

## FINDINGS

1. Pursuant to State Government Code Section 65868, a development agreement be entered into by mutual consent of the parties. An application for a Development Agreement was filed on August March 24, 2016, establishing the applicant's consent to enter into a Development Agreement.
2. The City of Los Angeles ("City") has adopted rules and regulations establishing procedures and requirements for consideration of development agreements under Citywide Development Agreement Procedures (CF 85-2313-S3). In addition, on November 19, 1992, the City Planning Commission adopted new guidelines for the processing of development agreement applications (CPC No. 86-404 MSC).
3. In accordance with Section 12.32 of the LAMC and California Government Code Section 65867, notification within a 500 foot radius of the Project Site, were mailed out on August 31, 2016 to all occupants and property owners, neighborhood council and others as identified in the mailing affidavit located in the administrative record. Further, notice of the public hearing was also published in the Daily Journal on September 2, 2016; verification of which is provided in the administrative record. In accordance with Section 12.32 C 4(c), posting for the site was done on September 15, 2016.
4. Pursuant to Sections 65867.5 of the Government Code, the Development Agreement is consistent with the objectives, policies, and programs specified in the City of Los Angeles General Plan, including the West Los Angeles Community Plan adopted by City Council on July 27, 1999 (CF 98-2024). Orderly development of the Project Site is further governed by CPC-2015-2662-VZC-ZAD-CDO-SPR, wherein the Project is seeking a Zone Change from [Q]C2-2-CDO to (T)(Q)C2-2-CDO, Special Permission for the Reduction of Off-Street parking for a commercial building located within 1,500 feet of a transit facility, Design Overlay approval with respect to the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Design Overlay District, and Site Plan Review. The Zone Change will be considered for adoption by resolution by the City Council.
5. This Development Agreement is administrative and technical in nature and will have no impact on the project under the EIR prepared for the project, ENV-2013-3747-EIR, to be considered by the City Council upon their consideration of the Zone Change. Moreover, the provisions of the Development Agreement do not grant the project or the project applicant any exceptions, variances, or otherwise allows the applicant to deviate from the required development regulations of the Code. The intent of the Development Agreement is to recognize the life of the entitlements to a specified term in exchange for the provision of public benefits. The proposed Development Agreement will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and general welfare. Approval of the Development Agreement will promote the expeditious delivery of public benefit monies directly from the Applicant to the identified parties for the provision of, but not limited to, scholarships and the establishment of a local business improvement district.
6. The Development Agreement provides extraordinary public benefits in the form of \$625,000 towards the development of affordable in the Council District boundaries for Council District 11 (Mike Bonin).
7. The Development Agreement complies in form and substance with all applicable City and State regulations governing development agreements.

8. Based upon the above Findings, the proposed Development Agreement is deemed consistent with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.

9. **CEQA FINDINGS**

### **FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR), consisting of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision-makers and the general public regarding the objectives and components of the project at 11750-11770 Wilshire Boulevard; 1211-1235 Stoner Avenue; 1222 Granville Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90025, consisting of a 34-story residential building containing up to 376 multi-family dwelling units and an approximately 40,544 square-foot, privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area (this is a revision from the originally submitted project) on a 2.8-acre site.

#### **II. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION BACKGROUND**

The project was reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental Analysis Section (serving as Lead Agency) in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA. The City prepared an Initial Study in accordance with Section 15063(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City then circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to State, regional and local agencies, and members of the public for a 33-day period commencing on March 6, 2014. The purpose of the NOP was to formally inform the public that the City was preparing a Draft EIR for the project, and to solicit input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR.

Written comment letters responding to the NOP were submitted to the City by public agencies and interested organizations. Comment letters were received from various public agencies. Also, written comments were provided by interested organizations and/or individuals via mail, e-mail or submittal at the NOP scoping meeting. The NOP, Initial Study, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR evaluated in detail the potential effects of the project. It also analyzed the effects of a reasonable range of four alternatives to the project, including a "No Project" alternative. The Draft EIR for the project (State Clearinghouse No. 2014031014), incorporated herein by reference in full, was prepared pursuant to CEQA and State, Agency, and City CEQA Guidelines (Pub. Resources Code § 21000, et seq.; 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000, et seq.; City of Los Angeles California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines). The Draft EIR was circulated for a 46-day public comment period beginning on April 28, 2016, and ending on June 13, 2016. Copies of the written comments received are provided in the Final EIR. Pursuant to Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City, as Lead Agency, reviewed all comments received during the review period for the Draft EIR and responded to each comment in Section III of the Final EIR.

The City released a Final EIR for the project on September 19, 2016, which is hereby incorporated by reference in full. The Final EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision-makers and the general public regarding objectives and components of the project. The Final EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with implementation of the project, identifies feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that may be adopted to reduce or eliminate these impacts, and includes written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period. Responses were sent to all public agencies that made comments on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to certification of the Final EIR pursuant to

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b). In addition, all individuals that commented on the Draft EIR also received a copy of the Final EIR. The Final EIR was also made available for review on the City's Department of City Planning website. Hard copies of the Final EIR were also made available at four libraries and the City Department of Planning. Notices regarding availability of the Final EIR were sent to those within a 500-foot radius of the project site, as well as individuals who commented on the Draft EIR, attended the NOP scoping meeting, or provided comments during the NOP comment period.

Following publication of the Final EIR, the applicant made minor changes to the site plan to increase the amount of publicly accessible open space. An Errata dated October 26, 2016 (the "Errata") was prepared to address these minor changes.

A duly noticed public hearing for the project was held by the Hearing Officer/Deputy Advisory Agency on behalf of the City Planning Commission on September 28, 2016.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the City's CEQA findings are based are located at the Department of City Planning, Environmental Review Section, 200 North Main Street, Room 750, Los Angeles, California 90012. This information is provided in compliance with CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2).

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

Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines (the "Guidelines") require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts and make one or more of three possible findings for each of the significant impacts.

- A. The first possible finding is that "[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (Guidelines Section 15091 (a)(1)); and
- B. The second possible finding is that "[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2)); and
- C. The third possible finding is that "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible, the mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (Guidelines, Section 15091(a)(3)).

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the Final EIR for the project as fully set forth therein. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as "significant." For each of the significant impacts associated with the project, either before or after mitigation, the following sections are provided:

1. Description of Significant Effects – A specific description of the environmental effects identified in the EIR, including a judgment regarding the significance of the impact;

2. Project Design Features – Reference to the identified Project Design Features that are a part of the project (numbering of the features corresponds to the numbering in the Draft EIR);
3. Mitigation Measures – Reference to the identified mitigation measures or actions that are required as part of the project (numbering of the mitigation measures correspond to the Mitigation Monitoring Program, which is included as Section V of the Final EIR);
4. Finding – One or more of the three specific findings in direct response to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091;
5. Rationale for Finding – A summary of the reasons for the finding(s);
6. Reference – A notation on the specific section in the Draft EIR which includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

#### IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The project applicant proposes to demolish the existing supermarket building and construct in its place a 34-story residential building containing up to 376 multi-family dwelling units. At least 16 of the residential units, or five percent of the maximum units allowed under the R4 zoning designation (which corresponds with the C2 zone), will be set aside as affordable housing for Very Low Income residents. The residential building includes various amenities to serve the needs of project residents and guests, including a lobby, lounge, fitness center, recreation room, and bicycle storage area, as well as leasing offices. An outdoor pool, pool deck, and terrace serve the recreational needs of project residents and guests. The proposed residential building would reach a height of 338 feet to the top of the parapet and be designed in a contemporary architectural style.

The project, includes construction of an approximately 40,544 square-foot, privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area at the northeast corner of the project site fronting Wilshire Boulevard consisting of enhanced landscape and hardscape features, including seating areas, pedestrian pathways, raised planters, and shade trees.

To support the foundation of the new residential building, the project proposes the partial demolition and reconstruction of the four-level subterranean parking structure. Upon completion, the project provides a total of 1,090 parking spaces (this is a revision from the originally submitted project). The project retains the existing office building and pedestrian plaza in the northwest portion of the project site, with no changes to existing operations therein.

In total, the project removes approximately 42,900 square feet of existing floor area and constructs approximately 360,291 square feet of new floor area, resulting in a net increase of approximately 317,391 square feet of floor area within the project site. With implementation of the project, the project site includes a total of 717,391 square feet of developed floor area. Upon completion of the project, the total Floor Area Ratio (FAR) on the project site, inclusive of the existing office building, will increase from 3.27:1 to 5.9:1.

The project incorporates features to support and promote environmental sustainability, including “green” principles that comply with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code (as amended pursuant to Ordinance No. 182,849). In so doing, the new buildings would be capable of achieving at least Silver certification under the U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-CS® or LEED NC® Rating System as of January 1, 2011.

