FINDINGS

(as amended by PLUM on December 13, 2016)

A. GENERAL PLAN / CHARTER FINDINGS.

The proposed zone change, height district change, and sign district are in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan. In addition, the proposed land use and sign district ordinances are consistent with and implement policies in the North Hollywood – Valley Village Community Plan, a component of the Land Use Element of the General Plan:

1. **Framework Element.** The General Plan Framework sets forth a citywide comprehensive long-range growth strategy and defines citywide policies regarding such issues as land use, housing, urban form, neighborhood design, open space, economic development, transportation, infrastructure, and public services. The framework plan denotes the project area as a "Regional Center", which is identified as a focal point for regional commerce, identity, and activity, and containing a diversity of uses such as corporate and professional offices, residential, retail commercial malls, government buildings, major health facilities, major entertainment and cultural facilities and supporting services. Regional Centers are usually major transportation hubs and are typically developed with floor area ratios from 1.5:1 to 6.0:1 and building heights from six to twenty stories, but floor area and height standards may be further refined by local community plans.

   The project site is currently underutilized with over twenty acres of surface parking and developed with a four-story commercial building and three-story office building. The proposed project would be an in-fill development comprised of a balanced mix of office, residential, retail, restaurant, fitness, and entertainment uses, with associated identifying and wayfinding signage. The project would intensify the use on the site, providing a mix of housing and employment to the area, supporting the objectives of the Framework Element.

2. **General Plan Land Use Designation.** The subject property is located within the North Hollywood – Valley Village Community Plan, updated and adopted by the City Council on May 14, 1996. The existing Plan designates the subject site for Community Commercial land uses with a corresponding zone of CR, C1, C1.5, C2, C4, RAS3, RAS4, P, and PB. The site is also subject to Footnote No.3 of the Plan, which states that the Community Commercial designation corresponds to an average Height District No. 1 with a maximum of Height District No. 2. The zone change request to the C2-1 zone and height district and establishment of the Sign District (-SN) is consistent with the proposed land use designation and footnotes and is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the General Plan as reflected in the adopted Community Plan.

3. **General Plan Text.** The North Hollywood – Valley Village Community Plan further defines a subset of the Framework's Regional Center area, which includes the project site and the adjacent Valley Plaza shopping center site, as the "Valley-Laurel Plaza Regional Shopping Area" (RSA), and states that the economic health of the community partially depends on the vitality of the Valley-Laurel Plaza RSA. The Plan proposes that the quantity of strip commercial zoning along certain streets outside Valley Laurel Plaza be reduced by redesigning underutilized and unneeded commercial zones for residential use. The Plan also addresses commercial and residential issues broadly, and notes that there is "*potential for residential and mixed use development along commercial corridors*" and intends *"to promote economic wellbeing and public convenience through allocating and distributing commercial lands for retail, service and office facilities*". The Plan also addresses circulation

issues by stating that "*adequate highway improvements shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning, permitting intensification of land use in order to avoid congestion and assure proper development*".

In addition, the site is within the Laurel Canyon Commercial Corridor Redevelopment Project Area for the Laurel Canyon commercial corridor. The Redevelopment Plan was prepared by the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) in response to the 1994 Northridge Earthquake to facilitate and provide for the repair and replacement of properties damaged or destroyed by the earthquake. The Plan does not further restrict land uses or add any building limitations which would be applicable to the proposed development. The site is not otherwise located within any other specific plan or special land use district.

The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the General Plan Framework, Community Plan, land use designations, and Redevelopment Plan. The project will redevelop an underutilized site currently comprised of over 20 acres of surface parking areas as well as limited office and department store uses, and replace it with a higher concentration and variety of commercial uses (such as retail, market, service, and office facilities) and residential uses, under a unified aesthetic and signage program. The construction of an integrated commercial, retail, and residential development totaling approximately 1.3 million square feet would serve as a regional destination and anchor for the community. This proposal would improve the economic vitality of the area by integrating a mix of uses in-line with Plan policies for the Valley-Laurel Plaza Regional Shopping Area. In addition, appropriate traffic mitigation measures and public right-of-way improvements have been imposed as conditions of approval for the project. Therefore, as conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and the land use designation and will serve to implement the goals and objective of the adopted Community Plan.

B. ENTITLEMENT FINDINGS

1. VESTING ZONE CHANGE AND HEIGHT DISTRICT CHANGE:

a) *The recommended zone change and height district change is in conformance with the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.*

The project site consists of approximately 24.75 acres of property, currently zoned in a "footprint zoning" style, restricting commercial uses to only the footprints of the existing buildings on the site, and otherwise limiting the remainder of the site for surface parking. Existing development consists of a four-story Macy's department store (465,000 sq. ft.) and annex (10,000 sq. ft.), and a three-story office building (90,000 sq. ft.). The site will be redesigned to accommodate a mix of commercial, retail, and residential development, with amenities, landscaping, and public plazas and parks.

The project site is currently zoned QC4-1L along the three-story office building on the northwest corner of the property, C4-1L on the area surrounding the Macy's department store, and P-1L for the remaining parking areas. Along the northwest corner, the Q conditions of the current zoning limit building height to three stories, limit building area to 140,000 square feet, set a minimum building setback of 25 feet along Erwin Street, further limit uses to those permitted by the CR zone, require a minimum of three parking spaces per 1,000 feet of floor area, and set other limitations regarding signage and lighting. The C4 zone surrounding the department store building limits commercial uses to a central footprint within the lot, and allows for commercial and multi-family residential uses, with restrictions such as the prohibition of health clubs and certain entertainment uses. The P zone, which covers the remainder of the site, only allows for surface parking uses. The entirety of the site is also located within the Height District 1L designation, which allows for a floor area ratio of

1.5:1 and limits building heights to 75 feet, with a further limitation on commercial building heights to a maximum of six stories.

The current zoning places several restrictions on the use of site, greatly limiting restaurants and retail establishments within the northwest portion of the site, prohibiting health club uses within the center of the site, and limiting a majority of the site for the sole use of automobile surface parking. The existing 106-foot height of the Macy's department store building exceeds the current 75-foot building height limit of the zone.

In order to revitalize the underutilized Project site with commercial and residential development under a unified designation, a zone change and height district change to the C2 zone and Height District No. 1 is requested. The proposed zoning is consistent with the existing Community Commercial land use designation, which allows for corresponding zones of CR, C1, C1.5, C2, C4, RAS3, RAS4, P, and PB. The C2 zone allows for general commercial uses, which includes restaurants, retail stores, health clubs, and cinemas, as well as multi-family residential and parking uses. The requested zone change would replace the varied sets of incongruent regulations resulting from the existing mix of QC4, C4, and P zones to a single unified C2 zone. This zone would allow for a broader range of compatible commercial and residential uses to be developed on-site under a cohesive set of zoning standards.

The requested change from Height District 1L to Height District 1 would remove the current 75-foot height limit on the site, thus bringing the existing Macy's building height of 106 feet into conformance with the Height District, and allowing for a 83-foot architectural tower feature to be included as a part of Building J. In addition, Q conditions included as part of the zone change would set height limits for new buildings on the site in order to ensure that any new development is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood context. These height limits for new development on the site include maximum residential buildings heights of 64 and 69 feet and maximum commercial building heights between 32 and 83 feet. The proposed Height District would continue to maintain the same floor area ratio limit of 1.5:1 allowed on the site, and the project's proposed 1.2:1 FAR is in line with this Height District standard.

The context of the project has also been considered in the Zone Change and Height District Change requests. The project site is convenient in location to several major streets, such as Oxnard Street, Laurel Canyon Boulevard, and with regional access from the 170 Freeway. As an infill project, the development will have adequate capacity and connections to existing City services and infrastructure. There is a necessity for housing in all income levels and housing types, and the project will create more opportunity for rental housing in the vicinity. Existing commercial development along Laurel Canyon Boulevard is primarily characterized by shopping centers, single-story retail buildings, and a number of multi-story office buildings in the C2 and C1 zones. Beyond the commercial corridors, development primarily consists of established single-family residential neighborhoods, some multi-family residential buildings, and several public and private schools, in the R1 and RD1.5 zones. A zone change from C4-1L, (Q)C4-1L, and P-1L to (T)(Q)C2-1-SN and the construction of an integrated commercial, retail, and residential development totaling approximately 1.3 million square feet would be serve as an regional destination and anchor for the community, while remaining compatible with the use of existing adjacent developments. Therefore, the zone change and height district change is provided as part of public necessity and convenience and in the general welfare of the neighborhood. Furthermore, such zone and height district change will be in good zoning practice by providing a harmonious density and land use activity for the vicinity.

The action, as recommended, has been made contingent upon compliance with the "(Q)" and "(T)" conditions imposed herein. Specific conditions and mitigation measures have been incorporated to address neighborhood concerns about parking, traffic, adjacency to the school and single-family residential neighborhood, and building design and layout. Additional conditions regarding local traffic improvements, raised crosswalks, and driveway permeability will serve to enhance public safety and encourage groundwater recharge. Furthermore, required phasing for the project has been instituted via a condition to require that a majority of the commercial component be constructed prior to the occupancy of the residential buildings. This condition will guarantee the continued commercial use of this historically commercial site and regional center, and will provide assurances that the existing Macy's building will not remain as an abandoned or derelict structure on the site, but will rather be rehabilitated and adaptively reused in conjunction with new retail, restaurant, office, and other commercial uses along the project's main driveway. Such limitations are necessary to protect the best interests of and to assure developments and improvements more compatible with surrounding properties, to secure an appropriate development in harmony with the General Plan, and to prevent or mitigate the potential adverse environmental effects of the subject recommended action.

2. SIGN DISTRICT:

a) *The proposed Sign District is in conformance with the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.*

The unique characteristics of the district will be enhanced by the imposition of special sign regulations designed to enhance the theme or unique qualities of the district. The project proposes a comprehensive sign program for the 25-acre site, comparable to other large-scale outdoor shopping developments within the City, and would include:

Commercial component:

- Two entryway "jumbo letter" monument signs identifying the "NoHo West" development
- Entryway pillar signs identifying the site and its tenants
- A freeway-facing series of projecting signs spelling "NoHo West"
- An internal supergraphic sign and three supergraphic signs facing the adjacent school
- Eight supergraphic signs along the freeway
- Two digital displays on the north and south ends of the parking structure
- One digital display facing the internal plaza
- Several project identification and multi-tenant panel tower wall signs
- For each tenant space, a projecting sign
- For each tenant space, a wall sign or architectural canopy sign
- Office tenant identification wall signs on the former Macy's building
- Marquee signage and a large projecting sign for the cinema
- Directional signage, directories, and advertising kiosks
- In-ground decorations, building attached murals, and freestanding art installations

Residential component:

- Monument signs, some integrated with planters
- Pillar signs identifying the buildings

- Residential- and amenity-identification wall signs

The Sign District ordinance (Exhibit E) proposes specially tailored dynamic signage regulations that will advance the goals for redevelopment of the area by creating an engaging visual environment for visitors and residents of the site. The proposed sign program creates a unified aesthetic and sense of identify by concentrating project identification signage along visible corridors, ensuring the appropriate identification of individual tenant spaces, providing functional way-finding signage and directories, and emboldening the central plaza as a focal point of the site through the use of a variety of sign typologies and artistic installations. As such, the NoHo West Sign District conforms to the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare of the city.

The signage regulations reflect good zoning practice in that they establish signage design criteria, standards, locations, illumination levels, and types of permitted and prohibited signs within the district. Appropriate and balanced sign regulations are necessary to maintain compatibility with surrounding development while fostering a vibrant urban environment. As such, signage has been concentrated on the interior of the commercial areas of the site, with minimized signage and light spillover adjacent to the private school and single-family residential areas, and specialized supergraphic signage dedicated to non-commercial signage along the school. In addition, permitted digital displays and supergraphic signage will be installed on-site in tandem with a program for the removal of billboards within the local vicinity, consistent with community policies and interests in improving the community aesthetic and reducing blight. The Sign District would establish regulations that allow signs which are appropriate for the commercial and residential context of the regional center, and illumination standards of the Sign District would restrict light pollution.

In addition, the proposed Sign District meets the technical requirements for establishment of the district, as defined in LAMC Section 13.11. The district only includes properties in the commercial “C” zone, the site contains at least one block or three acres in area, and the district includes only contiguous parcels. The Sign District was initiated by City Council motion (Council File No. 11-1995) on November 29, 2011. The motion identified the potential for the Sign District to include community public benefits in exchange for projects utilizing signage benefits of the district. To achieve this goal, standards are included for the removal of billboard signage within a three-mile radius of the site at a 10:1 ratio for each square-foot of digital display signage installed on-site, and at a 5:1 ratio for each square-foot of supergraphic signage installed on-site. These standards and the billboard removal program would aide in the reduction of blight in the community, while fostering a distinct identify for the site and region through a coordinated sign program.

C. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) FINDINGS

1. INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The City of Los Angeles (the "City") has evaluated the environmental impacts of implementation of the NoHo West Project by preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) (Case Number ENV-2015-888-EIR/State Clearinghouse No. 2015041001). The EIR was prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. (CEQA) and the California Code of Regulations Title 15, Chapter 6 (the "CEQA Guidelines"). The findings discussed in this document are made relative to the conclusions of the EIR.

The EIR analyzed both the project originally proposed by the applicant (referred to here as the "Original Project") and, among other project alternatives, a reduced project labeled Alternative 4B, which was analyzed both with and without an "Office Variation." The City has selected a further reduced project that is similar to Alternative 4B. The approved project is referred to in these Findings as "Revised Project." The term "Project" is used in these Findings for statements that are equally applicable to the Original Project, Alternative 4B, and the Revised Project; where a statement applies specifically only to the Original Project, Alternative 4B, or the Revised Project, the more specific terminology is used.

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

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

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

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

3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained

workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

(CEQA§ 21081[a]; see also CEQA Guidelines §15091[a].)

CEQA Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors [Goleta II] (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project (City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego [1982] 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 [City of Del Mar].). "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses "desirability" to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Ibid.; see also Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland [1993] 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 [Sequoyah Hills].)

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

Since the EIR identified significant effects that may occur as a result of the Revised Project, and in accordance with the provisions of the Guidelines presented above, the City hereby adopts these findings set forth in this document as part of the approval of the Revised Project. These findings constitute the City's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Revised Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings, in other words, are not solely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the City's approval of the Revised Project.

The findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the Project and the EIR. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations by the City in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

Although the findings below identify specific sections within the EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the City incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning and analysis set forth in the EIR and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. This is especially true with respect to the City's approval of all mitigation measures recommended in the EIR and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the EIR. The City further intends that if these findings fail to cross-reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, any finding required or permitted to be made by this City with respect to any particular subject matter of the Project must be deemed made if it appears in any portion of these findings or findings elsewhere in the record. The EIR, comments and responses to comments, and all appendices are hereby fully incorporated herein by this reference.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The record of proceedings includes the documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record upon which the City approved the Revised Project. The following information is incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these Findings of Fact:

- All Project plans and application materials including supportive technical reports;
- The Draft EIR and Appendices (December 2015) and Final EIR and Appendices (June 2016), and all documents relied upon or incorporated therein by reference;
- The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) prepared for the Revised Project;
- The City of Los Angeles General Plan and related EIR;
- Municipal Code of the City of Los Angeles, including but not limited to the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance.
- All records of decision, resolutions, staff reports, memoranda, maps, exhibits, letters, minutes of meetings, summaries, and other documents approved, reviewed, relied upon, or prepared by any City commissions, boards, officials, consultants, or staff relating to the Project;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings of Fact, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any and all other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from the Department of City Planning, as the custodian of such documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings, located at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Room 750, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The 24.7-acre Project Site is located within the North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles and approximately 12 miles northwest of Downtown Los Angeles. Regional access to the Project Site is provided by the I-170 (Hollywood) Freeway immediately adjacent to the west and the US-101 (Hollywood) Freeway located 1.70 miles to the south. The addresses of the Project Site are 6100, 6150, 6152, 6152 ½, 6160 North laurel Canyon Boulevard and 11931, 12001 West Oxnard Street. The Project Site fronts on Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street. The assessor's parcel numbers (APNs) for the Project Site are 2334-011-026 and 2334-011-027. The Project Site is currently developed with an approximately 90,000-square-foot, 3-story office building (currently used as both an office and educational/adult college); and an existing approximately 465,000-square-foot, 4-story Macy's Department Store (which includes an approximately 10,000-square-foot annex building).

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Project includes redevelopment/reuse of the Project Site with a mix of commercial, retail, and residential land uses. Approximately 16.44 acres (or 716,310 square feet) of the Project Site fronting Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street and near the 170 Freeway would be devoted to commercial use, with new interior access ways and private streets added for circulation. Approximately 8.26 acres (or 359,942 square feet) of the Project Site fronting Radford Avenue and Erwin Street would be developed with multi-family residential units.

The Project analyzed in the Draft EIR (referred to here as the "Original Project") included the demolition of the existing 90,000-square-foot office building at the corner of Laurel Canyon and Erwin Street and the 10,000-square-foot Macy's annex building, as well as the removal of an approximately 20,000-square-foot portion of the existing Macy's building. The existing main Macy's building would be expanded and re-used for approximately 500,000 square feet of office uses. The Original Project also involved the development of the remainder of the Project Site with approximately 300,000 square feet of commercial uses, as follows: approximately 142,513 square feet of retail land uses, 48,687 square feet of restaurant land uses, 40,000 square feet of health club/gym, and 68,800 square feet of cinema uses (with 1,750 seats).

Partly in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, the Project Applicant requested that the City consider a revised project alternative, which was named "Alternative 4B" and included in Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR. Alternative 4B is a reduced project, which includes less office use, fewer residential units, and more retail and restaurant uses when compared to the Original Project.

Alternative 4B includes the demolition of the existing 90,000-square-foot office building at the corner of Laurel Canyon and Erwin Street, the 10,000-square-foot Macy's annex building, a 13,000-square-foot portion of the Macy's building, as well as the removal of an approximately 20,000-square-foot portion of the existing Macy's building. Alternative 4B would re-use approximately 205,000 square feet of the main Macy's building for office uses (on the second through fourth floors) and restaurant uses (on the second floor). The remainder of the main Macy's building would be converted to 316 parking spaces in the basement (in approximately 150,000 square feet) and approximately 60,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor. In total, Alternative 4B would include the following commercial uses: 189,184 square feet of office uses; 208,171 square feet of retail uses; 66,645 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club/gym uses; and 68,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 1,750 seats). In addition to the commercial uses, the Project Site would also be developed with 658 residential units in two buildings.

Potential variations in the mix of uses for the commercial portion of Alternative 4B would include the replacement of up to 65,000 square feet of retail use on the ground floor of the Macy's building with 65,000 square feet of office use, and the replacement of up to 40,000 square feet of health use in Building G with 40,000 square feet of office (collectively referred to as the "Office Variation"). These variations in the mix of uses within the commercial center would not significantly change any impacts and would not alter the design or building envelope.

The Revised Project approved by the City is a slightly smaller version of Alternative 4B that would eliminate several significant impacts and reduce all impacts compared to the Original Project, and would have substantially similar impacts compared to Alternative 4B. The Revised Project includes a total of 572,000 square feet of commercial uses as follows: 244,150 square feet of office uses; 188,000 square feet of retail uses; 57,850 square feet of restaurant uses; 32,000 square feet of health club/gym uses; and 50,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 1,250 seats). In addition to the commercial uses, the Project Site would also be developed with 642 residential units in two buildings with 701,542 square feet. As compared to Alternative 4B, the Revised Project has 16 less residential units, approximately 12,300 square feet less residential floor area, and the same commercial floor area. Although the mix of commercial uses in the

Revised Project is different from Alternative 4B, the mix of uses is within the range analyzed in the Final EIR under Alternative 4B or Alternative 4B/Office Variation.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Project are as follows:

1. Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.

2. Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.

3. Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.

4. Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.

5. Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.

6. Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.

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

8. Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.

9. Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.

10. Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.

11. Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.

12. Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

ACTIONS REQUIRED

The approvals requested by the Project Applicant include the following:

1. Vesting Zone Change from P-1L, QC4-1L, and C4-1L to (Q)C2-1;

2. Master CUB for alcohol service in Project restaurants and cinema and alcohol sales at grocery store;

3. Transitional Height determination to allow heights to exceed allowances within 199 feet of R1 zoned property;

4. Vesting Conditional Use Permit to allow FAR averaging in a unified development project for the Project;

5. Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow a portion of one residential building to observe a 13.5-foot rear yard in lieu of an 18-foot rear yard;

6. Vesting Tentative Tract Map to subdivide the Project Site into five commercial and two residential lots;

7. Site Plan Review for a project over 50,000 square feet and 50 dwelling units;

8. Adoption of a Sign District;

9. Zoning Administrator's Determination for Shared Parking Approval to allow for shared off-street parking between commercial uses; and

10. Haul Route Approval.

3. CEQA REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project described in Section 1.2 above includes (but is not limited to) the following documents:

Notice of Preparation. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines §15375 and §15082, the City published the Notice of Preparation (the "NOP"), which was sent to responsible agencies and interested parties for a 30-day review period starting on April 2, 2015, identifying the scope of the environmental issues. The NOP is included in Appendix B to the Draft EIR, and the responses to the NOP from agencies and interested parties are included in Appendix C to the Draft EIR.

