

Hollywood Community Plan Second Addition to Final EIR

Additional Responses to Comments, Corrections and Additions, and Revised Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)

ENV-2005-2158-EIR

June 14, 2012

**Hollywood Community Plan
Second Addition to the Final EIR – June 14, 2012
Additional Responses to Comments, Corrections and Additions,
and Revised Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)**

**Environmental Impact Report
State Clearinghouse No. 2002041009
ENV-2005-2158-EIR**

This Addition to the Hollywood Final EIR includes the following components:

- 1) Additional Responses to correspondence received since publication of the Final EIR that address environmental issues. These comments were submitted after the close of the 90-day Draft EIR circulation and comment period.
- 2) Additional Corrections and Additions to further clarify the Draft and Final EIR
- 3) Revised Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)

Note- An Addition to the Hollywood Final EIR containing responses to comments received from public agencies, corrections and additions was released on May 18, 2012. The May 18, 2012 Addition is the First Addition to the Hollywood Community Plan Final EIR.

1. Additional Responses to Comments (by Topic) Received After the DEIR Circulation and Comment Period, Through June 14, 2012.

During the public hearing and adoption process, additional letters, testimony, and correspondence were received regarding the EIR. This response directs each commenter to the DEIR and FEIR prepared for the proposed plan, inclusive of each topical response and detailed explanation. In addition, the following additional responses are provided by topic area.

BASELINE/CAPACITY

Additional comments were received regarding the baseline year of the EIR analysis, population fluctuations in Hollywood, and the projections used for the Proposed Plan analysis of year 2030 conditions. Commenters are directed to the Final EIR in its entirety for responses to comments, with the following additional responses:

- Project Baseline: See Final EIR Master Response 1 (MR-1), Master Response 2 (MR-2), and Master Response 3 (MR-3), as amended. See Corrections and Additions. CEQA findings, required General Plan Consistency findings, and all other required findings have been made by the City Planning Commission, and have been forwarded to the Council for consideration.
- Population Fluctuation and Declines: See Final EIR Master Response 1 (MR-1), as amended. See Corrections and Additions.
- Adequacy of Current Plan capacity: The proposed plan seeks to accommodate projected population increases if and when such an increase occurs. Selection of a proposed plan residential capacity target for 2030 is informed by forecasts, but ultimately is a policy

decision. The Department of City Planning has prepared a proposed plan that accommodates the SCAG 2030 Forecast. Environmental analysis of the proposed plan residential capacity number, once identified, is a requirement of CEQA. The existing Hollywood Community plan capacity would not provide for the SCAG 2030 forecast for Hollywood (SCAG's forecast is 244,602 persons, while the existing plan capacity is 235,850 persons). The existing plan (no project alternative) does not fully meet this projection. Also see Final EIR Master Response MR-1, as amended. See Corrections and Additions.

- SCAG Population Estimates and Forecasts: See FEIR MR-1, as amended, FEIR MR-2, and Response 15-4 for discussion of SCAG's responsibility for developing demographic projections, and the methodology used. Details regarding data and methodology used in the Draft EIR can be found in Section 4.2, Population, Employment, and Housing.
- Comments were received regarding the population of Census Tract 1905.2. Comment noted, see FEIR Master Response MR-1, as amended. See Corrections and Additions. While three Census tracts are shown to have increased population between 2000 and 2010, housing units for the same tracts were shown to have increased in all four referenced tracts. Comments also state that it is possible that these population increases are resulting from the construction of housing units in these Census Tracts, and such increases may have resulted in decreases in other Hollywood Census Tracts if residents moving into the new units came from other Hollywood Census Tracts. Comment is noted, and is speculative in nature. The 2010 Census tract data does not provide information to draw a conclusion as to population migration and the specific locations from which increased population arrived. The EIR analyzes the total Hollywood population, and information on Census Tracts was provided in response to comments.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

Comments were received regarding required General Plan Consistency findings, including consistency findings with the General Plan Framework Element.

- See FEIR Master Response MR-1, as amended. See Responses 15-1 and 23-13. See CEQA findings, required General Plan Consistency findings (inclusive of General Plan Framework Element consistency findings) and other findings as part of the project Case File, which have been forwarded to the Council for consideration.
- The proposed project is an update of the Hollywood Community Plan, and is an element of the City's General Plan. It is a policy document, inclusive of land use designations and corresponding zoning. All proposed zoning is consistent with the proposed Community Plan. Consistency findings have been made for the Proposed Plan in relation to other General Plan Elements, and such findings have been forwarded to the Council for consideration. Comment regarding aesthetics is noted. The proposed Hollywood Community Plan contains urban design guidelines to promote an attractive built environment.
- Growth neutrality: Comment was received noting a project objective regarding additional housing was deleted and commenter erroneously concludes that the Proposed Plan is no longer growth neutral. The objectives were revised to provide clarity. In regards to growth neutrality, see FEIR Master Response MR-1 as amended, and Responses 23-13 and 48-3. See Corrections and Additions.

ALTERNATIVES

Comments were received regarding alternatives to the proposed project, including a no-growth alternative in which no building permits would be issued, and a downzoning alternative in which expected development capacity would be decreased instead of increased as in the Proposed Plan. These two alternatives were considered during the course of development of the Draft EIR. They were not taken forward as Project Alternatives because they do not meet project objectives. These alternatives along with brief analyses are summarized below.

No Growth/Development Alternative—As the Hollywood Community Plan Area (CPA) is an existing urban area within Los Angeles that has zoning in place today, and a Community Plan that permits additional development, a No Growth/Development Alternative does not represent a scenario that is feasible or would be likely to occur. Such an alternative would halt development and building activity of all types community-wide. This alternative was rejected as infeasible and would not meet the project objectives of providing increased employment and housing opportunities, encouraging sustainable land use in proximity to transit, expanding mobility options, ensuring that buildings and neighborhoods are well designed, and promoting the vitality and expansion of Hollywood’s media, entertainment, and tourism industry.

Downzoning & Lowered Capacity Alternative—This alternative would reduce the reasonable expected development of the current Hollywood Community Plan through downzoning actions and the imposition of additional development restrictions aimed at reducing the residential capacity and non-residential capacity of the plan to that below the level expected under the existing 1988 Community Plan. For example, the 1988 Community Plan has a reasonably expected development residential capacity of 235,850 persons. The 2005 estimated population for Hollywood was 224,426 persons. The 2010 Census population of Hollywood was 198,228 persons. This alternative would reduce the residential capacity of the Proposed Plan by 5,850 persons, for example, to 230,000 persons, which is less than the existing plan capacity, but more than the population of the Hollywood community (2005 estimate or 2010 Census), and similar reductions would be made as to non-residential development.

While this alternative, for the most part, would involve carrying the existing conditions in the CPA forward into the future, unlike the No Growth/Development Alternative, this is an “action alternative” that would require the adoption of new policies and development regulations to limit most existing development to improvements within the envelope of existing buildings rather than permit continued land use activity under the existing Community Plan. General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes would be prepared to downzone and limit future development levels below that currently permitted, reducing development capacity throughout the community plan area. The General Plan Framework, the City’s long-range adopted growth management plan directing growth into Regional Centers and along mixed-use boulevards, would need to be revised and the overall strategy for accommodating anticipated growth citywide would need to be revisited.

This alternative was rejected as infeasible because it would not accommodate the future growth forecasted by SCAG and would, therefore, be inconsistent with population, housing, and employment projections. This alternative would also be inconsistent with the adopted General Plan Framework which seeks to direct additional growth, if it occurs, into Regional Centers and away from stable lower density neighborhoods. Additionally, this alternative would not prohibit nor discourage the case-by-case consideration of out of scale discretionary projects throughout the Plan area, which is addressed through the

policies of the Proposed Plan. This alternative would provide less employment and housing opportunities than the current Community Plan, and would not meet the project objectives of providing increased employment and housing opportunities, encouraging sustainable land use in proximity to transit, expanding mobility options, ensuring that buildings and neighborhoods are well designed, and promoting the vitality and expansion of Hollywood's media, entertainment, and tourism industry. In fact, this alternative would reduce employment options, reduce housing opportunities, reduce capacity for media, entertainment, and tourism land uses, and require wholesale re-visitation of the General Plan Framework, the City's adopted long-term growth strategy as compared to the existing plan. In as much as the proposed Hollywood Community Plan is an update of an existing 1988 document, reliance on the existing "no-project" plan is an adequate alternative under CEQA. Therefore, for the entirety of the reasons listed above the "Downzoning and Lowered Capacity" alternative was rejected from further consideration.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

Comments were received regarding impacts to infrastructure and public services. See entirety of FEIR, including FEIR response MR-1 and FEIR MR-2 as amended, and Corrections and Additions. See revised Mitigation Monitoring Program. See FEIR MR-2 regarding infrastructure capacity, funding improvements and monitoring.