Project construction is anticipated to occur over approximately 30 months and is anticipated to be completed in 2020. Construction of the project will commence with demolition of the existing supermarket structure. Partial demolition of the subterranean parking garage will then be completed in order to install a pile foundation system for the residential building. Following installation of the pile foundation system, building construction, paving/concrete installation, and landscape installation will occur.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

The City Planning Department prepared an Initial Study dated March 6, 2014. The Initial Study is located in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The Initial Study found the following environmental impacts not to be significant or less than significant:

**A. Agricultural and Forest Resources**

1. Farmland
2. Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use or Williamson Act Contract
3. Forest Land or Timberland Zoning
4. Loss or Conversion of Forest Land
5. Cumulative Impacts

**B. Air Quality**

1. Objectionable Odors

**C. Biological Resources**

1. Sensitive Biological Species
2. Riparian Habitat and Wetlands
3. Movement of any Resident or Migratory Species
4. Habitat Conservation Plans

**D. Cultural Resources**

1. Historical Resources
2. Archeological Resources
3. Paleontological Resources
4. Tribal Cultural Resources, discussed below

**E. Geological Resources**

1. Seismic-related ground failure
2. Landslides

**F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

1. Hazardous Materials
2. Airport Land Use Plans and Private Airstrips
3. Wildland Fires

**G. Hydrology and Water Quality**

1. 100-Year Flood Hazard Areas, 100-year Flood and Flooding
2. Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow

**H. Land Use and Planning**

1. Divide an Established Community
2. Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plans

**I. Mineral Resources**

1. Loss of Availability of Known Mineral Resources
  2. Loss of Mineral Resources Recovery Site
  3. Cumulative Impacts
- J. Noise**
1. Airport Land Use Plans
  2. Private Airstrips
- K. Population and Housing**
1. Induce Substantial Population Growth
  2. Displacement of Existing Housing
  3. Displacement of Existing Residents
- L. Transportation/Circulation**
1. Air Traffic Patterns

Because the proposed project was filed prior to July 1, 2015, the project is not subject to AB 52 regarding tribal cultural resources. Three letters requesting construction monitoring were received from the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California, Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation, and the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians on June 7, 2016, September 21, 2016 and October 18, 2016, respectively. None of the letters that were received provide any substantial evidence that tribal cultural resources are located at the project site. Nonetheless, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 (c)(1), these letters and requested mitigation measure have been included in the administrative record. In conclusion, impacts to tribal cultural resources are less than significant.

## VI. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION

The following impact areas were determined to be less than significant, and based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the project, the City finds and determines that the following environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed:

### A. Aesthetics

Enacted in 2013, SB 743 adds Public Resources Code Section 21099, which provides that “aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” As set forth in Section IV.A.2, Light, Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, the project is a residential project on an infill site within a transit priority area. Therefore, the Project’s aesthetic impacts, pursuant to SB 743 shall not be considered to be significant impacts. CEQA Appendix G, which includes a comprehensive list of environmental topics under CEQA, does not expressly list shade and shadow impacts. The Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, however, considers shade and shadow impacts to be a type of aesthetic visual character impact under question 1c of Appendix G. The City has issued Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145, confirming that SB 743 applies to a project’s aesthetic impacts, including shade and shadow impacts. As such, the aesthetic impact analyses contained in the Draft EIR (visual character/quality, views, light and glare and shading) and below are included for informational purposes only.

#### 1. Visual Character/Quality and Views

Construction Impacts (Visual Character and Views): During construction activities for the Project, the visual appearance of the project site is altered due to the removal of the existing supermarket

and on-site landscaping. In addition, construction activities, including site preparation, grading, and excavation; the staging of construction equipment and materials; and the construction of the proposed structure alters the visual character of the project site and adjacent roadways. These construction activities are visible to pedestrians and motorists on adjacent streets, as well as to viewers within nearby buildings. In accordance with Project Design Features A.1-1 and A.1-2, temporary construction fencing is to be placed along the periphery of the project site to screen much of the construction activity from view at the street level, and graffiti is to be removed, as needed, from all temporary walkways and construction fencing throughout the project construction period.

Overall, while affecting the visual character of the project area on a short-term basis, project construction activities do not substantially alter or degrade the existing visual character of the project site, or generate substantial long-term contrast with the visual character of the surrounding area, for the following reasons: (1) views of construction activity are limited in duration and location as a result of intervening development; (2) the project site appearance is typical of construction sites in urban areas; (3) construction occurs within an urban setting with a high level of human activity and development; and (4) impacts are reduced through standard best management practices implemented during the construction period, including the use of construction fencing placed along the periphery of the project site to screen much of the construction activity from view at the street level, pursuant to Project Design Feature A.1-1. Therefore, with implementation of the project design features, aesthetics/visual character impacts associated with construction are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

Operation Impacts (Visual Character): The project alters the visual character of the project site by: (1) replacing a single-story supermarket with a high-rise residential building and attached pool deck in the southern portion of the project site; and (2) substantially increasing the amount of on-site landscaping, particularly by replacing an existing surface parking lot with an approximately 40,544 square-foot privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area along Wilshire Boulevard. The project does not result in any changes to the visual character of the on-site office building or landscaped courtyard in the northwestern portion of the project site.

As depicted in the visual simulations in the Draft EIR Section IV.A.1, the introduction of the high-rise residential building results in changes to short-range, focal views and long-range, distant views of the project site. Due to the height and mass of the proposed building, the changes to short-range views, particularly along the immediately adjacent roadways of Granville Avenue and Stoner Avenue, is more substantial than changes to long-range views (see, for example, View 5 in Draft EIR Figure IV.A.1 6 on page IV.A.1-26 and View 8 in Figure IV.A.1 9 on page IV.A.1-29). As shown, within short-range views from street-level vantage points adjacent to the project site, the project is highly visible and is substantially taller and have more mass than the existing supermarket.

The Wilshire Boulevard commercial corridor in the vicinity of the project site is anchored by a concentration of five other high-rise buildings, the tallest of which reaches a height of 334 feet, only four feet less than the height of the proposed high-rise building. The project site's C2 Zone normally permits a maximum FAR of 6:1, which is slightly greater than the project's proposed FAR, and places no restriction on maximum building height (as discussed below under subheading 3.d.3.e, the project requests a zone change to remove certain existing Q conditions from the project site's zoning designation). Thus, while the project substantially alters the visual character of the project site compared to existing conditions, which consists of a surface parking lot and low-rise building, the project is out of character with the surrounding area or inconsistent with the amount and intensity of development that is otherwise permitted for properties within the

same zone. Furthermore, close-range views of the project are similar to close-range views of the other high-rise buildings on and adjacent to the project site.

Additionally, as shown in the visual simulations in the Draft EIR, the proposed high-rise building consists of a slim, steel frame construction with floor-to-ceiling glazing accented by light metal and fritted glass panels, which are compatible with the existing architectural features of the surrounding environment. These architectural elements and varied surface materials provide horizontal and vertical articulation that reduce the perceived bulk and mass of the building. The visual simulations also demonstrate that, while the project can be seen from distant locations, views of the project are intermittent due to the densely developed nature of the project area. As shown in View 4 in Draft EIR Figure IV.A.1 5 on page IV.A.1-25, View 6 in Draft EIR Figure IV.A.1 7 on page IV.A.1-27, and View 7 in Draft EIR Figure IV.A.1 8 on page IV.A.1-28, once the viewer moves beyond a block or two from the project site, the only portion of the project site that is visible are the upper floors of the high-rise residential building and existing office building. From other locations within similar distances from the project site, such as View 3 in Draft EIR Figure IV.A.1 4 on page IV.A.1-24 (located approximately two blocks east of the project site), the proposed residential building is not be visible at all. Each of these simulations shows that when the project is visible from long-distance vantage points, the height of the proposed high-rise building is within the context of the heights of the existing high-rise buildings on and adjacent to the project site. As such, the project complements the existing high-rise skyline.

Finally, the project improves the visual character of the project site's Wilshire Boulevard frontage. Under existing conditions, the visual character of the project site's Wilshire Boulevard frontage east of the office building is characterized by a surface parking lot. The setback between the supermarket and the Wilshire Boulevard sidewalk (approximately 250 feet) creates a visual emphasis on surface parking when viewed in the context of the surrounding structures fronting Wilshire Boulevard, particularly those within the designated Mixed-Use Boulevard to the west. The project replaces the surface parking lot with an approximately 40,544 square-foot privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area along Wilshire Boulevard. The proposed open space area activates this portion of the Wilshire Boulevard frontage by providing mature trees, planters, and hardscape features and direct pedestrian access from the street front in accordance with the West Wilshire Boulevard CDO. As shown in Draft EIR Figure IV.A.1 10 on page IV.A.1-38, with its tree and landscape cover, pedestrian pathways, and seating areas, the proposed open space is an improvement to the visual character of the project site and area, particularly along the Wilshire Boulevard frontage.

Based on the analysis above, it is concluded that the project does not substantially alter, eliminate or degrade the existing visual character of the project area, including existing visual resources, or introduce elements that substantially detract from the visual character of the project area. Therefore, impacts to aesthetics/visual character are less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts "shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment."

Operation Impacts (Views): The analysis of view impacts focuses on whether access to visual resources on the project site or in the project area blocks or diminishes as a result of the project. There are no visual resources located on the project site. Off-site visual resources that may be viewed within the same viewshed as the project site from public or private vantage points in the area include the Santa Monica Mountains to the north of the project site, the Pacific Ocean to the west of the project site, and the Westwood high-rise skyline to the east of the project site.