Public Scoping Meeting. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines §15206 and §15082(c)(1), as a project of regional significance, a Public Scoping Meeting was held on April 16, 2015, at the Victory Boulevard Elementary School (6315 Radford Avenue, North Hollywood, CA 91606) to give the public the opportunity to provide comments as related to the Project and the issues the public would like addressed in the EIR.

Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was distributed for public review (including the State Clearinghouse) on December 3, 2015 for a 76-day review period with the comment period expiring on February 12, 2016. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was distributed to interested parties that informed them of where they could view the document and how to comment. The Draft EIR was available to the public at City Hall, Department of City Planning. A copy of the document was also posted online at http://planning.lacity.org/eir/NohoWest/deir/index.html. Notices were filed with the County Clerk on December 3, 2015.

Notice of Completion. A Notice of Completion was sent with the Draft EIR to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse on December 3, 2015, and notice was provided in newspapers of general and/or regional circulation.

Final EIR. A total of 84 comment letters were received by the close of the public comment period. The specific and general responses to comments are in Section 2 (Responses to Comments) of the Final EIR. Responses to public agency comments were distributed to those public agencies on June 28, 2016.

The Final EIR was distributed on June 28, 2016. The Final EIR has been prepared by the City in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City has relied on Section 15084(d)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines that allows contracting with another entity, public or private, to prepare the EIR. The City has reviewed drafts of all portions of the EIR and subjected them to its own review and analysis. The Final EIR that was released for public review reflected the independent judgment of the City.

Errata. An Errata of minor corrections to the Final EIR was issued on August 23, 2016, and is available in the City record.

Certification. On July 26, 2016, a joint hearing was held by the City Planning Commission Hearing Examiner and the Deputy Advisory Agency. The Deputy Advisory Agency certified the EIR on September 9, 2016 in connection with its approval of the vesting tentative tract map.

Addendum. On December 8, 2016, the Department of City Planning issued an Addendum to the FEIR to include changes to Mitigation Measures M-3 and M-4 regarding physical traffic improvements to two intersections, further reducing the Project impacts compared to those analyzed in the Certified EIR. In addition, the Addendum found that none of the conditions as described under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 requiring a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred under the proposed modified Project.

The City certifies, pursuant to section 15090(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, that the Final EIR and Addendum have been completed in compliance with CEQA; reflect the City's independent judgment and analysis; and have been present to the decision-making body, which reviewed and considered the information in it before approving the Revised Project.

4. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITHOUT MITIGATION

Impacts of the Original Project that were determined to be less than significant in the EIR (including as a result of implementation of project design features and regulatory compliance measures) and that require no mitigation are identified below. The impact area and the appropriate section number follow the impact titling and follow the numbering conventions used in the EIR. The City has reviewed the record and agrees with the conclusion that the following environmental issues would not be significantly affected by Alternative 4B or the Revised Project and therefore, no additional findings are needed.

These findings do not repeat the full discussions of environmental impacts contained in the EIR. The City ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR. The City adopts the reasoning of the EIR, City staff reports, and presentations regarding the Project.

AESTHETICS

The EIR discussed the impacts related to aesthetics in Section 4.B. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential Aesthetic impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Scenic Vistas

Implementation of the Project would not substantially affect any scenic vistas, since scenic vistas available from the Project area are largely obscured by existing development. Impacts related to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Scenic Resources

The Project Site does not contain scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, or other unique or landmark features; none of these resources are located in proximity to the Project Site. Therefore, Project development would not cause the removal of scenic resources and thus, would result in a less than significant impact to scenic resources.

Visual Character and Compatibility

The Project would change the visual character of the Project Site by redeveloping the Site with two residential buildings, and new commercial structures, including a cinema, built around a central plaza with pedestrian and vehicular linkages to all commercial and residential uses. This change would not constitute a substantial degradation to the existing visual character of the Project Site and surrounding areas. Also, the Project would be consistent with the policies contained in the North Hollywood – Valley Village Community Plan and applicable Citywide Design Guidelines.

The Project includes adoption of supplemental zone district known as a Sign District, which would contain site-specific regulations permitting a variety of signage types and styles. The majority of the proposed signs would face the internal areas of the commercial portion of the Project Site and therefore would not be highly visible from the residential areas. The most visible signage includes the parking structure signs and larger Project identification signs. The parking structure signs include large vinyl panels along the west facing elevation of the parking structure as well as digital active displays at the north and south corners of the parking structure. However, these signs would be facing the SR-170 freeway and Laurel Canyon Boulevard. Additional signs would be located in the central plaza area, and therefore, would not be highly visible from the residential areas. The remaining signs would be identification signs located at Project entrances and at the major corners of the Project Site, which is typical of identification signage for a commercial development and would not adversely affect surrounding uses. As such, visual impacts related to the Project's proposed signage would be less than significant.

For all of these reasons, Project impacts related to visual character and compatibility would be less than significant. Implementation of Project Design Features B-1 through B-4 would further minimize Project impacts related to visual character and compatibility.

Project Design Features

B-1 Temporary fencing would be installed around the Project Site during construction.

B-2 All mechanical and electrical equipment that is located on the rooftops would be screened from public view.

B-3 Utility equipment would be placed underground, screened from public view, or incorporated into the design of the Project.

B-4 All landscaped areas would be maintained in accordance with a landscape plan, including an automatic irrigation plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect in accordance with LAMC Sections 12.40 and 12.41. The final landscape plan shall be

reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning during the building permit process.

Views and Viewsheds

Due to existing surrounding buildings, public views toward the Verdugo Hills, Santa Susana Mountains, and the San Gabriel Mountains are currently partially obstructed. The development of the Project would not obstruct existing recognized or public views. Therefore, Project impacts related to views and viewsheds would be less than significant.

Shade/Shadows

During the winter, no shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM. During the summer, no shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM. Therefore, Project impacts related to shade/shadows would be less than significant.

Nighttime Light

Due to its scale in relation to existing development in the Project vicinity, light generated from the interior of the proposed buildings could potentially be seen from moderate distances from the Project Site. However, the increase in light that would be generated would not be out-of-character with the existing light sources in the Project vicinity. Furthermore, the light generated from the Project would comply with City regulations. Therefore, Project impacts related to nighttime light would be less than significant. Implementation of Project Design Feature B-5 and Regulatory Compliance Measure B-7 would further minimize Project impacts related to nighttime light.

Project Design Feature

B-5 All exterior lighting would be designed with internal and/or external glare control and would be designed, arranged, directed, or shielded to contain illumination on-site.

Regulatory Compliance Measure

B-7 Except as provided in the Sign District regulations adopted for the Project, the Project would comply with the generally applicable provisions of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code and Building Code related to signage.

Daytime Glare

The Project's potential sources of glare that would be introduced into the Project area would not result in hazardous conditions to motorists or result in substantial glare due to the various features designed to minimize glare-related impacts. Therefore, Project impacts related to daytime glare would be less than significant. Implementation of Project Design Feature B-6 would further minimize Project impacts related to daytime glare.

Project Design Feature

B-6 The exterior of the proposed structures shall be constructed of materials such as, but not limited to, high-performance and/or non-reflective tinted glass (no mirror-like tints or films) and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces to minimize glare and reflected heat.

Cumulative Impacts

The development of cumulative projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and regulations, which would result in individual review of the visual character of each project to ensure consistency and that design standards are compatible with existing land uses. In addition, similar to the Project, the cumulative projects would be required to submit a landscape plan to the City for review and approval. None of the cumulative projects are located in close enough proximity to the Project to combine with the Project to create additional shadow impacts. The closest cumulative project (Cumulative Project No. 2) is not close enough to combine impacts as to light with the Project for any particular sensitive site.

FINDINGS

As the Revised Project would be smaller than, and of the same design as, the Original Project and would include all of the Project Design Features and the Regulatory Compliance Measure identified for the Original Project, impacts with respect to aesthetics would remain unchanged. Based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that Revised Project impacts and cumulative impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and compatibility, views and viewsheds, shade/shadows, nighttime light, and daytime glare would be less than significant.

AIR QUALITY

The EIR discussed the impacts related to air quality in Section 4.C. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses impacts with respect to operational emissions, toxic air contaminants, odors, and AQMP consistency, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Air quality emissions during construction are addressed in Section 5.4.C, further below.

Regional Operational Emissions

The Project's net regional operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_x, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. Project impacts related to regional operational emissions would be less than significant. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measures C-8 through C-10 (compliance with CARB and SCAQMD regulations) would further reduce the Project's impact with respect to operational air quality.

Localized Operational Emissions

The Project's localized operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for NO_X, CO, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. Project impacts related to localized operational emissions would be less than significant. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measures C-8 through C-10 (compliance with CARB and SCAQMD regulations) would further reduce the Project's impact with respect to operational air quality.

Sensitive Receptors (Operational Emissions)

Long-term operations of the Project would not exceed CO air quality standards at roadways in the area, and the Project would not result in any CO hotspots. In addition, the Project would not significantly increase the percentage of vehicles operating in cold start mode or substantially worsen traffic flow. For these reasons, the Project would generate negligible pollutant concentrations of CO, NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, or PM_{10} associated with mobile sources at sensitive receptors. Therefore, Project operation impacts on sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)

Given the short-term construction schedule of approximately 31 months, construction of the Project would not represent a long-term (i.e., 70 years) source of TAC emissions on-site. Additionally, typical sources of acutely and chronically hazardous TACs include industrial truck stops and warehouse distribution facilities, neither of which would be included as part of the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in any significant impacts related to TACs.

Odors

The Project would utilize typical construction techniques, and odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. The Project would introduce new retail, restaurants, offices, and residences to the area and would not result in activities that create objectionable odors. Therefore, Project impacts related to odors would be less than significant.

Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Consistency

The Project satisfies both of the SCAQMD's criteria for determining consistency, the Project would be consistent with the AQMP, and impacts related to this issue would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

As described in the EIR, SCAQMD thresholds are to be used for evaluating both project-specific and cumulative impacts. Therefore, air quality impacts that are not significant at the Project level also are not cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would result in the same scope of construction as the Original Project, would generate fewer daily trips than the Original Project, and would include all of the Regulatory Compliance Measures identified for the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project impacts and cumulative impacts related to regional operational emissions, localized operational emissions, sensitive receptors (operational emissions), TACs, odors, and AQMP consistency would be less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The EIR discussed the impacts related to biological resources in Section 4.A. of the Draft EIR. The following discussion addresses impacts with respect to special status species, riparian habitat/wetlands, migratory wildlife corridors, the City's tree preservation ordinance, and habitat conservation plans, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by existing development. A portion of the Project Site contains some ornamental vegetation, and the Project Site does not support any sensitive species or habitat. Nevertheless, nesting birds are protected under the Federal Migratory Treaty Act (MBTA) (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 10), and California Fish and Wildlife Code Section 3503, as expressed in Regulatory Compliance Measure A-1. Implementation of RCM A-1, would ensure that any potential impacts related to nesting birds, should they be encountered, are less than significant.

Riparian Habitat/Wetlands

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City. The site does not contain any riparian habitat, sensitive natural community, or wetland that is identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Migratory Wildlife Corridor

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by existing development and roadway and utility infrastructure. The Project Site contains some ornamental vegetation, but given the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding area, the area is not used as a wildlife corridor. Additionally, there are no waterways in the Project Site that are used by migratory fish, and there are no wildlife nursery sites in the area. Accordingly, the Project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and no impact would occur.

Tree Preservation Ordinance

The Project Site contains various ornamental landscaping and 143 non-protected trees that would be replaced as part of the Project in accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. As such, the Project would not conflict with the City's policy related to tree replacement, and impacts would be less than significant.

Habitat Conservation Plan

The Project Site is not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other such plan. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Because the Project would cause no impact to biological resources, it would not contribute to any significant cumulative impact to biological resources.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would be constructed on the same Site as the Original Project, and therefore, would also result in no impact with respect to biological resources. Based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project would cause no impact and no cumulative impact related to biological resources.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The EIR discussed the impacts related to cultural resources in Section 4.D. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses impacts with respect to historic resources, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Project impacts with respect to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains are addressed in Section 5.4.D, further below.

Historic Resources

The May Company building is not currently designated under any national, state, or local landmark programs. The property is not eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or for designation as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument due to a lack of historical or architectural significance and a lack of physical integrity. Additionally, it does not contribute to a potential historic district. Therefore, the May Company building is not historical, and the Project would have no impact related to historic resources.

Cumulative Impacts

Because the Project would cause no impact to historic resources, it would not contribute to any significant cumulative impact to historic resources.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would be constructed on the same Site as the Original Project, and therefore, would also result in no impact with respect to historic resources. Based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project would cause no impact and no cumulative impact related to historic resources.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The EIR discussed the impacts related to geology and soils in Section 4.E. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential geology and soils impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Fault Rupture

The Project Site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study or Fault Rupture Study Area, and no known faults are located within the Project Site boundaries. All development associated with the Project would be required by state law to meet Uniform Building Code (UBC) and California Building Code (CBC) requirements. No significant impacts related to fault rupture would occur. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measures E-1 and E-2 and Project Design Features E-3 would further minimize Project impacts related to geology and soils, including fault rupture.

Seismic Ground Shaking

The Project Site is located in a seismically active region. However, the Project would conform to all applicable provisions of the City Building Code, CBC, and the UBC. Adherence to current building codes and engineering practices would ensure that the Project would not expose people, property or infrastructure to seismically-induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the Southern California region and would minimize the potential to expose people or structures to substantial risk, loss, or injury. Therefore, no significant impacts related to seismic ground shaking would occur. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measures E-1 and E-2 (for compliance with the City's grading permit regulations and applicable air quality and stormwater standards) and Project Design Features E-3 would further minimize Project impacts related to geology and soils, including seismic ground shaking.

Liquefaction

Based on the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared for the Project, the soils underlying the Project Site would not be capable of liquefaction during a major seismic event. Therefore, Project impacts related to liquefaction would be less than significant.

Landslides

Based on the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared for the Project, the probability of seismically-induced landslides occurring on the Project Site is considered low due to the general lack of elevation difference slope geometry across or adjacent to the Site. Therefore, Project impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

Substantial Erosion/Loss of Topsoil

During the Project's construction phase, the Project developer would be required to implement SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust to minimize wind and water-borne erosion at the Project Site. Also, the Project's developer would be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity and Land Disturbance Activities. During the Project's operational phase, most of the Project Site would be developed with impervious surfaces, and all stormwater flows would be directed to storm drainage features and would not come into contact with bare soil surfaces. Therefore, Project impacts related to substantial erosion/loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Soil Stability

Some seismically-induced settlement of the proposed structures should be expected as a result of strong ground-shaking. However, neither the soil nor geologic conditions would preclude construction of the Project provided the recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation are followed and implemented during design and construction. Therefore, Project impacts would be less than significant. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measures E-1 and E-2 (for compliance with the City's grading permit regulations and applicable air quality and stormwater standards) and Project Design Features E-3 would further minimize Project impacts related to geology and soils, including soil stability.

Expansive Soils

Based on the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared for the Project, onsite geologic materials are in the very-low expansion range. Therefore, Project impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Septic Tanks

The Project Site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment system operated by the City. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems are necessary, nor are they proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Project Design Feature

E-3 Geological Engineering Investigation Recommendations

The Project shall comply with the Conclusions and Recommendations found on pages 11 through 49 of the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, prepared by Geotechnologies, Inc., August 15, 2014, to the satisfaction of the Bureau of Engineering.

Cumulative Impacts

The impacts on each site are specific to that site and its users and would not be in common or contribute to (or be shared with, in an additive sense) the impacts on other sites. None of the cumulative projects propose elements or activities that would cause or accelerate geologic hazards offsite that would contribute to increased geological hazards on the Project Site.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would be constructed on the same Site as the Original Project and would include all of the Regulatory Compliance Measures and Project Design Features identified for the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, substantial erosion/loss of topsoil, soil stability, expansive soils, and septic tanks would be less than significant.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The EIR discussed the impacts related to GHG emissions in Section 4.F. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential greenhouse gas emission impacts; these cumulative impacts are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

GHG Emissions

Construction emissions of CO_2e would peak in 2017, when the Original Project would result in 43,947 pounds per day and Alternative 4B would result in 34,736 pounds per day of CO_2e during potential concurrent Site preparation and grading activities. During Project operations, the emissions for the Original Project and its associated California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2020 No Action Taken (NAT) scenario are estimated to be 29,296 and 42,875 $MTCO_2e$ per year, respectively, which shows the Original Project would reduce emissions by 32 percent from the CARB 2020 NAT scenario. The emissions for Alternative 4B and its associated CARB 2020 NAT scenario are estimated to be 25,717 and 37,568 $MTCO_2e$ per year, respectively, which shows Alternative 4B would reduce emissions by 31 percent from the CARB 2020 NAT scenario. Based on these results, both the Original Project and Alternative 4B meet the reduction target as a numeric threshold (15.3 percent) set forth in the 2014 Revised AB 32 Scoping Plan. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

The Project would be consistent with a number of relevant plans and policies that govern climate change, including the Assembly Bill (AB) 32 Scoping Plan and the City's Green Building ordinance. In particular, the Project is consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which calls for reducing GHG emissions statewide to 1990 levels by 2020. In addition, the Project is consistent with SCAG's 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which calls for regional growth and transportation emissions to be consistent with regional and State air pollution objectives. With regard to local policies and regulations, the Project will comply with the City of Los Angeles' Green Building Ordinance standards that reduce emissions beyond a Business As Usual (BAU) scenario. Therefore, Project impacts related to consistency with AB 32 would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would result in substantially reduced GHG emissions during construction and operations compared to the Original Project. Based on the EIR analysis and the whole of

the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's cumulative impacts related to GHG emission and consistency with applicable plans and policies would be less than significant.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The EIR discussed the impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials in Section 4.G. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Transport of Hazardous Materials

Construction of the Project would involve the temporary transport, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including paints, adhesives, surface coatings, cleaning agents, fuels, and oils. All of these materials would be used in a short-term nature during construction activities. Construction of the Project would comply with applicable regulations and would not expose persons to substantial risks resulting from the release of hazardous materials or exposure to health hazards in excess of regulatory standards. Implementation of hazardous waste reduction efforts on-site (i.e., the City's Green Building Ordinance and through source reduction, recycling, on-site treatment, etc.), as well as the proper treatment and disposal of such wastes at licensed resource recovery facilities. Hazardous waste transporters would be required to complete and carry with him/her a hazardous waste manifest. Placarding of vehicles carrying hazardous materials would also occur in accordance with Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Therefore, Project impacts related to the transport of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Release of Hazardous Materials

Evidence of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) containing equipment (fluorescent light ballasts) was observed on the Project Site at the time of the Site reconnaissance. If asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) are found to be present, they would be abated in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403, as well as other State and federal rules and regulations, including CAL-OSHA Asbestos for the Construction Industry Standard, EPA rules and regulations, and industry standards. Lead-based paint (LBP) found in the buildings shall be removed and disposed of as recommended by a qualified Department of Health Services lead consultant and in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, Project impacts related to related to release of hazardous materials would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures G-1 through G-3 summarize the existing regulations related to PCBs, ACMs, and LBP that are required to be implemented.

Hazards within One-Quarter Mile of a School

Although schools are within one-quarter mile of the Project Site, the Phase I ESA prepared for the Project Site did not identify any Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) associated with the Project Site. Therefore, Project impacts related to hazards within one-quarter mile of a school would be less than significant.

Listed Hazardous Materials Sites

The Project Site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, no impacts related to this issue would occur.

Airport Land Use Plan or Hazard

The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the Site. However, the Project is not within an airport hazard area. In addition, the airport's runways are oriented north-south and east-west, whereas the Project Site is southwest of the airport. The Site is not within the airport influence area. Therefore, no impact related to this issue would occur.

Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan

All emergency plans, procedures, and evacuation signs would be submitted to the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) for inspection and approval prior to their implementation. Therefore, Project impacts related to emergency response or evacuation plan would be less than significant.