- Infrastructure Chapter: The Proposed Plan includes Chapter 5: Community Facilities and Infrastructure and Chapter 6: Implementation Programs. Additionally, a detailed analysis of infrastructure and services is in the Draft and Final EIR.
- Sanitation issue: Wastewater planning is undertaken at two levels: (1) citywide for purposes of wastewater treatment -- citywide wastewater treatment capacity is tied to citywide population forecasts from SCAG; and (2) local wastewater transmission capacity upgrades are undertaken as necessary based on review of individual projects and conditioning of new projects with any necessary localized improvement in local sewer capacity. As indicated in Comment Letter 4 from the Department of Public Works, sewers in the Hollywood CPA are generally in good condition to very good condition. As noted in MR-3, the DEIR does not provide project-level environmental clearance.
- Impacts to services and utilities and Census 2010 data: See Master Response MR-1 and Master Response MR-2 as amended, as well as the "Baseline/Capacity" discussion above. The proposed plan EIR is programmatic and does not provide project level environmental clearance for discretionary developments. During the circulation period of the DEIR, additional Census 2010 data became available. In response to comments and for full information analysis purposes, this additional Census data was analyzed to the extent feasible along with a discussion of which conclusions, if any, would be changed by this new information. As noted in MR-1, no conclusions change if 2010 Census data is used. As documented in MR-2 other City Departments that provide citywide services and utilities undertake long-term service programs as well as project-specific review and mitigation in order to plan for and accommodate development anticipated in regional (SCAG) planning documents as well as this and other Community Plans. Also, see MR-2 for additional discussion as to how the provision of public services and utilities is determined on a departmental level. City Planning has proposed land use and zoning recommendations based on sustainable planning practices including accounting for recent substantial investments in transit and the program-level environmental analysis contained in the EIR. Project-specific environmental analysis of discretionary projects in the CPA will still be required and would result in identification of applicable and feasible mitigation of project impacts.

- **Study Area:** The EIR analyzes the proposed Hollywood Community Plan, which is one of 35 community level land use plans which together comprise the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan. Many related services and utilities as analyzed in the EIR are provided for on a city-wide or even regional basis, with further analysis at the Community Plan level where relevant. Impacts are analyzed at the appropriate geographic level to determine how each service and utility might be affected; impacts that might extend citywide are discussed as such (see for example the discussion of Water impacts that assesses project impacts as compared to citywide water supply). The impact analysis does not necessarily stop at the boundary of the planning area. Each department responsible for services and utilities prepares long-term plans to provide those services and utilities based on projections prepared by SCAG, the Department of City Planning, and other departmental forecasts.
- **Open/Greenspace:** Additional comments were received noting an existing scarcity of accessible open space. Policies in the Proposed Plan support the purchase and creation of additional open spaces. However, as noted in the Draft EIR impacts to parks at the community level would be significant.
- **Infrastructure Comments on Traffic, Fire, Police, Wastewater, and adequacy of levels of service:** Additional comments were received on the adequacy of infrastructure in general and requests for additional analysis. No specific relevant issue has been raised that was not disclosed, analyzed, or identified in the DEIR and FEIR. See FEIR and Master Responses MR-1 and MR-2 as amended. See Corrections and Additions. The EIR is an analysis of existing and future projected conditions in relation to the proposed Hollywood Community Plan, a portion of the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan. As such, the environmental analysis is programmatic in nature and looks at services, utilities, and traffic at a community-wide level. Individual discretionary development proposals will require project-level environmental review. A traffic analysis was prepared for the Hollywood Community Plan showing transportation levels of service for existing and proposed horizon years, as well as inclusion of a Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program that can be applied on a project-level discretionary basis. Many other infrastructure components continue to be serviced by customer fees (in some cases both developer fees and user fees) which will fund required investments and modernizations, along with continuing conservation efforts. These include water, electricity, gas, and wastewater. Other public services are funded through the City's General Fund or other federal, state, and local government sources, including police, fire, schools, libraries, and parks. The plan EIR includes an assessment of the projected long term needs of each of these components, along with plan level mitigation measures where appropriate. These assessments inform the review of individual discretionary projects and inform city department work programs, deployments, and the city's budget process. Some public services receive impact fees from certain types of new development, such as schools and parks. Other public services are actively involved in the approval and design of new development, such as Police and Fire through permit review and participation in the discretionary land use approval process including the subdivision process. Recognizing that changing economic cycles will occur, the Proposed Plan allows the city to better prepare to meet infrastructure needs and maintain adequate service levels.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- In addition to comments on specific topic areas of the EIR, comments were received regarding the general adequacy of mitigation measures developed for the EIR. See FEIR Master Response MR-2, as amended, and Responses 9-12, 9-17, 9-27, 9-37, and 48-16. A Mitigation Monitoring Program has been included in the EIR, as amended, to clearly identify each mitigation measure, monitoring action, phasing, and responsible agency.

The program level environmental clearance for the proposed Community Plan does not eliminate future environmental review for any discretionary specific project level development. Future development requiring discretionary action will be evaluated under project-level environmental clearance. All existing life safety and building code requirements are supported by the Proposed Plan. The Draft EIR contains language in the mitigation discussion of several issue areas that the Hollywood Community Plan includes programs and/or policies that “help mitigate” project impacts. It was not intended to imply that policies included in the Plan are mitigation measures. Policies analyzed in the document further the mitigation strategies. As is the case with all General Plan documents, policies are not rigid requirements and are used to guide and inform future discretionary decisionmaking.

- Comments alleging improper mitigation measures: See Master Response MR-2, as amended. The EIR includes mitigation measures at an appropriate level of detail for a General Plan document such as the Community Plan. The revised Mitigation Monitoring Program (see section 3 below) provides additional detail as to how mitigation will be monitored. All plan-level mitigation measures are generally funded as part of the discretionary project review process and permit fees, or as part of ongoing departmental work programs through the general fund of the City of Los Angeles. Project-level environmental analysis is required for future discretionary approvals at the project level.
- Mitigation Phasing: As a program EIR, many of the mitigations are identified to occur in the “pre-construction” monitoring phase. This is an appropriate phasing of those program mitigations designed to be primarily implemented through discretionary development review at the project level. Such phasing relates to the development review process, and would be implemented over the life of the plan. See FEIR Mitigation Monitoring Program, as clarified, for monitoring phasing information.
- Comments regarding funding of Mitigation Measures and Transportation Improvement Mitigation Program (TIMP): The TIMP presents a programmatic analysis and it relies on known, reasonably anticipated sources of funding (project-specific mitigation). Mitigation measures in the EIR would be accomplished within the framework of existing development review procedures and known funding sources (existing Department budgets, project-specific mitigation, etc.). Furthermore, in regards to comments received relating to development impact fees, it is important to note that where mitigations developed for the EIR rely on existing development impact fees, those development impact fees are already adopted and in effect and therefore can be implemented and are not speculative. The plan does include policies supporting the study and establishment of additional development impact fees relating to transportation and open space, however these are not mitigations of the Proposed Plan.
- Comments regarding “contingent mitigation” and comments regarding the difference between program-level mitigations and project-level mitigations: As a General Plan document, the proposed Hollywood Community Plan includes policies that guide future work programs and decision-making. The Community Plan also identifies Land Use Designations that shape future development intensity and uses in the community. This is precisely the nature of the General Plan. The General Plan is implemented through a variety of actions, including project-level discretionary review as well as implementation of the zoning code. The General Plan does not take the place of discretionary project-level review, and does not void the implementation of parcel level zoning and building code requirements. In fact, parcel level zoning and development procedures serve to implement the General Plan and such zoning must be consistent with the adopted General Plan. Land use policies are indeed policies, not zoning requirements. The purpose of Community Plan land use policy is to inform future discretionary decisions and inform project-level development review. In addition to policies at a General Plan level, the zoning code contains the regulations, standards, and specific development requirements that implement the General Plan. These zoning level requirements include parcel level

density regulations, floor area regulations, height, setback, and articulation requirements; parking, open space, and landscape regulations; and building and life safety code regulations. These requirements ensure that the General Plan Land Use Designations and consistent zones are implemented over the life of the plan. Mitigations designed to be implemented via future discretionary approvals are in addition to these zoning requirements, and are appropriately developed at the program level. They are not contingent, they are program-level measures. Project-level mitigation measures will be developed and implemented through discretionary project review and impositions of conditions. The mitigations identified in the proposed plan EIR do not replace or preclude the implementation of the city's zoning code, building code, and life safety code, nor do they replace project-level environmental review for future discretionary projects. To develop the full array of appropriate discretionary project-level mitigations throughout the Hollywood Community Plan Area at the General Plan level would be speculative and infeasible. All identified mitigation measures are feasible.