The Pacific Ocean is located approximately 3 miles west of the project site. Given the distance and dense, urban development located between the project site and the Pacific Ocean, views of the Pacific Ocean are not available looking west from public, street-level vantage points in the project vicinity. However, limited and distant private views of the Pacific Ocean are available from

elevated vantage points in the vicinity, including from the Barrington Plaza residential buildings, the 11775 Wilshire Boulevard commercial building, and possibly other high-rise buildings located farther east on Wilshire Boulevard. The analysis focuses on impacts to the private views from within the Barrington Plaza buildings because they are the closest high-rise buildings to the project site and are located directly east of the project site. As shown in View 1 and View 2 in Draft EIR, the extent to which the project site blocks views of the Pacific Ocean from Barrington Plaza varies depending on several factors, including the height of the vantage point and the building in which the viewer is located. In general, the central building of the Barrington Plaza complex affords better quality views of the Pacific Ocean than the northern and southern buildings, due to its location and orientation relative to the project site and viewshed. From some locations, views of the Pacific Ocean are already partially or mostly obscured by the existing on-site office building and other high-rise development in the distance. At these locations, development of the project results in further blockage of already intermittent views. However, other locations provide better quality, panoramic views of the Pacific Ocean. At these locations, the project appears in the foreground of the view, similar to the existing office building, but does not result in substantial view blockage, as the majority of the distant background view remains visible. In the analysis of view impacts, consideration is given to the extent of obstruction and whether the project covers more than an incidental/small portion of the resource, and if the obstruction occurs from a public or private vantage point (under CEQA, the question is whether a project will affect the environment of persons in general, not whether a project will affect particular persons). Because the project only affects a limited number of private views of the Pacific Ocean, and because only some units could experience substantial view blockage, the project's impacts on views of the Pacific Ocean are not considered substantial.

The Westwood high-rise skyline is located approximately 1 mile east of the project site. Given its distance from the project site, the dense intervening development, and the curvature of Wilshire Boulevard east of San Vicente Boulevard/Federal Avenue, views of the Westwood skyline are not available from public (i.e., street-level) locations within the vicinity of the project site. Private views of the Westwood skyline may be available from the upper floors of the Barrington Plaza residential buildings, the 11775 Wilshire Boulevard commercial building, and other high-rise buildings farther east on Wilshire Boulevard; however, such views do not include the project because the project site is located west or south of these uses. Private views that include the Westwood skyline and the project may also be available from high-rise buildings farther west along Wilshire Boulevard (e.g., at Wilshire Boulevard and Bundy Drive). However, given the distances between these buildings, the project site, and the Westwood skyline, the project's residential building appears similar to the existing on-site and adjacent high-rise buildings in the vicinity. Therefore, the project does not obstruct existing views of the Westwood skyline beyond the existing conditions.

In the vicinity of the project site, public views of the Santa Monica Mountains are available looking north along the Granville Avenue roadway corridor. However, due to the terrain and intervening development, such views are intermittent. Furthermore, the project's residential building is set back approximately 94 feet from Granville Avenue, and as such, does not block views of the Santa Monica Mountains. The Santa Monica Mountains are not visible from Stoner Avenue adjacent to the project site due to terrain and intervening development. Similarly, as the viewer moves farther south, views of the Santa Monica Mountains generally become unavailable. Private panoramic views of the Santa Monica Mountains may be available from some units on the upper floors of the high-rise buildings surrounding the project site, including the Barrington Plaza residential buildings and the 11775 Wilshire Boulevard commercial building. However, the project does not appear within these views because the project site is located west and south of these buildings. Therefore, the project does not obstruct existing views of the Santa Monica Mountains.

As for views of scenic resources available from Wilshire Boulevard, a designated scenic highway, due to the distance and dense, urban development located between the project site and the Pacific Ocean, views of the Pacific Ocean are not available looking west from public vantage

points on Wilshire Boulevard in the project vicinity. Similarly, due to the distance from the project site, the dense intervening development, and the curvature of Wilshire Boulevard east of San Vicente Boulevard/Federal Avenue, views of the Westwood skyline are not available looking east from public vantage points on Wilshire Boulevard in the project vicinity. Views of the Santa Monica Mountains may be available from locations on Wilshire Boulevard when looking north along intersecting north/south perimeter streets (e.g., Granville Avenue). However, such views are not affected by project development because the project site is located on the south side of Wilshire Boulevard. Finally, there are no scenic resources located on the project site. Therefore, the project does not damage or obstruct views of visual resources along the Wilshire Boulevard scenic highway.

The project would not substantially obstruct an existing view of a visual resource. Therefore, impacts to views are less than significant. As per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

Cumulative Impacts: The majority of the related projects are located farther south of the project site along Santa Monica Boulevard and beyond, or farther north of the project site along San Vicente Boulevard and beyond. Generally speaking, these related projects are not located sufficiently close to the project site to enter the same field of view as the project. While the potential exists for the proposed high-rise residential building to be seen in distant background views including these related projects, the extent to which the project site is distinguishable among the greater fabric of urban development would be minimal. The nearest related projects are Related Project No. 6 and Related Project No. 7, located approximately four blocks west and three blocks east of the project site along Wilshire Boulevard, respectively. Related Project No. 6 involves the construction of a mixed-use development, including 108 residential dwelling units and 13,000 square feet of retail uses. Related Project No. 7 involves the construction of an office building, including approximately 240,000 square feet of office and medical office uses. Each type of project is consistent with existing uses in the project area. Given the dense intervening development along Wilshire Boulevard, the extent to which the related projects and the project are visible within the same field of view is limited, and likely entails intermittent views of the upper floors of the proposed residential high-rise building. Furthermore, similar to the project, future developments are subject to applicable LAMC requirements, such as height limits, density, and setback requirements, and are reviewed by the City to ensure consistency with adopted guidelines and standards that relate to aesthetics and visual character. Further, many of the related projects in the area represent infill development that is not expected to be out of scale or character with the existing visual environment. Therefore, it is not anticipated that future development will substantially alter, degrade, or eliminate the existing visual character of the project area, including existing visual resources, or introduce elements that substantially detract from the visual character of the area. Thus, project impacts associated with aesthetics/visual character are not cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics/visual character are less than significant. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

Visual and scenic resources within and near the project site include the Pacific Ocean, the Santa Monica Mountains, and the Westwood skyline. The majority of the related projects are located farther south of the project site along Santa Monica Boulevard and beyond, or farther north of the project site along San Vicente Boulevard and beyond. The nearest related projects are Related Project No. 6 and Related Project No. 7, located approximately four blocks west and three blocks east of the project site along Wilshire Boulevard, respectively. None of the related projects is located sufficiently close to the project site to combine with the project and result in substantial view blockage of the identified visual resources. As such, future development in the project area is not expected to cumulatively obstruct public views of visual resources within and in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Project impacts associated with views are not cumulatively

considerable, and cumulative impacts associated with views are less than significant. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

## 2. Light or Glare

Construction Impacts: Lighting needed during project construction has the potential to generate light spillover to off-site sensitive land uses in the project vicinity, including the residential uses directly west and south of the project site. However, construction activities will occur in accordance with the provisions of LAMC Section 41.40, which limits the hours of construction to between 7:00 A.M. and 9:00 P.M. on weekdays and between 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. on Saturdays, with no construction permitted on Sundays. Therefore, construction will occur primarily during daylight hours, and construction lighting is only to be used for the duration needed if construction were to occur during evening hours. Furthermore, construction-related illumination is used for safety and security purposes only, and is shielded and/or aimed so that no direct beam illumination is provided outside of the project site boundary in accordance with Project Design Feature A.2-1. Therefore, light resulting from construction activities does not significantly impact off-site sensitive uses, substantially alter the character of off-site areas surrounding the construction area, or interfere with the performance of an off-site activity.

Daytime glare could potentially occur during construction activities, if reflective construction materials were positioned in highly visible locations where the reflection of sunlight could occur. However, any glare would be highly transitory and short-term, given the movement of construction equipment and materials within the construction area and the temporary nature of construction activities. In addition, large, flat surfaces that are generally required to generate substantial glare are typically not an element of construction activities. Furthermore, as noted above, construction primarily occurs during the daytime hours in accordance with the LAMC. Therefore, there is a negligible potential for nighttime glare associated with construction activities to occur.

With compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of project design features, light and glare associated with project construction will not substantially alter the character of off-site areas surrounding the project site or interfere with the performance of an off-site activity. Impacts from project-related sources of artificial light and glare during construction are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. As per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

### Operation Impacts:

#### (i) Lighting Impacts from the Residential Building

To estimate light levels that result from operation of the proposed residential building, an interior lighting scenario was studied along the south side of the project site that includes residential lighting in the proposed tower’s upper floors and lighting at the ground floor from the building’s amenities. The south side of the proposed tower was chosen as the focus of the interior lighting scenario because it is closest to existing residential uses due to the residential tower’s proposed siting and the narrow width of the alley that separates the existing residential uses to the south from the project site. Additionally, to provide a conservative analysis, the lighting scenario assumed that the building calculation model is within 20 to 25 feet from the property line when, in fact, the proposed setback is up to 94 feet to the property line to the west of the project site. Therefore, the potential lighting impacts at the west property line are likely overstated.