Wildland Fires

The Project Site is located within an improved suburban area and is not located within or near any areas susceptible to wildland fires. Therefore, no impacts related to wildland fires would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, together with cumulative projects, would not create an impact that is cumulatively considerable, as each project would have to comply with site-specific development standards and state hazardous materials handling and transporting regulations. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would require approximately the same amount of demolition as the Original Project and would not introduce new uses in addition to those described for the Original Project. The Revised Project would also include the same Regulatory Compliance Measures identified for the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to transport of hazardous materials, release of hazardous materials, hazards within one-quarter mile of a school, listed hazardous materials sites, airport land use plan or hazard, emergency response or evacuation plan, and wildland fires would be less than significant.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The EIR discussed the impacts related to hydrology and water quality in Section 4.H. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential hydrology and water quality impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Water Quality

Implementation of appropriate project design features and compliance with local, state and federal regulations, code requirements, and permit provisions would prevent significant impacts related to the release of potentially polluted discharge into surface water. In order to prevent both short-term (construction) and long-term (operational) impacts to water quality, the Project would be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) water quality permit from the Los Angeles Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB), and would be designed and constructed to comply with the requirements of the LARWQCB Order No. R4-2012-0175; NPDES Permit No. CAS004001; the Construction General Permit Water Quality

Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ; and the City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Watershed Protection "How to Build Protection for Mother Nature Into Your Project, Standard Urban Stormwater Urban Mitigation Plans (SUSMP) Site-Specific Mitigation Plans." Requirements of the SUSMP are enforced through the City's plan approval and permit process. Therefore, Project impacts related to water quality would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures H-1 through H-4 support the existing regulations related to water quality that are required to be implemented.

Groundwater

The Project Site is nearly completely impervious. Therefore, limited to no groundwater recharge currently occurs at the Project Site. The Project would not substantially change the amount of impervious surface. In addition, the Project would be served by the municipal water and sewer system, and no production wells for a source of water are planned to be installed. Therefore, Project impacts related to groundwater would be less than significant.

Drainage

The Project would alter the on-site drainage patterns due to the development of the buildings and open space areas, which would change the elevations of the Project Site. However, this alteration would not result in on-site erosion or siltation because all runoff would be directed to the storm drain infrastructure. In addition, the Project would be increasing the landscaping at the Project Site as compared to existing uses. Since the Project Site is entirely paved predominantly by a surface parking lot, the Project would allow for some additional pervious surfaces through landscaped and open space areas. Therefore, no impacts related to drainage would occur.

Runoff

Required design elements, as established in the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County, would be incorporated into the Project, which would minimize the off-site conveyance of pollutants. Therefore, Project impacts related to runoff would be less than significant.

100-Year Flood

The Project Site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the Project would not result in any impacts related to the 100-year flood.

Flooding from Levee or Dam

The Project Site is located within the potential inundation boundary of the Hansen Dam. The risk of failure of Hanson Dam is considered remote and does not present a significant risk of loss, injury or death to people or structures. Therefore, Project impacts related to flooding from levee or dam would be less than significant.

Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

No major water-retaining structures are located immediately upgradient from the Project Site. The Project Site is not in an area susceptible to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows. Therefore, the Project would not result in any impacts related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Cumulative Impacts

Similar to the Project, each of the four cumulative projects in the vicinity would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP and/or SUSMP and undergo a preliminary review by the City to determine what drainage improvement and BMPS would be required to ensure no significant water quality issues occur. In addition, the Project and cumulative projects must implement more stringent BMPs than those in use under existing conditions. For all of these reasons, no significant cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would occur.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would be constructed on the same Site as the Original Project and would include all of the Regulatory Compliance Measures identified for the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to water quality, groundwater, drainage, runoff, 100-year flood, flooding from levee or dam, and inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would be less than significant.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The EIR discussed the impacts related to land use and planning in Section 4.I. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential land use and planning impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Physically Divide an Established Community

The Project Site is developed and located in a dense suburban area of the City and the Project is not of a size or type to physically divide a community. No impacts related to this issue would occur.

Consistency Analysis

The Project would be substantially consistent with all of the applicable plans, policies, and regulations associated with development of the Project Site. Therefore, no significant impacts related to consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations would occur. Regulatory Compliance Measure I-1 ensures consistency with applicable components of the commercial and residential Citywide design guidelines.

Zoning

With approval of the requested approvals, the Project would conform to the Zoning Code provisions applicable to the Project. Therefore, Project impacts related to zoning would be less than significant.

Conservation Plan

The Project Site is not subject to any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impacts related to this issue would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Future development associated with the cumulative projects would support additional buildout of Los Angeles and the surrounding area. This is consistent with SCAG and other regional policies for promoting more intense land uses adjacent to transit stations and job centers, providing a variety of housing options, and increasing the number of retail and commercial uses.

Further, all cumulative projects would be subject to the same local development and mitigation standards as the Project.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would require the same approvals as the Original Project and would include the same Regulatory Compliance Measure identified for the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to physical division of an established community, consistency with existing land use plans, zoning, and conservation plans would be either less than significant or nonexistent.

NOISE

The EIR discussed the impacts related to noise in Section 4.J. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to operational noise, vibration (from construction and operation), and distance from an airport, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation Potential impacts with respect to construction noise are addressed in Section 5.4.J, further below.

Operational Noise

The greatest Project-related noise increases would be 0.4 dBA L_{eq} along Laurel Canyon Boulevard between Victory and Sylvan in both directions in the AM peak hour, and 0.5 dBA L_{eq} on the northbound side of Laurel Canyon Boulevard between Victory and Sylvan during the PM peak hour. These increases would be inaudible, and below the 5 dBA increase considered noticeable by the public at large. Therefore, Project impacts related to operational noise would be less than significant.

Construction Vibration

Vibration velocities could range from 0.003 to 0.089 inch/second peak particulate velocity (PPV) at 25 feet from the source activity, with corresponding vibration levels ranging from 58 vibration decibels (VdB) to 87 VdB at 25 feet from the source activity, depending on the type of construction equipment in use. The peak particle velocity and vibration levels that would occur at these on- and off-site sensitive uses during construction would be less than the thresholds associated with building damage.

The vibration levels experienced at off-site sensitive receptors could range from 65 VdB at the 11926 Oxnard Street residence to 94 VdB at the Laurel Hall School's mobile classrooms. Pursuant to Federal Transportation Authority (FTA) guidance, the vibration impacts from construction of the Project would exceed the 80 VdB considered acceptable for residences at the two sensitive receptor locations on the Laurel Hall School campus that are adjacent to the Project Site. However, any human annoyance would be temporary and would not be evaluated against FTA standards, because those standards are generally applied to long-term operations. Therefore, Project impacts related to construction vibration would be less than significant.

Operational Vibration

Project-related traffic would expose nearby residential land uses and other sensitive receptors during long-term operations to a vibration level far less than 75 VdB. Therefore, Project impacts related to operational vibration would be less than significant.

Within Two Miles of Airport

Although the Project Site is approximately 1.5 miles southwest of Bob Hope Airport, the Project Site is not located within the Airport Influence Area which extends as far west as Tujunga Boulevard and represents the geographic area that could be impacted by flight paths in and out of the regional airport. The Project Site also does not fall within the airport's 65 dB, 70 dB, or 75 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contours that are associated with airport flights paths that expose the public to elevated noise levels. The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, Project impacts related to being located within two miles of an airport would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

For the reasons stated in the EIR, the Project would not combine with any of the cumulative projects to cause a cumulatively significant operational noise, construction vibration, operational vibration or airport proximity impact. At a minimum of 750 feet from the Project Site, cumulative projects are not near enough to result in cumulative construction noise or vibration impacts; the Project's operational noise and vibration impacts are too small to be cumulatively considerable; and proximity to an airport is a site-specific impact.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would result in similar vibration-inducing construction activity compared to the Original Project. The Revised Project would not add operational uses to those included in the Original Project, and therefore would generate similar stationary source noise on the Project Site. The Revised Project would generate substantially fewer daily vehicle trips than the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to construction vibration, operational noise, operational vibration, and being located within two miles of an airport would be less than significant.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The EIR discussed the impacts related to population and housing in Section 4.K. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential population and housing impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Construction

The construction of the Project would result in increased employment opportunities in the construction field, which could potentially result in increased population and demand for housing in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California are such that it is not likely that they would relocate their households due to the construction employment associated with the Project. No impacts related to this issue would occur.

Operation Infrastructure

The Project Site is currently developed with several buildings and is located within an urbanized area in the City. Thus, the construction of a potential growth-inducing roadway or other infrastructure extensions would not be required. No impacts related to this issue would occur.

Population and Employee Generation

It is estimated that the Original Project and Alternative 4B would generate approximately 1,848 or 1,638 residents, respectively, using the Growth and Infrastructure Report rate of 2.49 persons

per unit for the Community Plan Area based on 2014 estimated population and housing units. It is estimated that the Original Project would generate approximately 2,114 net employees and that Alternative 4B would generate approximately 1,122 net employees, or 1,227 net employees under the Office Variation. The Project would contribute a negligible percentage of the estimated population and housing growth in the City. The Project's residents and housing units would be within the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) estimates and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. Thus, the Project does not represent a substantial or significant growth as compared to the existing characteristics. In addition, the Project would help respond to the unmet housing demand in both the North Hollywood Community Plan and the City as a whole. Specifically, the Project would help achieve a portion of the household growth forecast for the City of Los Angeles, while also being consistent with regional policies to reduce urban sprawl and efficiently utilize existing infrastructure. Therefore, Project impacts related to population and employee generation would be less than significant.

The Revised Project would generate fewer residents than the Original Project and Alternative 4B. The Revised Project would generate fewer employees than the Original Project and approximately the same number of employees as Alternative 4B. Therefore, the Revised Project would not cause substantial, unplanned growth.

Displace Housing or Persons

The Project Site does not include existing residential uses and the Project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units or displace a substantial number of people. No impacts related to this issue would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

For the reasons stated in the EIR, the Project would not combine with the cumulative projects to cause a significant cumulative impact to population or housing. The Original Project and the cumulative projects combined would add approximately 4,980 residents and 3,623 employees, which would be well within growth projections for the City; both Alternative 4B and the Revised Project would add fewer residents and employees.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would cause reduced growth in residents and employment compared to the Original Project and reduced growth in residents compared to Alternative 4B. Based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to construction employment, operation infrastructure, population and employee generation, and displacement of housing or persons would be less than significant.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The EIR discussed the impacts related to public services in Section 4.L. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to fire protection, police protection (during operation), schools, parks, and libraries, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Potential impacts with respect to police protection (during construction) are addressed in Section 5.4.L, further below.

Fire Protection - Construction

Construction is not considered to be a high-risk activity, and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) is equipped and prepared to deal with construction-related traffic and fires should they occur. Due to the limited duration of construction activities and compliance with applicable

codes, Project construction would not be expected to adversely impact firefighting and emergency services to the extent that there would be a need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LAFD. Therefore, the Project's construction-related impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures L.1-1 through L.1-4 state compliance with existing fire regulations. Project Design Features L.1-5 through L.1-8 further minimize the Project's need for fire protection services.

Project Design Features

L.1-5 The construction contractors and work crews shall (1) properly maintain the mechanical equipment according to best practices and the manufacturers' procedures; (2) ensure proper storage of flammable materials; and (3) cleanup of spills of flammable liquid.

L.1-6 If there are partial closures to streets surrounding the Project Site, flagmen shall be used to facilitate the traffic flow until the street closure around the construction is complete.

L.1-7 During demolition and construction, LAFD access from major roadways shall remain clear and unobstructed.

L.1-8 The design of the Project Site shall provide adequate access for LAFD equipment and personnel to the structures.

Fire Protection - Operation

The Water Operations Division of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) would perform a detailed fire flow study at the time of permit review (plan check) in order to ascertain whether further water system or site-specific improvements would be necessary. Hydrants, water lines, and water tanks would be installed per Division 7, Section 57.09.06 of the Fire Code requirements. The nearest fire station with an engine and truck company (such as a Light Force) is Station No. 89, approximately 1.12 miles away. Additional fire stations are within 2.0 miles (Station Nos. 60 and 102). Therefore, the Project's operational impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.

Police Protection – Operation

As a result of the Project, the LAPD would add up to three police officers to maintain current resident service ratios. The demand for three additional officers to maintain current resident service ratios would not require the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of the North Hollywood Community Police Station, the construction of which could cause a significant impact. The Project's direct minimal population increase and associated demand for police services, along with the provision of on-site security features, coordination with the LAPD, and incorporation of crime prevention features would not require the provision of new or physically altered police stations in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for police protection. Therefore, Project impacts on police protection services would be less than significant. Project Design Feature L.2-6 further minimizes the Project's need for police protection services.

Project Design Feature

L.2-6 The Project shall provide for on-site security measures and controlled access systems for residents and tenants to minimize the demand for police protection services.

Schools

The Original Project would result in approximately 1,087 additional LAUSD students and Alternative 4B would result in approximately 763 additional LAUSD students (or 791 students under the Office Variation). The Project Applicant would be required to pay applicable developer fees, which would ensure that Project impacts related to school services would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measure L.3-1 summarizes the existing regulation related to school services required to be implemented.

Regulatory Compliance Measure

L.3-1 Payment of School Development Fee

Prior to issuance of a building permit, the General Manager of the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall ensure that the Applicant has paid all applicable school facility development fees in accordance with California Government Code Section 65995.

Parks

Based on six acres of regional parkland per 1,000 residents, the Original Project would generate an additional demand for approximately 11 acres of regional parkland and 7.39 acres of neighborhood and community parkland; Alternative 4B would generate demand for 9.8 acres of regional parkland and 6.6 acres of neighborhood and community parkland. The Project Applicant would be required to pay applicable parkland fees, as stated in Regulatory Compliance Measure L.4-1, which would ensure that Project impacts related to parks would be less than significant.

Libraries

The Project would increase the demand for library services through its resident population, but it would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. An additional branch is only recommended when a community reaches a population of 90,000. The Project population combined with reasonable localized growth (approximately 0.73% annual growth rate) would not increase the service population to 90,000 persons. Consequently, the LAPL has confirmed that there are no planned improvements to add capacity through expansion of any identified branch or build any new libraries in the area. Therefore, Project impacts related to libraries would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

As stated in the EIR, cumulative development combined with the Project would not cause the LAFD, LAPD or LAPL to construct new or expanded facilities; cumulative school impacts would be mitigated by the payment of Government Code section 65995 school facility development fees; and cumulative park demand would be met through developer park fee payments under City ordinances.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would result in reduced impacts compared to the Original Project, and approximately the same impacts compared to Alternative 4B, with respect to fire protection services, police protection services (operation), parks, and libraries, and would include all of the Project Design Features and Regulatory Compliance Measures identified for the Original Project and Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to fire protection

services, police protection services (operation), schools, parks, and libraries would be less than significant.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The EIR discussed the impacts related to transportation/traffic in Section 4.M. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion summarizes the Project's impacts with respect to CMP facilities, Caltrans facilities, residential streets, Project Site access, and alternative modes of transportation. The Project's transportation/traffic impacts with respect to construction impacts to schools are addressed in Section 5.4.M, further below. Alternative 4B's transportation/traffic impacts with respect to construction traffic and intersection level of service are addressed in Section 6.4.M, also further below.

CMP Facilities and Caltrans Facilities

Under either the Original Project or Alternative 4B, the number of vehicle trips would not exceed the CMP threshold of 150 trips in any one direction at any of the freeway monitoring locations closest to the Project Site during either AM or PM weekday peak hours.

LADOT and Caltrans have entered into a series of agreements designed, among other things, to establish screening thresholds designed to identify when a project may have potential impacts to Caltrans facilities, including freeway segments and ramps. The applicable screening thresholds are established per agreement between LADOT and Caltrans, memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding dated October 2013 (the "2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU"). The 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU sets a capacity threshold of 1,500 veh/hr/lane for freeway ramp level of service analysis. The 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU and the 1,500 veh/hr/lane screening threshold are applicable to the Project, based on the fact that the Project MOU for the Project's Traffic Study was approved and signed by LADOT on March 4, 2015. Actual traffic counts in the Traffic Study for each off-ramp facility were conducted in November 2014 (see Draft EIR page 4.M-8). Thus, off-ramp level of service for the Project was calculated using the applicable 1,500 vehicles per hour/per lane capacity as specified in the 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU. The 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU establishes a threshold for all ramps and does not state that a different analysis is needed to determine appropriate ramp capacity for a controlled ramp.

The purpose of the 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU is to identify if there is a need for any further CEQA analysis. Per the 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU, the following thresholds apply for off-ramps:

- For a freeway off-ramp operating at LOS D, if Project-related vehicle trips were to exceed 2% of the assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane, then additional analysis is required.

- For a freeway off-ramp operating at LOS E or F, if Project-related vehicle trips were to exceed 1% of the assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane, then additional analysis is required.

Therefore any freeway off-ramps operating at LOS C or better do not exceed the threshold check, indicating that no significant impacts would be anticipated.

The threshold check was conducted consistent with the 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU using traffic count data collected in November 2014. The resulting evaluation showed that all freeway off-ramp locations identified are expected to operate at LOS C or better and therefore do not meet the criteria requiring further analysis. It should be noted that the Traffic Study identified that the existing conditions at the intersection of Oxnard Street & SR-170 Northbound Ramps

are LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour, as shown in Table 2.2 of the Traffic Study, and based on traffic counts conducted in November 2014. In addition, the Traffic Study shows that the freeway off-ramp operates at LOS B in the AM peak hour and LOS C in the PM peak hour, as shown in Table E-3 of the Traffic Study, based on traffic counts conducted in November 2014 and analyzed using the methodology outlined in the 2013 LADOT/Caltrans MOU. The combination of the threshold check results and the existing conditions at the intersection indicate that no significant impacts would be anticipated.

Therefore, Project impacts related to CMP facilities and Caltrans facilities including SR-170, SR-101 and SR-134 would be less than significant.

Project Site Access

Five of the six principal driveway locations would be at mid-block locations, and would be located away from adjacent intersections, at locations with good visibility for both drivers and pedestrians. The sixth driveway location, East Oxnard Street, is the northern leg of the SR-170 Northbound Ramps & Oxnard Street intersection. As this driveway operates as part of a signalized intersection, pedestrians and bicyclists will be afforded clear visibility and refuge from any potentially hazardous conditions through the use of the existing crosswalks located in three of the intersection approaches. All driveways would be perpendicular to the roadway and are proposed with standard curb-cuts and designs, and would thus afford good visibility to drivers and pedestrians. All Project driveways would be designed in accordance with LADOT standards and approvals. All driveways would operate at LOS D or better, below City thresholds. Therefore, Project impacts related to driveways would be less than significant.

Alternative Transportation Modes

In the Project vicinity, there is an existing bike lane (backbone) along Laurel Canyon Boulevard from Hamlin Street to Riverside Drive. In addition, a future bike lane (backbone) is proposed for Victory Boulevard from Lankershim Boulevard to Clybourn Avenue. The Project would not conflict or interfere with any existing or future bicycle lanes. In addition, transit use was assumed to be negligible due to the distance to major transit stations in the area. Finally, access has been designed to afford clear visibility to pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, Project impacts related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

Residential Street Analysis

An analysis of residential street cut-through traffic is included in Appendix E to the Final EIR. A majority of the streets located in close proximity to the Project Site are non-continuous streets due in large part to the location and borders of the Project Site itself. The local streets to the immediate north of the Project Site (Agnes Avenue, Ben Avenue, and Gentry Avenue) are physically separated from the Project Site by an existing raised median located along Erwin Street. As such, vehicle traffic using these streets cannot access the Project Site and would therefore not provide any time-savings or connectivity above that afforded by Radford Avenue or Laurel Canyon Boulevard. The local streets to the immediate east of the Project Site (Carpenter Avenue, Morella Avenue, and Simpson Avenue) do not provide direct access to the Project Site, as they are all oriented in a north-south direction. Again, these streets would not provide any time-savings or increased connectivity that is not available from Radford Avenue. Calvert Street is a local street located east of the Project Site and north of Oxnard Street. This street is also physically separated from the Project Site by an existing raised median prohibiting direct access into the Project Site. As vehicles entering the Project Site would be required to travel either north along Radford Avenue to Erwin Street or south to Oxnard Street to gain access, the use of Calvert Street does not provide any time-savings above that provided by Oxnard Street.

Project traffic using Radford Avenue, or Erwin Street east of the Agnes Avenue intersection, is expected to primarily be traffic from the residential portion of the Project. This traffic is expected to use Radford Avenue to access Victory Boulevard to travel to/from the Project Site to the north and east and is expected to use Oxnard Street to travel to/from the Project Site to the south and east. Residential traffic is also expected to use Erwin Street to access Laurel Canyon Boulevard before turning either north to Victory Boulevard or south to Oxnard Street.