MONITORING OF THE EIR

- **General Plan Framework Monitoring and Reporting:** The Proposed Plan does not change or modify General Plan Framework polices regarding infrastructure and monitoring. Findings of General Plan consistency, inclusive of the Framework Element, have been made.
- **Monitoring of Mitigation Measures:** A clarified Mitigation Monitoring Program has been developed in response to comments over monitoring actions, revising the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in the FEIR. See Final EIR Corrections and Additions. As part of the General Plan, mitigation monitoring is applied over the lifetime of the Plan. Mitigations are applied and monitored as part of discretionary review of individual development projects, and also through the routine Planning Department and Building and Safety work program and related department work programs. All mitigation measures from the Draft and Final EIR are included in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The inclusion of General Plan level mitigations such as actions promoting future policy work, implementation of departmental work programs, and case-by-case discretionary project review is appropriate, effective, and feasible over the life of a Community Plan.
- **Concerns over Monitoring Deficiencies:** The Mitigation Monitoring Program includes the identification of the implementing agency, the enforcement and monitoring agency, and the monitoring phase. The Mitigation Monitoring Program meets the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6. The Mitigation Monitoring Program has been clarified in response to comments to provide additional information as to monitoring actions of each applicable agency. See revised Mitigation Monitoring Program in FEIR, Corrections and Additions.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Comments suggested the development of additional preservation tools in regards to Cultural Resources / Historic Resources, including developing a program of transfer of floor area rights, and demolition controls. The Community Plan is a General Plan document, and the Proposed Plan does include a mitigation measure that requires application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties where any of the plan's development incentives are used. In addition, City regulatory measures and codes protect designated historic resources, and require review of demolition permits for these structures. In response to this request, expanded policies have been submitted to the City Council for

consideration, including a program to develop a Community Plan Implementation Overlay or Specific Plan for the central portion of Hollywood. This program would include the evaluation of a transfer of floor area rights tool, and the study of potential lot consolidation regulations, demolition controls, and expanded design regulations for a specific area of the Hollywood Community Plan. Existing city regulatory measures protect identified historic resources, and a community wide prohibition on all demolitions would be infeasible. However, the mitigation measure proposed in the EIR directly addresses potential future impacts to recognized historic properties. Furthermore, the Proposed Plan includes expanded policies to identify additional historic resources over the life of the plan through survey work, including the Survey LA program currently underway.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

In response to traffic comments, see Responses 8-34, 9-14, 9-15, 9-27, and 9-46. The TIMP (Transportation and Improvement Mitigation Program) provides traffic analysis and mitigations to address transportation improvements in the CPA. In addition to vehicle/capacity ratios for the street network, the analysis includes vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled for the AM peak period, mid-day peak period, PM peak period, nighttime period, and 24-hour period totals. This effectively analyzes daytime/nighttime traffic generation and congestion reflective of the community's daytime and nighttime populations and activity. Furthermore, discretionary project approvals will require project-level CEQA analysis, including project-level traffic analysis and the development of project-level mitigations. Comment requesting a restriction on the U-turn from eastbound Franklin at the 101 Freeway north entrance ramp is noted and has been referred to LADOT for consideration. The Proposed Plan includes policies for increased pedestrian amenities, enhanced sidewalks, and pedestrian crossing lights.

AIR QUALITY/FREEWAY ADJACENCY

Comments were received regarding air quality and mitigation measures for residential development adjacent to freeways. See "Additional Responses to Public Agency Comments, Corrections and Additions" dated May 18, 2012 for response to letter received from South Coast Air Quality Management District regarding mitigation measures for air quality for residential projects within 500 feet of the 101 Freeway. Also, see same for responses to comments regarding concerns about increasing residential densities adjacent to freeways, health impact assessments, and the responsibilities of CEQA in regards to mitigating the impact of a project on the environment.

Comments were received requesting the removal/modification of Subareas 5:1 and 23:4 to limit additional residential density next to freeways. At its meeting on December 8, 2011, the City Planning Commission voted to remove residential development incentives proposed for Subarea 23:4 and modified Subarea 5:1 to maintain existing density limitations adjacent to the freeway. Such recommendations have been forwarded to the City Council for consideration. A comment was received claiming that the Final EIR reaches a conclusion of no significant impact for Air Quality. The FEIR does not change the conclusions stated in the DEIR on Pg 4.6-26 that "impacts from the Proposed Plan would be significant and unavoidable." and the discussion of Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts on Pg. 4-27 which state that operational impacts are anticipated to be less than significant but construction impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

GEOLOGY AND FAULT ZONES

Additional comments were received regarding geology, oil fracking, and fault zones.

See “Geology and Soils” beginning on pg. 4.8-1 of the DEIR, and FEIR Response 52-31 regarding geologic hazards and fault zones. See Corrections and Additions.

A comment was received regarding the identification of fault lines as part of the unrelated Westside Subway Extension Final EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2009031083). Subsequent to the release of the Hollywood Community Plan Final EIR, Metro released a report prepared for evaluating the route of the proposed Westside Subway Extension. The report identifies the nature and location of faults in the Century City area and identifies a topographic feature, the West Beverly Hills Lineament fault zone, which is inferred to be the northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood fault zone. As identified, the West Beverly Hills Lineament extends generally north-northwest from Culver City through West Los Angeles, bisecting the western portions of Beverly Hills and the east portions of Century City, generally traversing Constellation and Santa Monica Boulevards between Moreno Drive and Century Park East before ending roughly at Sunset Boulevard, approximately two miles west of the westernmost boundary of the Hollywood Community Plan area. The Newport-Inglewood Fault is considered to be an Alquist-Priolo zone, however, the West Beverly Hills Lineament has not been classified as such. Both the Newport-Inglewood Fault and the West Beverly Hills Lineament are outside of the Hollywood Community Plan Area.

A comment was received regarding oil “fracking” and pollutants. Hydraulic fracturing, often referred to as “fracking”, is a well stimulation process used to maximize the extraction of underground resources; including oil, natural gas, geothermal energy, and even water. The potential for oil well fracking would not change with implementation of the Proposed Plan. The potential would remain as under the current community plan. The DEIR only addresses those environmental impacts that would change. Page 4.8-7 describes that oil is currently extracted in the project area, and page 4.8-14 indicates that the Proposed Plan would not significantly impact the availability of resources. (Recent CEQA litigation has confirmed that it is the impact of the project on the environment and not the impact of the environment on the project that must be analyzed in CEQA documents.) Requirements for construction sites to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting are discussed on page 4.8-12 of the DEIR. Given that the project area is already highly urbanized and runoff is not anticipated to substantially worsen, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Plan would add significantly to pollutant loads.

PUBLIC OUTREACH, PARTICIPATION, AND AVAILABILITY TO COMMENT ON EIR

Comments were received on the EIR’s public review process, and the ability of the public to meaningfully participate in the development of the EIR. See FEIR Master Response MR-1, MR-2, and MR-3 as amended. See FEIR Chapter 3 Response to Comments. A Scoping Meeting was held in 2005 as part of the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report, with more than 100 persons attending. Two public workshops were held in 2006 to present draft plan ideas and obtain public feedback, the first was attended by approximately 300 people, the second attended by approximately 200 people. Drafts of the Community Plan were released in 2009 and 2010, and Planning Staff met with neighborhood councils, community groups, and residents to answer questions and explain details of the plan. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 90-day period between March 3 and June 1, 2011, 45 days longer than the 45 days required. Sixty-eight comment letters were received during the circulation period, and responses to all comments were included in the Final EIR, released in October 2011. Two public hearings were held in the Hollywood Community on November 7

and 10, 2011, with 83,000 public notices mailed to property owners and occupants within 500 feet of any proposed zone or General Plan land use designation change. The Central Area Planning Commission reviewed the proposed plan at its meeting on November 22, 2011. The City Planning Commission held a hearing and reviewed the proposed plan at its meeting on December 8, 2011. The community has had numerous opportunities throughout the plan development process for meaningful consultation and participation through meetings, written comments and formal input at public hearings.

RECIRCULATION

A number of comments were received calling for the recirculation of the EIR. Findings have been prepared for City Council consideration clearly indicating that there is no requirement to recirculate the EIR. See Master Responses MR-1, as amended, and MR2.

No new baseline is being proposed for evaluation. Census 2010 data was reviewed to determine if conclusions would differ when compared to 2005; no substantial difference was identified; impacts remain unchanged. No new conclusions have been made and no new baseline year data have been introduced and recirculation is not required. The 2005 baseline utilized by the proposed Hollywood Community Plan is correct and impacts identified remain unchanged by the analysis of 2010 Census data. The Draft and Final EIR present this data and analysis as full disclosure. CEQA requires that the responses to comments in the Final EIR demonstrate good faith and a well-reasoned analysis, and not be overly conclusory. The Final Environmental Impact Report, including responses to comments received during the circulation period of the Draft EIR, was issued in October 2011 with detailed responses to all comment letters received during the circulation period of the EIR. Some comments assert that the EIR is inadequate for not appropriately addressing impacts of the Plan. The information in the Final EIR demonstrates that no additional impacts beyond those already identified in the Draft EIR have been identified by the comments, and thus, the Final EIR is adequate. In addition, staff has prepared this Additional Response to Comments document, indicating that no additional impacts beyond those already identified in the Draft EIR have been raised since the close of the DEIR circulation period. Where available, additional data from the 2010 Census was reported and analyzed in the Final EIR; addition of these data did not result in the identification of any new significant impacts. Such data was released by the Federal Government after the Notice of Preparation and after the Notice of Availability was published for the Draft EIR. See responses to Baseline and Capacity comments above, and Master Response MR-1, as amended, and Corrections and Additions.