The residential building lighting analysis assumed that a typical evening/night has a residential occupancy of 80 percent (percentage of overall residences with internal lighting turned on during early nighttime hours) and first floor amenities occupancy of 50 percent (percentage of overall

amenities spaces with internal lighting turned on during average nighttime business hours). In order to determine the anticipated maximum amount of light spill onto adjacent properties, the residential building lighting analysis assumed 60 percent as the transmittance factor for the proposed residential tower glazing. Per Southern California Edison (SCE) guidelines, the maximum recommended transmittance factor is 70 percent for daylighting applications and in typical Southern California residential structures. Industry standard practice is to use glass with a 40-50 percent transmittance factor. Residential interior reflectance factors are assumed to be 80 percent for ceilings, 50 percent for walls, and 30 percent for floors. A pool deck podium is anticipated for the project site with well-shielded, low-level lighting proposed for the area. The reflectance of the adjacent asphalt streets is assumed to be three percent, since very little light is reflected back up to the neighboring residential units.

As shown in Appendix D of the Lighting Report included in Appendix C of the Draft EIR, the high-rise residential tower light spill is 0.2 FC or less at the southern property line of the project site, which is well below the 2.0 FC threshold at the adjacent residential properties to the south. Even if the residential tower were to experience a higher occupancy rate during normal nighttime hours than assumed, with the nature of the residential lighting proposed and the distance of the building from the residences to the south (and other light sensitive receptors to the north, east, and west) impacts will continue to be less than significant.

Based on these levels, the ambient light level produced by the proposed high-rise residential tower is less than the current ambient light level produced by the adjacent high-rise apartments. In addition, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

#### (ii) Lighting Impacts from Other Lighting Sources

Additional light sources associated with project operation include low-level exterior lights adjacent to buildings and along pathways for security and wayfinding purposes. In addition, low-level lighting to accent signage (discussed below), architectural features, and landscaping elements will also be incorporated throughout the project site. Project lighting is designed to provide efficient and effective on-site lighting while minimizing light trespass from the project site, reducing sky-glow, and improving nighttime visibility through glare reduction. Specifically, in accordance with Project Design Feature A.2-3, all on-site exterior lighting, including lighting fixtures on the pool deck, will be shielded and directed toward areas to be illuminated to limit spillover onto nearby residential areas. Additionally, in accordance with LAMC Section 93.0117(b), exterior light sources other than signage lighting (discussed below) is designed so that lighting levels produced do not exceed 2 foot-candles above ambient lighting at the property line of the nearest residential property or light-sensitive receptor.

In addition, lighting for the open space area along Wilshire Boulevard is consistent with guidelines established for the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Design Overlay District (CDO). The open space area includes low-level fixture lighting for security and wayfinding purposes, as well as low-level accent lighting for landscape elements.

Proposed signage for the residential building includes monument signage, building identification signage at the entry portico and garage entries, and general ground level and wayfinding pedestrian signage. Signage for the open space area along Wilshire Boulevard includes identification signage and informational signage (e.g., hours of operation). No off-premises or billboard advertising are proposed as part of the project. The proposed signage for the project is either LED back-lit acrylic panel signage or laminated signage with top-mounted hooded LED lighting to reduce potential light spill. In accordance with LAMC Section 14.4.4 E, lighting used to illuminate project signage is designed so that lighting levels produced do not exceed 3 FC above ambient lighting, as measured at the property line of the nearest residentially zoned property.

Additional sources of light include headlights from on-site vehicles. Such lighting is typical of the mixed-use urban character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the size and amount of parking associated with the circulation areas is not greater than existing conditions. Additionally, as is the case under existing conditions, the proposed parking is subterranean, which substantially reduces on-site lighting levels from vehicle headlights. The project maintains the existing on-site driveway off of Granville Avenue. Headlights from vehicles exiting the project are directed toward the residential receptors west of the project site during the evening hours. In addition, there would also be headlights from vehicles exiting the project from the new parking garage exits at the southeast and southwest corners of the project site, which would be directed toward the residential receptors to the east and west of the project site during the evening hours. However, such lighting levels are similar to or less than existing levels because the project results in a net reduction in average daily trips and P.M. peak-hour trips from the project site. Therefore, light generated by headlights exiting the project driveway during the evening hours does not result in a substantial adverse impact. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

### (iii) Glare Impacts

Glare generation is generally associated with sun angles and, although glare resulting from reflected sunlight is frequent at certain times of the year, it can also be produced during evening and nighttime hours by artificial light directed toward a light sensitive land use. New building windows and façades that could reflect sunlight and cause off-site glare impacts will be developed at the project site. Specifically, the project includes floor-to-ceiling glazing consisting of panels with metal and fritted glass. However, in accordance with Project Design Feature A.2-2, glass and building materials are anti-reflective or treated with an anti-reflective coating in order to minimize glare. Nighttime lighting generally consists of identification sign illumination and parking lot security and pedestrian lighting. As required by Project Design Feature A.2-3, all exterior lighting is hooded, well shielded, and light is directed downward. Vehicle headlights are also a source of nighttime lighting. Such lighting is consistent with the character of the surrounding area, similar to existing levels, and largely contained within the subterranean parking garage. Additionally, for the reasons stated above, glare from headlights exiting the project driveways does not result in substantial adverse glare impacts on adjacent receptors. Therefore, project development does not result in glare levels that are excessive or otherwise out of character with the project area. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

### (iv) Conclusion

With the implementation of regulatory requirements and the specific project design features, light and glare associated with project operation do not substantially alter the character of off-site areas surrounding the project site; interfere with the performance of an off-site activity; generate light intensity levels of 2.0 FC or more at the property line of the nearest off-site residence or other light-sensitive use; or produce a light intensity exceeding 3.0 FC at the property line of a residence or other sensitive receptor (for illuminated signage). Therefore, impacts from Project-related sources of artificial light and glare during operation are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. Moreover, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative growth in the greater project area includes 26 known development projects, as well as general ambient growth projected to occur, as described in Section III, Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR. The related projects generally consist of infill development and redevelopment of existing uses, including mixed-use, residential, commercial, office, and institutional developments. Development of the project in conjunction with the related projects in the area introduces new or expanded sources of artificial light and glare. Consequently,

ambient light and glare levels in the West Los Angeles area may increase overall. However, the additional artificial light and glare sources introduced by these projects does not significantly alter the existing light and glare environment that currently exists in the immediate project area. In addition, each of the related projects is required to comply with existing regulatory requirements that address light spill and glare and will be subject to discretionary review to ensure that building designs do not create substantial light spill or glare impacts. Furthermore, the related projects are sufficiently distant from the project site so as not to result in cumulative light spill or glare impacts. Specifically, the closest related project (Related Project No. 7) is located approximately three blocks east of the project site on Wilshire Boulevard and based on its distance from the project site does not result in light spill to any of the same properties as the project. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to light and glare is not cumulatively considerable. Moreover, as such, cumulative impacts with regard to light and glare is less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. As per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts "shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment."

### 3. Shade or Shadow

Shadow-sensitive uses are not be shaded by the project for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time between early March and early November. However, the project shades Sensitive Receptor 1 (the northernmost residential building in the Barrington Plaza residential high-rise community located to the east of the project site) for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. during the winter solstice. Sensitive Receptor 1 is considered to be shadow-sensitive because it includes routinely usable outdoor spaces in the form of private balconies. The private balconies are arranged in four columns on the western elevation of the Barrington Plaza building (one on either end of the building and two in the middle). During the hours of shading, the project's shadow gradually spans across the building so that no single private balcony is shaded for more than three hours. Therefore, the DEIR conservatively concluded that the project shades a shadow-sensitive use for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time between early November and early March. However, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts "shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment."

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative shading impacts can occur when related projects are located sufficiently close to the project site so as to create shadows that overlap with those of the proposed project and affect the same shade-sensitive uses. Based on the location of the related projects identified in the area, as shown in Figure III-1 in Section III, Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR, the related projects are sufficiently distant from the project site so as not to result in cumulative shading impacts. Specifically, the closest related project (Related Project No. 7) is located approximately three blocks east of the project site on Wilshire Boulevard and does not shade Sensitive Receptor 1. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative shading impacts is not cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts with regard to shading are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. In addition, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, aesthetic impacts "shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment."

### 4. Project Design Features

The City finds that the Project Design Features A.1-1 to A.1-6 and A.2-1 to A.2-3, incorporated into the project, reduce the potential aesthetics impacts of the project. The Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

## B. Air Quality

### 1. Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Management Plan

The SCAQMD's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The project complies with all SCAQMD rules and regulations that are in effect at the time of development. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

## 2. Violation of Air Quality Standards or Substantial Contribution to Air Quality Violations

As demonstrated in Draft EIR Section IV.B and Draft EIR Appendix D:

Mass Daily Construction Emissions: Based on conservative assumptions, the mass daily emissions generated during the project construction phase do not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Localized Impacts from Construction Activities: As presented in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, a conservative estimate of maximum localized construction emissions for off-site sensitive receptors does not exceed the localized screening thresholds for CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Construction Odors: As a result of the project applicant's mandatory compliance with applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, construction activities and materials result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to odors.