Vehicles traveling to/from the east are not expected to use Erwin Street as it does not provide any time-savings or additional connectivity to the Project Site when compared to either Victory Boulevard or Oxnard Street. As with Erwin Street, none of the other neighborhood streets would provide any time-savings or mobility options that would make them attractive as an alternative "cut-through" route for traffic traveling to the east.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project's impacts with respect to CMP facilities, Caltrans facilities, project site access and alternative transportation modes would be reduced compared to those of the Original Project and approximately the same as those of Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts and cumulative impacts related to CMP facilities, Caltrans facilities, project site access and alternative transportation modes would be less than significant.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The EIR discussed the impacts related to utilities and service systems in Section 4.N. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses all potential utilities and service systems impacts, which are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Wastewater – Construction

Project construction would involve off-site construction for sewer connection and related infrastructure upgrades if required. This infrastructure construction would not be expected to create a significant impact to the physical environment because: (1) existing service would not be disrupted; (2) replacement of the sewer lines, if required, would be within public and private rights-of-way; and (3) the existing infrastructure (sewer lines and connectors) would be replaced with improved infrastructure in areas that have already been significantly disturbed. Therefore, the Project's construction related impacts related to wastewater would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measure N.1-2 requires compliance with existing regulations related to wastewater service. Project Design Feature N.1-3 further minimizes the Project's demand for wastewater service.

Project Design Feature

N.1-3 In the event of full or partial public street closures, such as during the construction of new wastewater lines, the Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be implemented.

Wastewater – Operation

It is estimated that the Original Project would generate a net total of approximately 149,387 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater and that Alternative 4B would generate approximately 110,760 gpd (or 112,110 gpd for the Office Variation). There is adequate treatment capacity within the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) system to accommodate the Project, and thus, the increase in wastewater generation would not have a significant impact on treatment plant

capacity. As HTP complies with the state's wastewater treatment requirements and the Project's wastewater generation is well within the existing capacity, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of LAWQCB. Therefore, Project impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measure N.1-1 states compliance with the Green Building Ordinance related to wastewater service.

Stormwater

The Project would neither create, nor contribute, runoff water that would result in the need for any additional storm water drainage facilities. Low Impact Development (LID) is a storm water management strategy that seeks to prevent impacts of runoff and storm water pollution as close to its source as possible. Therefore, Project impacts related to stormwater would be less than significant.

Water – Construction

Water consumption would be required to accommodate construction activities, such as soil watering (i.e. for fugitive dust control), clean up, masonry, painting, and other related activities. The construction activities requiring water would not create substantial water demand. Typically, fugitive dust watering is provided by private purveyors and not provided by on-site water sources. Reclaimed/recycled water can be used for dust control. Overall, construction activities would require minimal water consumption and would not be expected to have adverse impact on available water supplies or existing water distribution systems. Therefore, the Project's construction-related impacts on water service would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measure N.2-5 states the project is subject to existing regulations related to water service. Project Design Feature N.2-6 further minimizes the Project's demand for water service.

Project Design Feature

N.2-6 In the event of full or partial public street closures, such as during the construction of new water lines, the Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be implemented.

Water Treatment

The Original Project is estimated to consume a total of approximately 182,370 gpd; Alternative 4B is estimated to consume approximately 133,927 gpd (or 135,655 for the Office Variation). The Project would not require new or expanded water treatment facilities. Therefore, Project impacts related to water treatment would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures N.2-2, N.2-3, and N.2-4 state that the project will comply with existing regulations such as the Green Building Code, the Water Management Ordinance, and the Low Impact Development Ordinance.

Fire Flow

The Project design includes features to increase the capacity of existing water infrastructure in accordance with LADWP standards, which take into account LAFD fire flow and pressure requirements. The Water Operations Division of the LADWP would perform a detailed fire flow study at the time of permit review in order to ascertain whether further water system or site-specific improvements would be necessary. Hydrants, water lines, and water tanks would be installed per Fire Code requirements for the Project. In addition, proposed plot plans are required to be submitted to the LAFD for review for compliance with applicable Los Angeles Fire Code, California Fire Code, City of Los Angeles Building Code, and National Fire Protection Association standards, which would ensure that the Project would not create any undue fire hazard. Therefore, Project impacts related to fire flow would be less than significant. Regulatory

Compliance Measure N.2-1 summarizes the above-mentioned existing regulations related to fire flow required to be implemented.

Water Supply

The LADWP Board of Commissioners approved a WSA prepared for the Project in accordance with requirements of Senate Bills 610 and 221. Existing water supply sources would be adequate to serve the Project, and the Project would not require new or expanded water supply sources. Therefore, Project impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Solid Waste – Construction

The Project is predicted to generate a total of approximately 10,380 tons of solid waste during demolition and 2,521 tons of solid waste over the construction period. The Mesquite Landfill would have adequate capacity to accept the Project's demolition and construction waste. Therefore, the Project's construction related impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measure N.3-2 indicates that conformance with existing regulations related to solid waste will be implemented. Project Design Feature N.3-4 further minimizes the Project's need for landfill capacity.

Project Design Feature

N.3-4 To the maximum extent feasible, demolition and construction debris including, but not limited to, concrete, asphalt, wood, drywall, metals, and other miscellaneous and composite materials shall be recycled and salvaged.

Solid Waste – Operation

It is estimated the Original Project would generate a net total of approximately 6.78 tons per day (tpd) of solid waste and Alternative 4B would generate approximately 5.5 tons per day (or 5.1 tpd for the Office Variation). The Sunshine Canyon Landfill can accept 12,100 tpd and currently accepts an average of 7,107 tpd, and could therefore accommodate the additional solid waste resulting from the Project. In addition, the Project could be served by the Mesquite Regional Landfill (simultaneously with Sunshine, or after Sunshine closes in 2033), which can accept 20,000 tons per day, with an overall capacity of 600 million tons and a lifespan of 100 years. Thus, the Project would not cause a need for new or expanded landfill capacity. Therefore, Project impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures N.3-1 and N.3-3 state that existing Municipal Code requirements to include a designated recycling area and mandatory recycling services will be implemented.

Comply with Recycling Regulations

The City of Los Angeles prepared a Solid Waste Management Policy Plan that was adopted by the City Council in 1994. Solid waste generated on-site by the Project would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and policies related to solid waste, including (but not limited to) AB 939, CiSWMPP, SRRE, Ordinance No. 171687 and the Framework Element of the General Plan. The Project developer would provide clearly marked, durable, source sorted recycling bins throughout the Project Site to facilitate recycling in accordance with Ordinance No. 171687. Therefore, Project impacts related to compliance with recycling regulations would be less than significant.

Energy Conservation

Electricity – Construction

Electricity used to provide temporary power for lighting and electronic equipment (e.g., computers, etc.) inside temporary construction trailers, and for lighting when necessary for general construction and renovation activity would generally not result in a net increase in on-site electricity use over existing conditions, since the Project Site is currently occupied. Therefore, the Project's construction-related impacts on electricity would be less than significant.

Electricity – Operation

The Original Project would demand approximately 8,567,262 kw-h/year of electricity; Alternative 4B would demand approximately 5,802,942 kw-h/year (or 5,861,942 kw-h/year for the Office Variation). The Project's electricity demand is within the anticipated demand of the LADWP system. Therefore, Project impacts related to electricity would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures N.4-1 through N.4-3 state that the project will comply with existing regulations such as the City's Green Building Ordinance and Green Building Code, as well as the California Energy Code. Project Design Feature N.4-4 further minimizes the Project's demand for energy.

Project Design Feature

N.4-4 The Project shall use Energy Star appliances where available.

Natural Gas – Construction

Construction equipment fuels (diesel, gas, or natural gas) would be provided by local or regional suppliers and vendors. The Project's construction activities would not require new or expanded natural gas supplies. Therefore, the Project's construction related impacts on natural gas would be less than significant.

Natural Gas – Operation

The Original Project is estimated to demand approximately 3,318,033 cf/month of natural gas; Alternative 4B would demand approximately 2,599,602 cf/month (or 2,505,102 for the Office Variation). It was found that operation of the Project would not require new or expanded natural gas supplies. Therefore, Project impacts related to natural gas would be less than significant.

Transportation Energy

Based on the Original Project's estimated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of 45,048,578 million per year, and assuming the Project's mix of vehicle types (automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles) have an average fuel economy of 22.711 mpg, approximately 1,983,558 gallons of fuel would be required in a year. In 2012, California consumed a total of 337,666 thousand barrels of gasoline for transportation, which is equivalent to a total annual consumption of 14.1 billion gallons by the transportation sector. Thus, the Original Project would represent 0.014 percent of the statewide gasoline consumption. Gasoline consumption for Alternative 4B would be substantially reduced due to lower total VMT for a smaller project. Therefore, Project impacts related to transportation energy would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would generate substantially less wastewater and solid waste than the Original Project, and would consume substantially less water, natural gas, electricity and transportation energy than the Original Project. The Revised Project would generate approximately the same wastewater and solid waste, and would consume approximately the

same water, natural gas, electricity and transportation energy, as Alternative 4B. The Revised Project would include all of the Regulatory Compliance Measures and Project Design Features identified for the Original Project. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts related to wastewater, water, solid waste, and energy conservation would be less than significant.

5. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION

The EIR determined that the Project has potentially significant environmental impacts in the areas discussed below. The EIR identified feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts in these areas to a level of less than significant. Based on the information and analysis set forth in the EIR, the Revised Project would not have any significant environmental impacts in these areas, as long as all identified feasible mitigation measures are incorporated into the Revised Project. The City again ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the full analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR.

AIR QUALITY

The EIR discussed the impacts related to air quality in Section 4.C. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to construction emissions, which would not result in significant impacts with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

Regional Construction Emissions

The Project would generate regional VOC and NO_x emissions during the Project's construction phase in excess of the significance threshold for these pollutant emissions. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 1113 (Regulatory Compliance Measures C-6 through C-7), and with implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5 and Project Design Features C-11 through C-13, the Project's regional construction-related emissions would be reduced and would not exceed the significance thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

C-1 All off-road construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards, where available, to reduce NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions at the Project site. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.

C-2 Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) and if the Lead Agency determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained, the Lead Agency shall require trucks that meet U.S. EPA 2007 model year NO_x emissions requirements.

C-3 At the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment, a copy of each unit's certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided.

C-4 Encourage construction contractors to apply for SCAQMD "SOON" funds. Incentives could be provided for those construction contractors who apply for SCAQMD "SOON" funds. The "SOON" program provides funds to accelerate clean up of off-

road diesel vehicles, such as heavy duty construction equipment. More information on this program can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/programs/business/business-detail?title=off-road-diesel-engines&parent=vehicle-engine-upgrades.

C-5 Lengthen the period for the application of architectural coatings to four months or limit application of coatings to no more than 35,156 square feet of surface area per day to minimize any daily emissions of VOC that could exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance.

Project Design Features

C-11 The Project Applicant shall ensure that construction vehicles avoid, to the extent feasible, travel on streets immediately adjacent to the Laurel Hall School. The City shall ensure that haul routes are designed to comply with this measure.

C-12 The Project Applicant shall provide for the funding for the replacement of air filters at the beginning and at the end of construction in any air conditioning units at Laurel Hall School.

C-13 The Project Applicant shall provide advance notification of the Project's anticipated general construction schedule and a specific schedule for site grading and preparation activities.

Localized Construction Emissions

The Project would generate localized NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions during the Project's construction phase in excess of the significance threshold for these pollutant emissions. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 1113 (Regulatory Compliance Measures C-6 through C-7), and with implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5, Regulatory Compliance Measures C-6 and C-7, and Project Design Features C-11 through C-13, the Project's localized construction-related emissions would be reduced and would not exceed the significance thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5 listed previously.

Project Design Features

Refer to Project Design Features C-11 through C-13 listed previously.

Sensitive Receptors (Construction-Related Emissions)

Nearby sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial concentrations of localized pollutants NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ from construction of the Project. Specifically, construction activities would exceed SCAQMD LST thresholds for NO_2, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 1113 (Regulatory Compliance Measures C-6 through C-7), and with implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5 and Project Design Features C-11 through C-13, the Project's localized construction-related emissions would not exceed the significance threshold, and sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5 listed previously.

Project Design Features

Refer to Project Design Features C-11 through C-13 listed previously.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would substantially reduce construction emissions compared to the Original Project because it would be smaller than the Original Project, and would cause similar construction emissions to those of Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts would be significant absent mitigation, but that Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5, Regulatory Compliance Measures C-6 and C-7, and Project Design Features C-11 through C-13 are hereby incorporated into the Revised Project and avoid or substantially lessen the significant regional construction emissions, localized construction emissions, sensitive receptors (construction-related emissions) impacts to less than significant.

RATIONALE

As discussed above, the Revised Project would have potentially significant impacts during the construction phase with respect to regional VOC and NOx emissions, localized NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions, and exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to concentrations of NO_2, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ exceeding SCAQMD local significance thresholds. The primary generator of regional VOC and NOx emissions would be the operation of diesel-fueled construction equipment and VOC emissions from the application of architectural coatings. Localized NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions primarily result from vehicle exhaust and fugitive dust emissions of off-road construction vehicles.

The regional and local construction-related emissions were estimated using SCAQMD's CalEEMod software (2103.2.2 model) based on the Revised Project's proposed construction schedule of 31 months. The air quality thresholds of significance recognize that the South Coast Air Basin is an area with high air pollution potential due to its climate and topography. The thresholds of significance were designed to protect human health and welfare, and the most sensitive persons, including the elderly, children, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-5, Regulatory Compliance Measures C-6 through C-7, and Project Design Features C-11 through C-13, would reduce the Revised Project's regional and local construction-related emissions below SCAQMD's recommended significance thresholds. Specifically, Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-4 and Regulatory Compliance Measure C-6 would substantially reduce on-site NOx emissions to below the regional significance threshold and emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ to below the local threshold of significance. Mitigation Measure C-5 and Regulatory Compliance Measure C-7 would substantially reduce daily VOC emissions below the regional significance threshold. Further, implementation of Project Design Features C-11 through C-13 would lower the concentrations of NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ below the local significance thresholds for the sensitive receptors near the Project Site. The maximum mitigated regional and localized construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional and local significance thresholds and construction of the Revised Project after implementation of the above-referenced mitigation measures will not conflict with the purpose of the air quality standards to protect the health and welfare of the population.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce the Revised Project's impacts with respect to regional construction emissions, localized construction emissions, sensitive receptors (construction-related emissions) during construction to a less than significant level. For these reasons, discussed in more detail in the below-referenced sections of the EIR, construction air quality impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

REFERENCE

For a complete discussion of impacts with respect to regional construction emissions, localized construction emissions, sensitive receptors (construction-related emissions), please see Section 4.C, Air Quality, and Section 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See also, Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR. See Section 2.2 of these Findings above for the Project Characteristics of the Revised Project.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The EIR discussed the impacts related to cultural resources in Section 4.D. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, which would not result in significant impacts with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

Archaeological Resources

No known archaeological resources are located within the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area, which has been previously disturbed by construction activities. However, the possibility remains that unknown archaeological resources could be located subsurface. Implementation of Mitigation Measure D-1 would ensure that Project impacts related to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

D-1 If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activity shall be halted in the area of the discovery and:

a. The services of an archaeologist shall then be secured by contacting the South Central Coastal Information Center located at California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA), or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist, who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study, or report evaluating the impact.

b. The archaeologist's survey, study, or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource.

c. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating archaeologist, as contained in the survey, study, or report.

d. Project development activities may resume once copies of the archaeological survey, study, or report are submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University Fullerton.

e. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, archaeological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered.

f. A covenant and agreement binding the applicant to this condition shall be recorded prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Paleontological Resources

No known paleontological resources are located within the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area, which has been previously disturbed by construction activities. However, the possibility remains that unknown paleontological resources could be located subsurface. Implementation of Mitigation Measure D-2 would ensure that Project impacts related to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

D-2 If any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activities shall be halted in the area of the discovery and:

a. The services of a paleontologist shall then be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology – USC, UCLA, California State University Los Angeles, California State University Long Beach, or the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum – who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study, or report evaluating the impact.

b. The paleontologist's survey, study, or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource.

c. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating paleontologist, as contained in the survey, study, or report.

d. Project development activities may resume once copies of the paleontological survey, study, or report are submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

e. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, paleontological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered.

f. A covenant and agreement binding the applicant to this condition shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

Human Remains

No known human remains are located within the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area, which has been previously disturbed by construction activities. However, the possibility remains that unknown archaeological resources (including human remains) could be located subsurface. Implementation of Mitigation Measure D-3 would ensure that Project impacts related to human remains would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

D-3 In the event that human remains are discovered during excavation activities, the following procedure shall be observed:

a. Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner.

b. The coroner has two working days to examine human remains after being notified by the responsible person. If the remains are Native American, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.

c. The Native American Heritage Commission will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American.

d. The most likely descendant has 48 hours to make recommendations to the owner, or representative, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave gods.

e. If the descendant does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance.

f. If the owner does not accept the descendant's recommendations, the owner or the descendant may request mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would have the same potential impacts to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains as the Original Project and Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's would be significant absent mitigation, but that Mitigation Measures D-1 through D-3 are hereby incorporated into the Revised Project and avoid or substantially lessen the significant impact related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains to less than significant.

RATIONALE

The Project Site is located in an urban area that has previously been disturbed by construction activities and any archaeological resources which may have existed at the time would have likely already been unearthed or disturbed. Although it is unlikely that archaeological resources will be discovered during the construction of the Revised Project, it remains a possibility that archaeological resources could be encountered during excavation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure D-1 would protect any subsurface archaeological resources discovered by ensuring effective monitoring, identification, recovery, and analysis of any archaeological resource found during site preparation. This would safeguard any potential archaeological resource and ensure that important California history or prehistory would be preserved.

Similarly, since the Project Site has previously been disturbed and any paleontological resources existing at the time would have likely been unearthed or disturbed, it is unlikely that paleontological resources would be discovered during construction of the Revised Project. However, it is possible that paleontological resources may be discovered during construction of the Revised Project, and impacts to these resources would be significant. Since implementation of Mitigation Measure D-2 would provide for the preservation and recovery of any paleontological resources encountered during the construction of the Revised Project, the Revised Project would not directly or indirectly destroy paleontological resources at the Project Site and any potential significant impact to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

In terms of human remains, the Native American Heritage Commission is unaware of any human remains at the Project Site. As with archaeological and paleontological resources, prior construction activities would likely have unearthed any human remains existing at that time, however, there is a possibility that human remains could be located subsurface and impacts to

these human remains would be potentially significant. Since implementation of Mitigation Measure D-3 would ensure the identification, recovery, and proper treatment of any human remains discovered during construction of the Revised Project, the potential impacts related to human remains would be reduced to less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 through D-3 would ensure that impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level. For the reasons set forth above, and as more fully described in the referenced EIR provisions below, potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level.

REFERENCE

For a complete discussion of Project impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, please see Section 4.D, Cultural Resources, and Section 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See also, Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR. See Section 2.2 above for the Project Characteristics of the Revised Project.

NOISE

The EIR discussed the impacts related to noise in Section 4.J. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to construction noise, which would not result in significant impacts with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

Construction Noise

The estimated construction-related noise levels associated with the Project would exceed the numerical noise threshold of 75 dBA at 50 feet from the noise source as outlined in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). During the demolition and grading phases, haul trucks could add an average of 15 trips over a ten-hour workday, which would not double roadway traffic volumes on local streets. Further, the Project Site is immediately adjacent to the SR-170 freeway, allowing immediate access for haul trucks via Oxnard Street, which would minimize travel on local roads with sensitive receptors. Compliance with City of Los Angeles Building Regulations Ordinance No. 178048 regarding construction site noticing (Regulatory Compliance Measure J-7) and implementation of Mitigation Measures J-1 through J-6 and Project Design Feature J-8 would: (1) reduce ambient noise increases at the nearby receptors below the 75 dBA limit established in the LAMC for construction machinery at 50 feet; and (2) reduce noise increases below 10 dBA on any given day, below 5 dBA for more than ten days in a three-month period, and below a 5 dBA noise increase overall. As such, construction noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

J-1 Two weeks prior to commencement of construction, notification shall be provided to the off-site residential and school uses within 500 feet of the Project Site that discloses the construction schedule, including the types of activities and equipment that would be used throughout the duration of the construction period.

J-2 Temporary sound barriers, capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 10 dBA (e.g., construction sound wall with sound blankets) at 50 feet of distance, and capable of blocking the line-of-sight from ground level construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines to the adjacent sensitive receptors shall be installed.

J-3 All powered construction equipment shall be equipped with exhaust mufflers or other suitable noise reduction devices capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 3 dBA at 50 feet of distance.

J-4 All construction areas for staging and warming-up equipment shall be located as far away as possible from adjacent residences and sensitive receptors.

J-5 Portable noise sheds for smaller, noisy equipment, such as air compressors, dewatering pumps, and generators shall be provided where feasible.

