT CO₂e per year, respectively, which demonstrates that the Current Project would reduce emissions by 23 percent from the CARB 2020 NAT scenario. Based on these results, the Current Project exceeds or meets the reduction target as a numeric threshold (16.7 percent) set forth in the Revised AB 32 Scoping Plan. As a result, the Current Project's contribution to global climate change is not cumulatively considerable and is considered less than significant.

There is no adopted quantitative GHG significance threshold applicable to the Project. The SCAQMD has formed a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group ("Working Group") to provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents. As of the last Working Group meeting (Meeting No. 15) held in September 2010, the SCAQMD is proposing to adopt a tiered approach for evaluating GHG emissions for development projects where SCAQMD is not the lead agency. With the tiered approach, the project is compared with the requirements of each tier sequentially and would not result in a significant impact, if it complies with any tier. Tier 3 excludes projects with annual emissions lower than a screening threshold. For all non-industrial projects, the SCAQMD is considering a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂eq per year. SCAQMD concluded that projects with emissions less than the screening threshold would not result in a significant cumulative impact. As noted, the Current Project would generate 1343 metric tons of

CO₂e per year, which is well below the proposed screening threshold. While this screening threshold is not a formally adopted significance threshold, it supports the conclusion that the Current Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions and global climate change. Moreover, as set forth in Table 4 to the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would be consistent with all feasible and applicable strategies recommended in the Scoping Plan.

Cumulative Impacts

The CO₂ estimates from mobile sources (particularly CO₂, CH₄, and NO₂ emissions) are likely much greater than the emissions that would actually occur. The methodology used assumes that all emissions sources are new sources and that emissions from these sources are 100 percent additive to existing conditions. This is a standard approach taken for air quality analyses. In many cases, such an assumption is appropriate because it is impossible to determine whether emissions sources associated with a project move from outside the air basin and are, in effect, new emissions sources, or whether they are sources that were already in the air basin and just shifted to a new location. However, because the effects of GHGs are global, a project that shifts the location of a GHG-emitting activity (e.g., where people live, where vehicles drive, or where companies conduct business) would result in no net change in global GHG emissions levels.

Much of the vehicle-generated CO₂ emissions attributed to the Current Project could simply be from vehicles at an existing location moving to the Project Site, and not from new vehicle emissions sources relative to global climate change. Therefore, although it is not possible to calculate the net contribution of vehicle-generated CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O₂ emissions from the Current Project (i.e., Project generated emissions minus current emissions from vehicles that would move to the Project Site), the net contribution would likely be much less than the estimated emissions.

For the foregoing reasons, the Current Project's cumulative impact on climate change is considered less than significant.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The previously existing office/radio station structure on-site has been demolished. Prior to such demolition, the structure was surveyed for hazardous materials and any such materials (including PCBs, ACM, LBP, and USTs) would have been abated in accordance with applicable laws. Therefore, the Current Project does not involve the demolition of existing structures that would have an impact related to the upset or release of materials during demolition.

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would use, at most, minimal amounts of hazardous materials for routine cleaning that would not pose any health risk and would not include elements or other aspects that would create any health hazard or produce hazardous emissions. Therefore, hazardous waste impacts during operation of the Current Project would be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project and also less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Hazardous materials and risk of upset conditions are largely site-specific, and, therefore, each related project would require evaluation for potential threats to public safety. Further, local municipalities are required to follow local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials. Therefore, cumulative hazardous waste impacts under the Current Project would be the same as

those under the Original Project and the Revised Project and also less than significant.

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

The conditions that could affect Current Project impacts to hydrology and water quality remain unchanged compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project. These conditions include the location of the Project Site, the construction plan, and the Project's compliance with all water quality and waste discharge requirements.

The Current Project's surface water quality impacts during construction will be similar to or less than those of the Original Project and the Revised Project. While the same amount of land will be graded and the construction area would be the same, the Current Project would have one to 1.5 fewer levels of subterranean parking.

The Current Project's water quality impacts during operation will be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and the Current Project also proposes multi-family residential uses with ground-floor commercial space, within the same building footprint. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will comply with the requirements of NPDES Permit No. CA0061654. Further, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will not result in a change in the Project Site coverage from existing setting conditions and would include approximately the same impervious and permeable surface ratios, and would not contribute to groundwater depletion or interfere with groundwater recharge to an environmentally significant degree.

Finally, as the Current Project will be located on the same site as the Original Project and the Revised Project, it would result in a less than significant impact with respect to flooding.

For the foregoing reasons, hydrology and water quality impacts of the Current Project will be the same as or less than the impacts for the Original Project and the Revised Project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will have a less than significant impact associated with groundwater supplies, drainage patterns, water quality, stormwater drainage, and flooding. Also like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will have a less than significant impact associated with water quality, with the incorporation of the EIR's mitigation measures to ensure compliance with water quality requirements.

Cumulative Impacts

Little, if any, additional cumulative runoff would be expected from the Project Site and the related project sites since this part of the City is already fully developed with impervious surfaces. Therefore, cumulative impacts to the existing or planned stormwater drainage system would be less than significant. In addition, development on each site would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards that are designed to ensure water quality and hydrological conditions are not adversely affected. All of the related projects would be required to implement BMPs and to conform to the existing NPDES water quality program. Therefore, cumulative water quality impacts would be the same for the Current Project as the Original Project and the Revised Project and less than significant.

10. Land Use

As the Current Project is located on the same site as the Original Project and the Revised Project, it would not physically divide an established community, nor would it conflict with a habitat or

community conservation plan.

The Current Project proposes a similar building with a similar footprint to the Revised Project, with eight apartment units in lieu of the eight live/work units proposed for the Revised Project. The Current Project also replaces the Revised Project's 13,442 square feet of office space with 2,325 square feet of restaurant/retail space. Therefore, the Current Project is also consistent with the land use designations for the Project Site contained in the General Plan Framework, the currently applicable 1988 Hollywood Community Plan, and the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan.