As illustrated in the Findings provided to the City Council for consideration, CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 does not require recirculation of the Final EIR based on the following:

- a) No significant new information has been added that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project, a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an impact that the Applicant has declined to implement, or a feasible Project alternative;
- b) The new information, including certain factual corrections and minor changes, provides clarification to points and information already included in the Draft EIR;
- c) There are no significant new environmental impacts resulting from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;
- d) There is no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact that has not been mitigated to a level of insignificance;
- e) The decision maker has not declined to adopt any feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures, considerably different from others previously analyzed, that clearly would lessen the environmental impacts of the Project; and

- f) The Final EIR is not so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment are precluded.
- g) The decision maker will consider the Final EIR, as to whether there is substantial evidence to conclude that none of the conditions requiring recirculation of the Final EIR are present and therefore recirculation of the Final EIR is not required.

PARKING

Comments were received regarding parking requirements and the establishment of preferential parking districts. The proposed plan does not change or reduce any parking requirements; all code-required parking remains in effect. Comment regarding a policy supporting the study of preferential parking in residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial centers is noted and forwarded to the decisionmakers for consideration.

SPECIFIC SUBAREAS

- Subarea 23:4: The current zoning in this neighborhood (5400 block of La Mirada Avenue) is [Q]R4-1VL. The City Planning Commission recommended downzoning the area to RD1.5-1XL further limiting height and density in this area. This recommendation has been included in the zoning ordinance for consideration by the City Council.
- Subarea 38:A: Comments regarding the topography and details of Subarea 38:A and a request for additional height and stepback regulations are noted. The subarea currently has no height limit with C2-1 zoning, and the proposed zone change would establish the [Q]C2-2D zoning with a 50-foot height limit. Staff has prepared additional restriction language that would require building stepbacks from the rear property line for that portion of the building above 35-feet in height, and such language has been forwarded to the City Council for consideration.
- Subarea 39:4: Comments were received requesting that the MR1 zone be retained for this subarea along La Brea Avenue and Willoughby Avenue. The Hollywood Community Plan EIR analyzed a zone change to commercial manufacturing and a change of height district, which would have permitted residential uses and retail/restaurant/office uses. The Planning Staff recommendation and City Planning Commission recommendation taken on December 8, 2011 was to retain the MR1 zone on this subarea, with a change in height district. The City Council may consider a zone change to the M1 zone, which would be consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Designation of the area, and would permit retail, restaurant, and office uses in addition to those industrial uses permitted by the MR1 zone, but not permit residential uses. Comment is noted and has been forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

SCALE AND DENSITY CONCERNS

- Comments were received regarding the need for scale and density regulations. Many existing zoning controls or restrictions are maintained by the Proposed Plan and accompanying zoning ordinance, while many new height regulations, design regulations, and transitional regulations are proposed. New growth is directed to the Regional Center where some development restrictions have been proposed to be removed. Growth is directed away from hillside areas and lower-density neighborhoods. In the East Hollywood area, the Proposed Plan includes downzones along Serrano Avenue and in the Serrano/La Mirada neighborhoods. The Proposed Plan includes mixed-use development incentives along Santa Monica Boulevard. Comments were received regarding concern

over the potential scale of Regional Center development. The Proposed Plan does not exceed the maximum floor area ratio limits of Height District 2, which limits development generally between a floor area ratio of 2:1 to a maximum of 6:1. The plan also maintains the requirement that projects seeking a floor area ratio above 4.5:1 receive discretionary approval by the City Planning Commission. The proposed plan does not raise height limits along the Vine corridor or for any property fronting Hollywood Boulevard. The proposed plan raises height limits for only two parcels plan-wide. One such parcel is being zoned for Open Space as a park, therefore the height limit increase is a technicality. The other parcel's height limit is being raised from 45-feet to 60-feet to be consistent with adjacent height limits. The proposed plan establishes new restrictive height limits for many portions of Hollywood, including those portions north and south of Hollywood Boulevard generally from Highland Avenue east to Cahuenga Boulevard. The existing 1988 Community Plan does not have height limits for Hollywood Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and the 101 Freeway. See also FEIR Master Response MR-1, as amended, MR-2, and MR-3.

- Hollywood Boulevard Historic District: The proposed plan maintains the 45-foot existing height limit for the majority of the Hollywood Boulevard Historic District, and establishes a new restrictive 60-foot and 75-foot height limit generally to the immediate north and south as a transition area. These transition areas previously were generally without height limits. The proposed plan supports the creation of detailed design guidelines for this important centerpiece of the community.
- Aesthetics Concerns: As indicated in the Initial Study (2005), the proposed Hollywood Community Plan Update is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts to aesthetics or biological resources and no Initial Study comments were received on these issues. In addition, individual discretionary projects will be required to complete project-specific environmental review, including analysis of potential project-level impacts to public views. Private view protection is not a component of CEQA. New discretionary development, including any project resulting in 50 or more net new units or 50,000 square feet of net new commercial or industrial floor area will require Site Plan Review and project level CEQA analysis, including aesthetics analysis, shade/shadow analysis, and light/glare analysis. All projects will be subject to specific regulations of the zoning and building code addressing construction type, setbacks, height, parking, open space, density, intensity, etc.
- Comments were received regarding development floor area ratios, and impacts on traffic. The FEIR analyzes proposed changes in permitted floor area ratios, and analyzes the reasonable expected development capacity of the plan. See Project Case File, Findings, and Staff Recommendation Report for description of basis for plan amendments and zone changes. Refer to transportation chapter of the EIR and TIMP for traffic analysis details.

CONCERN THAT THE PLAN MAKES TOWER DEVELOPMENT BY-RIGHT

A number of comments were received regarding the proposed high-rise development on the Capitol Records / Millennium development site. This site is located within Subarea 4:3 of the Proposed Plan. The Millennium project is a project that has filed for discretionary approval (Case No CPC-2008-3440-ZC-CUB-CU-ZV-DA-HD, VTT-71837 and ENV-2011-675-EIR). Adoption of the Hollywood Community Plan does not grant any discretionary project level approvals and does not approve any particular discretionary development on Subarea 4:3. Furthermore, adoption of the Hollywood Community Plan does not reduce or remove any required project entitlements for the proposed development under Case No CPC-2008-3440-ZC-CUB-CU-ZV-DA-HD, VTT-71837 and ENV-2011-675-EIR. The Millennium project requires its own project-level environmental analysis. A project-level Draft EIR for the proposed Millennium project is being prepared by the Planning Department at the time of the

preparation of this response to comment. See also responses under “Scale and Density Concerns” of this document.

The proposed plan would raise the base floor area ratio permitted for Subarea 4:3 from a floor area ratio of 3:1 to 4.5:1, while the maximum permitted floor area ratio remains constant at 6:1. Any floor area over the base floor area requires discretionary approval and related project-level CEQA analysis. Furthermore, for development on Subarea 4:3 and all similar subareas, the Site Plan Review threshold for discretionary project review remains in place and is not being changed. Any project resulting in 50 or more net new units or 50,000 square feet of net new commercial or industrial development requires discretionary approval and project-level environmental analysis pursuant to citywide regulations. This current requirement is not being changed in the proposed plan and will continue to be in effect. In addition, zoning requirements regulating setbacks, density, open space, parking, height, massing and construction type continue to be in effect to regulate development at the parcel level.

The Proposed Plan also increases floor area ratios along selected arterial corridors to focus development, if and when it occurs, along transit infrastructure and away from existing lower density residential neighborhoods. Generally, these corridor incentives limit floor area to a maximum ratio of 3:1 or 2.5:1. The Proposed Plan establishes many new restrictive height limits, design standards, and transitional heights to regulate development and compatibility. As noted in the above paragraph, zoning and building code requirements and discretionary entitlement requirements such as Site Plan Review also effectively regulate development in these areas.

2. Additional Corrections and Additions to the Draft and Final EIR

Page 3-9, at the bottom of the page under the heading “Tiering from this Program EIR . . .” is revised as follows:

This Program EIR identifies area-wide environmental impacts that could occur upon implementation of the proposed Hollywood Community Plan. To the extent that the analysis contained within this EIR remains current and applicable, future projects within the Hollywood Community Plan area that are consistent with the plan may tier from this Program EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21094. As the project analyzed in the Program EIR is a general planning document, no future project within the Hollywood Community Plan area will be within the scope of the project under CEQA Guidelines section 15168, would likely require focused environmental analysis that would concentrate on the environmental effects that:

- ~~(a) are capable of being further mitigated or~~
- ~~(b) were not analyzed as significant effects on the environment in this Program EIR.~~

~~Project-specific environmental review would “tier” from this Program EIR potentially expediting the discretionary planning approval process for those projects.~~

Page 4.3-18 of the DEIR, “the following is added to the end of the first full paragraph beginning with “The Proposed Community Plan incorporates...”:

Furthermore, the City has prepared a Library Strategic Plan that is implemented City-wide.

Page 4.3-22 of the DEIR (and page 4-7 of the FEIR), the added mitigation measure 5 is revised as follows:

5. The City shall ensure that individual projects within the Hollywood Planning Area comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code with respect to provision of open space and recreational facilities. Compliance with this measure ~~shall~~ may be sufficient to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to Parks and Recreation.