J-6 A haul route for exporting demolition materials from the site to a nearby landfill shall access the Hollywood Freeway (SR-170) via Oxnard Street and should minimize travel on residential streets with sensitive receptors. Similarly, import of materials should use the SR-170 off-ramp at Oxnard Street.

Project Design Feature

J-8 The City shall require that truck deliveries and haul routes during construction, to the extent feasible, shall be directed away from Laurel Hall School.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would reduce the duration of construction noise compared to the Original Project because it would be smaller than the Original Project, and would cause similar construction noise to Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts would be significant absent mitigation, but that Mitigation Measures J-1 through J-6, Regulatory Compliance Measure J-7, and Project Design Feature J-8 are hereby incorporated into the Revised Project and avoid or substantially lessen the significant noise-related land use compatibility impact to less than significant.

RATIONALE

Construction of the Revised Project would generate noise from on-site construction equipment and noise off-site from the use of haul trucks transporting demolition materials from the Project Site.

To determine ambient noise levels near the Project Site, noise measurements were taken at several sensitive receptors near the Project Site. The noise measurements indicated that motor vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways were the predominant cause of noise. Given the ambient noise levels and the proximity of the sensitive receptors to the Project Site, the estimated construction-related noise levels for the Revised Project would potentially cause the noise impacts from the construction of the Revised Project to exceed the numerical noise threshold of 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet for construction activities. Further, the construction-related noise levels for the Revised Project would exceed the 5 dBA noise increase threshold identified as significant by the LAMC.

The temporary sound barriers set forth in Mitigation Measure J-2 can achieve a reduction of a minimum of 10 dBA at a distance of 50 feet and can block the line-of-sight from certain ground level construction equipment to the nearby sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure J-2 would decrease the construction-related noise levels for the Revised Project to below 75 dBA at the sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure J-3 would further achieve a sound attenuation of at least 3 dBA at a distance of 50 feet by equipping all powered construction equipment with exhaust mufflers or other noise reduction devices. Mitigation Measures J-1, J-4, and J-5 and Regulatory Compliance Measure J-7 would further

reduce the construction-related noise impacts by providing advance notification to off-site residential and schools uses within 500 feet of the Project Site of construction activities, locating construction staging areas and warming-up construction equipment as far away as possible from the sensitive receptors, and providing portable noise sheds for smaller equipment, when feasible. The mitigated construction noise levels are reduced below levels of significance as ambient noise levels at the nearby receptors are below the 75 dBA limit for construction equipment at a distance of 50 feet, and noise increases are reduced below 10 dBA on any given day, below 5 dBA for more than ten days in a three-month period, and below a 5 dBA noise increase overall.

Haul truck activity occurring during the construction of the Revised Project is not expected to significantly increase ambient levels by 5dBA at the sensitive receptors because the haul trucks would not double roadway traffic volumes and the Project Site is immediately adjacent to the SR-170 freeway, allowing immediate access to the freeway from Oxnard Street thereby minimizing travel on local roads. Although noise impacts from haul trucks would be less than significant, implementation of Mitigation Measure J-6 would further minimize noise generated by haul trucks on local roadways with sensitive receptors by ensuring that trucks importing or exporting materials from the Project Site immediately access or exit SR-170 via Oxnard Street. Implementation of Project Design Feature J-8 further reduces off-site construction-related noise impacts on sensitive receptors by requiring truck deliveries and haul routes to be directed away from Laurel Hall School to the extent feasible.

Accordingly, implementation of Mitigation Measures J-1 through J-6, Regulatory Compliance Measure J-7, and Project Design Feature J-8 would ensure that impacts related to construction noise levels are less than significant. For the reasons set forth above, and as more fully described in the referenced EIR provisions below, potentially significant impacts due to construction-related noise would be reduced to a less than significant level.

REFERENCE

For a complete discussion of noise impacts, please see Section 4.J, Noise, and Section 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See also, Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR. See Section 2.2 above for the Project Characteristics of the Revised Project.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The EIR discussed the impacts related to Public Service in Section 4.L. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to police protection (during construction), which would not result in significant impacts with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

Police Protection - Construction

With implementation of Mitigation Measures L.2.1 and L.2-2, construction of the Project would not be expected to affect the LAPD's ability to respond to emergencies to the extent that there would be a need for any additional new or expanded police facilities, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LAPD. Therefore, the Project's construction-related impact on police protection services would be less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures L.2-3 and L.2-4 state existing regulations for temporary construction fencing and compliance with "Design Out Crime" guidelines related to police protection services. Project Design Feature L.5-5 further minimizes the Project's need for police protection services.

Mitigation Measures

L.2-1 The Project Applicant shall provide for the deployment of a private security guard to monitor and patrol the Sites, appropriate to the phase of construction throughout the construction period. The patrol shall be deployed at times that are typical within the local-area construction industry for a Project of this size.

L.2-2 The Project Applicant shall provide the LAPD with a diagram of each portion of the Project Site, showing access routes and additional access information as requested by the LAPD, to facilitate police response.

Project Design Feature

L.2-5 Emergency access shall be maintained to the Project Site during construction through marked emergency access points approved by the LAPD.

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would cause the same impact with respect to police protection services during construction as the Original Project and Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts would be significant absent mitigation, but that Mitigation Measures L.2-1 and L.2-2, Regulatory Compliance Measures L.2-3 and L.2-4, and Project Design Feature L.2-5 are hereby incorporated into the Revised Project and avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts to police protection services (construction) to less than significant.

RATIONALE

Construction sites can result in an increase in demand for police protection services since construction sites have increased potential for trespass and theft. Implementation of Mitigation Measure L.2.1 will address the potential impacts related to public services by providing a private security patrol on the Project Site as needed and appropriate during the construction of the Revised Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure L.2.2 will facilitate police response as LAPD will be provided with a diagram of each portion of the Project Site, showing access routes and additional access information as requested by the LAPD.

The installation of temporary construction fencing around active construction areas at the Project Site, and incorporation of design guidelines relating to security during construction pursuant to Regulatory Compliance Measures L.2.3 and L.2.4 will further reduce the potential for trespass and theft. Project Design Feature L.2-5 further minimizes the Revised Project's need for police protection services by requiring marked emergency access points. Accordingly, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures L.2-1 and L.2-2, Regulatory Compliance Measures L.2-3 and L.2-4, and Project Design Feature L.2-5, the Revised Project's impacts to police protection services will be reduced to less than significant. For the reasons set forth above, and as more fully described in the referenced EIR provisions below, potentially significant impacts to police protection during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

REFERENCE

For a complete discussion of Project impacts related to public services, please see Section 4.L, Public Services, and Section 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See also, Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR. See Section 2.2 above for the Project Characteristics of the Revised Project.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The EIR discussed the impacts related to transportation/traffic in Section 4.M. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential construction traffic impacts with respect to proximity to a school and transportation/traffic - intersection level of service, which would not result in significant impacts with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Potential impacts with respect to construction traffic are addressed in Section 6.4.M, further below.**Construction Impacts to Schools**

The Project is located adjacent to a private school and one block from a public elementary school. Therefore, potential construction traffic impacts to school operations were evaluated. The Project is adjacent to the Laurel Hall School, which is a private school. The nearest public school is Victory Boulevard Elementary, which is located one block to the north of the Project Site. There are intervening residential buildings between the Project and the school, which would reduce construction traffic impacts to the public school. Due to the proximity of both public and private schools, Mitigation Measure M-8 is recommended, which requires construction activities to be coordinated with these schools. With implementation of mitigation, Project construction impacts related to proximity to a school would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

M-8 LAUSD Transportation Branch shall be contacted at (213) 580-2950 regarding the potential impact upon existing school bus routes. Laurel Hall School shall also be contacted regarding the potential impact upon existing school bus routes.

- School buses must have unrestricted access to schools.
- During the construction phase, truck traffic and construction vehicles may not cause traffic delays for transported students.
- During and after construction, changed traffic patterns, lane adjustment, traffic light patterns, and altered bus stops may not affect school buses' on-time performance and passenger safety.
- Pursuant to the California Vehicle Code, other trucks and construction vehicles that encounter school buses using red-flashing-lights must-stop-indicators shall stop.
- The Project Manager or designee shall have to notify the LAUSD Transportation Branch and Laurel Hall School of the expected start and ending dates for various portions of the project that may affect traffic within nearby school areas.
- Contractors shall maintain safe and convenient pedestrian routes to all nearby schools. The applicable Pedestrian Route to School map can be found at http://www.lausd-oehs.org/saferoutestoschools.asp and a pedestrian route map shall also be requested from Laurel Hall School.
- Contractors shall maintain ongoing communication with LAUSD school administrators, providing sufficient notice to forewarn children and parents when existing pedestrian and vehicle routes to school may be impacted.
- Contractors shall maintain ongoing communication with Laurel Hall School administrators, providing sufficient notice to forewarn children and parents when existing pedestrian and vehicle routes to school may be impacted.
- Installation and maintenance of appropriate traffic controls (signs and signals) to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety.

- Construction vehicles shall avoid, to the extent feasible, travel on streets immediately adjacent to Laurel Hall School and Victory Elementary School.

- No staging or parking of construction-related vehicles, including worker-transport vehicles, shall occur on or adjacent to a school property. The staging and parking of construction-related vehicles shall be located as far away from Laurel Hall School as feasible.

- Funding for crossing guards (at contractor's expense) is required when safety of children may be compromised by construction-related activities at impacted school crossings.

- Barriers and/or fencing shall be installed to secure construction equipment and to minimize trespassing, vandalism, short-cut attractions, and attractive nuisances.

- Contractors are required to provide security patrols (at their expense) to minimize trespassing, vandalism, and short-cut attractions.

LOS Impacts

Future With Project

Under the Future With Project scenario, both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would result in significant impacts at the following four intersections during the AM peak hour:

8. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

11. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

12. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

20. Lankershim Boulevard & Oxnard Street

Under the Future With Project scenario, both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would result in significant impacts at the following six intersections in the PM peak hour:

4. Whitsett Avenue & Victory Boulevard

8. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

11. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

12. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

13. SR-170 NB Ramps & Oxnard Street

17. Lankershim Boulevard/Colfax Ave & Victory Boulevard

The feasibility of specific intersection improvements and mitigation measures was investigated for the intersection locations where the Project would cause significant traffic impacts. This evaluation, which was conducted in conjunction with LADOT staff, looked at the feasibility of re-striping traffic lanes and/or adding traffic lanes to modify intersection lane configurations, roadway widenings, potential changes to signal timing and phasing, and other traffic signal

operational improvements. Some roadway widenings were generally not feasible (due to lack of available right-of-way because of existing buildings or lack of control over adjacent right-of-way).

The following physical improvements and operational mitigation measures have been identified to enhance intersection levels of service. These measures have been reviewed and determined to be feasible by LADOT.

Whitsett Avenue & Victory Boulevard (Intersection #4)

Both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would cause a significant impact at this intersection in the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F but would cause the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio to increase from 1.047 to 1.062, an increase of 0.015. Similarly, Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F but would cause the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio to increase from 1.047 to 1.058, an increase of 0.011.

The proposed mitigation measures are to restripe the northbound approach of Whitsett Avenue to provide an exclusive right-turn lane, restripe the southbound approach of Whitsett Avenue to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and modify the existing traffic signal to include both eastbound and westbound left-turn phases and northbound and southbound right-turn overlap phases. These improvements would change both the northbound and southbound approaches from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane (see concept plan in Appendix F of the traffic study). These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening but would require the removal of approximately two on-street parking spaces along the west side of Whitsett Avenue. For the Original Project during the PM peak hour, the implementation of these improvements would keep the level of service at LOS F but reduce the V/C ratio from 1.062 to 0.988, a decrease of 0.074. For Alternative 4B, the implementation of these improvements would also keep the level of service at LOS F but reduce the V/C ratio from 1.058 to 0.984, a decrease of 0.074. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate the PM peak hour impact for both the Original Project and Alternative 4B.

Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard (Intersection #8)

Both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would cause a significant impact at this intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. During the AM peak hour, the Original Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.936 to 0.983, an increase of 0,047. Similarly, Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.936 to 0.957, an increase of 0.021. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS E to LOS F and cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.984 to 1.006, an increase of 0.022. However, during the PM peak hour, Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.984 to 0.999, an increase of 0.015.

The proposed mitigation measures are to restripe the southbound approach of Laurel Canyon Boulevard to provide a second left-turn lane and an exclusive right-turn lane and to modify the existing traffic signal to include a southbound right-turn overlap phase. These improvements would change the southbound approach from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to two left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane (see concept plan in Appendix F to the traffic study). These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening with the removal of the existing raised median. For the Original Project in the AM peak hour, the implementation of these improvements would keep the level of service at LOS E but reduce the V/C ratio from 0.983 to 0.933, a decrease of 0.050. For the

Original Project in the PM peak hour, the level of service would improve from LOS F to LOS E and reduce the V/C ratio from 1.006 to 0.947, a decrease of 0.059. For Alternative 4B in the AM peak hour, the implementation of these improvements would keep the level of service at LOS E but reduce the V/C ratio from 0.957 to 0.908, a decrease of 0.049. For Alternative 4B in the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS E but reduce the V/C ratio from 0.999 to 0.940, a decrease of 0.059. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate both the AM and PM peak hour impacts for both the Original Project and Alternative 4B.

Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street (Intersection #11)

The Original Project would cause a significant impact at this intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. During the AM peak hour, the Original Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 1.079 to 1.117, an increase of 0.038. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would again not cause the level of service to change from LOS F but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 1.021 to 1.049, an increase of 0.028.

Alternative 4B would result in one fewer significant impact at this intersection. After mitigation, only the AM peak hour LOS will remain significant. During the AM peak hour, Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 1.079 to 1.104, an increase of 0.025. During the PM peak hour, Alternative 4B would again not cause the level of service to change from LOS F but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 1.021 to 1.039, an increase of 0.018.

Physical improvements and operational mitigation measures were identified and analyzed, but initially determined to be infeasible after evaluation by LADOT. LADOT determined that the measures would require the removal of a total of 21 on-street parking spaces to accommodate the proposed improvements and that these parking spaces were necessary to serve existing small businesses in the area.

In addition, traffic signal operational improvements for requiring the installation of a CCTV camera, were identified at this location. This improvement would enhance the effectiveness of the traffic signal system in the area of the Project, specifically along Laurel Canyon Boulevard.

For the Original Project in the AM peak hour, the implementation of this improvement would not change the level of service but would reduce the V/C ratio from 1.117 to 1.107, a decrease of 0.010. For the Original Project in the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS F but the V/C ratio would be reduced from 1.049 to 1.039, a decrease of 0.010. This mitigation measure would partially mitigate the impacts but the significant impacts would remain in both the AM and PM peak hours for the Original Project.

For Alternative 4B the AM peak hour, the implementation of this improvement would not change the level of service but would reduce the V/C ratio from 1.104 to 1.094, a decrease of 0.010 and an overall change in V/C of 0.015. For Alternative 4B in the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS F but the V/C ratio would be reduced from 1.039 to 1.029, a decrease of 0.010. This mitigation measure would fully mitigate Alternative 4B's PM peak hour impact but would only partially mitigate Alternative 4B's AM peak hour impact. Therefore, the significant impact would remain in the AM peak hour for Alternative 4B, but Alternative 4B would reduce the PM peak hour impact to less than significant.

However, LADOT re-evaluated the traffic study included in the EIR to consider the aforementioned physical improvements and determined that the improvements are feasible (see Appendix A to the Addendum, dated December 8, 2016, which contains LADOT's letter dated December 5, 2016). The added physical improvements in Mitigation Measure M-3 would reduce

the previously-identified significant and unavoidable impact in the EIR at Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street (Intersection #11) to a less than significant level. The identified changes to these Mitigation Measures would also not create any new or previously unidentified impacts.

Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard (Intersection #12)

Both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would cause a significant impact at this intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. During the AM peak hour, the Original Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.928 to 0.945, an increase of 0.017. Similarly, during the AM peak hour Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.928 to 0.938, an increase of 0.010. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would again not cause the level of service the change from LOS D but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.833 to 0.870, an increase of 0.037. Alternative 4B would also not cause the level of service the change from LOS D but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.833 to 0.862, an increase of 0.029.

Several potential geometric mitigation measures were identified and analyzed, but initially determined to be infeasible by LADOT due to the need to remove a total of 15 on-street parking spaces to accommodate the proposed improvements, which parking spaces were necessary to service local residents and businesses.

In coordination with LADOT staff, traffic signal operational improvements consisting of the installation of protected left-turn phasing in all four approaches were identified as a potential mitigation measure. This improvement would enhance the effectiveness of the traffic signal system in the area of the Project, specifically along Laurel Canyon Boulevard.

For the Original Project in the AM peak hour, the implementation of this improvement would change the level of service from LOS E (V/C of 0.945) to LOS D (V/C of 0.882), a decrease of 0.063. For the Original Project in the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS D but the V/C ratio would be reduced from 0.870 to 0.817, a decrease of 0.053. For Alternative 4B in the AM peak hour, the implementation of this improvement would not change the level of service but would reduce the V/C ratio from 0.938 to 0.928, a decrease of 0.010. For Alternative 4B in the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS D but the V/C ratio would be reduced from 0.862 to 0.852, a decrease of 0.010. This mitigation measure would fully mitigate both the AM and PM peak hour impacts for both the Original Project and Alternative 4B.

However, LADOT re-evaluated the traffic study included in the EIR to consider the aforementioned physical improvements and determined that the improvements are feasible (see Appendix A to the Addendum, dated December 8, 2016, which contains LADOT's letter dated December 5, 2016). Impacts would also be lessened with the added physical improvements in Mitigation Measure M-4, although the impact level would remain the same as identified in the EIR, as less than significant, at Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Burbank Boulevard (Intersection #12). The identified changes to these Mitigation Measures would also not create any new or previously unidentified impacts.

SR-170 Northbound Ramps & Oxnard Street (Intersection #13)

Both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would cause a significant impact at this intersection in the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS C (V/C of 0.727) to LOS D (V/C of 0.809), an increase of 0.082. However, Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS C but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.727 to 0.775, an increase of 0.048.

The proposed mitigation measures are to restripe the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and to modify the existing traffic signal to include an eastbound right-turn overlap phase. These improvements would change the eastbound approach from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane (see concept plan in Appendix F to the traffic study). These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening and with a slight reduction in the width of the existing striped median in the eastbound approach. For the Original Project in the PM peak hour, the level of service would change from LOS D (V/C of 0.809) to LOS C (V/C of 0.748), a decrease of 0.061. For Alternative 4B in the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS C but reduce the V/C ratio from 0.775 to 0.715, a decrease of 0.060. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate the PM peak hour impact for both the Original Project and Alternative 4B.

Lankershim Boulevard/Colfax Avenue & Victory Boulevard (Intersection #17)

Both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would cause a significant impact at this intersection in the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS D (V/C of 0.880) to LOS E (V/C of 0.917), an increase of 0.037. Similarly, Alternative 4B would cause the level of service to change from LOS D (V/C of 0.880) to LOS E (V/C of 0.908), an increase of 0.028.

The proposed mitigation measures are to restripe the southbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and to modify the existing traffic signal to include a southbound right-turn overlap phase. These improvements would change the southbound approach from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane (see concept plan in Appendix F to the traffic study). These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening but would require the removal of approximately two on-street parking spaces and the relocation of a bus stop along the west side of Lankershim Boulevard. For the Original Project in the PM peak hour, the level of service would change from LOS E (V/C of 0.917) to LOS D (V/C of 0.896), a decrease of 0.021. For Alternative 4B in the PM peak hour, the level of service would change from LOS E (V/C of 0.908) to LOS D (V/C of 0.886), a decrease of 0.022. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate the PM peak hour impact for both the Original Project and Alternative 4B.

Lankershim Boulevard & Oxnard Street (Intersection #20)

The Revised Project reduces to less than significant the AM peak hour impact. Both the Original Project and Alternative 4B would cause a significant impact at this intersection in the AM peak hour. During the AM peak hour, the Original Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS C (V/C of 0.781) to LOS D (V/C of 0.830), an increase of 0.049. Similarly, Alternative 4B would cause the level of service to change from LOS C (V/C of 0.781) to LOS D (V/C of 0.811), an increase of 0.030.

The proposed mitigation measures are to restripe the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane, restripe the westbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and modify the existing traffic signal to include both northbound and southbound left-turn phases and eastbound and westbound right-turn overlap phases. These improvements would change both the eastbound and westbound approaches from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane (see concept plan in Appendix F to the traffic study). These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening but would require the relocation of a bus stop along the south side of Oxnard Street. As a condition of approval, LADOT has stated that lead/lag combination phasing for the eastbound and westbound protected left-turn movements

would be required as part of the final traffic signal design to avoid the possibility of "interlock" conditions.