Construction Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs): The greatest potential for TACs emissions during construction comes from diesel particulate matter emissions associated with heavy-duty equipment during demolition, excavation and grading activities. Potential TAC impacts during proposed construction activities were evaluated by identifying potential sources of TAC emissions. Page IV.B-35 of the Draft EIR identified the greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction are from diesel particulate (DPM) emissions associated with heavy equipment operations. DPM has no acute exposure factors and, therefore, the discussion appropriately focused on long-term exposure that could lead to carcinogenic risk. The SCAQMD Handbook does not recommend analysis of TACs from short-term construction activities. The rationale for not requiring a health risk assessment for construction activities is the limited duration of exposure. According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk. Specifically, "Individual Cancer Risk" is the likelihood that a person continuously exposed to concentrations of TACs over a 70-year lifetime will contract cancer based on the use of standard risk assessment methodology. Given the short-term construction schedule of approximately 30 months, the project does not result in a long-term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions, as disclosed on page IV.B-35 of the Draft EIR. No residual emissions and corresponding individual cancer risk are anticipated after construction. Because there is such a short-term exposure period (30 out of 840 months of a 70-year lifetime), TAC emissions result in a less-than-significant impact.

Mass Daily Operational Emissions: The mass daily emissions generated during project operations do not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Localized Operational Impacts: As shown in Table IV.B-8 in Section IV.B, Air Quality, localized impacts from on-site operational emissions do not exceed any of the applicable SCAQMD localized significance thresholds (LSTs). Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Operational TACs: The project does not include sources of acutely and chronically hazardous TACs such as those that are typically used in industrial manufacturing processes (e.g., chrome plating, electrical manufacturing, petroleum refinery). In addition, no such acutely and chronically hazardous materials are currently used within the project site. As such, the project will not release

substantial amounts of TACs that result in significant impacts on human health. Impacts are less than significant.

Operational Odors: The project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Garbage collection areas for the project shall be covered, and good housekeeping practices to prevent objectionable odors from garbage collection areas. Therefore, potential odor impacts are less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: According to the SCAQMD, individual construction projects that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Air Basin is in non-attainment. Construction-related daily emissions at the project site do not exceed any of the SCAQMD's regional or localized significance thresholds. Thus, the project's contribution to cumulative construction-related regional emissions results in a less-than-significant cumulative impact. Construction of the project also has a less-than-significant impact with regard to localized emissions. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality is less than significant.

According to the SCAQMD, if an individual project results in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts, then the project results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants. Operational emissions from project build-out and the project under existing conditions do not exceed the SCAQMD's regional thresholds. Therefore, the emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated by project operation is not cumulatively considerable.

### 3. Consistency with General Plan Air Quality Element

As set forth in Section IV.B of the Draft EIR, the project is consistent with the General Plan Air Quality Element of the City's General Plan. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

## C. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

1. Construction and Operation Impacts: The project generates GHG emissions. However, even a very large individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions on its own to significantly influence global climate change. Moreover, as set forth in Section IV.C of the Draft EIR, the project is consistent with CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan for the implementation of AB 32, Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15; SB 375, SCAG's Sustainable Communities Strategy, and the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and project-specific impacts with regard to climate change are less than significant. Moreover, as set forth in Table IV.C-4 of the Draft EIR, the existing project site total annual GHG emissions are estimated to be 13,162 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. As Table IV.C-6 shows that the project will only generate 4,057 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually, representing an annual reduction in GHG emissions of 9,105 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

2. Cumulative Impacts: Although the project is expected to emit GHGs, the emission of GHGs by a single project into the atmosphere is not itself necessarily an adverse environmental effect. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHG from more than one project and many sources in the atmosphere that may result in global climate change. The resultant consequences of that climate change can cause adverse environmental effects. A project's GHG emissions are typically very small in comparison to state or global GHG emissions and, consequently, they, in isolation, have no significant direct impact on climate change. The State has mandated a goal of reducing statewide emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, even though statewide population and commerce is predicted to continue to expand. In order to achieve this goal, the CARB is in the

process of establishing and implementing regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions. Currently, there are no applicable CARB, SCAQMD, or City of Los Angeles significance thresholds or specific reduction targets, and no approved policy or guidance to assist in determining impact significance at the project or cumulative levels. Additionally, there is currently no generally accepted methodology to determine whether GHG emissions associated with a specific project represent new emissions or existing, displaced emissions. Therefore, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064h(3), the City, as lead agency, has determined that the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions and global climate change is less than significant if the project is consistent with the applicable regulatory plans and policies to reduce GHG emissions: Executive Orders S 3 05 and B-30-15; SB 375; SCAG's Sustainable Communities Strategy; and the City of Los Angeles Green Building Ordinance.

The Draft EIR illustrates that implementation of the project design features and compliance with State mandates, such as AB 32 and the California Renewables Portfolio Standard, lead to GHG reductions. These represent a reduction from no action taken or "NAT" and support State goals for GHG emissions reduction. The methods used to establish this relative reduction are consistent with the approach used in the CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan for the implementation of AB 32.

The project is consistent with the approach outlined in CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan, particularly its emphasis on the identification of emission reduction opportunities that promote economic growth while achieving greater energy efficiency and accelerating the transition to a low-carbon economy. In addition, as recommended by CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan, the project uses "green building" features as a framework for achieving GHG emissions reductions, as the project is designed to achieve the standards of the Silver Rating under LEED.

The project also complies with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, which emphasizes improving energy conservation and energy efficiency, increasing renewable energy generation, and changing transportation and land use patterns to reduce auto dependence. The project design features advance these objectives. Further, the related projects are also anticipated to comply with many of these same emissions reduction goals and objectives (e.g., City of Los Angeles Green Building Code).

As part of SCAG's 2012–2035 SCS/RTP, a reduction in VMT within the region is a key component to achieve the 2020 and 2035 GHG emission reduction targets established by CARB. As shown in Appendix D to the Draft EIR, the project results in a VMT reduction of 16.5 percent in comparison to the NAT scenario, and is consistent with the SCS/RTP.

Additionally, the project has incorporated sustainability design features to reduce VMT and the project's potential impact with respect to GHG emissions. With implementation of the project Design Features, the project results in a 16.4 percent reduction in GHG emissions from the NAT scenario. The project Design Features and GHG reduction measures make the project consistent with AB 32.

The project is consistent with the applicable GHG reduction plans and policies. The NAT comparison demonstrates the efficacy of the measures contained in these policies. Moreover, while the project is not directly subject to the Cap-and-Trade Program, that Program will indirectly reduce the project's GHG emissions by regulating "covered entities" that affect the project's GHG emissions, including energy, mobile, and construction emissions. More importantly, the Cap-and-Trade Program will backstop the GHG reduction plans and policies applicable to the project in that the Cap-and-Trade Program will be responsible for relatively more emissions reductions, if California's direct regulatory measures reduce GHG emissions less than expected. This will ensure that the GHG reduction targets of AB 32 are met. Also, the project is consistent with applicable land use policies of the City of Los Angeles and SCAG pertaining to air quality,

including reducing GHG emissions. Thus, given the project's consistency with State, SCAG, and City of Los Angeles GHG emission reduction goals and objectives, the project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. In the absence of adopted standards and established significance thresholds, and given this consistency, the project's impacts are concluded to be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

### 3. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Features C-1, C-2, C-3 and C-4, which are incorporated into the project and are incorporated into these Findings as though fully set forth herein, reduce the potential greenhouse gas emissions of the project. These Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

## D. Geology and Soils

### 1. Seismic Hazards

#### (a) Fault Rupture

The project site is not within a currently established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards, but the project site is located within a City-designated Fault Rupture Study Area for the Santa Monica Fault. The site-specific fault rupture hazard investigation concluded that the closest active fault to the project site is the North Branch of the Santa Monica Fault, located approximately 940 feet south of the project site, and that active faults are not present at the project site. Further, additional faulting studies are not required as the North Branch of the Santa Monica Fault is more than 500 feet from the project site. Therefore, no active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the project site, and as such, the potential for surface rupture due to faulting occurring beneath the project site is considered low. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (b) Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

The project site is located within the seismically active region of Southern California. Thus, the project site is subject to strong seismic ground shaking typical of areas within Southern California. The seismic exposure for the project site was analyzed in the Geotechnical Investigation. As with other development projects in the Southern California region, the project will comply with the current seismic design provisions of the 2013 California Building Code to minimize seismic impacts. The 2013 California Building Code incorporates the latest seismic design standards for structural loads and materials, as well as provisions from the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) to mitigate losses from an earthquake and provide for the latest in earthquake safety. Additionally, construction of the project is required to adhere to the seismic safety requirements contained in the Los Angeles Building Code (LAMC, Chapter IX, Article 1). The Los Angeles Building Code incorporates by reference the California Building Code, with City amendments for additional requirements. The Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) is responsible for implementing the provisions of the Los Angeles Building Code. The project is also required to comply with the site plan review and permitting requirements of the LADBS, including the recommendations provided in a final, site-specific geotechnical report subject to LADBS review and approval, pursuant to project Design Feature D-1. Through compliance with regulatory requirements and site-specific geotechnical recommendations, the project does not cause or accelerate geologic hazards related to strong seismic ground shaking, which result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial

risk of injury. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(c) Liquefaction