Page 4.4-7 of the Draft EIR, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

The impact on water demand from a given Community Plan must be balanced against the necessity of accommodating the citywide growth forecast by SCAG for 2030. ~~The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is currently in the process of developing the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. One of the key objectives of that plan will be to serve SCAG forecast 2035 growth. LADWP is looking at a number of strategies to serve this growth, including conservation and recycling as well as seeking additional sources of water.~~

The 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was the most recent UWMP in effect at the time of the Hollywood Community Plan NOP. During circulation of the DEIR, the 2010 UWMP was published. Both the LADWP 2005 and 2010 UWMP demand forecast

projections account for the Proposed Plan and water demand at a plan-wide level. Detailed data is presented here for 2005 and followed by a general description of 2010 UWMP projections.

Page 4.4-9 of the Draft EIR, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

LADWPs 2010 Urban Water Management Plan is in preparation and will provide greater specificity as to how water will be provide to the City as a whole including the Hollywood CPA. The 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (adopted in 2011) addresses water supply citywide through 2035. The projections in the 2010 UWMP, based on SCAG's 2008 RTP, utilized a City of Los Angeles population projection of 4,398,408 for 2030 and 4,467,560 for 2035. The 2010 UWMP reflects adjustments in growth and the higher rate at which the population is expected to grow as projected by SCAG. Since the population projections in the Proposed Plan are also based on SCAG projections and are consistent with assumptions the UWMP utilizes, the UWMP addresses the adequacy of water supply and indicates that the projected water availability is suitable for the projected population. While supply is projected to be adequate, LADWP is looking at a number of strategies to serve this growth, including conservation and recycling as well as seeking additional sources of water. The EIR does not eliminate environmental review for any project-level discretionary development.

Page 4.8-3 Figure 4.8-1, the following note is added to the bottom of the figure:

Note: The course of the West Beverly Lineament fault zone (inferred to be the northern extension of the active Newport Inglewood fault zone) has been shown to generally extend north-northwest from Culver City through West Los Angeles, bisecting the western portions of Beverly Hills and the east portions of Century City, generally traversing Constellation and Santa Monica Boulevards between Moreno Drive and Century Park East before ending roughly at Sunset Boulevard, approximately two miles west of the westernmost boundary of the Hollywood Community Plan area; this recent finding is not mapped on this figure. No portion of this feature is within the Hollywood Community Plan area.

Page 4.8-11, the end of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

The closest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone to the area is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone, located approximately five miles south of the Hollywood area. The West Beverly Hills Lineament fault zone, which is inferred to be the northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood fault zone, ends approximately two miles west of the western most boundary of the Hollywood Community Plan area. Potential impacts for specific geophysical conditions are discussed below.

Final EIR, page 3-2, in Master Response 1, the fifth paragraph is revised as follows:

There are at least ~~four~~ three census tracts in central Hollywood that exhibited a net population gain. The tracts include census tracts 1905.10, ~~1905.20~~, 1907 and 1910. These same tracts also exhibited a gain in dwelling units. All four of these These census tracts are located within the Community Redevelopment Agency Project Area and are areas where the Hollywood Community Plan is proposing increased capacity.

Final EIR, page 3-2, in Master Response 1 (MR-1), the following is added after the first partial paragraph:

Population within the Hollywood CPA has fluctuated over the years. Population decreased from the 2005 estimated population of 224,426 to the 2010 census population of 198,228. Over the longer term, population may decline or may increase. SCAG forecasts the population will increase projecting a 2030 Hollywood population of 244,602 persons. There may be a number of reasons for this fluctuation in Hollywood population, and the decline seen between 2005 and 2010.

In response to disinvestment and concerns of blight, the Hollywood Redevelopment Project area was adopted in 1986. Major transit investment followed with the Metro Red Line's Hollywood stations opening in 1999 and 2000; and residential infill development following in the latter half of the 2000-2010 decade, resulting in increased population in some central Hollywood census tracts. It is reasonable to plan for growth in Hollywood, consistent with the City's adopted growth policies of the General Plan Framework, and the regional growth strategy of SCAG focusing future housing in existing urban areas well served by transit thereby minimizing the need for greenfield development.

It is an adopted City policy to concentrate growth in conjunction with services, infrastructure and access to amenities (see General Plan Framework). State and regional regulations and policy also support concentrating growth near transit (SB 375, SCAG 2012 Regional Transportation Plan including the Sustainable Communities Strategy, 2% Growth Strategy, Compass Blueprint Plan). While population in the Hollywood CPA dropped between 2005 and 2010, the number of housing units increased by 2.6% between the 2005 estimate and the 2010 Census. The number of persons per household also dropped (in 2000, census data showed there were 2.33 people per unit, in 2005 SCAG data estimates showed there were 2.23 people per unit, in 2010, census data showed there were 2.09 people per unit). There could be a variety of factors that account for this drop in household population including increased vacancy rates, fewer couples and households with children and not all those living in a unit being reported to the Census. It is reasonable that population increased from 2000 to 2005 followed by a decline between 2005 and 2010 as housing prices and rents rose, followed by economic crashes and economic declines. The Census data does not identify the cause of population changes during the 10-year period between Census surveys, nor can it identify fluctuations during the period between Censuses.

Household size is also a factor that can reasonably be expected to impact population in Hollywood. The Hollywood Community Plan area saw average household sizes drop from 2.33 people per dwelling unit in 2000 to 2.09 people per dwelling unit in 2010. This reduction in household size mirrors overall population declines in many portions of central and east Hollywood. Also, Hollywood experienced a rise in average household income from 2000 to 2010, increasing potential pressures of gentrification and displacement which may have resulted in the loss of many families with children, and the increase of many more single-occupant households. Additionally, major increases in housing prices and residential rents occurred during the housing crisis of 2000 through 2008, leading to possible displacement pressures for lower income families. As prices collapsed and rents eased in 2008, the regional employment picture also deteriorated, creating a possible additional factor of reduced population growth as jobs decreased.

Given the substantial transit investment in the Hollywood CPA and increasing pressure to develop in a more sustainable manner adjacent to transit infrastructure, combined with a land use plan designed to complement the transportation infrastructure, it is reasonably anticipated that the longer-term trend of increased population in urban areas, especially those well-served by transit, including Hollywood, will more closely match SCAG projections. It is reasonably anticipated that population growth will resume in the area, and the Proposed Plan is a long term land use document developed to guide and shape future development if and when it occurs through the year 2030.

Final EIR Page 3-7, the following is added to the end of Master Response 1 (MR-1):

Baseline Year for Hollywood Community Plan Update EIR

The baseline year for the EIR is 2005. As indicated on p. 4.2-2 of the Draft EIR, the 2005 population estimate was derived from SCAG's 2004 RTP; housing units were estimated by the Planning Department Demographic Unit using 2000 census data and permit data. The 2005 population was a reasonable estimate at the time it was made, and remains a reasonable estimate of the 2005 population in Hollywood. Many government agencies, including public service providers, rely on the same sources of SCAG RTP data, and use of such data estimates is the best practice. See above discussion of demographic trends and current population numbers. A projection is a forecast and it is valid to use such forecasts for analyzing future conditions.

The Draft EIR evaluates the environmental impacts related to population and housing based upon information from a variety of sources including, the United States Census (US Census), California Department of Finance (DOF), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element (Framework), and associated documents. Since each of these organizations may use different methods of data collection and analysis, the data do not always arrive at precisely the same results. Accordingly, the population and housing numbers used in the analysis may vary somewhat, depending upon the source cited. Despite the variances, the data used in this EIR represent the best available data sources and provide a reasonable description of the population, housing, and employment characteristics of the CPA.

To address concerns raised that 2005 SCAG data underestimate impacts of the Proposed Plan, additional analysis was conducted using 2010 census data which had become available after publication of the DEIR. The results of this supplemental analysis indicate no change in the conclusions of the FEIR. As noted in response MR-2, service and utility planning is generally based on long-term population forecasts provided by SCAG that the service and utility providers use to project long-term demand, combined with localized upgrades in response to individual projects as needed.

2005 Census as Compared to 2010 Census as the Baseline

As noted above 2005 is the baseline for the Hollywood Community Plan Update EIR. The Planning Department used data from SCAG as the basis for the 2005 analysis. This was the best source of data at the time of publication of the Draft EIR. This 2005 estimate was, and remains a reasonable estimate. 2010 Census data became available after publication of the Draft EIR. Analysis of available 2010 Census data was included in the Final EIR to fully inform decisionmakers, and shows the conclusions of the Draft EIR remain consistent and have not changed.

It is not feasible to change the baseline year of EIR analysis every time a government agency at the state, federal, or local level issues a projection for a future condition or issues an estimate for those years subsequent to the NOP and EIR baseline year. As stated above, the 2005 SCAG population was a reasonable estimate at the time it was made, and remains a reasonable estimate of the 2005 population in Hollywood.

The following presents a summary of the analyses and conclusions by issue area using 2010 Census data, as indicated in the FEIR. It is presented as supplemental analysis, and does not replace the 2005 analysis.