For the Original Project in the AM peak hour, the level of service would not change from LOS D but the V/C ratio would be reduced from 0.830 to 0.805, a decrease of 0.025. These mitigation measures would partially mitigate the Original Project's AM peak hour impact. However, for Alternative 4B in the AM peak hour, the level of service would change from LOS D (V/C of 0.811) to LOS C (V/C of 0.785), a decrease of 0.026. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate Alternative 4B's AM peak hour impact.

Mitigation Measures

M-1 Whitsett Avenue & Victory Boulevard (Intersection #4): Restripe the northbound approach of Whitsett Avenue to provide an exclusive right-turn lane, restripe the southbound approach of Whitsett Avenue to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and modify the existing traffic signal to include both eastbound and westbound left-turn phases and northbound and southbound right-turn overlap phases. These improvements would change both the northbound and southbound approaches from one left-turn lane, one thru lane, and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes, and one exclusive right-turn lane. These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening but would require the removal of approximately two on-street parking spaces along the west side of Whitsett Avenue.

M-2 Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard (Intersection #8): Restripe the southbound approach of Laurel Canyon Boulevard to provide a second left-turn lane and an exclusive right-turn lane and to modify the existing traffic signal to include a southbound right-turn overlap phase. These improvements would change the southbound approach from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to two left-turn lanes, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane.

M-3 Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street (Intersection #11): Install a CCTV camera at this location, in coordination with LADOT staff. Restripe the northbound approach of Laurel Canyon Boulevard to provide a second left-turn lane, restripe the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane, and to modify the existing traffic signal to include a northbound left-turn phase and an eastbound right-turn overlap.

M-4 Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard (Intersection #12): Install protected left-turn phasing in all four approaches at this intersection. Restripe the southbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and modify the existing traffic signal to include an eastbound left-turn phase and a southbound right-turn overlap phase.

M-5 SR-170 Northbound Ramps & Oxnard Street (Intersection #13): Restripe the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and to modify the existing traffic signal to include an eastbound right-turn overlap phase. These improvements would change the eastbound approach from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane.

M-6 Lankershim Boulevard/Colfax Avenue & Victory Boulevard (Intersection #17): Restripe the southbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and to modify the existing traffic signal to include a southbound right-turn overlap phase. These improvements would change the southbound approach from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane.

M-7 Lankershim Boulevard & Oxnard Street (Intersection #20): Restripe the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane, restripe the westbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and modify the existing traffic signal to include both northbound and southbound left-turn phases and eastbound and westbound right-turn overlap phases. These improvements would change both the eastbound and westbound approaches from one left-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two thru lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane. These improvements can be accommodated without any roadway widening but would require the relocation of a bus stop along the south side of Oxnard Street. As a condition of approval, LADOT has stated that the lead/lag combination phasing for the eastbound and westbound protected left-turn movements would be required as part of the final traffic signal design to avoid the possibility of "interlock."

Project Design Feature

The following Project Design Feature has been incorporated into the Project, and is designed to reduce vehicular trips and vehicle miles traveled and promote public transportation and alternative modes of transportation.

M-10 The Project shall incorporate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, which could include, but are not limited to:

- Provide an Internal Transportation Management Coordination Program with on-site transportation coordinator;
- Implement enhanced pedestrian connections (e.g., improve sidewalks, widen crosswalks adjacent to the Project, install wayfinding signage and pedestrian level lighting, etc.);
- Design the Project to ensure a bicycle, pedestrian, and transit friendly environment;
- Include a provision that all retailers over 10,000 square feet and office users are required to comply with the state parking cash-out law;
- Provide on-site car share amenities;
- Provide rideshare program and support for Project employees and tenants;
- Allow for subsidized transit passes for eligible Project employees and tenants;
- Coordinate with LADOT to determine if the site would be eligible for one or more of the services to be provided by the future Mobility Hubs program (secure bike parking, bike share kiosks, and car-share parking spaces;
- Provide on-site transit routing and schedule information;
- Upgrade bus shelters immediately adjacent to the Project Site;
- Provide a program to discount transit passes for residents/employees possibly through negotiated bulk purchasing of passes with transit providers;
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program; and
- Preferential parking for HOVs, carpools, and vanpools.

Prior to occupancy, a comprehensive TDM program tailored specifically for the Project will be developed.

Impacts After Mitigation

Original Project

For the Original Project, the mitigation program identified in the Final EIR would fully mitigate two AM peak-hour impacts and five PM peak-hour impacts. They would partially mitigate the remaining two AM peak hour impacts and one PM peak hour impact.

AM Peak Hour

Fully mitigated intersections:

8. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

12. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

Partially mitigated intersections:

11. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

20. Lankershim Boulevard & Oxnard Street

PM Peak Hour

Fully mitigated intersections:

4. Whitsett Avenue & Victory Boulevard

8. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

12. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

13. SR-170 Northbound Ramps & Oxnard Street

17. Lankershim Boulevard/Colfax Avenue & Victory Boulevard

Partially mitigated intersections:

11. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

Alternative 4B

For Alternative 4B, the mitigation program identified above would fully mitigate all four AM peak hour impacts and six PM peak hour impacts. For these reasons, the Alternative 4B's LOS impact would be less than significant after mitigation.

AM Peak Hour

Fully mitigated intersections:

8. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

12. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

20. Lankershim Boulevard & Oxnard Street

11. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

PM Peak Hour

Fully mitigated intersections:

4. Whitsett Avenue & Victory Boulevard

8. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

11. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

12. Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

13. SR-170 Northbound Ramps & Oxnard Street

17. Lankershim Boulevard/Colfax Avenue & Victory Boulevard

FINDINGS

The Revised Project would reduce the duration of construction impacts near schools compared to the Original Project because the Revised Project would be smaller, and therefore require reduced construction activity compared to the Original Project. The Revised Project would cause similar impacts to those of Alternative 4B. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts would be significant absent mitigation, but that Mitigation Measure M-8 is hereby incorporated into the Revised Project and avoid or substantially lessen impacts related to proximity to a school to less than significant.

The Revised Project would substantially reduce intersection level of service impacts compared to the Original Project because it would be smaller than the Original Project, and would cause reduced intersection level of service impacts to those of Alternative 4B, after incorporation of the revised Mitigation Measures M-3 and M-4, as identified in the Addendum, dated December 8, 2016. Therefore, based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts are less than significant after mitigation, and that Mitigation Measures M-1 through M-9 are hereby incorporated into the Revised Project. As stated above, Mitigation Measures M-1 through M-7 would reduce six PM intersection impacts and four AM intersection impacts to less than significant. Project Design Feature M-10 further minimizes Project traffic impacts.

RATIONALE

Construction Impacts to Schools

The Project Site is located adjacent to Laurel Hall School and approximately one block away from Victory Boulevard Elementary. Construction activity associated with the Revised Project is expected to occur over a period of approximately 31 months occurring on weekdays between 7:00 AM and 9:00 PM and between 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM on Saturdays.

During the construction of the Revised Project, haul trips and concrete/delivery trips are expected to travel to and from the Project Site. Haul trips consist of removing demolition debris and are expected to occur Mondays to Saturdays between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM. Two primary haul routes and two secondary haul routes have been identified for use by trucks traveling to or from the Project Site.

To assess potential impacts, daily truck trips were converted into estimated average passenger-car equivalent (PCE) trips per hour using a passenger-car equivalent of 2.0. The number of truck trips would vary depending on the type of work being performed. During the demolition and site preparation stages, haul truck trips are expected to average between 75 and 150 truck

trips per day. This would be equivalent to between 11 and 21 PCE trips per hour. During the grading and construction stages, haul trips would typically average between 100 and 150 trips per day. This would be equivalent to between 14 and 21 PCE trips per hour. No haul trips are expected to occur during the paving and architectural coating stages.

Concrete/delivery truck trips are expected to occur during 28 months of the construction period. These trips would occur throughout the scheduled construction times of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM weekdays and 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays and holidays. Concrete/delivery truck trips are not expected during the demolition stage. During the site preparation stage, concrete/delivery truck trips are expected to average approximately 75 truck trips per day, equivalent to approximately 11 PCE trips per hour. During the grading and construction stages, concrete/delivery truck trips are expected to range between 75 and 100 trips a day, corresponding to between 11 and 14 PCE trips per hour. During the paving and architectural coating stages, concrete/delivery truck trips are expected to range between 5 and 20 trips per day, or approximately 1 to 3 PCE trips per hour.

The majority of truck trips would occur outside the peak periods. Even during peak traffic periods, these overall volumes of trips would not be expected to cause significant traffic impacts. However, during the construction period, there may be times when the number of trips could potentially cause temporary impacts that would result in some temporary and intermittent reductions in street and intersection capacity on roadways adjacent to the Project Site. Since such increases in delays and travel times would be noticeable to drivers, construction-related traffic impacts to nearby schools would be potentially short-term and temporary significant impacts.

Since the Project Site is located adjacent to Laurel Hall School and one block from Victory Boulevard Elementary, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-8 would reduce any potential traffic impacts related to the construction of the Revised Project to less than significant. Mitigation Measure M-8 requires, to the extent feasible, coordination of construction activities with these schools so that school buses will have unrestricted access to the schools, truck traffic and other construction vehicles do not cause traffic delays for students, and traffic controls ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety. For the reasons set forth above, and as more fully described in the referenced EIR provisions below, potentially significant impacts related to construction in proximity to schools would be reduced to a less than significant level.

LOS Impacts

The Revised Project would result in significant impacts at four intersections during the AM peak hour and six during the PM peak hour. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-1 through M-7 would reduce all six PM intersection impacts, and four AM intersections, to a less than significant level.

Summary Intersection Traffic Impacts

Intersection #4: Whitsett Avenue & Victory Boulevard

Original Project: The traffic analysis for the Original Project identified that the Original Project would cause a significant PM peak hour impact. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F, but would cause the V/C to increase from 1.047 to 1.062, an increase of 0.015. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-1 would keep the level of service at LOS F but reduce the V/C ratio from 1.062 to 0.988, a decrease of 0.074, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Alternative 4B: During the PM peak hour, Alternative 4B would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F, but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 1.047 to 1.058, an increase of 0.011. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-1 would not change the level of service at LOS F, but would reduce the V/C ratio from 1.058 to 0.984, a decrease of 0.074, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Office Variation: During the PM peak hour, the Office Variation would not cause the level of service to change from LOS F, but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 1.047 to 1.057, an increase of 0.010. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-1 would change the level of service from LOS F to LOS E and decrease V/C ratio from 1.058 to 0.094, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Intersection No. #8: Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Victory Boulevard

Original Project: The traffic analysis identified that the Original Project would cause a significant impact at this intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. During the AM peak hour, the Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.936 to 0.983, an increase of 0.047. During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS E to LOS F and cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.984 to 1.006, an increase of 0.022. For the AM peak hour, the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-2 would keep the level of service at LOS E but reduce the V/C ratio from 0.983 to 0.933, a decrease of 0.050. For the PM peak hour, the level of service would improve from LOS F to LOS E and reduce the V/C ratio from 1.006 to 0.947, a decrease of 0.059. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate both the AM and PM peak hour impacts.

Alternative 4B: The traffic analysis for Alternative 4B identified a significant impact during the AM and PM peak hours. During the AM peak hour, the Alternative 4B Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E, but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.936 to 0.957, an increase of 0.021. During the PM peak hour, the Alternative 4B also would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E, but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.984 to 0.999, an increase of 0.015. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-2 would not change the AM peak hour level of service from LOS E, but would reduce the V/C ratio from 0.957 to 0.908, a decrease of 0.049. For the PM peak hour, the level of service would also remain at LOS E, but the V/C ratio would be reduced from 0.999 to 0.940, a decrease of 0.059. Accordingly, both the AM and PM peak hours would be fully mitigated.

Office Variation: The traffic analysis for the Office Variation identified a significant impact during the AM and PM peak hours. During the AM peak hour, the Office Variation would not change the level of service from LOS E, however, the V/C ratio would increase from 0.936 to 0.964, an increase of 0.028. During the PM Peak hour, the Office Variation would not change the level of service from LOS E, but would increase V/C from 0.984 to 0.999, an increase of 0.015. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-2 would not change the AM peak hour level of service from LOS E, but would reduce the V/C ratio from 0.964 to 0.915, a decrease of 0.049. During the PM peak hour, the V/C ratio would decrease from 0.999 to 0.940, a decrease of 0.059. Accordingly, both the AM and PM peak hours would be fully mitigated.

Intersection #11: Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Oxnard Street

Original Project: The traffic analysis identified partially mitigated significant impacts during the AM and PM peak hours. For the AM peak hour the Original Project would increase the V/C ratio to 1.117 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.038, making it a significant impact. With mitigation for the Original Project, the V/C ratio would be 1.108 with LOS F, producing an increase in V/C ratio of 0.028 and a partially mitigated significant impact. For the PM peak hour

the Original Project would result in a V/C ratio of 1.049 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.028 and a significant impact. With mitigation for the Original Project, the V/C ratio would be 1.039 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.018 and a significant impact with partial mitigation.

Alterative 4B: The traffic analysis identified partially mitigated significant impacts during the AM peak hours. For AM peak hours under Alternative 4B, the V/C ratio would be 1.100 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.021 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B, the AM peak V/C ratio would be 1.090 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.011 and a significant impact with partial mitigation. For PM peak hours under Alternative 4B, the V/C ratio would be 1.039 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.018 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B, the PM peak V/C ratio would be 1.029 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.004 and no significant impact with full mitigation.

Office Variation: The traffic analysis identified a partially mitigated significant impact in the AM peak hours. For AM peak hours under Alternative 4B/Office Variation, the V/C ratio would be 1.104 and LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.025 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B /Office Variation, the V/C ratio would be 1.094 and LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.015 and a significant impact with partial mitigation. For PM peak hours under Alternative 4B/Office Variation, the V/C ratio would be 1.039 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.018 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B/Office Variation, the V/C ratio would be 1.029 with LOS F, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.008 and no significant impact with full mitigation.

However, LADOT re-evaluated the traffic study included in the EIR to consider the aforementioned physical improvements and determined that the improvements are feasible (see Appendix A to the Addendum, dated December 8, 2016, which contains LADOT's letter dated December 5, 2016). The added physical improvements in Mitigation Measure M-3 would reduce the previously-identified significant and unavoidable impact for Alternative 4B and the Office Variation in the EIR at Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street (Intersection #11) to a less than significant level.

Intersection #12: Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Burbank Boulevard

Original Project: The traffic analysis showed no AM or PM peak hour significant impact after mitigation. For Intersection #12, AM peak hour, the Original Project would not cause the level of service to change from LOS E, but would cause V/C ratio to increase from 0.928 to 0.945, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.017, making it a significant impact. With mitigation for the Original Project, during the AM peak hour, the V/C ratio would decrease to 0.882 and level of service would change from LOS E to LOS D. For Intersection #12, PM peak hour, without mitigation, the V/C ratio would increase from 0.0833 to 0.870 with LOS D, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.037 and a significant impact. With mitigation for the Original Project during the PM peak hour, the V/C ratio would be reduced to 0.817 with LOS D, a decrease in V/C ratio of 0.053, with no significant impact with full mitigation.

Alternative 4B: The traffic analysis identified no AM or PM peak hours significant impacts after mitigation. For Intersection #12, AM peak hour, under Alternative 4B the V/C ratio would be 0.938 with LOS E, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.010 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B, the V/C ratio would be 0.928 with LOS E, a net change in V/C ratio of 0.010 and no significant impact with full mitigation. For Intersection #12, PM peak hour under Alternative 4B, the V/C ratio would increase from 0.833 to 0.862 with LOS D, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.029 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B, the V/C ratio would be reduced to 0.852 with LOS D, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.010 and no significant impact with full mitigation.

Office Variation: The traffic analysis identified no AM or PM peak hours significant impacts after mitigation. For Intersection #12, AM peak hour, the V/C ratio would increase from 0.928 to 0.938 and LOS E without mitigation, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.010 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B /Office Variation, the V/C ratio would be 0.928 and LOS E, a net change in V/C ratio of 0.010 and no significant impact with full mitigation. For Intersection #12, PM peak hour, the V/C ratio would increase from 0.833 to 0.857 with LOS D, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.024 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B/Office Variation, the V/C ratio would decrease from 0.857 to 0.847 with LOS D, a decrease in V/C ratio of 0.010 and no significant impact with full mitigation.

However, LADOT re-evaluated the traffic study included in the EIR to consider the aforementioned physical improvements and determined that the improvements are feasible (see Appendix A to the Addendum, dated December 8, 2016, which contains LADOT's letter dated December 5, 2016). Impacts would also be lessened with the added physical improvements in Mitigation Measure M-4, although the impact level would remain the same as identified in the EIR, as less than significant, at Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Burbank Boulevard (Intersection #12).

Intersection #13: SR-170 Northbound Ramps & Oxnard Street

Original Project: The traffic analysis identified that the Original Project would cause a significant impact at this intersection in the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Original Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS C (V/C of 0.727) to LOS D (V/C of 0.809), an increase of 0.082. Mitigation Measure M-5 would fully mitigate the PM peak hour impact. The level of service would change from LOS D (V/C of 0.809) to LOS C (V/C of 0.748), a decrease of 0.061.

Alternative 4B: The traffic analysis for Alternative 4B identified a significant impact at this intersection in the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the level of service would not change from LOS C, but would cause the V/C ratio to increase from 0.727 to 0.775, an increase of 0.048. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-5 would cause the level of service to remain at LOS C, but would reduce the V/C ratio from 0.775 to 0.715, a decrease of 0.060, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Office Variation: The traffic analysis for the Office Variation identified a significant impact during the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the level of service would remain at LOS C, but the V/C ratio would increase from 0.727 to 0.772, an increase of 0.045. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-5 would reduce the V/C ratio from 0.772 to 0.712, a decrease of 0.060, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Intersection #17: Lankershim Boulevard/Colfax Avenue & Victory Boulevard

Original Project: The traffic analysis for the Original Project identified a significant impact at this intersection in the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause the level of service to change from LOS D (V/C of 0.880) to LOS E (V/C of 0.917), an increase of 0.037. Mitigation Measure M-6 would decrease the level of service from LOS E (V/C of 0.917) to LOS D (V/C of 0.896), a decrease of 0.021, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Alterative 4B: The traffic analysis for Alternative 4B identified a significant impact during the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, Alternative 4B would cause the level of service to change from LOS D (V/C of 0.880) to LOS E (V/C of 0.908) an increase of 0.028. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-6, would change the level of service from LOS E (V/C of 0.908) to LOS D (V/C of 0.886), a decrease of 0.022, fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Office Variation: The traffic analysis for the Office Variation identified a significant impact during the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Office Variation would increase the level of service from LOS D (V/C of 0.880) to LOS E (V/C of 0.905), an increase of 0.025. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-6 would change the level of service from LOS E (V/C of 0.905) to LOS D (V/C of 0.886), a decrease of 0.019 fully mitigating the PM peak hour impact.

Intersection #20: Lankershim Boulevard & Oxnard Street

Original Project: The traffic analysis identified an AM peak hours significant impact with partial mitigation. For Intersection #20, AM peak hour, without a project its V/C ratio would be 0.781 with LOS C. With the Original Project, the V/C ratio increases to 0.830 with LOS D, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.049 and LOS, making it a significant impact. With mitigation for the Original Project, the V/C ratio would be reduced from 0.830 to 0.805 with LOS D, a decrease in V/C ratio of 0.025 and LOS, partially mitigating the significant impact.

Alterative 4B: The traffic analysis identified no AM or PM peak hours significant impacts after mitigation. For Intersection #20, AM peak hour, under Alternative 4B the V/C ratio would increase from 0.781 to 0.803 and level of service would change from LOS C to LOS D, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.022 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B, the V/C ratio would decrease from 0.803 to 0.776 and level of service would change from LOS D to LOS C, resulting in a decrease in V/C ratio of 0.027 and no significant impact with full mitigation.

Office Variation: The traffic analysis identified no AM or PM peak hours significant impacts after mitigation. For Intersection #20, AM peak hour, under Alternative 4B/Office Variation level of service would change from LOS C to LOS D and the V/C ratio would increase from 0.781 to 0.811, an increase in V/C ratio of 0.030 and a significant impact. With mitigation for Alternative 4B /Office Variation, the V/C ratio would be reduced from 0.811 to 0.785 and LOS C, an decrease in V/C ratio of -0.026 and LOS, thus there would be no significant impact with full mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

As discussed above, Mitigation Measures M-1 through M-7 would reduce six PM intersection impacts and four AM intersection impacts to less than significant. These will mitigate all potential impacts discussed for the Revised Project.

REFERENCE

For a complete discussion of Project impacts related to proximity to a school and traffic impacts, please see Section 4.M, Transportation and Traffic, and Section 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See also, Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR, and Addendum to the FEIR, dated December 8, 2016. See Section 2.2 above for the Project Characteristics of the Revised Project.

6. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The EIR determined that the Project would result in potentially significant environmental impacts related to transportation/traffic. The EIR identified all feasible mitigation measures to reduce these impacts, but even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the following impacts:

Construction Traffic

The City again ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the full analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR and Addendum.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The EIR discussed the impacts related to transportation/traffic in Section 4.M. of the Draft EIR and Section 3 of the Final EIR. The following discussion addresses potential impacts with respect to construction traffic, which cannot be fully mitigated even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Construction Traffic

Overall, impacts from construction on the transportation system would be temporary and short-term, and could cause some temporary and intermittent reductions in street and intersection capacity on roadways adjacent to the Project Site. As increases in delays and travel times would be noticeable to drivers, traffic impacts would be potentially short-term and temporary significant impacts. While development and implementation of a detailed and comprehensive Construction Traffic Control Plan (Mitigation Measure M-9) and coordination with LAUSD and the Laurel Hall School (Mitigation Measure M-8) (contained above in section 5.4.M of these Findings) would reduce such impacts, it is conservatively concluded that impacts due to truck traffic and construction worker traffic would at times be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

M-8 See Section 5.4.M, above.

M-9 **Construction Traffic Management Plan.** The Project shall prepare a Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plans for all stages of construction activity at the Project Site. These will be developed in close coordination with LADOT and will include specific provisions for truck routes and staging and construction worker parking. These plans should include but not be limited to the following, as appropriate:

- Identification of truck staging areas, and management of truck access/egress to minimize truck impacts on the street system.
- Development of Worksite Traffic Control Plans, including temporary traffic controls, lane reconfigurations, temporary traffic signal operation, signage, detour plans as appropriate, and provisions for flag personnel, etc.
- Development of a construction worker transportation demand management plan to encourage use of ridesharing and minimize parking needs.
- Development of a construction worker Parking Management Plan to provide sufficient on-site parking and to minimize temporary impacts to the local street network as a result of construction worker traffic entering or exiting the Project Site.
- An adequate provision for alternate routing, protection barriers, covered walkways where necessary and feasible, and other safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through the Project Area.
- To the extent possible schedule construction-related deliveries, other than concrete and earthwork-related deliveries, to reduce travel during peak commute periods.
- Develop and submit a Freeway Truck Management Plan to Caltrans.

FINDINGS

Based on the EIR analysis and the whole of the record, the City finds that the Revised Project's impacts are significant, and that Mitigation Measures M-8 through M-9 are hereby incorporated into the Revised Project. While development and implementation of a detailed and comprehensive Construction Traffic Control Plan (Mitigation Measure M-9) and coordination with LAUSD and the Laurel Hall School (Mitigation Measure M-8) would reduce construction impacts, it is conservatively concluded that impacts due to truck traffic and construction worker traffic would at times be significant and unavoidable.

RATIONALE

As discussed above, Mitigation Measures M-8 through M-9 would reduce impacts, but would remain potentially significant.

REFERENCE

For a complete discussion of Project traffic impacts, please see Section 4.M, Transportation and Traffic, and Section 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See also, Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR, and the Addendum to the EIR dated December 8, 2016. As set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, these impacts are acceptable in the light of the Project's benefits. See Section 2.2 of these Findings above for the Project Characteristics of the Revised Project.

7. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives in the Draft EIR

In order to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives, Section 6 (Alternatives to the Project) of the Draft EIR includes an analysis of the following six alternatives to the Original Project:

Alternative 1:	No Project
Alternative 2:	Existing Zoning (All Residential)
Alternative 2A:	Existing Zoning (All Commercial)
Alternative 3:	Existing Development with Residential Uses
Alternative 4:	Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component)
Alternative 5:	Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component and Fewer Residential Units)

These alternatives and their impacts are summarized below. For purposes of this section, impacts of the alternatives are discussed with reference to the Original Project and the Revised Project, as appropriate.

Section 6 (Alternatives to the Project) of the Draft EIR also discloses that an additional alternative, an "Alternate Project Site Alternative," was identified and considered but rejected without full analysis. The Alternate Project Site Alternative was rejected from further consideration because the Project Applicant does not own any other developable property in the City and cannot "reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to [an] alternative site" (refer to Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines). In addition, the Alternate Project Site Alternative in the Project area would likely result in environmental impacts similar to those

identified in this EIR, including significant and unavoidable construction traffic and intersection level of service impacts, due to similar existing environmental conditions as those associated with the Project Site (i.e., the developed nature of the Project area, regional air quality, and traffic conditions). Further, the Alternate Project Site Alternative would fail to meet the basic Project Objectives.

Alternatives in the Final EIR

Partly in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, the Project Applicant requested that the City consider a seventh alternative in the Final EIR. This alternative was identified as "Alternative 4B," because it is a modification of the Reduced Density Alternative 4 in the Draft EIR. Alternative 4B is discussed in detail in Section 3 of the Final EIR. Alternative 4B is a reduced project, primarily reducing the number of residential units. Alternative 4B includes less office use, fewer residential units, and more retail and restaurant uses when compared to the Original Project. The analysis of Alternative 4B also included an "Alternative 4B/Office Variation" which included different mix of commercial uses within the commercial portion of the site, without changing the building layout or design. These alternatives are discussed in detail below.

Alternatives Suggested in Comments

In addition, some commenters requested an all-commercial alternative with a minimum of 500,000 square feet of retail space and a maximum of 500,000 square feet of office space. This requested alternative closely resembles Alternative 1 analyzed in the Draft EIR at pages 6-6 through 6-12. Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, provides 465,000 square feet of retail and 90,000 square feet of office uses – nearly meeting the commenters' proposed minimum of 500,000 square feet of retail and falling within the commenters' proposed maximum of 500,000 square feet of office. In addition, the Draft EIR provided an analysis of a smaller all-commercial alternative (Alternative 2A discussed on pages 6-41 through 6-56 of the Draft EIR). These alternatives are discussed in detail below.

Summary of Findings

Based upon the following analysis, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15096(g)(2) that the Project alternatives would either not substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the Project would have on the environment, or are infeasible. One alternative, Alternative 4B analyzed in the Final EIR, is feasible and does substantially lessen or avoid significant effects of the Project; thus, the Revised Project approved by the City (which is substantially similar to Alternative 4B with slightly reduced residential building heights, residential building floor area and residential unit count) would eliminate several significant impacts and reduce all impacts compared to the Original Project.

ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT

Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain in its existing condition. Existing uses, including the approximately 90,000-square-foot, 3-story office building (currently used as both an office and educational/adult college) and 465,000-square-foot, 4-story Macy's Department Store would continue to operate. Although no new development would occur on the Project Site under Alternative 1, this Alternative assumes the development of other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area of the Project Site.

Impact Summary of Alternative

This Alternative would not cause environmental impacts, but would not meet any of the Project Objectives compared to the Original Project or the Revised Project. Specifically, impacts with respect to visual resources/views, shade/shadow , and light and glare; localized construction emissions, operational emissions, and toxic air contaminants; geology and soils; greenhouse gases; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use consistency and compatibility; off-site construction noise, operational noise; population, housing, and employment; fire protection, police, schools, parks and recreation, or libraries; wastewater, water supply, solid waste, electricity or natural gas, would result in no impact. Compared to the Original Project and the Revised Project, this Alternative would result in less impacts associated with views, light, glare, and shade/shadow; air quality; cultural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; land use and planning; noise; fire, police, schools, parks, libraries; water, wastewater, solid waste, electricity, and natural gas. In addition, the Original Project and the Revised Project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at two intersections and one intersection, respectively, under future year 2020 conditions, but this Alternative maintains the existing conditions at the Project Site, therefore, it would avoid these significant traffic impacts.

Findings

Alternative 1: No Project would not cause environmental impacts, because the new impacts projected to occur from development of the Original Project or the Revised Project would be avoided or reduced. Therefore, this Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[e][2]). In addition, this Alternative would not satisfy any of the Project Objectives. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 1: No Project Alternative infeasible.

Rationale for Findings

Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would retain existing uses, including the approximately 90,000-square-foot, 3-story office building (currently used as both an office and educational/adult college) and 465,000-square-foot, 4-story Macy's Department Store would continue to operate. Since no new development would occur on the Project Site under this Alternative, it would not meet any of the twelve (12) Project Objectives, as outlined below:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.
- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.
- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.
- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.

- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent. City of Los Angeles December 2015 NoHo West Project 6. Alternatives to the Project Draft Environmental Impact Report Page 6-12
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.
- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, this Alternative would not provide certain benefits associated with the Original Project or the Revised Project, including the development of additional housing units, creation of new employment opportunities, enhancement of the property and community, or implementation of energy efficiency, energy conservation, or water quality measures. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this Alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Original Project and the Revised Project, and is rejected.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 1, please see Section 6 pages 6-6 to 6-12 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR provides a summary comparative matrix on Table 6-110.

ALTERNATIVE 2: EXISTING ZONING (ALL RESIDENTIAL)

Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 2, the Existing Zoning (All Residential) Alternative, all of the existing buildings on the Project Site would be demolished. In addition, it is assumed that the site would be built-out to the maximum residential uses allowed under the existing C4 zoned portion of the Project Site (344,688 square feet), which is approximately 861 multi-family residential units.

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 2 would result in the same or similar impacts to those of the Original Project and the Revised Project, particularly with respect to cultural resources, geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; off-site construction noise, operational noise; and population, housing, and employment, all of which would be less than significant. This Alternative would develop less floor area, therefore, it would result in reduced impacts with respect to visual resources/views, shade/shadow, light and glare, and greenhouse gas emissions during operation. In addition, this Alternative would avoid significant traffic impacts, because it would result in fewer trips than the Original or Revised Project. Further, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts with respect to fire, police, and schools; water, wastewater, solid waste during operation, electricity, and natural gas when compared to the Original or Revised Project, since it would be smaller than either the Original or Revised Project (in terms of overall square footage). However, this Alternative would result in new significant air quality impacts during construction with respect to NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, due to the demolition of all of the existing buildings, whereas the Original

Project and the Revised Project would demolish only 120,000 square feet of the existing buildings.

Findings

With this Alternative, the new environmental impacts projected to occur would be generally the same or similar to those projected to occur from the Original Project or the Revised Project, however, this Alternative would result in new significant air quality impacts during construction. In addition, this Alternative would not maximize the development possibilities or provide the critical mass and mix of uses necessary to successfully activate the area. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make this Alternative, the Existing Zoning (All Residential) Alternative, infeasible.

Rationale for Findings

Under this Alternative, the Existing Zoning (All Residential) Alternative, all of the existing buildings on the Project Site would be demolished. In addition, it is assumed that the site would be built-out to the maximum residential uses allowed under the existing C4 zoned portion of the Project Site (344,688 square feet), which is approximately 861 multi-family residential units. Since this Alternative would only provide residential uses, it would not provide the critical mass, mix of uses, and amenities necessary to activate the area. Therefore, this Alternative would not achieve policy objectives relating to enhancement of the community, walkability, and pedestrian activation, to the same extent as the Original Project or the Revised Project. In addition, this Alternative proposes demolition of all of the existing buildings, whereas the Original Project and Revised Project only propose demolition of 120,000 square feet of the existing buildings; thus, this Alternative would result in new significant air quality impacts during construction with respect to NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. This Alternative does not successfully re-use the existing Macy's building.

Further, this Alternative would only meet three (3) of the twelve (12) Project Objectives, as outlined below:

- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.

Alternative 2 would not meet the following objectives:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.
- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.
- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project Site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.

- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.
- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this Alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Original Project, and is rejected.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 2, please see Section 6 pages 6-13 to 6-41 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR provides a summary comparative matrix on Table 6-110.

ALTERNATIVE 2A: EXISTING ZONING (ALL COMMERCIAL)

Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 2A, the Existing Zoning (All Commercial) Alternative, all of the existing buildings on the Project Site would be demolished. It is assumed the Project Site would be built-out with the maximum 1.5 floor area ratio on the existing C4 zoned portion of the Project Site, which is 344,688 square feet in area. This Alternative would have approximately 517,000 square feet of commercial uses and a maximum height of 75 feet which would include: 150,000 square feet of office uses; 227,000 square feet of retail uses; 40,000 square feet of restaurant uses; and 100,000 square feet of cinema uses (2,000 seats).

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 2A would result in the same or similar impacts to those of the Original Project and the Revised Project, particularly with respect to cultural resources, geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; off-site construction noise, and operational noise, all of which would be less than significant. This Alternative would develop less floor area than either the Original Project or the Revised Project, and therefore, it would result in reduced impacts with respect to visual resources and views, shade/shadow, light and glare, and greenhouse gas emissions during operation. In addition, this Alternative would reduce significant traffic impacts associated with the Original Project and the Revised Project, because it would result in fewer trips. Further, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts with respect to fire, police, schools, parks and recreation, and libraries; water, wastewater, solid waste during operation, electricity, and natural gas, since it would be smaller than the Original Project or the Revised Project (in terms of overall square footage). However, because this Alternative proposes demolition of all of the existing buildings, whereas the Original and Revised Project only propose demolition of 120,000 square feet of the existing buildings, this Alternative would result in new significant air quality impacts during construction with respect to NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. This Alternative does not successfully re-use the existing Macy's building.

Findings

With this Alternative, the new environmental impacts projected to occur from development of the Project would be generally the same or similar to those projected to occur from the Original or Revised Project, however, this Alternative would result in new significant air quality impacts during construction. In addition, this Alternative would not maximize the development possibilities or provide the critical mass and mix of uses to successfully activate the existing underutilized area. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 2A, the Existing Zoning (All Commercial) Alternative, infeasible.

Rationale for Findings

Under Alternative 2A, the Existing Zoning (All Commercial) Alternative, all of the existing buildings on the Project Site would be demolished. It is assumed the Project Site would be built-out with the maximum 1.5 floor area ratio on the existing C4 zoned portion of the Project Site, which is 344,688 square feet in area. Alternative 2A would have approximately 517,000 square feet of commercial uses and a maximum height of 75 feet which would include: 150,000 square feet of office uses; 227,000 square feet of retail uses; 40,000 square feet of restaurant uses; and 100,000 square feet of cinema uses (2,000 seats).

Alternative 2A would only provide commercial uses, which would not provide the critical mass and mix of uses necessary to successfully activate the existing underutilized area. As this Alternative does not propose any residential uses, it would not help respond to the unmet housing demand in both the North Hollywood Community Plan Area and the City as a whole. In addition, this Alternative proposes demolition of all of the existing buildings, whereas the Original and Revised Project only proposes demolition of 120,000 square feet of the existing buildings; thus, this Alternative would result in new significant air quality impacts during construction with respect to NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. Further, this Alternative would not maximize the potential development possibilities at the Project Site to the same extent as the Project, and would not provide a similar mix of uses, or successfully re-use the existing Macy's building. Therefore, this Alternative would not achieve policy objectives relating to enhancement of the community, walkability, pedestrian activation, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled. In fact, this Alternative would only meet six (6) of the twelve (12) Project Objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Original or Revised Project, as outlined below:

- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.
- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.
- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent.
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.

Alternative 2A would not meet the following objectives:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.
- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.
- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this Alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Original or Revised Project, and is rejected.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 2A, please see Section 6 pages 6-42 to 6-65 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR provides a summary comparative matrix on Table 6-110.

ALTERNATIVE 3: EXISTING DEVELOPMENT WITH RESIDENTIAL USES

Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 3, the Existing Development with Residential Uses Alternative, approximately 555,000 square feet of existing office and retail uses would remain, and 742 residential units would be added to the existing surface parking area at Radford Avenue and Erwin Street. Parking would be provided in accordance with Code requirements. The existing main Macy's building and the existing office building would be re-used in their current condition and configuration.

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 3 would result in the same or similar impacts to those of the Original or Revised Project, particularly with respect to cultural resources, geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning, off-site construction noise, operational noise; population/housing; and fire, police, schools, parks, and libraries, all of which would be less than significant. This Alternative would develop less floor area, and would not add new commercial buildings, parking structures and signage, therefore, it would result in reduced impacts with respect to views, light, glare, and greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation, compared to the Original or Revised Project. In addition, due to its smaller scale, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts with respect to water, wastewater, solid waste during construction and operation, electricity, and natural gas. While this Alternative would generate approximately 36 percent fewer trips than the Original Project, it would still result in one unmitigated significant traffic impact in the AM peak hour, which is less than the Original Project but equal to the traffic impacts of the Revised Project.

Findings

With this Alternative, the new environmental impacts projected to occur from development of the Project would be generally similar to those projected to occur from the Original Project, including

one unmitigated significant traffic impact, which is less than the Original Project, and equal to the Revised Project. In addition, this Alternative would not maximize the development possibilities, enhance the commercial appearance or viability of the property, or provide the critical mass and mix of uses to activate the area. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 3, the Existing Development with Residential Uses Alternative, infeasible.

Rationale for Findings

Under Alternative 3, the Existing Development with Residential Uses Alternative, approximately 555,000 square feet of existing office and retail uses would remain, and 742 residential units would be added to the existing surface parking area at Radford Avenue and Erwin Street. Parking would be provided in accordance with Code requirements. The existing main Macy's building and the existing office building would be re-used in their current condition and configuration.

This Alternative would generate approximately 36 percent fewer trips than the Original Project, however, it would still result in one unmitigated significant traffic impacts in the AM peak hour, which is a reduced traffic impact compared to the Original Project, and which is equal to the Revised Project's traffic impacts. This Alternative also retains existing outdated retail and office structures on the site, and would not maximize the potential development possibilities at the Project Site to the same extent as the Original or Revised Project. This Alternative would not provide the same diverse mix of uses or create a viable vibrant commercial center on the property. Therefore, this Alternative would not meet policy objectives relating to enhancement of the community, walkability, and pedestrian activation, to the same extent as the Original Project or the Revised Project.

In addition, this Alternative only meet one (1) of the twelve (12) Project Objectives, and would partially meet five (5) of the Project Objectives, as outlined below:

- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.

Alternative 3 would only partially meet the following Project Objectives and to a lesser extent than would the Original Project:

- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent.
- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.

Alternative 3 would not meet the following objectives:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.

- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.
- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this Alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Original Project, and is rejected.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 3, please see Section 6 pages 6-66 to 6-92 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR provides a summary comparative matrix on Table 6-110.

ALTERNATIVE 4: REDUCED DENSITY (WITH LARGER RETAIL COMPONENT)

Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 4, the Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component) Alternative, the 90,000-square-foot office building and approximately 30,000 square feet of the existing Macy's would be demolished. Approximately 200,000 square feet of the main Macy's building would be re-used for office uses, and the remainder of the Macy's building would be converted to 328 parking spaces in the basement and 55,000 square feet of retail uses on the ground floor. In addition, this Alternative would include approximately 385,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, as follows: 185,000 square feet of retail uses; 60,000 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club uses; and 100,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 2,000 seats), as well as 742 residential units.

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 4 would result in the same or similar impacts to those of the Original and Revised Project, particularly with respect to visual resources/views, shade/shadow, and light and glare; cultural resources, geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; off-site construction noise, operational noise; and population/housing; and fire, police, schools, parks and libraries all of which would be less than significant. This Alternative would result in reduced impacts with respect to water, wastewater, solid waste during operation, electricity, and natural gas. Due to the increase in retail vs. office use, this Alternative would result in a greater number of daily, AM, and PM peak hour trips when compared to the Original Project, resulting in similar significant traffic intersection impacts during the PM peak hour and one fewer significant traffic intersection impact during the AM peak hour as compared to the Original Project. In addition, this Alternative would result in greater significant traffic intersections impacts during the AM and PM peak hour as compared to the Revised Project. Further, this Alternative would result in a significant operational air quality

impact with respect to NO_x emissions, which is greater than the Original or Revised Project's less than significant impact.

Findings

With this Alternative, the new environmental impacts projected to occur from development of the Project would be generally similar to those projected to occur from the Original or Revised Project, however, it would result in one fewer significant traffic intersection impact compared to the Original Project and greater significant traffic intersection impacts compared to the Revised Project. In addition, this Alternative would provide the same critical mass of uses necessary to activate the area, and would meet all of the Project Objectives to approximately the same extent as the Original Project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 4, the Existing Development with Residential Uses Alternative, feasible.

Rationale for Findings

Under Alternative 4, the Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component) Alternative, the 90,000-square-foot office building and approximately 30,000 square feet of the existing Macy's would be demolished. Approximately 200,000 square feet of the main Macy's building would be re-used for office uses, and the remainder of the Macy's building would be converted to 328 parking spaces in the basement and 55,000 square feet of retail uses on the ground floor. In addition, this Alternative would include approximately 385,000 square feet of retail uses, as follows: 185,000 square feet of retail uses; 60,000 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club uses; and 100,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 2,000 seats), as well as 742 residential units.