The State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Beverly Hills Quadrangle indicates that the project site is not located in an area designated as liquefiable. This determination is based on groundwater depth records, soil type, and distance to a fault capable of producing a substantial earthquake. In addition, the project site is not located within an area identified by the City of Los Angeles as having a potential for liquefaction. The soils at and below the basement excavation level on the project site are primarily dense and stiff to hard. Based on these considerations, the Geotechnical Investigation concluded that the potential for liquefaction at the project site is low. Therefore, impacts related to liquefaction are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(d) Seismically Induced Settlement

The nature of the soils at the project site is dense and consolidated. Based on these considerations, the Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed High Rise Tower, 11750 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California (Geotechnical Investigation) prepared for the project by Geocon West, Inc. (March 24, 2014), which is included as Appendix E of the EIR, concluded that the potential for appreciable seismically induced settlements is very low. Therefore, impacts related to seismically induced settlement are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

2. Sedimentation and Erosion

As evaluated in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, project-related construction activities will occur in accordance with erosion control requirements, including grading and dust control measures, imposed by the City pursuant to grading permit regulations. As part of these requirements, the project will adhere to Best Management Practices (BMPs) prescribed as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). With compliance with regulatory requirements that include the implementation of BMPs, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

3. Soil Stability

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the soils underlying the project site consist of Pleistocene age alluvial-fan deposits consisting of gravel, sand, silt, and clay. The Geotechnical Investigation concluded that the integrity of the soils underlying the project site is such that the project could be adequately supported provided the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation are implemented pursuant to Project Design Feature D-1. No soil or geologic conditions were encountered that pose a substantial safety risk during project construction or operation. Furthermore, the existing fill encountered during site exploration is suitable for re-use as an engineered fill, provided any encountered oversize material (greater than 6 inches) and any encountered deleterious debris are removed pursuant to Project Design Feature D-1. Pursuant to Project Design Feature D-1, and as part of the project's site plan review and permitting process, the project applicant is required to prepare and implement a final, site-specific geotechnical report that incorporates the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation. Through compliance with regulatory requirements and site-specific geotechnical recommendations, impacts related to soil stability are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### 4. Subsidence

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the project site is not located within an area of known ground subsidence. No large-scale extraction of groundwater, gas, oil, or geothermal energy will occur under the project. Therefore, the Geotechnical Investigation concluded that there is little or no potential for ground subsidence due to withdrawal of fluids or gases at the project site. Therefore, impacts related to subsidence are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### 5. Groundwater

According to the California Geological Survey, the historic high groundwater level beneath the project area is approximately 20 feet below the existing ground surface. The historic high groundwater level is based on available groundwater records from the early 1900s to the 2000s. Groundwater seepage was encountered in the boring conducted as part of the Geotechnical Investigation within granular layers at depths of 20 and 40 feet beneath the existing ground surface. Prior borings drilled at the project site reported groundwater encountered at depths of 35 to 40 feet beneath the ground surface. Foundation installation for the proposed residential building requires an export of approximately 16,000 cy of soil from below the existing foundation of the parking garage. The existing structure has a drainage system located below the slab-on-grade, which could increase the potential for water to collect in the proposed excavations. In addition, the potential exists for groundwater levels to vary seasonally, and for groundwater seepage conditions to develop where none previously existed, especially in impermeable fine-grained soils which are heavily irrigated or after seasonal rainfall. Accordingly, the project design incorporates recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation to ensure that a temporary dewatering system is installed in the event that groundwater is encountered during excavation, as required by Project Design Feature D-1. The project also ensures that the existing permanent dewatering system, which will be relocated to another location within the proposed subterranean parking structure, are reconstructed to meet the standards outlined in Section 8.5 of the Geotechnical Investigation. The final permanent dewatering system will also be subject to existing NPDES permit requirements, as discussed in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Section IV.E, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR.

Additionally, recent Low Impact Development (LID) requirements promote stormwater infiltration and have the potential to result in shallower seepage conditions and thus affect groundwater conditions in the immediate vicinity of the project site. As discussed in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, the project does not propose infiltration systems as part of its post-construction stormwater runoff management system due to the relatively high groundwater table in the vicinity. Runoff from the project will be directed to planting media distributed throughout the project site to catch downstream flows. There, pollutants will be filtered, absorbed, and biodegraded by the soil and plants prior to discharge into the local stormwater infrastructure serving the project site. Given these design features, potential geologic hazards from groundwater are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### 6. Expansive and Corrosive Soils

According to a prior investigation performed by Leighton in June 1987, the soils at a depth of 40 feet below the ground surface are considered to be "non-expansive" as defined by 2013 California Building Code Section 1803.5.3. As previously discussed, according to the Geotechnical Investigation, buried ferrous metals (e.g., pipes) on the project site could be exposed to corrosion, if additional precautions are not implemented. However, implementation of Project Design Feature D-1 ensures that necessary precautions (e.g., protective coatings, cathodic protection) as determined by a corrosion engineer are taken to avoid premature corrosion of buried metal

pipes and concrete structures in direct contact with corrosive soils, subject to the approval of the Department of Building and Safety. Therefore, impacts with regard to expansive and corrosive soils are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### 7. Landform Alteration

The project site is currently occupied by an approximate 42,900 square-foot, single-story supermarket building; an approximately 357,100 square-foot, 17-story office building; and surface parking and circulation areas. There are no unique geologic or topographic features located on the project site, such as hilltops, ridges, hillslopes, canyons, ravines, rock outcrops, water bodies, streambeds, or wetlands. Therefore, no landform alteration impacts can occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### 8. Cumulative Impacts

Due to the site-specific nature of geological conditions (i.e., soils, geological features, subsurface features, seismic features, etc.), geology impacts are typically assessed on a project-by-project basis rather than on a cumulative basis. Nonetheless, cumulative growth in the project area could expose a greater number of people to seismic hazards. However, as with the project, the related projects (i.e., retail, restaurant, residential, office, and education facility uses) are subject to established guidelines and regulations pertaining to building design and seismic safety, including those set forth in the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. With adherence to such regulations, project impacts with regard to geology and soils are not cumulatively considerable.

#### 9. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Feature D-1, H-4 and H-5, which are incorporated into the project and are incorporated into these Findings as though fully set forth herein, reduce the potential geological impacts of the project. These Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

### **E. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

#### 1. Construction and Operational Impacts of Hazardous Materials, Proximity to a School, and Emergency Response Plan

##### (a) Construction Impacts

##### (1) Hazardous Materials Use and Storage

During demolition and building construction, fuel and oils associated with construction equipment, as well as coatings, paints, adhesives, and caustic or acidic cleaners could be used, handled, and stored on the project site. The use, handling, and storage of these materials could increase the opportunity for hazardous materials releases and, subsequently, the exposure of people and the environment to hazardous materials. However, all potentially hazardous materials will be used and stored in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and do not include materials beyond what are generally used in typical construction activities, thereby reducing the risk of hazardous materials use. In addition, applicable laws and regulations are aimed at establishing specific guidelines regarding risk planning and accident prevention, protection from exposure to specific chemicals, and the proper storage of hazardous materials. The project will be in full compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements concerning the use, storage, and management of hazardous materials. Consequently, there is limited potential for project construction activities to expose people to a substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion

of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard in excess of regulatory standards. In addition, no significant quantities of hazardous substances were noted on-site at the time of the Phase I ESA inspection on November 14, 2013 and no evidence of hazardous environmental conditions was observed on the project site. Therefore, impacts related to the use, storage, and management of hazardous materials during construction is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

## (2) Hazardous Waste Generation, Handling, and Disposal

During on-site grading and building construction, fuel, and oils associated with construction equipment, as well as coatings, paints, adhesives, and caustic or acidic cleaners, could be used, handled, and stored on the project site. Use and disposal of such materials is typical for construction activities. Use of and disposal of hazardous materials during construction shall occur in compliance with manufacturers' instructions and all applicable federal, state, and local requirements. In particular, construction activities will occur in accordance with specific OSHA requirements regarding worker safety and use of hazardous materials, and construction activities will be conducted in accordance with permits and associated conditions issued by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. With compliance with relevant regulations and requirements, project construction activities do not expose people to a substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous waste management during construction are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

## (3) Underground and Aboveground Storage Tanks

Partial demolition of the subterranean parking garage will be completed in order to install a pile foundation system for the residential building. The demolition will occur within an approximately 13,300 square-foot area in the parking garage and require an export of approximately 16,000 cy of soil from below the existing foundation of the parking garage. Six underground storage tanks (USTs) associated with a previous auto sales/leasing facility were removed from the project site in 1961. Subsequent to the removal of the USTs, the project site was redeveloped twice (once in the mid-1960s and again in 1990). To construct the existing subterranean parking garage, 40 to 45 feet of soil was excavated and removed from the project site. Thus, any impacted soil associated with the auto sales/leasing facility and former USTs was removed and disposed of during past excavation activities. Thus, there is limited potential to encounter residual contamination in the subsurface during project-related excavation activities.