The City Council approved a Zone/Height District Change for the Original Project from C4-2D-SN to (T)(Q)C4-2-SN pursuant to LAMC Section 12.32F and included a Q Condition that permits a maximum FAR on the project site of 4.5:1, or 114,642 square feet. The Current Project proposes slightly less floor area of 114,311 square feet, which is consistent with the Q Condition and zoning. Therefore, the Current Project's impacts with respect to height and FAR would be less than significant, and the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project.

The Current Project's signage is consistent with the current requirements of the Hollywood Signage Supplemental Use District ("SUD"). Subsequent to certification of the Final EIR, the Hollywood SUD was amended and now prohibits new supergraphic signs in Hollywood. Any new signage, such as building identification signage, would be required to comply with the LAMC and Hollywood SUD. The Current Project does not propose a supergraphic sign, and all signage will comply with the Hollywood SUD. Therefore, impacts related to signage for the Current Project would be less than significant.

In accordance with Section 12.22.A.18 of the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code, the Current Project's residential density is governed by the R5 standards. Per Section 12.12 C 4 (c), the R5 zone permits one dwelling unit per 200 square feet of lot area. Based on the Project Site total area of 25,476 square feet, a maximum total of 127 residential units are permitted on the project site. The Current Project proposes a total of 116 apartment units, which is below the maximum density permitted for the site. Therefore, the Current Project is consistent with residential zoning density requirements, and, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, impacts would remain less than significant.

The Current Project provides LAMC required parking for the proposed apartment and commercial uses. As part of the project approvals, Q Condition A.5 requires a minimum of 242 parking spaces for the project. However, this Q condition is based on the condominium uses that were part of the Original Project and reflected the Applicant's desire to provide more parking spaces for the for-sale units. Therefore, the Applicant has requested clarification of this Q condition as the Current Project meets Code requirements for apartment uses. With the Q condition clarification, the Current Project is consistent with the parking requirements of the Q conditions.

All other aspects of the Current Project that would have the potential to result in a land use impact remain unchanged from the Original Project and the Revised Project. As the entitlements requested for the Original Project were granted upon project EIR certification and project approval, the Current Project would be consistent with the existing zoning and all other development limitations of the site. Therefore, the land use and planning impacts of the Current Project would be less than significant, like the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of the related projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and
Page 15

regulations. As with the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project in conjunction with the related projects would result in an intensification of existing prevailing land uses in the project area. In addition, based upon the information available regarding the related projects, it is reasonable to assume that the projects under consideration in the surrounding area would implement and support important local and regional planning goals and policies. Therefore, cumulative land use impacts would be the same for the Current Project as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and less than significant.

11. Mineral Resources

The conditions that could affect mineral resources would remain unchanged with the Current Project because the Project Site does not include any areas of mineral resource value. The mineral resource impacts of the Current Project would be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project; there would continue to be no impact to mineral resources.

Cumulative Impacts

As with the Original Project, the Current Project would result in no impact with respect to mineral resources and would not combine with any other project to result in a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts to mineral resources would be the same for the Current Project as the Original Project and less than significant.

12. Noise

Potential noise impacts of the Original Project are set forth in the EIR and the 2008 Addendum. The 2008 Addendum was prepared in response to EMI's concerns regarding the construction and operational noise and vibration impacts of the Original Project on EMI's recording studio echo chambers. The 2008 Addendum included additional information developed from on-site studies, technical and expert noise and vibration analysis and reports, on-site noise and vibration measurements, and consultation with EMI's noise consultants and recording engineers. The additional information and analysis contained in the 2008 Addendum supports the conclusions of the EIR that (1) the Original Project would cause a temporary significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impact to the Capitol Records site, and (2) impacts to the Capitol Records site due to operation of the Original Project would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant volunteered to comply with additional mitigation measures to further reduce impacts related to the Capitol Records site.

Construction Noise

The Current Project proposes a building in the same general footprint as the Original Project and the Revised Project, although the Current Project would be slightly larger than the Revised Project (by approximately 2,729 square feet) and slightly smaller (by approximately 331 square feet) than the Original Project. In addition, the Current Project would remove a level of subterranean parking when compared to the Revised Project and 1.5 levels when compared to the Original Project. Construction noise levels will be the same as the Original Project and the Revised Project, but the duration of constructing a smaller subterranean parking structure will be shorter than the Original Project and the Revised Project. Nevertheless, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the Capitol Records Tower during project construction, but the impacts would be slightly less severe due to the reduction in the amount of subterranean parking and the previous demolition of the on-site uses.

Construction Vibration

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, construction activities for the Current Project have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration at the multi-family residential units and the Capitol Records Tower. However, the Current Project's construction activities are reduced compared to the Original Project and Revised Project because on-site structures have already been demolished and the subterranean parking has been reduced—thereby reducing the duration of construction impacts. The Capitol Records Tower contains active recording studios that are located in subterranean spaces approximately 30 to 40 feet from the western project site boundary. Therefore, vibration sensitive activities at the Capitol Records Tower may be temporarily and intermittently impacted during various phases of Current Project construction, thus, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact, which is slightly less than the Original Project and the Revised Project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project will implement the supplemental mitigation measures proposed in the 2008 Addendum to reduce such impacts to the extent feasible.

Operational Noise – Vehicular

The traffic impact memorandum prepared by traffic experts Fehr & Peers for the Current Project concluded that the Current Project would result in the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project and more daily trips per day when compared to the Original Project. Typically, it takes a doubling of traffic to increase roadway noise by 3 dBA CNEL, which is the City's most stringent threshold for a significant impact. While the Current Project would generate 109 more daily trips than the Original Project's 364 daily trips, this modest increase does not represent a doubling of traffic on any roadways in the vicinity of the Project Site. As set forth in the EIR, traffic generated by the Original Project would only increase local noise levels by a maximum of 0.1 dBA CNEL for the roadway segments of Yucca Street (from Argyle Avenue to Gower Street) and Gower Street (north of Yucca Street), when compared with the future traffic volumes without the project, which is well below the significance threshold of 3.0 dBA. Therefore, the additional trips generated by the Current Project would not result in any significant impact. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and similar to the impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Operational Noise – Stationary

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project would contribute to an overall increase in ambient noise levels in the project area. However, the Current Project is of the same size and scale as the Original Project and the Revised Project, and would develop the same uses on the Project Site. Therefore, impacts associated with noise generated as a result of the operation of the Current Project upon the adjacent multi-family uses and Capitol Records Tower will be less than significant, and the same as the impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project.