Compared to the Original Project, this Alternative would cause the same significant traffic intersection impact during the PM peak hour, however, it would result in one fewer significant traffic intersection impact during the AM peak hour. Compared to the Revised Project, this Alternative would result in greater significant traffic intersection impacts. In addition, this Alternative would result in slightly reduced impacts with respect to water, wastewater, solid waste during operation, electricity, and natural gas when compared to the Original Project, as this Alternative would generate fewer employees at the Project Site than the Original Project. Further, this Alternative would also provide the same diverse mix of uses as the Original and Revised Project, therefore, it would meet policy objectives relating to enhancement of the community, walkability, pedestrian activation, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled, as well as help respond to the unmet housing demand in both the North Hollywood Community Plan and the City as a whole.. As such, Alternative 4 would meet all twelve (12) of the Project objectives to approximately the same extent as the Project as outlined below:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.
- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.
- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford

Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.

- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.
- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent.
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.
- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, Alternative 4 is feasible and more desirable than the Original Project.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 4, please see Section 6 pages 6-93 to 6-126 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR provides a summary comparative matrix on Table 6-110.

ALTERNATIVE 4B

Description of Alternative

Partly in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, the Project Applicant requested that the City consider Alternative 4B, which includes less commercial use and fewer residential units when compared to either the Original Project or Alternative 4.

Alternative 4B includes the demolition of the existing 90,000-square-foot office building at the corner of Laurel Canyon and Erwin Street, the 10,000-square-foot Macy's annex building, a 13,000-square-foot portion of the Macy's building, as well as the removal of an approximately 20,000-square-foot portion of the existing Macy's building. Alternative 4B would re-use approximately 205,000 square feet of the main Macy's building for office uses (on the second through fourth floors) and restaurant uses (on the second floor). The remainder of the main Macy's building would be converted to 316 parking spaces in the basement (in approximately 150,000 square feet) and approximately 60,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor. In total, Alternative 4B would include the following commercial uses: 189,184 square feet of office uses; 208,171 square feet of retail uses; 66,645 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club/gym uses; and 68,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 1,750 seats). In addition to the commercial uses, the Project Site would also be developed with 658 residential units in two buildings.

<u>Alternative 4B/Office Variation</u>

Potential variations in the mix of uses for the commercial portion of Alternative 4B would include the replacement of up to 65,000 square feet of retail use on the ground floor of the Macy's building with 65,000 square feet of office use, and the replacement of up to 40,000 square feet of health use in Building G with 40,000 square feet of office (collectively referred to as the "Alternative 4B/Office Variation"). The variation in the mix of uses within the commercial portion of the project would not alter the design or building envelope of the Alternative 4B project. These variations in the mix of uses within the commercial center were evaluated in the Final EIR in Appendix D, and would not result in significant changes to any impacts compared to Alternative 4B.

The Revised Project approved by the City is a slightly smaller version of Alternative 4B with a reduced number of residential units and reduced residential building heights. As compared to Alternative 4B, the Revised Project has 16 less residential units, approximately 12,300 square feet less residential floor area, and the same commercial floor area. Although the mix of commercial uses in the Revised Project is different from Alternative 4B, the mix of uses is within the range analyzed in the Final EIR under Alternative 4B or Alternative 4B/Office Variation. For purposes of environmental analysis, the Revised Project is considered equivalent to and substantially similar to Alternative 4B.

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 4B and the Alternative 4B/Office Variation would result in same or similar impacts to those of the Original Project, particularly with respect to cultural resources, geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; off-site construction noise and operational noise; and population/housing, all of which would be less than significant. Due to the reduction in office space and the additional basement parking, the size and height of the parking structure would be reduced from the seven levels for the Project to three and four levels, resulting in reduced impacts to visual resources/views, shade/shadow, and light and glare, as well as greenhouse gas emissions. With respect to traffic impacts, Alternative 4B would result in a fewer number of daily, AM, and PM peak hour trips, and two fewer significant traffic intersection impacts than the Original Project. In addition, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts with respect to water, wastewater, solid waste during operation, electricity, and natural gas when compared to the Original Project, as this Alternative would generate fewer residents and employees at the Project Site, resulting in less demand for those resources. The impacts of Alternative 4B are the same as the Revised Project.

Findings

With this Alternative, the new environmental impacts projected to occur from development of the Project would be generally similar to those projected to occur from the Original Project, however, it would result in two fewer significant traffic intersection impact compared to the Original Project. In addition, this Alternative would provide the same critical mass of uses necessary to activate the area, and would meet all of the Project objectives to approximately the same extent as the Original Project. Since this Alternative would achieve the Project Objectives and result in fewer significant traffic impacts, it is feasible and more desirable than the Original Project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 4B and Alternative 4B/Office Variation, feasible. The Revised Project approved by the City is a slightly smaller version of Alternative 4B that would eliminate several significant impacts and reduce all impacts compared to the Original Project, and has the same impacts as Alternative 4B.

Rationale for Findings

This Alternative includes the demolition of the existing 90,000-square-foot office building at the corner of Laurel Canyon and Erwin Street, the 10,000-square-foot Macy's annex building, a 13,000-square-foot portion of the Macy's building, as well as the removal of an approximately 20,000-square-foot portion of the existing Macy's building. This Alternative would re-use approximately 205,000 square feet of the main Macy's building for office uses (on the second through fourth floors) and restaurant uses (on the second floor). The remainder of the main Macy's building would be converted to 316 parking spaces in the basement (in approximately 150,000 square feet) and approximately 60,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor. In total, this Alternative would include the following commercial uses: 189,184 square feet of office uses; 208,171 square feet of retail uses; 66,645 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club/gym uses; and 68,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 1,750 seats). In addition to the commercial uses, the Project Site would also be developed with 658 residential units in two buildings.

Alternative 4B/Office Variation

Potential variations in the mix of uses for the commercial portion of this Alternative would include the replacement of up to 65,000 square feet of retail use on the ground floor of the Macy's building with 65,000 square feet of office use, and the replacement of up to 40,000 square feet of health use in Building G with 40,000 square feet of office (collectively referred to as the "Alternative 4B Office Variation"). The variation in the mix of uses within the commercial portion of the project would not alter the design or building envelope of this Alternative. These variations in the mix of uses within the commercial center were evaluated in the Final EIR in Appendix D, and would not result in significant changes to any impacts compared to Alternative 4B.

This Alternative would result in a fewer number of daily, AM, and PM peak hour trips and cause two fewer significant traffic intersection impacts than the Original Project. In addition, this Alternative includes development of the Project Site with a mix of uses, similar to the Original Project, and would provide the same critical mass of uses necessary to activate the area. The impacts of Alternative 4B are the same as the Revised Project. This Alternative would also meet all twelve (12) of the following Project Objectives:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.
- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.
- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.
- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.
- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent.
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.

- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this Alternative (and therefore, the Revised Project) is feasible and more desirable than the Original Project. The Revised Project approved by the City is a slightly smaller version of Alternative 4B with a reduced number of residential units and reduced residential building heights. As compared to Alternative 4B, the Revised Project has 16 less residential units, approximately 12,300 square feet less residential floor area, and the same commercial floor area. Although the mix of commercial uses in the Revised Project is different from Alternative 4B, the mix of uses is within the range analyzed in the Final EIR under Alternative 4B or Alternative 4B/Office Variation. All impacts from the Revised Project are substantially similar to the impacts of Alternative 4B and Alternative 4B/Office Variation as described in the EIR. Thus, by approval of the Revised Project, the City is, in effect, adopting this Alternative.

Furthermore, subsequent to the certification of the EIR, LADOT re-evaluated the traffic study included in the EIR to consider physical improvements at Intersections #11 and #12, and determined that the improvements are feasible (see Appendix A to this Addendum, which contains LADOT's letter dated December 5, 2016). The added physical improvements in Mitigation Measure M-3 would reduce the previously-identified significant and unavoidable impact in the EIR at Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street (Intersection #11) to a less than significant level. Impacts would also be lessened with the added physical improvements in Mitigation Measure M-4, although the impact level would remain the same as identified in the EIR, as less than significant, at Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Burbank Boulevard (Intersection #12). The identified changes to these Mitigation Measures would also not create any new or previously unidentified impacts.

As stated on pages 4.M-51 and -52 of the Draft EIR, and in the LADOT letter attached as Appendix A to the Addendum, implementation of these physical improvements would fully mitigate the Project's impacts at Intersections #11 and #12, respectively. With the implementation of revised Mitigation Measures M-3 and M-4, as provided above, the Project would not cause any other impacts related to transportation or traffic. Project impacts during construction would not change, as the size of the Project, construction schedule, and number of construction trips would remain the same, and restriping the existing roadways would not cause new significant noise or other construction-phase impacts. The removal of on-street parking spaces along the two intersections would also not result in any new impacts, as parking for adjacent businesses is provided within existing surface parking lots and the removal of a portion of on-street parking spaces along these intersections is not expected to result in significant changes to traffic or circulation. In addition, there would be no new impacts with respect to intersection level of service or emergency access, as implementation of revised Mitigation Measures M-3 and M-4 would actually improve the traffic conditions at Intersections #11 and #12. Therefore, there would be better circulation through these intersections and emergency access would be improved.

With the implementation of additional mitigation measures M-3 and M-4, the Project impacts would be reduced compared to those analyzed in the Certified EIR. As such, none of the conditions as described under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 requiring a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred under the proposed modified Project. No new significant environmental effects and no substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects would occur as a result of the proposed modified Project. Furthermore, there are no other additional known mitigation measures or project alternatives that were previously considered infeasible but are now considered feasible that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment identified in the certified Final EIR. Accordingly, the preparation of the Addendum to the Final EIR is appropriate and in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 4B and Alternative 4B/Office Variation, please see Section 3, Additions and Corrections, of the Final EIR and Appendix D of the Final EIR, as well as the Addendum, dated December 8, 2016.

ALTERNATIVE 5: REDUCED DENSITY (WITH LARGER RETAIL COMPONENT AND FEWER RESIDENTIAL UNITS)

Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 5, the Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component and Fewer Residential Units) Alternative, the 90,000-square-foot office building and approximately 30,000 square feet of the existing Macy's would be demolished. Approximately 200,000 square feet of the main Macy's building would be re-used for office uses. The remainder of the Macy's building and the remainder of the Project Site would be developed with approximately 440,000 square feet of commercial uses, as follows: 240,000 square feet of retail uses; 60,000 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club uses; and 100,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 2,000 seats). In addition, this Alternative would include 200 residential units.

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 4 would result in the same or similar impacts to those of the Original or Revised Project, particularly with respect to cultural resources, geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; off-site construction noise and operational noise, all of which would be less than significant. Due to the reduction in office space (which would therefore require less parking) and the additional basement parking, the size and height of the parking structure would be reduced from the Original Project, similar to the Revised Project. In addition, because of the smaller number of residential units, the height of the residential component of Alternative 5 would also be reduced when compared to the Original and Revised Project. Thus, when compared to the Original and Revised Project, Alternative 5 would develop less floor area, and, therefore, could result in reduced impacts with respect to visual resources/views, shade/shadow, and light and glare compared to the Project's less than significant (with mitigation) impacts. With respect to traffic impacts, this Alternative would result in fewer trips than the Original Project, and would eliminate one of the significantly impacted traffic intersections, but greater than the Revised Project. In addition, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts with respect to fire, police, schools, parks, and libraries; water, wastewater, solid waste during operation, electricity and natural gas when compared to the Original and Revised Project, since it would be smaller (in terms of overall square footage).

Findings

With this Alternative, the new environmental impacts projected to occur from development of the Project would be generally similar to those projected to occur from the Original or Revised Project, and would result in one fewer significant traffic intersection impact compared to the Original Project, but greater traffic impacts compared to the Revised Project. However, this Alternative only proposes 200 residential units, therefore, it would not respond to the unmet housing demand in both the North Hollywood Community Plan Area and the City as a whole to the same extent as the Original Project. Further, this Alternative would not provide the same critical mass and mix of uses necessary to successfully and sustainably activate the area. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), the City finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section 8 of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make this Alternative, the Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component and Fewer Residential Units) Alternative, infeasible.

Rationale for Findings

Under Alternative 5, the Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component and Fewer Residential Units) Alternative, the 90,000-square-foot office building and approximately 30,000 square feet of the existing Macy's would be demolished. Approximately 200,000 square feet of the main Macy's building would be re-used for office uses. The remainder of the Macy's building and the remainder of the Project Site would be developed with approximately 440,000 square feet of commercial uses, as follows: 240,000 square feet of retail uses; 60,000 square feet of restaurant uses; 40,000 square feet of health club uses; and 100,000 square feet of cinema uses (with 2,000 seats). In addition, this Alternative would include 200 residential units.

As this Alternative only proposes 200 residential units, it would not meet the following two (2) Project Objectives:

- Create a sustainable balance of commercial and housing uses to encourage mixed-use living.
- Redevelop the Project Site in a manner that promotes and enhances a healthy and diverse economy in North Hollywood.

This Alternative would meet the following ten (10) Project Objectives:

- Redevelop a currently underutilized site into a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that combines retail, office, and residential uses.
- Support infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas to reduce "greenfield" development and urban sprawl.
- Provide the opportunity to maintain and re-use the existing Macy's Building.
- Activate and encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity by developing a mix of complementary land uses, and by providing bicycle parking and pedestrian linkages within the Project site; an attractive pedestrian experience on Erwin Street, Radford Drive and within the open and green spaces, walkways, plazas, and other gathering spaces.
- Improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site by removing or upgrading outdated buildings by designing an integrated unified architectural commercial center with linkages to adjacent housing.
- Incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction to promote resource conservation, including waste reduction, efficient water management techniques, and conservation of energy to achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent.
- Create a range of construction and permanent jobs.

- Improve public safety by creating a development that provides the level of density and mix of uses necessary to activate the area both day and night, which provides natural surveillance.
- Improve the job-housing balance in the eastern San Fernando Valley area by providing new housing within a major employment center.
- Provide retail, office, and housing along a major transit-served transportation corridor in furtherance of City's goals and policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to reduce pollutant emission, including greenhouse gas emissions.

Further, this Alternative would not help address the housing demand in both the North Hollywood Community Plan Area and the City to the same extent as the Original or Revised Project, and may not be economically sustainable due to the low density of the housing, which cannot support the redevelopment of the commercial portion of the Project Site.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this Alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Original Project, and is rejected.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with this Alternative, please see Section 6 pages 6-127 to 6-161 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR provides a summary comparative matrix on Table 6-110.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an analysis of alternatives shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR and that, if the "no project" alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall also identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives.

In the EIR, Alternative 1: No Project is considered the overall environmentally superior alterative as it would avoid nearly all of the impacts that would occur under the Original or Revised Project. It should be noted however that although most impacts would be avoided, beneficial aspects of the project such as upgrading the property, enhancing the community and the fulfillment of numerous regional and City plan and policy goals for the area would not occur.

Based on the analysis of alternatives in the Draft EIR, Alternative 3: Existing Development with Residential Uses is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 3's impacts would be generally similar or reduced to those of the Original Project, including one unmitigated AM peak significant traffic intersection impact, which is less than the Original Project, and equal to the Revised Project. However, since Alternative 3 would keep all existing commercial buildings and only develop new residential buildings, this Alternative would not maximize the development possibilities, enhance the commercial appearance or viability of the property, or provide the critical mass and mix of uses to activate the area.

However, based on the analysis of the revised alternatives in the Final EIR, Alternative 4B: Reduced Density (with Larger Retail Component) and the Office Variation is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 4B analyzed in the Final EIR is equal to Alternative 3 in reducing impacts, including traffic impacts, as compared to the Original Project. In addition, Alternative 4B meets all of the same objectives as the Original Project. Therefore, the City finds that Alternative 4B is considered the environmentally superior alternative. As discussed in more detail in these Findings above, the City finds that Alternative 3 is not a feasible alternative, and further that Alternative 3, while superior to the Original Project, is not

environmentally superior to the Revised Project due to the reduction in traffic and size in the Revised Project.

8. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The EIR has identified unavoidable significant impacts that would result from implementation of the Revised Project. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts that are identified in the EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the completed EIR and/or other information in the record. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b), the decision-maker must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects have been identified in the EIR which cannot be substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or be eliminated. To adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the decision-maker must balance the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

As described in Sections 1 through 7 of these CEQA Findings of Fact, the City has considered all mitigation measures and alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid the Revised Project's significant and unavoidable impacts and found that both additional mitigation measures and environmentally favorable alternatives to be infeasible. Based on analysis contained in the EIR, the City has adopted a variant of Alternative 4B – the Revised Project – because it substantially reduces some of the impacts of the Original Project, while meeting all of the Original Project's objectives. As discussed in Section 6 of these Findings, implementation of feasible mitigation measures adopted as part of the Revised Project will reduce all impacts to a less than significant level, with the exception of the identified construction traffic impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of the Revised Project. Thus, having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected alternatives to the Revised Project discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the Revised Project against the Revised Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below.

These below-stated reasons summarize the benefits, goals, and objectives of the Revised Project, and provide, in addition to the above findings, the detailed rationale for the benefits of the Revised Project. Each of the overriding considerations, consisting of economic, social, aesthetic, and environmental benefits for the Revised Project, justify adoption of the Revised Project and certification of the completed EIR, and each of these overriding considerations, independently, is sufficient to override all remaining significant and unavoidable impacts of the Revised Project.

1. Implementation of the Revised Project will redevelop an underutilized site into a more vibrant mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development which combines complementary uses, such as office, retail, and residential uses that are designed to serve residents, the surrounding neighborhood, visitors, and the larger community in furtherance of Community Plan goals.

2. Implementation of the Revised Project will help respond to the City's critical housing deficiency, as well as the Mayor's housing goal to add 100,000 new residential units within the City by 2020, and further the goals of the City's Housing Element of its General Plan by adding over 640 rental housing units to the Project Site.

3. Implementation of the Revised Project will result in a unified and cohesive development that will enhance the aesthetics of the community, by rehabilitating and repurposing an older structure (the Macy's building) and replacing a large surface parking lot with updated, modern-designed buildings that are integrated with the surrounding urban environment.

4. Implementation of the Revised Project will support efforts to achieve local and regional sustainability and mobility goals by promoting and encouraging transit usage and the reduction of automobile trips through the incorporation of pedestrian pathways, transit linkages, ample bicycle parking and storage, a well-balanced mix of on-site amenities, and a Traffic Demand Management program to encourage more efficient and alternative modes of transportation.

5. Implementation of the Revised Project will serve existing and new residents with increased visitor-serving land use opportunities, and will provide a more vibrant mixed-use environment with new amenities, landscaped open space, public gathering spaces, an approximately 27,000 square-foot central park, new pedestrian crosswalks, and various streetscape improvements.

6. Implementation of the Revised Project will incorporate sustainable and green building design and construction consistent with the California Green Building Code and City of Los Angeles Green Plan, as well as additional features such as solar panels and electric vehicle parking, to promote resource conservation and achieve a LEED-qualified equivalent development.

7. Implementation of the Revised Project will create a substantial number of temporary construction jobs and permanent jobs at the Project Site.

9. FINDINGS ON MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Pursuant to Section 15091 (a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that implementation of the mitigation measures, regulatory compliance measures, and project design features included in Section 4 of the Final EIR would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from the Project. These mitigation measures, regulatory compliance measures, and project design features have been required in, or incorporated into the Project. In accordance with Section 15091(d) and Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines that require a public agency to adopt a program for reporting or monitoring required changes or conditions of approval to substantially lessen significant environmental effects, the Mitigation Monitoring Plan provided as Section 4 of the Final EIR is hereby adopted as the mitigation monitoring plan for this Project.

10. FINDINGS ON CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR AND RECIRCULATION

CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

In response to comments from the public and other public agencies, the Project has incorporated changes subsequent to publication of the Draft EIR. All of the changes to the Draft EIR are described in Section 3 of the Final EIR. An Errata of minor corrections to the Final EIR was issued on August 23, 2016, and is available in the City record. In addition, an Addendum was prepared on December 8, 2016, which found reduced impacts to two intersections.

FINDINGS REGARDING FINAL EIR

Pursuant to CEQA, on the basis of the review and consideration of the Final EIR, the City finds the following:

1. Factual corrections and minor changes have been set forth as clarifications and modifications to the Draft EIR;

2. The factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR are not substantial changes in the Draft EIR that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project, a feasible way to mitigated or avoid such an effect, or a feasible project alternative;

3. The factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR will not result in new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of the previously identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft EIR;

4. The factual corrections and minor changes in the Draft EIR will not involve mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the Draft EIR that would substantially reduce one or more significant effect on the environment; and

5. The factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR do not render the Draft EIR so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment would be precluded.

Thus, none of the conditions set forth in CEQA requiring recirculation of a Draft EIR have been met. Incorporation of the factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR into the Final EIR does not require the Final EIR to be circulated for public comment.