The project site is equipped with a 1,000-gallon double-wall steel UST that contains diesel fuel for the emergency generator. This UST is located at the northwest corner of the existing office building, is placed inside a concrete vault, and is not in contact with soil. An on-site reconnaissance conducted as part of the Phase I ESA did not detect any evidence of leaks, stains, or spills from the UST, and no releases have been reported. Below-grade construction activities associated with the project will be confined to an approximately 13,300 square-foot area within the parking garage. The demolition area is located approximately 100 feet from the UST at its closest point. Therefore, there is no potential to encounter the UST or residual contamination in the subsurface (since the UST is not in contact with soil) during construction at the project site. In addition, because the on-site diesel fuel above ground storage tank (AST) is located in the office building, it could not be encountered or affected during project construction. Based on the above, impacts related to USTs and ASTs during construction are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

## (4) Asbestos-Containing Materials

Based on the age of the on-site buildings (constructed in 1990), it is unlikely that asbestos-containing materials are present on-site. Furthermore, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1403, the applicant shall be required to conduct a comprehensive asbestos survey prior to demolition, subject to approval by the LADBS. In the unlikely event that asbestos-containing materials are found within areas proposed for demolition (e.g., the retail building), suspect materials will be removed by a certified asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations. Therefore, impacts related to asbestos-containing materials are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (5) Lead-Based Paint

Based on the age of the on-site buildings (constructed in 1990), it is unlikely that lead-based paint is present on-site. In the unlikely event that lead-based paint is found within areas proposed for demolition, suspect materials will be removed in accordance with procedural requirements and regulations for the proper removal and disposal of lead-based paint. Therefore, impacts related to lead-based paint are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (6) Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Based on the age of the on-site equipment (constructed in 1990), and the conditions observed on-site, it is unlikely that PCBs are present on-site. In the unlikely event that PCBs are found within areas proposed for demolition, suspect materials shall be removed in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, impacts related to PCBs are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (7) Oil Wells and Methane Gas

The project site is not within a designated Methane Zone or Methane Buffer Zone. There are no oil wells on the project site, and the project site is not located within an oil field. Therefore, the potential for construction of the project to result in the accidental release or upset of subsurface methane or oil is negligible. Impacts related to oil wells and methane gas during construction are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (8) Other Site Conditions

The project will require dewatering during construction. Discharges from dewatering operations can contain high levels of fine sediments, which if not properly treated, could lead to exceedence of the NPDES requirements. The project requires the relocation of the existing groundwater sump pump and filtration system that is currently maintained under General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004 to another area within the subterranean parking garage. Pursuant to Project Design Feature F-4 in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, the temporary pump and filtration system comply with all relevant NPDES requirements related to construction and discharges from dewatering operations, including treatment and monitoring consistent with the requirements of the current permanent dewatering system. Therefore, impacts associated with dewatering during construction are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

The project requires the installation of a pile foundation system within a portion of the subterranean parking garage, which requires an export of approximately 16,000 cy of soil from below the existing foundation of the parking garage. A former dry cleaner operated on the project site from at least 1970 until approximately 1985. While it is not known whether PCE was used on-site in connection with this dry cleaning facility, in 1990 the project site was redeveloped to construct the existing improvements and 40 to 45 feet of soil was excavated and removed to construct the existing parking garage. Thus, any impacted soil associated with the former dry cleaner was likely removed and disposed of. Furthermore, as noted in the Phase I ESA, current

and former on-site dry cleaning tenants also operated in the existing office building in 2003 and in 2008-2012. However, these tenants consisted of drop-off cleaners. No dry cleaning activities have been conducted on-site since 1990 when the existing on-site buildings were constructed. Thus, the potential to encounter residual contamination in the subsurface during project-related excavation activities is considered to be very low. In the unlikely event that contaminated soil is found, the soil shall be removed and remediated at an approved disposal facility in accordance with regulatory requirements. Therefore, impacts related to subsurface contamination from the previous on-site dry cleaner during construction are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (9) Emergency Response

According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the project site is not located along a designated disaster route. The nearest disaster routes are San Vicente Boulevard approximately 0.5 mile to the north and Santa Monica Boulevard approximately 0.5 mile to the south. Project construction is confined to the immediate vicinity of the project site and, therefore, will not interfere with these routes or have a significant impact on the City's emergency evacuation plan. However, construction activities could increase response times for emergency vehicles traveling to the project site and nearby uses along surrounding streets. As part of the project, a construction management plan and haul truck route program shall be implemented during construction to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic and ensure that adequate and safe access remains available to, from and within the project site during construction activities (refer to Project Design Features J-1 and J-2 in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR). The construction management plan and haul truck route program are subject to review and approval by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). Therefore, construction of the project is not anticipated to significantly impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, any adopted or on-site emergency response or evacuation plans and impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

#### (b) Operation Impacts

##### (1) Hazardous Materials Use and Storage

Operation of the project will involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of those used in residential developments, including cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, and other materials used for landscaping. Because of the intensity of the proposed residential uses, hazardous materials will be used and stored on-site at similar levels to that of the previously existing supermarket uses. However, all potentially hazardous materials will be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Any risks associated with these materials are adequately reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. Therefore, as the project complies with applicable regulations and does not expose persons to substantial risk resulting from the release of hazardous materials or exposure to health hazards in excess of regulatory standards, impacts associated with the use of these hazardous substances during operation of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

##### (2) Hazardous Waste Generation, Handling, and Disposal

The extent to which hazardous materials will be used and stored on-site and hazardous wastes will be disposed of will be similar to operation of the existing supermarket building. Specifically, activities involving the handling and disposal of hazardous wastes on-site will occur in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements concerning the handling and disposal of hazardous waste. Further, hazardous wastes shall continue to be properly stored and conveyed to licensed waste treatment, disposal, or recycling facilities. Therefore, with compliance with relevant regulations and requirements, operational activities do not expose people to a substantial risk resulting from hazardous waste, handling and disposal. Thus, impacts during operation of the project are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(3) Underground and Aboveground Storage Tanks

The existing UST and AST that store diesel fuel for the emergency generator will remain with implementation of the project. As noted in the Phase I ESA, the UST is equipped with an electronic leak detection system that is regularly monitored by trained personnel, and has passed all required tests and certifications. The UST and AST operate in compliance with applicable regulations. No evidence of leaks, stains, or spills was observed as part of the Phase I ESA investigation, and no releases have been reported. The Phase I ESA concluded that the UST and AST do not represent a significant environmental concern. Existing monitoring and regulatory compliance enforcement efforts shall continue with implementation of the project. Therefore, the UST and AST will not expose people to substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard in excess of regulatory standards. Impacts associated with USTs and ASTs are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(4) Asbestos-Containing Materials

Development of the project includes the use of commercially sold construction materials that do not contain asbestos or asbestos-containing materials. Project construction is therefore not anticipated to increase the occurrence of friable asbestos or asbestos-containing materials at the project site. Operation of the new development proposed at the project site does not include asbestos or asbestos-containing materials and does not expose persons to friable asbestos. As such, operation of the project upon completion does not expose people to substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Thus, impacts associated with asbestos-containing materials during operation of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

(5) Lead-Based Paint

Development of the project includes the use of commercially sold construction materials that do not include lead-based paint. Project development is therefore not anticipated to increase the occurrence of lead-based paint at the project site. Operation of the new development proposed at the project site will not expose persons to lead-based paint, as no lead-based paints shall be used. As such, the project does not expose people to substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Thus, impacts associated with lead-based paint during operation of the project are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(6) Polychlorinated Biphenyls

In accordance with existing regulations, the new electrical systems to be installed as part of the project do not contain PCBs. Therefore, during operation of the project, maintenance of such electrical systems will not expose people to PCBs. In addition, the project applicant shall comply

with applicable laws regulating PCBs. Therefore, impacts related to PCBs during project operation are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

(7) Oil Wells and Methane Gas

The project site is not within a designated Methane Zone or Methane Buffer Zone. There are no oil wells on the project site, and the project site is not located within an oil field. Therefore, the project does not expose people to a substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of oil or methane gas, or from exposure to a health hazard associated with oil or methane gas, in excess of regulatory standards. Impacts during operation of the project are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(8) Other Site Conditions

The project requires the relocation and reconstruction of the existing groundwater sump pump and filtration system that is currently maintained under General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004 to another area within the subterranean parking garage. The NPDES permit requires monthly, quarterly, and annual sampling in accordance with appropriate EPA procedures. According to the latest sampling records documented in the Phase I ESA, all constituent pollutants, including VOCs, were found to be below the effluent limits established in the NPDES permit. Thus, the Phase I ESA concluded that the dewatering system does not represent a significant environmental concern. Existing monitoring and regulatory compliance enforcement efforts will continue with implementation of the project. Therefore, impacts associated with the dewatering system are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