Cumulative Impacts

Each of the related projects would be subject to the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331, which reduces construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible by prohibiting loud, unnecessary, and unusual construction noise within 500 feet from any residential zone, and LAMC Section 41.40, which limits the hours of allowable construction activities. Conformance with these City policies would reduce construction-related noise for the related projects. However, due to the close proximity of the related projects on the Project Site block, as well as additional related projects located along Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street,

under a worst case scenario, all of these projects (including the Current Project) could be developed simultaneously. Therefore, noise generated during the construction phase of these projects is conservatively considered to be a significant temporary cumulative impact, and, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution would be considerable.

With respect to operational noise, all related projects would require exterior walls to be constructed to provide a Sound Transmission Class of 50 or greater as defined in UBC No. 35-1, 1979 edition or any amendment thereto, or to mitigate interior noise levels below a CNEL of 45 dBA in any habitable room. Conformance with these requirements would reduce operational-related noise. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable operational noise impact, and cumulative noise impacts due to operation would be less than significant. In addition, the cumulative increase in roadway noise would be below the significance threshold. Therefore, as with the Original Project and the Revised Project, roadway noise impacts under the Current Project would not be cumulatively considerable. In addition, as with the Original Project and Revised Project, with Noise Ordinance compliance, the combined impact of the operational noise levels from the Current Project and existing noise levels on interior and exterior noise levels on adjacent properties would be less than significant and, therefore, not cumulatively considerable.

13. Population and Housing

For purposes of impact analysis, the Technical Memorandum calculated that approximately 269 people would occupy the proposed residential units in the Current Project—which is higher than the 219 people estimated to occupy the Original Project. This estimate is based on an average household size of 2.3 persons in the Hollywood Community Plan Area (“HCPA”) provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”). However, this estimate is conservative and likely overstates the actual population of the Current Project because it does not account for common household size relative to unit type. The Current Project proposes 15 studios, 77 one-bedroom units, and 24 two-bedroom units. Typically studio units are occupied by one occupant, reducing the Current Project's population to 247.

In April 2012, SCAG adopted the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012-2035 RTP/SCS) based, in part, on data from the 2010 U.S. Census. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS provides population estimates for the City of Los Angeles in both 2020 and 2035. The 2020 population is estimated to be 3,991,700 persons, and the 2035 population is estimated to be 4,320,600 persons. The Current Project's population growth would therefore represent a negligible portion of the City's estimated population growth. In addition, as of the 2010 U.S. Census, the Project Site's Census Tract (1910.00) had a population of 3,228 persons. Therefore, the Current Project represents approximately 7.7 percent of the Census Tract population. Overall, the Current Project does not represent a substantial or significant growth as compared to the existing characteristics. The 116 housing units added by the Revised Project would represent approximately 0.88 percent of the anticipated new housing units between 2005 and 2030 in the Hollywood community. As such, the Current Project would not directly induce substantial housing growth, and impacts related to housing would be less than significant.

The Current Project also results in the generation of job opportunities for approximately five new employees. To provide a conservative analysis, the Technical Memorandum assumed that the majority of jobs created by the Current Project would be filled by individuals with families. Therefore, each employee would represent one family household, assuming that only one person per family would be employed by the Current Project. The Technical Memorandum also

conservatively assumes that each family would move to the project area as a result of the job in the Current Project. In fact, the Current Project would have a large local pool of potential employees from which to draw. Based on a ratio of approximately 2.3 persons per household, the five new jobs generated by the Current Project would generate an additional 12 new residents under the conservative assumptions.

The total project population, including the residential component combined with the commercial uses (247 + 12 = 259 people), would constitute approximately 1.3 percent of the Hollywood population growth expected by 2030. This is not considered to be a substantial increase, as the project's contribution to the growth does not exceed the population estimate for the Hollywood community by 2030. As such, the population growth associated with the Current Project has already been anticipated and planned for in the area, and impacts would be less than significant.

Overall, the population and housing impacts of the Current Project would be similar to the Original Project and the Revised Project, and impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The number of people that would be generated by the Original Project in combination with the related projects would potentially exceed the projected population increase for the Hollywood Community Plan Area. However, this overall growth has been anticipated by SCAG, City, and CRA regional forecasts. Moreover, recent census data shows that actual population growth in Hollywood through 2010 was slower than anticipated, thereby making it unlikely that growth will exceed the projections. In addition, concentration of population and employment growth in a highly urbanized area such as Hollywood, with excellent access to the regional transportation system, is promoted in numerous regional and local land use plans and policies. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution to cumulative population and housing growth would not be considerable.

14. Public Services

Demand for public services depends on the type and intensity of land uses. A change in a project's operational land uses, a substantial increase in floor area, or a substantial increase in the number of dwelling units could have the potential to increase the demand for police, fire, school, parks, and other public facilities, thereby changing the impacts to public services.

The Current Project is the same size and scale as the Original Project and the Revised Project. While the Current Project proposes incrementally more residential units than the Original Project, there is no change of use or substantial change in use intensity compared to the Original Project or the Revised Project. Moreover, as set forth in Section 13, Population and Housing of the Technical Memorandum, the total onsite population (residents plus employees) would be somewhat less under the Current Project (259), than under the Original Project (290) or the Revised Project (305). Consequently, there is no potential to increase substantially impacts or demands on public services as set forth in the EIR and Addendum.

The Current Project would utilize the same public services infrastructure as the Original Project and the Revised Project because all proposed changes are generally internal and overall project intensity and size is not increasing. The analysis in the EIR concluded that the existing public services infrastructure could sufficiently accommodate the Original Project. The changes of the Current Project with respect to public services would not increase substantially the demand for public services to the extent that the Current Project's demand for services could not be met.