Land Use. The land use analysis is based on the calculation of acreage per land use category. Using the 2010 Census data as the baseline for the analysis would make no difference to the land use analysis.

Population, Employment, and Housing. Using the 2010 Census data as the baseline would result in the analysis of an increase in 50,834 people and 11,681 housing units (no data was available on employment at the time of this response analysis) between 2010 and 2030 under the Proposed Plan as compared to using 2005 SCAG estimates, which result in an analysis of increases of 24,636 people and 14,268 housing units between 2005 and 2030 under the Proposed Plan. Analysis of 2010 Census data as the baseline in comparison to the Proposed Plan would demonstrate a relative increase of more people and a relative increase of fewer housing units. Using either 2005 or 2010 as the baseline, the project would not result in a significant adverse impact because future conditions would accommodate the SCAG projection.

Public Services.

Fire. Using the 2010 baseline would show less impact in terms of dwelling unit increases from 2010 to the proposed 2030 Plan. As discussed below, differences in traffic congestion anticipated using the 2010 Census data as compared to the 2005 SCAG projection result in negligible differences and therefore congestion changes would not be significantly different whether 2005 is used as the baseline or 2010 census data is used as the baseline.

Police. As noted on page 4.3-9, police deployment is based on a number of factors and cannot be precisely calculated on police-need-per-population standards. While using the 2010 Census data would show a greater increase in police need if population standards were used, population is not the only factor. As noted in Master Response 2, page 3-8 of the Final EIR, LAPD uses a computer model called Patrol Plan that considers 25 different variables, such as forecast call rate, average service time, etc. Police services are addressed Citywide, the anticipated population in 2030 in the Hollywood area is consistent with Citywide projections used by LAPD for planning purposes. Newer buildings are anticipated to have better security and removal of blight reduces crime, while development generally increases the tax base of the city providing increased general fund revenues. The mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR (including hiring and deployment of police personnel pursuant to LAPD practices) would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore use of the 2010 census data would not change the conclusions of the Draft EIR.

Libraries. Impacts were evaluated based on future anticipated population compared to a standard (square feet of library space and volumes of library material per person) and not based on an increase in population. Therefore the impact analysis would not change if the 2010 census data were used.

Public Parks. Impacts were evaluated based on future anticipated population compared to a standard (acres of parks per thousand residents) and not based on an increase in population. Therefore the impact analysis would not change if the 2010 census data were used.

Public Schools. Impacts were evaluated based on future anticipated students compared to 2007/08 actual enrollments. Student generation is calculated based on residential units not population. Using 2010 Census data for the baseline would show less impact as compared to using 2005 data because existing students were calculated based on housing units (which increased from 2005 to 2010, therefore reducing the net increase in dwelling units from existing conditions to 2030 if 2010 Census data is used) not population.

Utilities.

Water Resources. Residential water consumption is based on residential units not population and therefore using the 2010 Census data would show less of an impact as compared to using the 2005 data.

Energy Resources. Residential energy consumption is based on residential units not population and therefore using the 2010 Census data would show less of an impact as compared to using the 2005 data.

Wastewater. As with water consumption, residential wastewater generation is calculated based on residential units not population and therefore using the 2010 Census data would show less of an impact as compared to using the 2005 data.

Solid Waste. Residential solid waste generation is calculated based on residential units not population and therefore using the 2010 Census data would show less of an impact as compared to using the 2005 data.

Transportation. Hollywood is located in an area that is heavily affected by cross-town traffic. The impact of residential traffic generation in Hollywood is tempered therefore in its effect on street traffic within the community. As seen in the traffic model analysis, as traffic generation rates decline in Hollywood itself, more regional traffic is attracted into the area from surrounding communities. Therefore, while 2010 population is less than 2005, the traffic model for the Hollywood area shows that traffic congestion using the 2010 Census data would be only negligibly different from traffic congestion using the 2005 data and the impact analysis would not change (see FEIR Corrections and Additions for pages 4.5-9, 4.5-11, 4.5-12, 4.5-13, 4.5-23, 4.5-29).

Air Quality. The air quality analysis is based on land use data including housing units for residential land use and square feet of non-residential uses (for existing conditions) and VMT data from the traffic model (for future conditions). Therefore the air quality analysis would show less impact if 2010 Census data were used as the baseline (because the number of housing units in 2010 is more than 2005 and therefore the increase in emissions from 2010 to 2030 is less than the increase from 2005 to 2010).

Noise. The noise analysis is based on measurements of actual noise, anticipated construction and the traffic analysis. Since the traffic analysis does not change substantially between the 2005 data and the 2010 Census data (see above), the operational noise analysis would similarly change in a negligible manner.

Geology. The analysis is based on land use not population. Using the 2010 Census data as the baseline for the analysis would make no difference to the geology analysis.

Cultural Resources. The analysis of cultural resources does not depend on the population change. Therefore use of the 2010 Census data as the baseline would not affect the analysis.

Safety/Risk of Upset. The analysis of safety/risk of upset is based on land use changes and not population. Therefore use of the 2010 Census data as the baseline would not affect the analysis.

3. Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)

In response to comments received on the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in the Final EIR, and to more clearly address monitoring of mitigation measures associated with implementation of the Hollywood Community Plan update, a new Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) has been prepared which clarifies and replaces the prior program. The MMP contains an expanded column entitled “Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action” to clarify language on monitoring actions and to better illustrate how mitigations will be monitored. See following MMP which replaces Chapter 5.0 of the FEIR.

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines require adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) for all projects for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared. This requirement was originally mandated by Assembly Bill (AB) 3180 which was enacted on January 1, 1989 to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Specifically, Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code states that "...the agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment...[and that the program]...shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation."

AB 3180 provided general guidelines for implementing monitoring and reporting programs, which are enumerated in more detail in Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines. Specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements to be enforced during project implementation are defined prior to final approval of the project. The proposed monitoring program will be considered by the City of Los Angeles (the lead agency) prior to certification of the EIR. Although the lead agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to other agencies or entities, it "...remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program."

The Mitigation Monitoring Program describes the procedures for the implementation of the mitigation measures to be adopted for the proposed project as identified in the Draft and Final EIR. The MMP for the proposed project will be in place through the planning horizon of the Plan (2030) or until the Plan and EIR are updated again. The Proposed Project is a planning document and therefore does not include construction. However some mitigation measures are designed to be applied to projects that proceed under the Plan. The City is responsible for administering the MMP activities. The City may choose to delegate parts of the Plan (particularly enforcement and monitoring) to staff, other City departments (e.g., Department of Building and Safety, Department of Public Works, etc.), consultants, or contractors. The City will ensure that monitoring is documented through reports (as required) and that deficiencies are promptly corrected. The City may choose to designate one or more environmental monitor(s) (e.g. City building inspector, project contractor, certified professionals, etc., depending on the provision specified below).

Each mitigation measure is categorized by impact area, with an accompanying identification of:

- Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Actions – this is the criteria that would determine when the measure has been accomplished and/or the monitoring actions to be undertaken to ensure the measure is implemented.
- The implementing agency – this is the agency or agencies that will undertake the measure.
- The enforcement agency and monitoring agency -- this is the agency or agencies that will monitor the measure and ensure that it is implemented in accordance with this MMP.

**Hollywood Community Plan Update
Mitigation Monitoring Program**

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
Land Use				
1	1. Implement the Urban Design Policies, Guidelines, and Standards included in the Proposed Plan.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
2	2. Implement Specific Plans and/or Community Design Overlay (CDO) Districts to address proposed development standards.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review. Implement existing overlay districts, study and evaluation of proposed districts where applicable.	DCP	DBS
3	3. Implement Transit Oriented Districts (TODs) and/or Pedestrian Oriented Districts (PODs) to mitigate the impacts of increased residential and commercial intensity where appropriate.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review. Implement existing overlay districts, study and evaluation of proposed districts where applicable.	DCP	DBS
4	4. The City shall ensure that review of individual discretionary projects shall address aesthetic concerns as appropriate to minimize site-specific aesthetic impacts, including impacts to views, scenic resources, lighting, and shading.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
Public Services				
<i>Fire Protection</i>				
5	1. Identify areas of the Hollywood CPA with deficient fire protection facilities and/or services and prioritize the order in which the areas should be upgraded to established fire protection standards to ensure acceptable fire protection at all times.	Plan implementation. Implement existing procedures and standards including LAMC regulations.	LAFD	LAFD
6	2. Continue to require, in coordination with the Fire Department, adequate fire service capacity prior to the approval of proposed developments in areas currently located outside of the service areas or capability of existing city fire stations.	Plan check and approval, pre-construction. Implement existing procedures and standards including LAMC regulations. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	LAFD/DBS	LAFD/DBS
7	3. Promote continued mutual assistance agreements with neighboring cities, the County of Los Angeles, and other applicable agencies for the provision of fire protection services to the residents of the Hollywood CPA.	Plan implementation. Continued cooperation between neighboring jurisdictions including as a part of joint response to large fires/incidences.	LAFD	LAFD
8	4. Implement the Hollywood Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program (TIMP) contained in Section 4.5 of the DEIR (Transportation) to	Plan implementation. 1. As part of discretionary development review for	LADOT	LADOT