As such, the public services impacts of the Current Project would be comparable to the Original Project and the Approved Project. Impacts would remain less than significant with the implementation of the EIR's mitigation measures.

Cumulative Impacts

Each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAFD review and would be required to comply with all applicable construction-related and operational fire safety requirements of the LAFD and the City in order to adequately mitigate fire protection impacts.

Any new or expanded police station would be funded via existing mechanisms (i.e., sales taxes, government funding) to which the Current Project and related projects would contribute. Furthermore, similar to the Current Project, each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAPD review, and would be required to comply with all applicable safety requirements of the LAPD and the City in order to adequately address police protection service demands.

The applicants of the related projects would be required to pay required developer school fees to the LAUSD (pursuant to SB 50) to help reduce any impacts they may have on school services. The provisions of SB 50 are deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. The payment of these fees by the related projects would ensure that cumulative impacts upon school services remain less than significant.

The increase in the residential population by cumulative growth in the HCPA and project area would, in the absence of mitigation, lower the City's existing parkland to population ratio, which is below their preferred standard. Impacts associated with cumulative growth would be reduced through developer fees, conditions of approval, and environmental review procedures. However, there is no certainty that conditions of approval or Quimby fees would be effective in addressing cumulative impacts, due to the limited number of existing parks and lack of available sites on which new parks could be developed. Further, the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment EIR concluded that cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation would be cumulatively significant. Therefore, it is conservatively assumed that, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution would be considerable and impacts would be cumulatively significant.

The cumulative demand of the Current Project and the related projects may present a potentially significant impact on library facilities. However, with payment of the library mitigation fees recommended in Mitigation Measure K.5-1, the potentially significant cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than significant. As such, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project and the related projects would result in a less than significant impact with respect to library services. Therefore, like the Original Project, the Current Project's impact on libraries would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

15. Traffic/Transportation/Parking

Fehr & Peers prepared the Revised Project Traffic Analysis Validation & Update, dated June 14, 2012 (the "Traffic Study Update"), which updated the traffic analysis that was prepared for the Original Project. The Traffic Study Update is set forth in Appendix B to the Addendum.

The Traffic Study Update analyzed: (1) whether the original traffic study baseline (traffic counts and cumulative analysis) in the EIR remains sufficient or needs updating for the Revised

Project; (2) whether the Revised Project description with increased residential density could potentially create new significant traffic impacts not previously identified; and (3) an “existing plus project” approach consistent with recent case law decisions.

LADOT reviewed and approved the Traffic Study Update by letter to the Department of City Planning on January 11, 2013 (included as Appendix C to the Addendum). This letter stated that the Traffic Study Update adequately evaluated and determined that the Revised Project would not result in new or more severe traffic impacts.

Baseline Validation

Base Year

The Traffic Study Update shows that existing traffic volumes at the intersections in the vicinity of the Revised Project are measurably lower than traffic volumes identified in the EIR.

Baseline traffic counts for the original traffic study for the Original Project were collected primarily in 2005 to 2006. To determine whether the counts adequately represent current conditions, new traffic counts were collected at four of the 10 study intersections and on the one study roadway segment identified in the EIR to determine whether traffic volumes have increased since the original traffic study was prepared. Intersections that were shown in the 2007 traffic study to have the worst level of service and highest project incremental increase in volume to capacity (V/C) ratio were selected to this comparison, because they would have the highest potential for a project traffic impact to be triggered if baseline traffic volumes had grown since the original traffic study was prepared.

New traffic volumes were collected in May 2012, during a non-holiday week when schools were in session. Addendum Table IV-4 lists the study intersections that were counted in 2012, and compares the total a.m. and p.m. peak hour turning movement volumes between 2006 and 2012. As shown in this table, traffic volumes at the four comparison study intersections in 2012 are the same or less than the traffic volumes at the same study intersections in 2006, ranging from approximately 100% to 86% of the 2006 traffic volumes (0% to 14% less).

During the same day that the peak period intersection turning movement counts were collected, a 24-hour roadway segment count was conducted on Yucca Street. The 2012 count showed 2,157 daily trips on Yucca Street during the 24-hour period, compared to 2,440 trips during a 24-hour period in 2006. Thus, the 2012 count is approximately 88% of the 2012 count (12% less).

Because the 2012 peak hour intersection counts and the 24-hour count are the same or less than the baseline 2006 traffic volumes in the original traffic study, the base year traffic analysis contained in the original traffic study remains representative of existing conditions set forth in the Addendum. For several intersections, use of the base year analysis for the original traffic study is a conservative assessment of existing conditions because traffic volumes have declined at some intersections relative to 2006 traffic volumes.

Cumulative Baseline

As required by LADOT, the potential for Revised Project impacts was assessed against a future cumulative baseline, which accounted for growth in regional traffic (ambient growth), as well as traffic from known development projects in the study area (related projects).

Following common practice at the time, the original traffic study added an ambient growth factor

of 1% per year to the 2006 base year traffic (4% total growth). Addendum Table IV-4 shows that this level of expected ambient growth in traffic has not occurred; 2012 traffic volumes are the same or less than the 2006 traffic volumes. Thus, the use of the Cumulative Base scenario from the original traffic study would result in a conservative assessment of regional traffic growth, and so can be considered an adequate baseline to assess the potential for project related impacts for a new future base year that reflects the delayed implementation of the project.

To determine the adequacy of the analysis of related projects in the original traffic study, a new related project list was obtained from LADOT in May 2012 for related projects located within a two-mile radius of the Current Project. Some projects that were analyzed in the original traffic study are still on the list, but many new projects have been added, and old projects have been removed. Traffic Study Update Table 2 details the current related project list, as well as LADOT's estimates for daily, a.m., and p.m. peak hour trips generated for each related project. This table compares the total daily, a.m., and p.m. peak hour trip generation for all related projects against the totals for the related projects on the list from the original traffic study.

Table 2 to Traffic Study Update shows that cumulative trips from the 2012 related projects list are lower than the cumulative trips from the original related projects list. Projects on the 2012 related project list are estimated to generate approximately 102,980 daily, 6,722 a.m. peak hour, and 9,668 p.m. peak hour trips, approximately 10% fewer daily trips, 12% fewer a.m. peak hour trips, and 11% fewer p.m. peak hour trips than the related projects list from the original traffic study. Because the related projects from the original traffic study generated more trips than the current list, the use of the original Cumulative Base scenario would thus result in a more conservative baseline to assess potential Revised Project impacts.

Because both the ambient growth rate and related project trip generation for the original Cumulative Base scenario would result in a more conservative baseline for assessing the potential for Revised Project impacts, the baseline from the original traffic study has been retained for the updated analysis detailed in the Traffic Study Update to provide a more conservative analysis.

Updated Trip Generation Analysis

Addendum Table IV-5 shows that the Revised Project is expected to generate 473 daily trips, 32 a.m. peak hour trips, and 38 p.m. peak hour trips, which are approximately 109 additional daily trips, 7 additional a.m. peak hour trips, and 6 additional p.m. peak hour trips compared to the Original Project.

Intersection and Street Segment Analysis

The Revised Project trips were distributed to the street network using the trip distribution pattern specified in the 2007 traffic study. Project trips were assigned to the Cumulative Base traffic volumes from the original traffic study to develop Cumulative plus Project traffic volumes reflecting the updated project description. Addendum Table IV-6 shows that the Revised Project would not result in any significant project-related traffic impacts.

As set forth in Table 10 to the Technical Memorandum, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project, but 20 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and eight fewer p.m. peak hour trips. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the Addendum regarding Cumulative plus Project traffic impacts also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plus Project Traffic Impact Analysis

The original traffic study for the Original Project was prepared in accordance with the methodology prescribed in LADOT's Traffic Study Guidelines applicable at the time the study was prepared. Consistent with LADOT's methodology, the study evaluated the potential for project-related intersection traffic impacts against a future baseline condition at the date of anticipated project build out (then 2010).

In December 2010, the California Court of Appeal for the Sixth District issued an opinion on the case *Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Association v. City of Sunnyvale City Council* ("*Sunnyvale*"), pertaining to the environmental baselines used in an EIR for a long-range transportation improvement. The *Sunnyvale* decision interprets CEQA to require that project-specific impacts should be analyzed based upon adding a project's impacts to existing conditions.

Consistent with *Sunnyvale*, the Revised Project was analyzed using existing conditions as the baseline to assess the potential for Revised Project impacts, including lane configurations and the 2006 existing traffic volumes. Project-only trips reflecting the Revised Project were assigned to existing traffic volumes using the same procedure as described above for the Cumulative plus Project scenario to develop Existing plus Project traffic volumes. Addendum Table IV-7 shows that the Revised Project does not result in a significant impact at any study intersection under an Existing-plus-Project scenario, as the increase in traffic from the Revised Project would not exceed any LADOT thresholds of significance.

As noted, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips than the Revised Project, but 20 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and eight fewer p.m. peak hour trips. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the Addendum regarding Existing plus Project traffic impacts also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant.

2013 Additional Update

In response to the Appeal, Fehr & Peers further updated the Traffic Study Update by Memorandum dated October 7, 2013 (the "2013 Traffic Memo"). The 2013 Traffic Memo addressed whether adding the recently approved Millennium Hollywood Project to the related projects list would change the Revised Project's cumulative impact analysis.

Like the Traffic Study Update, the 2013 Traffic Memo also shows that the EIR's cumulative traffic analysis was more conservative and had greater impacts than would occur under present conditions.

"[T]he related project list used in the [original] 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base scenario has **higher trip generation, and thus is more conservative, than the 2012 related project list, with the addition of the Millennium Hollywood Project trips**. The second comparison reviewed the Millennium Hollywood Project Future + Project V/C ratios and LOS, compared with the 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base Scenario. We found that the [original] 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base Scenario **was more conservative** at most intersections and most peak hours." (2013 Traffic Memo, p. 6 [emphasis added].)

Similarly, adding the Millennium Hollywood Project trips to the cumulative analysis did not result in a significant increase in cumulative traffic impacts under current conditions.

"We found that the 6230 Yucca Cumulative Base Scenario was more conservative at

most intersections and most peak hours. The two intersections where the Millennium Hollywood Project estimated level of service falls an LOS letter grade, and which would result in a stricter traffic impact criteria, are locations where the 6230 Yucca Project related V/C increase is well below the strictest traffic impact criteria. Thus **the inclusion of the Millennium Hollywood Project in the analysis for the 6230 Yucca Project does not alter the conclusions of the prior analysis: that there are no expected significant project-related traffic impacts.**

As noted, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project, but 20 fewer a.m. peak hour trips and eight fewer p.m. peak hour trips. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the 2013 Traffic Memo also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant even with the inclusion of the Millennium Hollywood Project in the analysis.

Residential Street Segment Analysis

The residential street segment analysis from the traffic study for the Original Project was updated based on the revised trip generation estimates. Addendum Table IV-8 shows that the Revised Project would be expected to generate 198 daily trips on the segment (compared with 152 trips for the Original Project as analyzed in 2007). While this represents an increase of 46 daily trips, the Revised Project generated traffic would still be below the impact threshold, so this increase would not cause a new significant impact.

As noted, the Current Project would generate the same number of daily trips as the Revised Project. Therefore, the traffic analysis and conclusions in the Addendum regarding residential street impacts also apply to the Current Project. Like the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts would be less than significant.

Parking

The Current Project would provide a sufficient number of parking spaces to meet the LAMC requirements for the proposed apartment and commercial uses. The City's guidelines for determining CEQA impacts set forth significance thresholds for parking impacts. Under the guidelines, a project that provides all the vehicle parking required by City regulations and policies is deemed to have a less than significant parking impact. The Current Project parking meets the LAMC requirements. Therefore, the Current Project results in a less than significant impact with respect to parking, same as the Original Project.