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	improve traffic conditions thereby improving fire and life safety in the community.	those projects requiring traffic studies, LADOT will review the Hollywood TIMP to determine if there are measures in the TIMP that could be implemented by the development as mitigation for its transportation impacts. 2. Continue to evaluate and prioritize projects identified in the Hollywood Community Plan TIMP that could be implemented through the City's Capital Improvement Program or by a METRO Call For Projects grant.		
	<i>Police Protection</i>			
9	1. Hire and deploy additional police officers and civilian personnel to accommodate growth or development generated by the implementation of the Proposed Plan pursuant to LAPD hiring and deployment procedures.	Plan implementation. Continue to implement departmental hiring and deployment procedures to identify needs for additional police protection.	LAPD	LAPD
10	2. Expand and/or upgrade existing police protection equipment and/or facilities in areas of the CPA that do not receive adequate police protection services.	Plan implementation. Continue to implement departmental procedures to identify needs for additional equipment and/or facilities.	LAPD	LAPD
11	3. Pursue State, Federal and other non-conventional funding sources to expand the number of sworn police officers.	Plan implementation. Continue to submit proposals for funding that would allow LAPD to expand the number of sworn officers.	LAPD	LAPD
12	4. Promote the establishment of police facilities that provide police protection at a neighborhood level.	Plan implementation. Ongoing monitoring of crime rates and service response times (through the computer program Patrol Plan or other means).	LAPD	LAPD
13	5. Implement the Hollywood Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program (TIMP) contained in Section 4.5 of the DEIR (Transportation), to improve traffic conditions thereby improving police response times in the community.	Plan implementation. 1. As part of discretionary development review for those projects requiring traffic studies, LADOT will review the Hollywood TIMP to determine if there are measures in the TIMP that could be implemented by the development as mitigation for its transportation impacts.	LADOT	LADOT

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
		2. Continue to evaluate and prioritize projects identified in the Hollywood CP TIMP that could be implemented through the City's Capital Improvement Program or by a METRO Call For Projects grant.		
	<i>Parks</i>			
14	1. Develop City or private funding programs for the acquisition and construction of new Community and Neighborhood recreation and park facilities.	Plan implementation. Ongoing identification of City and/or private funding sources and potential suitable recreation and park locations as opportunities arise.	DRP	DRP
15	2. Prioritize the implementation of recreation and park projects in parts of the CPA with the greatest existing deficiencies.	Plan implementation. Implement adopted plans and procedures.	DRP	DRP
16	3. Establish joint-use agreements with the Los Angeles Unified School District and other public and private entities that could contribute to the availability of recreational opportunities in the CPA.	Plan implementation. Ongoing identification of opportunities for joint use with LAUSD.	DRP	DRP
17	4. Monitor appropriate recreation and park statistics and compare with population projections and demand to identify the existing and future recreation and park needs of the Hollywood CPA.	Plan implementation. Implement adopted plans and procedures.	DRP	DRP
18	5. The City shall ensure that individual discretionary projects within the Hollywood Planning Area comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code with respect to provision of open space and recreational facilities. Compliance with this measure may be sufficient to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to Parks and Recreation.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/DRP	DCP/DRP
	<i>Public Schools</i>			
19	1. Develop plans to address issues relating to siting and the joint use of facilities. To this end, identify strategies for the expansion of the school facilities, including a. Siting of schools and other community facilities (libraries, parks, etc.) within transit stations, centers or mixed-use areas so that they can complement each other and make the most use of the land provided for these services; b. Locating middle schools and high schools close to transit stations and key centers, where possible, so that students can use the transit system to get to and from school; c. Encouraging private redevelopment of existing school sites in the immediate vicinity of transit station and centers so that the existing site (a low intensity site) would be replaced by a high intensity mixed-use development that would	Plan implementation. Ongoing LAUSD identification of need and planning for new schools. LAUSD to contact DCP for assistance in planning new schools. As feasible, DCP to assist in coordination of school siting to meet objectives.	DCP/LAUSD	DCP/LAUSD

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	incorporate school facilities.			
20	2. Work cooperatively with LAUSD and other entities to facilitate construction of schools where necessary to accommodate increased student population.	Plan implementation. Ongoing cooperation between DCP and LAUSD.	DCP/LAUSD	DCP/LAUSD
21	3. The City shall ensure that, prior to issuance of a building permit, project developers shall pay to LAUSD the prevailing State Department of Education Development Fee to the extent allowed by State law. School fees exacted from residential and commercial uses would help fund necessary school service and facilities improvements to accommodate anticipated population and school enrollment within the LAUSD service.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/DBS/LAUSD	DCP/DBS/LAUSD
	Utilities			
	<i>Water Resources</i>			
22	1. As part of review of individual projects, the Planning Department shall work with LADWP to ensure appropriate expansion, upgrade and/or improvement of the local water supply and distribution system within the CPA as may be necessary to accommodate anticipated growth.	Plan implementation. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DWP
23	2. Individual projects that are consistent with the UWMP, undertake a Water Supply Analysis as required by State Law and/or comply with recommendations as appropriate identified on a site by site basis by the Department of Water and Power will be considered to not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to this potential cumulatively significant impact unless project specific impacts are found to be significant.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/DWP	DCP/DWP
	<i>Energy Resources</i>			
24	1. Promote energy conservation and efficiency to the maximum extent that are cost effective and practical.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP	DWP
25	2. Encourage and provide incentives for the development and use of alternative sources of energy.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP	DWP
26	3. Adopt and implement a program to provide technical assistance and incentives to property owners and developers on building design and/or the use of energy-efficient systems in new residential, commercial and industrial developments to exceed existing State of California Energy Code standards.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP/DBS	DWP/DBS
27	4. Promote the responsible use of natural resources in consonance with City environmental policies.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP	DWP
28	5. Expand, upgrade or improve local distribution lines and facilities within the community plan area whenever necessary to accommodate increased demand for energy.	Plan implementation. Ongoing review of water distribution facilities; implementation of maintenance and repair as necessary. Ongoing review of	DWP	DWP

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
		discretionary projects and addition of project conditions to improve water distribution system as appropriate.		
	<i>Wastewater</i>			
29	1. Continue to implement existing water conservation measures, including ultra low-flush installation and, school educational, public information, and residential programs, and develop new ones as needed.	Plan implementation. Ongoing programs by LADWP to promote water conservation and use of reclaimed water.	DWP	DWP
30	2. Adopt a comprehensive water reuse ordinance that will establish, among other things, goals on reuse of reclaimed water.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP/LABOS	DWP/LABOS
31	3. Establish water reuse demonstration and research programs and implement educational programs among consumers to increase the level of acceptance of reclaimed water.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP/LABOS	DWP/LABOS
32	4. Provide incentives for the development of new markets and uses for reclaimed water.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of programs.	DWP/LABOS	DWP/LABOS
33	5. Rehabilitate existing sewers in poor structural condition and construct relief sewers to accommodate growth whenever necessary.	Plan implementation. Ongoing review of wastewater distribution facilities; implementation of maintenance and repair as necessary. Ongoing review of discretionary projects and addition of project conditions to improve wastewater distribution system as appropriate.	LABOS	LABOS
34	6. Expand or upgrade existing local sewers in the community plan area to accommodate increased wastewater flow whenever necessary.	Plan implementation. Ongoing review of wastewater distribution facilities; implementation of maintenance and repair as necessary. Ongoing review of discretionary projects and addition of project conditions to improve wastewater distribution system as appropriate.	LABOS	LABOS
35	7. As part of the review of individual discretionary projects, drainage and hydrology issues shall be evaluated to ensure that impacts to drainage, groundwater and water quality are mitigated as necessary to comply with State law and City Code, including the City's Low Impact Development Ordinance.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/LABOS	LABOS
	<i>Solid Waste</i>			
36	1. Implement the Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan to maximize source reduction and materials recovery and minimize the amount of solid waste requiring disposal with the goal of leading the City to achieve zero waste by	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of solid waste recycling programs.	LABOS	LABOS

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	2025.			
37	2. Encourage and provide incentives for the processing and marketing of recyclable items.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of solid waste recycling programs.	LABOS	LABOS
38	3. Accelerate on-going efforts to provide alternative solid waste treatment processes and the expansion of existing landfills and establishment of new sites.	Plan implementation. Ongoing implementation of existing programs to identify and implement improvements.	LABOS	LABOS
Transportation				
39	1. Implement development review procedures to ensure that the applicable Mobility policies of the Hollywood Community Plan are applied and implemented by individual development projects when they are considered for approval in the plan area.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	LADOT/DCP	LADOT/DCP
Air Quality				
40	1. The City, as a condition of approval of all discretionary projects, shall require contractors building projects within the Hollywood CPA to: i) Use properly tuned and maintained equipment. Contractors shall enforce the idling limit of five minutes as set forth in the California Code of Regulations ii) Use diesel-fueled construction equipment to be retrofitted with after treatment products (e.g. engine catalysts) to the extent they are readily available and feasible iii) Use heavy duty diesel-fueled equipment that uses low NOx diesel fuel to the extent it is readily available and feasible iv) Use construction equipment that uses low polluting fuels (i.e. compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) to the extent available and feasible v) Maintain construction equipment in good operating condition to minimize air pollutants. vi) Use building materials, paints, sealants, mechanical equipment, and other materials that yield low air pollutants and are nontoxic. vii) Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow. viii) Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on-and off-site. ix) Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas. x) Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to	Pre-construction and construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/SCAQMD	DBS

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	<p>PM10 generation.</p> <p>xi) Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization, and ensure that all vehicles and equipment will be properly tuned and maintained according to manufacturers' specifications.</p> <p>xii) Use coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than that required under AQMD Rule 1113.</p> <p>xiii) Construct or build with materials that do not require painting.</p> <p>xiv) Require the use of pre-painted construction materials.</p> <p>xv) Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export).</p> <p>xvi) During project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction equipment operating on the project site shall meet EPA-Certified Tier 2 emissions standards, or higher according to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Project Start, to December 31, 2011: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 2 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with the BACT 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 2 or Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. ✓ January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 3 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT 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. ✓ Post-January 1, 2015: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT 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. ✓ A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. 			