Freeway Impacts

In October 2013, the City and Caltrans District 7 entered into an Agreement Between City of Los Angeles and Caltrans District 7 On Freeway Impact Analysis Procedures. The purpose of this agreement was to develop a screening methodology to determine when a proposed project within the City should work with Caltrans to prepare a Freeway Impact Analysis, utilizing Caltrans' "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" ("TIS Guide"). Based on the agreement, this coordination and analysis would be required for projects that meet any of the following criteria:

- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 1-percent or more increase to the freeway mainline capacity of a freeway segment operating at level-of-service (LOS) E or F (based on an assumed capacity of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane);

- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 2-percent or more increase to the freeway mainline capacity of a freeway segment operating at LOS D (based on an assumed capacity of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane); or
- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 1-percent or more increase to the capacity of a freeway off-ramp operating at LOS E or F (based on an assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane); or
- The project's peak hour trips would result in a 2-percent or more increase to the capacity of a freeway off-ramp operating at LOS D (based on an assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane).

Projects that do not exceed any of the above thresholds are deemed to have a less than significant impact on Caltrans' facilities.

Fehr & Peers prepared a memorandum entitled "6230 Yucca Street Project Caltrans Freeway Screening," dated October 13, 2014 (included as Attachment C to the Technical Memorandum), in order to determine whether the Current Project exceed any of the above thresholds. The memorandum concluded that the Current Project would not exceed any of the thresholds. Therefore, no Freeway Impact Analysis is warranted, and the Current Project's freeway impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The analysis described above includes an analysis of cumulative impacts. As set forth above, cumulative impacts for the Current Project would be similar to the Original Project and the Revised Project and also less than significant.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

The Current Project would utilize the same utilities infrastructure as the Original Project and the Revised Project. The analysis in the EIR and Addendum respectively concluded that the existing infrastructure had capacity to accommodate the Original Project and the Revised Project, and that utility impacts of the Original Project and the Revised Project would be less than significant. As set forth in the Technical Memorandum, the minor changes of the Current Project would not increase the demand for public utilities to the extent where the Current Project's utilities demand would exceed the infrastructure capacity.

With respect to wastewater generation, the Current Project would generate approximately 14,978 gallons per day, which represents a decrease of 478 gallons per day when compared to the Revised Project. With respect to water consumption, the Current Project would consume approximately 17,973 gallons per day, which represents a decrease of 575 gallons per day when compared to the Revised Project. The Current Project would generate approximately 1,431 pounds of solid waste per day, which is a decrease of 69 pounds per day when compared to the Revised Project. Implementation of the Current Project would consume approximately 15,736 cubic feet of natural gas per day, which is a decrease of approximately 1,074 cubic feet per day when compared to the Revised Project. The Current Project would consume approximately 2,090 kilowatt hours of electricity per day, which is a decrease of approximately 175 kilowatt hours per day when compared to the Revised Project.

The Addendum concluded that the Revised Project's impacts on utilities and service systems would be similar to the Approved Project and less than significant. The Current Project's

impacts on water, wastewater, solid waste, natural gas, and electricity would be less than those of the Revised Project and thus also less than significant. Overall, the changes proposed by the Current Project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts upon public utilities or result in a substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Based on the service area reliability assessment conducted by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (“LADWP”) in its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, LADWP determined that it will be able to reliably provide water to its customers through the year 2035, as well as the intervening years (e.g., the year that the Current Project will become operational). Additionally, under the provisions of Senate Bill 610, LADWP is required to prepare a comprehensive water supply assessment for every new development “project” (as defined by Section 10912 of the Water Code) within its service area that reaches certain thresholds. The types of projects that are subject to the requirements of Senate Bill 610 tend to be larger projects that may or may not have been included within the growth projections of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. The water supply assessment for such projects would evaluate the quality and reliability of existing and projected water supplies, as well as alternative sources of water supply and measures to secure alternative sources if needed. Furthermore, through LADWP’s Urban Water Management Plan process and the City’s Securing L.A.’s Water Supply, the City will meet all new demand for water due to projected population growth through a combination of water conservation and water recycling. These plans outline the creation of sustainable sources of water for the City to reduce dependence on imported supplies. LADWP is planning to achieve these goals by expanding its water conservation efforts through public education, installing high efficient water fixtures, providing incentives, and expanding the City’s outdoor water conservation program. To increase recycled water use, LADWP is expanding the recycled water distribution system to provide water for irrigation, industrial use, and groundwater recharge.

Compliance of the Current Project and future development projects with regulatory requirements that promote water conservation such as the LAMC, including the City’s Green Building Code, as well as AB 32, would also assist in assuring that adequate water supply is available on a cumulative basis. Based on the above, it is anticipated that LADWP would be able to supply the demands of the Current Project, as well as future growth. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project’s impacts on water supply would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts on water supply would be less than significant.

As with the Current Project, new development projects occurring in the project vicinity would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation via a sewer capacity availability request to determine adequate sewer capacity. In addition, new development projects would also be subject to LAMC Sections 64.11 and 64.12, which require approval of a sewer permit prior to connection to the sewer system. Additionally, in order to connect to the sewer system, related projects in the City of Los Angeles would be subject to payment of the City’s Sewerage Facilities Charge. Payment of such fees would help to offset the costs associated with infrastructure improvements that would be needed to accommodate wastewater generated by overall future growth. If system upgrades are required as a result of a given project’s additional flow, arrangements would be made between the related project and the Bureau of Sanitation to construct the necessary improvements. Furthermore, similar to the Current Project, each related project would be required to comply with applicable water conservation programs, including the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Related Project’s impacts on the City’s wastewater infrastructure would not be

cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

The City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation's Integrated Resources Plan ("IRP") projects wastewater flows and wastewater treatment capacity through 2020. Therefore, cumulative impacts on wastewater facilities were analyzed relative to future growth projected in the Hyperion Service Area. The Hyperion Service Area's total treatment capacity would be approximately 550 mgd in 2020, which is the same as its existing capacity. As set forth in the Addendum, the cumulative wastewater generation would represent only approximately two percent of remaining capacity. Therefore, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's impacts on wastewater treatment would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Operation of the Current Project in conjunction with forecasted growth in the County (inclusive of the related projects) would generate municipal solid waste and result in a cumulative increase in the demand for waste disposal capacity at Class III landfills. The Countywide demand for landfill capacity is continually evaluated by the County through preparation of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Reports ("Annual Reports"). Each Annual Report assesses future landfill disposal needs over a 15-year planning horizon. As such, 2012 Annual Report projects waste generation and available landfill capacity through 2027. The Annual Report assumes a 60 percent diversion rate. Given the recent approval of the City's Exclusive Franchise System, which the City expects to start implementing in 2017, waste diversion from City sources will likely be higher than the assumed 60 percent (based on the City's current diversion rate of 72 percent). Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the estimated Current Project's generation of waste per year would represent only a fraction of the cumulative waste generation. Thus, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project's contribution to the County's estimated cumulative waste stream in the Project buildout year would not be cumulatively considerable.

Furthermore, the 2012 Annual Report demonstrates that future disposal needs can be adequately met through the planning period (i.e., 2027) without disposal capacity shortages via a multi-pronged approach that includes successfully permitting and developing proposed in-County landfill expansions, utilizing available or planned out-of-County disposal capacity, developing necessary infrastructure to facilitate exportation of waste to out-of-County landfills, and developing conversion and other alternative technologies. Jurisdictions in the County of Los Angeles continue to implement and enhance the waste reduction, recycling, special waste, and public education programs identified in their respective planning directives. These efforts, together with Countywide and regional programs implemented by the County and the cities, acting in concert or independently, have achieved significant, measurable results, as documented in the 2012 Annual Report. Based on this trend, and because solid waste disposal is an essential public service that must be provided without interruption in order to protect public health and safety, as well as the environment, it is reasonable to assume that concerted actions will continue to be taken by jurisdictions towards expanding and enhancing waste reduction and recycling programs, and implementing prudent solid waste management strategies in response to the strategies identified in the 2012 Annual Report. With respect to regulatory consistency, it is anticipated that, similar to the Current Project, the related projects would not conflict with and instead would promote source reduction and recycling, consistent with AB 939 and the City's Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan, City's General Plan Framework Element, RENEW LA Plan, and Green LA Plan. Thus, overall, as with the Original Project and the Revised Project, cumulative impacts with regard to solid waste under the Current Project would be less than significant.

Like the Current Project, the related projects would be required to comply with Title 24 energy conservation standards. The Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment 2003 Final EIR documented that natural gas supply and infrastructure capacity would be sufficient to accommodate natural gas consumption associated with the buildout of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area to 2026, including the cumulative effects of other growth anticipated to occur within the Redevelopment Project Area (i.e., growth projected to occur under the No Project scenario). The Gas Company undertakes expansion or modification of natural gas service infrastructure to serve future growth in the within its service area as required in the normal process of providing service. Cumulative impacts related to natural gas service would be addressed through this process. As such, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable effects on natural gas supplies and infrastructure.

The Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment 2003 Final EIR documented that electrical generation and infrastructure capacity would be sufficient to accommodate electricity consumption associated with the buildout of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area to 2026, including the cumulative effects of other growth anticipated to occur within the Redevelopment Project Area (i.e., growth projected to occur under the No Project scenario). As with the Current Project, LADWP undertakes expansion or modification of electrical service infrastructure and distribution systems to serve future growth in the City as required in the normal process of providing electrical service. Cumulative impacts related to electric power service would be addressed through this process. As such, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable effect on electricity generation or infrastructure and impacts would be less than significant.

B. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the types and level of development associated with the Current Project would slowly consume renewable and non-renewable resources over the project's operational lifetime. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project would require a commitment of resources that would include (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site. Also like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project will require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics) and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development will limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during the operation of the proposed project. However, this resource consumption of the Current Project would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the Los Angeles region and is not a substantial change from the resource consumption of the Original Project and the Revised Project.

C. Growth Inducing Impacts

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, development of the Current Project could foster economic growth in the Project area by increasing the number of residents at the project site who could patronize local business and services in the area. In addition, employment

opportunities would be provided during the construction and operation of the proposed project. Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, growth induced by development of the Current Project would be consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts. Also, like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the roadways and other infrastructure (e.g., water facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) associated with the Current Project would not induce growth because they are existing and would only serve project residents and businesses.

D. Alternatives

The EIR considered the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1: No Build/No Project Alternative and Adaptive Re-Use/No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Density Alternative
- Alternative 3: Office Development Alternative
- Alternative 4: Mixed-Use Alternative

The Current Project constitutes a minor alteration to the Original Project, and does not create new significant impacts or increase the severity of the Original Project's significant impacts. Furthermore, no alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previously certified EIR have been identified that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

E. Statement of Overriding Considerations

The EIR identified unavoidable significant impacts that will result from implementation of the Original Project. The Current Project would result in the same significant and unavoidable impacts—albeit the severity of some of those impacts will be reduced. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decisions of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts identified in the EIR that are not substantially lessened or avoided, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. Article I of the City's CEQA Guidelines incorporates all of the State CEQA Guidelines contained in Title 15, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 *et seq.* and thereby requires, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, that the decision maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. These Addendum findings incorporate and re-state the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the Original Project.

Like the Original Project and the Revised Project, the Current Project would result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts with respect to construction noise and vibration and would considerably contribute to significant cumulative impacts with respect to views of the Capitol Records Tower and parks and recreational facilities, and it is not feasible to mitigate such impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the City re-adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the project, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced

the benefits of the Current Project against the Current Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that the each of the project's benefits, as listed below, outweighs and overrides the significant unavoidable impacts of the project's noise and vibration during construction, as well as its contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to views of the Capitol Records Tower and parks and recreational facilities.