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	<p>✓ Encourage construction contractors to apply for AQMD "SOON" funds. Incentives could be provided for those construction contractors who apply for AQMD "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 the following website: http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/implementation/soonprogram.htm.</p> <p>xvii) Other measures as applicable on a project by project basis and as may be recommended by SCAQMD on their web site or elsewhere: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html.</p>			
41	2. The City, as a condition of approval for all discretionary projects, shall require developers to implement applicable GHG reduction measures in project design and comply with regulatory targets.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/SCAQMD	DBS
42	3. In the event that future projects under the Community Plan cover areas greater than five acres, appropriate analysis and modeling would be required for CO, NOx, PM10 and PM2.5.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/SCAQMD	DBS
43	4. Require health risk assessments to be conducted for all residential projects located within 500 feet of the 101 Freeway that take advantage of any of the increased residential densities provided by the plan (i.e. a project that builds more units on a parcel than currently permitted under the existing plan). Mitigation measures shall be required at the project level as necessary to reduce health risk (for indoor and outdoor uses) to an acceptable level below SCAQMD adopted thresholds of significance. These health risk assessments shall be circulated to SCAQMD for review and comment.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/SCAQMD	DBS
44	<p>5. In order to comply with the California Air Resources Board Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (June 2005) and achieve an acceptable interior air quality level for sensitive receptors, appropriate measures, shall be incorporated into project building design. The appropriate measures shall include one of the following methods:</p> <p>a. The project applicant shall retain a qualified air quality consultant to prepare a health risk assessment (HRA) in accordance with the California Air Resources Board and the Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment requirements to determine the exposure of project residents/occupants/users to stationary air quality pollutants prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit. The HRA shall be submitted to the Lead Agency for review and approval. The applicant or implementation agency shall implement the approved HRA recommendations, if any. If the HRA concludes that the air quality risks from nearby sources are at or below acceptable levels, then</p>	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/SCAQMD	DBS

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	<p>additional measures are not required.</p> <p>b. The applicant shall implement the following features that have been found to reduce the air quality risk to sensitive receptors and shall be included in the project construction plans. These shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division and the Building Services Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit and ongoing.</p> <p>c. Do not locate sensitive receptors near distribution center's entry and exit points.</p> <p>d. Do not locate sensitive receptors in the same building as a perchloroethylene dry cleaning facility.</p> <p>e. Maintain a 50' buffer from a typical gas dispensing facility (under 3.6 million gallons of gas per year).</p> <p>f. Install, operate and maintain in good working order a central heating and ventilation (HV) system or other air take system in the building, or in each individual residential unit, that meets the efficiency standard of the MERV 13. The HV system shall include the following features: Installation of a high efficiency filter and/or carbon filter-to-filter particulates and other chemical matter from entering the building. Either HEPA filters or ASHRAE 85% supply filters shall be used.</p> <p>g. Retain a qualified HV consultant or HERS rater during the design phase of the project to locate the HV system based on exposure modeling from the mobile and/or stationary pollutant sources.</p> <p>h. Maintain positive pressure within the building.</p> <p>i. Achieve a performance standard of at least one air exchange per hour of fresh outside filtered air.</p> <p>j. Achieve a performance standard of at least 4 air exchanges per hour of recirculation</p> <p>k. Achieve a performance standard of .25 air exchanges per hour of unfiltered infiltration if the building is not positively pressurized.</p> <p>l. Project applicant shall maintain, repair and/or replace HV system or prepare an Operation and Maintenance Manual for the HV system and the filter. The manual shall include the operating instructions and maintenance and replacement schedule. This manual shall be included in the CC&R's for residential projects and distributed to the building maintenance staff. In addition, the applicant shall prepare a separate Homeowners Manual. The manual shall contain the operating instructions and maintenance and replacement schedule for the HV system and the filters. It shall also include a disclosure to the buyers of the air quality analysis findings.</p>			

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	Noise			
45	1. Re-route truck traffic away from residential streets, if possible. If no alternatives are available, route truck traffic on streets with the fewest residences.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS
46	2. Site equipment on construction lots as far away from noise-sensitive sites as possible.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS
47	3. When construction activities are located in close proximity to noise-sensitive sites, construct noise barriers, such as temporary walls or piles of excavated material between activities and noise sensitive uses.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS
48	4. Avoid the use of impact pile drivers where possible in noise-sensitive areas. Drilled piles or the use of a sonic vibratory pile driver are quieter alternatives where geological conditions permit their use. Use noise shrouds when necessary to reduce noise of pile driving/drilling.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS
49	5. Use construction equipment with mufflers that comply with manufacturers' requirements.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS
50	6. Consider potential vibration impacts to older (historic) buildings in Hollywood as part of the approval process.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS
51	7. Commercial rooftop discretionary uses within 500 feet of residentially zoned areas shall be subject to noise analyses; mitigation shall be required to ensure that noise levels in residential areas will not result in a significant impact.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
52	8. For all newly proposed entertainment venues requiring discretionary approval, noise abatement plans shall be required as conditions of approval.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
	Cultural Resources			
	<i>Historic Resources</i>			
53	1. Cultural Heritage Commission/Office of Historic Resources Building Permit Review of Historic-Cultural Monuments.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
54	2. Office of Historical Resources Building Permit Review of Properties on the National Register/California Register.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
55	3. Historic-Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ) Program.	Plan implementation. Evaluate proposed districts as applicable.	DCP	DCP

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
56	4. SurveyLA.	Plan implementation. Continue historic resource surveys in applicable areas.	DCP	DCP
57	5. Project-Specific CEQA Review by City.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
58	6. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Incentive Areas Compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
59	7. Cultural Heritage Commission/Office of Historic Resources Building Permit Review of the Hollywood Walk of Fame.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
60	8. Project-Specific CEQA Review by the City of projects along the Hollywood Walk of Fame.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
<i>Archeological Resources</i>				
61	9. As part of individual project CEQA review, the potential for impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources shall be evaluated and mitigation measures identified as appropriate. In the event any archaeological and/or paleontological resources are determined to be potentially present, as appropriate the City shall require the developer to retain an on-site qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist with expertise in the area in order to monitor excavation in previously undisturbed area and to assess the nature, extent and significance of any cultural materials that are encountered and to recommend appropriate methods to preserve any such resources. Said archaeologist and/or paleontologist will have the authority to put a hold on grading operations and mark, collect and evaluate any archaeological materials discovered during construction. Said archaeologist and/or paleontologist shall be provided a reasonable amount of time to prepare and implement protection measures coordinating with the City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Department.	Construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP	DBS
Safety/Risk of Upset				
62	1. As part of the discretionary review of individual projects, the City shall ensure that potential hazards are evaluated and mitigated consistent with State Law, City Code and recommendations of the City Building and Safety and Fire Departments, State Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board and South Coast Air Quality Management District, as appropriate. The evaluation of hazards shall consider all hazards that might be	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DBS	DBS/SCAQMD

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

No.	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Monitoring Action(s)	Implementing Agency	Enforcement and Monitoring Agency
	applicable to an individual project/site including but not limited to, methane gas, lead-based paint, asbestos, potential presence of hazardous materials associated with past use of a site, potential chemicals proposed to be used on-site, and emergency access.			
63	2. As part of the review of individual discretionary projects, the City will ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are identified and required prior to approval of residential or public facility projects within 1,000 feet of a site known to be releasing substantial hazardous materials or wastes (as defined by the State of California), that could present a hazard to proposed development. These measures should address considerations of setbacks and buffers, barriers, risk of upset plans and safety evacuation plans.	Pre-construction. Implement zoning regulations and discretionary permit review.	DCP/DBS	DBS

DCP = Department of City Planning, DBS = Department of Building and Safety, LAFD = Los Angeles Fire Department, LAPD = Los Angeles Police Department, LADOT= Los Angeles Department of Transportation, DRP = Department of Recreation and Parks, LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District, DWP = Department of Water and Power, LABOS = Bureau of Sanitation, SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District