Summarized below are the benefits of the Original Project, which remain benefits of the Current Project. These provided the rationale for approval of the Original Project as the provide rationale for approval of the Current Project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the significant unavoidable impacts and justify the approval, adoption or issuance of all of the required permits, approvals and other entitlements for the Current Project. Despite the unavoidable impacts regarding construction noise and vibration and a contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to views of the Capitol Records Tower and parks and recreational facilities, the City approves the Current Project based on the following contributions of the Current Project to the community:

1. The project will reuse and redevelop the currently underutilized project site to provide housing and commercial office space and live/work units to serve the local community.
2. The project will provide a well-designed development that is compatible and complementary with surrounding land uses and enhances pedestrian circulation in the area.
3. In addition to providing adequate parking facilities to serve the project residents and employees, and any surplus parking would be made available to the public in the evening to for night-time parking in Hollywood.
4. The project will generate employment opportunities for the local area.
5. The project will reactivate and revitalize an under-utilized parcel of land.
6. The project will mitigate, to the extent feasible, the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.
7. The project will provide development that is financially viable.
8. The Applicant has agreed to contribute to the rehabilitation of the triangle parcel across from the Project.

F. Mitigation Monitoring Program

In accordance with the Requirements of Public Resources Code § 21081.6, the previously-adopted Mitigation Monitoring Program, which is described in full in Section IV of the Final EIR, is incorporated herein by reference and shall apply to the Current Project. The City Council reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of mitigation measures if the City Council or their designee determines that the amended or substituted mitigation measure will mitigate the identified potential environmental impacts to at least the same degree as the original mitigation measure, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

G. Independent Judgment

The Applicant's consultants prepared the screencheck versions of the Addendum, Technical Memorandum and related technical reports and memoranda. All such materials and all other materials related to the Addendum and Technical Memorandum were extensively reviewed and, where appropriate, modified by the Planning Department or other City representatives. As such, the Addendum, Technical Memorandum and all other related materials reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the Lead Agency.

H. Substantial Evidence

The City Council finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Final EIR, the Addendum, Technical Memorandum and related technical reports and memoranda referenced therein and herein, and other related materials, each of which are incorporated herein by this reference. Moreover, the City Council finds that where more than one reason exists for any finding, the City Council finds that each reason independently supports such finding, and that any reason in support of a given finding individually constitutes a sufficient basis for that finding.

I. Relationship of Findings to EIR, Addendum and Technical Memorandum

These Findings are based on the most current information available. Accordingly, to the extent there are any apparent conflicts or inconsistencies between the EIR, Addendum and/or Technical Memorandum, on the one hand, and these Findings, on the other, these Findings shall control and the EIR and Addendum or both, as the case may be, are hereby amended as set forth in these Findings.

J. Project Conditions of Approval

The mitigation measures set forth in the EIR and which are incorporated into the Original Project conditions of approval shall also be incorporated into and made conditions of the Current Project to be monitored and enforced by the City pursuant to the building permit process and the Mitigation Monitoring Program. To the extent feasible, each of the other findings and conditions of approval made by or adopted by the City Council in connection with the Current Project are also incorporated herein by this reference.

K. Custodian of Documents

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitutes the record of proceedings upon which the Director's decision is based is the City of Los Angeles, Planning Department, located at 200 North Spring Street, Room 750, Los Angeles, California 90012.

III. ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

Findings. On September 26, 2014, the Planning Director approved the Addendum in connection with approving Site Plan Review for the Current Project, finding that the EIR, along with the Addendum adequately serve as environmental clearance under CEQA for the Current Project. The City Council is relying on the Director's approval and findings in connection with the subject Q Clarification. The City Council finds that there are no changes to the Current Project, no changes in the circumstances under which the Current Project is being undertaken, and no significant new information regarding the Current Project since the Director's September 26, 2014 action.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163 and 15164, as well as CEQA Section 21166, and based upon the substantial evidence set forth in the administrative record and summarized herein the City Council further finds:

- A. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows the Current Project necessitates minor technical changes or additions to the previously-certified EIR, but that none of the conditions described CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 or 15163 calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred;
- B. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that no substantial changes are proposed in the project, including but not limited to the changes reflected in the Revised Project and the Current Project, which will require major revisions of the EIR;
- C. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that no substantial changes will occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the EIR;
- D. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that no new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete, has become available;
 - i. The project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - ii. Significant effects previously examined in EIR will not be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - iii. No mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible have been identified as now in fact to be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project;
 - iv. No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR have been identified that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment;
- E. Substantial evidence in the administrative record shows that although an addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the EIR, the public nevertheless had opportunities to review and comment upon the Addendum, the Technical Memorandum, and supporting analyses ;
- F. None of the public comments in the administrative record, and none of the claims or allegations set forth in the Appeal, constitute substantial evidence that would require preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR or that would require substantial revision of the previously-certified Final EIR.
 - a. The Appeal contains no expert analysis or other substantial evidence that the Current Project will result in significant impact related to geology or traffic, including impacts on local freeways, but rather consists entirely of speculation and opinion unsupported by fact.
 - b. The expert analysis set forth in the Group Delta Fault Activity Report directly refutes speculation in the Appeal that an active fault exists on the project site;

- c. The traffic analysis prepared for the Addendum, the Technical Memorandum, and supported analyses prepared in response to the Appeal provide expert analysis that directly contradicts speculation in the Appeal that the traffic trips from the recently-approved Millennium Hollywood Project would cause a new significant cumulative traffic impact.
- d. The analysis in the 6230 Yucca Street Project Caltrans Freeway Screening, provides expert analysis that directly contradicts speculation the Appeal that traffic from the Current Project would result in significant impacts on area freeways.

As summarized in Addendum and the Technical Memorandum, the changes proposed to the Original Project reduce the intensity of development in many ways and are minor. The changes would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the intensity of the severity of previously identified significant effects. The analysis contained in the Addendum and the Technical Memorandum demonstrates that the Current Project is consistent with the size, scale, and massing of the Original Project and the impact issues previously examined in the EIR would remain unchanged with the proposed minor modifications.