(9) Emergency Response

Existing emergency response and evacuation plans will be updated and/or new plans created, as appropriate, to include operation of the project. As discussed in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, traffic generated by the project does not result in significant impacts to project area intersections, including intersections along the City-designated disaster routes along San Vicente Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard, based on LADOT criteria. Furthermore, the drivers of emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Therefore, it is not anticipated that project operations significantly impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with, any adopted or on-site emergency response or evacuation plans or a federal, state, or local agency's emergency evacuation plan. As such, impacts associated with emergency response and emergency evacuation plans are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Cumulative Impacts:** The related projects in the vicinity of the project site include retail, restaurant, residential, office, and educational facility uses. Operation of these related projects can reasonably be expected to involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of those used in residential and commercial developments, including cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, and other materials used for landscaping. However, all future development located within the vicinity of the project site shall be subject to the same local, regional, state, and federal regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials. It is expected that all potentially hazardous materials shall be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Any risks associated with these materials is adequately reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. Therefore, with full compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules and regulations, cumulative impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

## **F. Hydrology and Water Quality**

### **1. Surface Water Quality, Groundwater, Surface Water Flood Hazards, Hydrology/Drainage**

#### **(a) Construction**

##### **(1) Surface Water Hydrology**

Construction activities for the project includes demolition of the one-story supermarket building and hardscape and landscape around that structure, while preserving the office building and four-level underground parking structure. Construction of the 34-story residential building and the approximately 40,544 square-foot open space area follows demolition. These activities have the potential to temporarily alter existing surface drainage patterns and flows on the project site by diverting existing surface flows. The project requires the relocation and reconstruction of the existing groundwater sump pump and filtration system that is currently maintained under General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004 to another area within the subterranean parking garage. During construction, temporary pumps and filtration shall be utilized in compliance with the NPDES permit to collect and treat surface flows from drainage area B, as well as rainwater that directly enter the below-grade parking structure after the supermarket is demolished and before the residential building is constructed.

The project shall comply with all applicable City grading permit regulations that require necessary measures, plans, and inspections to reduce sedimentation and erosion. Thus, through compliance with all NPDES groundwater discharge requirements (related to the dewatering system), implementation of BMPs, and compliance with applicable City grading regulations, the project does not substantially alter the project site drainage patterns in a manner that results in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding on- or off-site. Similarly, adherence to standard compliance measurements in construction activities ensures that during construction the project does not cause flooding, substantially increase or decrease the amount of surface water flow from the project site into a water body, or result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water. Finally, as the existing project site is almost entirely impervious and remains so during the majority of the construction period, construction activities have a minimal effect on drainage patterns. As such, construction-related impacts to surface water hydrology are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

##### **(2) Surface Water Quality**

Construction activities such as earth moving, maintenance/operation of construction equipment, dewatering, and handling/storage/disposal of materials could contribute to pollutant loading in stormwater runoff. A SWPPP shall be prepared pursuant to Section 99.05.106 of the Los Angeles Green Building Code that includes a menu of BMPs that may include the following: sandbags; storm drain inlets protection; stabilized construction entrance/exit; wind erosion control; and stockpile management.

The project requires dewatering during construction. Discharges from dewatering operations can contain high levels of fine sediments, which if not properly treated, lead to exceedance of the NPDES requirements. The project requires the relocation and reconstruction of the existing groundwater sump pump and filtration system that is currently maintained under General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004 to another area within the subterranean parking garage. The temporary pumps and filtration system shall comply with all relevant NPDES requirements related to construction and discharges from dewatering operations including treatment and monitoring consistent with the requirements of the current permanent dewatering system. Additionally, excavation is anticipated in an approximately 13,300 square-foot area below the parking structure's lowest level to provide for foundation reinforcement to support the proposed high-rise

structure. On-site watering activities to control dust (e.g., water trucks, sweepers, watering of soils) could contribute to pollutant loading in runoff. Such activities will be limited to the parking garage, and runoff will be contained within the garage limits and managed during construction through the use of the temporary dewatering pumps and filtration system.

Through compliance with NPDES requirements and City grading regulations, including the implementation of BMPs, construction of the project does not result in discharge that cause: (1) pollution which alters the quality of the water of the State (i.e., Santa Monica Bay) to a degree which unreasonably affects beneficial uses of the waters; (2) contamination of the quality of the water of the State by waste to a degree which creates a hazard to the public health through poisoning or through the spread of diseases; or (3) nuisance that is injurious to health; affect an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons; and occurs during or as a result of the treatment or disposal of wastes. Furthermore, construction of the project does not result in discharges that cause regulatory standards to be violated in Santa Monica Bay. As such, construction-related impacts to surface water quality are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

### (3) Groundwater Hydrology

The project site does not contain water supply wells, nor do any wells exist within 1 mile of the project site. The project does not include the construction of water supply wells. Additionally, project construction does not reduce groundwater recharge rates since no appreciable recharge occurs on-site.

Development of the 34-story residential high-rise building over the existing underground parking structure requires demolition and reconstruction of portions of the subterranean parking structure. Excavation is anticipated in an approximately 13,300 square-foot area below the parking structure's lowest level to provide for foundation reinforcement to support the proposed high-rise structure. Groundwater encountered during excavation will be directed to the temporary dewatering system and discharged in accordance with NPDES permit requirements. Operation of the temporary dewatering system will have a minimal effect on local groundwater hydrology in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The purpose of dewatering operations is to protect existing and proposed building structures on-site. As is the case under existing conditions, groundwater pumping will be limited to the top 10 to 15 feet of the groundwater table (based on the historic high groundwater level). As such, regional impacts to groundwater flow and level are not considered to be significant. Therefore, as project construction will not adversely impact the rate or direction of flow of groundwater, result in appreciable changes to groundwater recharge capacity, or affect water supply wells, the project impacts on groundwater hydrology are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

### (4) Groundwater Quality

The project includes excavation in an approximately 13,300 square-foot area below the parking structure's lowest level to provide for foundation reinforcement to support the proposed high-rise structure. The project requires dewatering during construction. Discharges from dewatering operations can contain high levels of fine sediments, which if not properly treated, could lead to exceedance of NPDES requirements. The project requires the relocation and reconstruction of the existing groundwater sump pump and filtration system that is currently maintained under General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004 to another area within the subterranean parking garage. Therefore, during construction, temporary pumps and filtration shall be utilized in compliance with the NPDES permit. The temporary system shall comply with all relevant NPDES requirements related to construction and discharges from dewatering operations, including treatment and monitoring consistent with the requirements of the current permanent dewatering system.

Contaminated soil, if present, has the potential to adversely impact the quality of groundwater. A former dry cleaner operated on the project site from at least 1970 until approximately 1985. In 1990, the project site was redeveloped to construct the existing improvements, and 40 to 45 feet of soil was excavated and removed from the project site to construct the existing parking garage. Thus, any impacted soil associated with the former dry cleaner was likely removed and disposed of. Based on the project site's redevelopment history and quarterly groundwater monitoring associated with the dewatering system in the parking garage, the former historical dry cleaner on-site is no longer considered a recognized environmental condition. In the unlikely event that contaminated soil is found, the soil will be captured and removed from the project site and remediated at an approved disposal facility in accordance with DTSC and or/Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) requirements regarding containment and disposal.

Surface contaminants also have the potential to adversely impact the quality of groundwater. During on-site grading and building construction, hazardous materials, such as fuels, paints, solvents, and concrete additives, could be used, and require proper management and, in some cases, disposal. The management of any resultant hazardous wastes could increase the opportunity for hazardous materials releases into groundwater. As discussed in Section IV.E, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements concerning the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous waste reduce the potential for the construction of the project to release contaminants into groundwater that could affect existing contaminants, expand the area or increase the level of groundwater contamination, or cause a violation of regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well. In addition, as there are no groundwater production wells or public water supply wells within 1 mile of the project site, construction activities are not anticipated to affect existing wells. Accordingly, project impacts on groundwater quality are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(b) Operation

(1) Surface Water Hydrology

The project site is currently developed with a one-story supermarket building, a 17-story office building, a paved parking lot and circulation areas, and a four-level below-grade parking structure spanning the project site. The project site has approximately 94.6 percent impervious surface coverage. Development of the project reduces the amount of impervious surface area on-site to approximately 64.8 percent. While there is a reduction in impervious surface area, there will be no incremental change in runoff volumes that flow into the existing storm drain system and the flow patterns and discharge points under existing conditions will be generally maintained. As such, the project does not result in an incremental impact on flooding during a 50-year storm event, nor substantially reduce or increase the amount of surface water in a water body, nor result in a permanent adverse change to the movement of surface water that results in an incremental effect on the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Thus, operation of the project results in a less-than-significant impact on surface water hydrology, and no mitigation measures are required.

(2) Surface Water Quality

The project decreases the percentage of impervious surface area on-site compared to existing conditions. Under existing conditions, most runoff from the project site is discharged without any controls. In order to comply with LID requirements, the project implements BMPs to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff from the project site. Furthermore, feasibility screening methods delineated in the LID manual were applied to determine which BMPs best suit the project. Based on the screening criteria, infiltration is not considered feasible at the project site due to the relatively high groundwater and the proximity of the existing and proposed

structures to the groundwater. In addition, there is not a sufficient amount of proposed landscaping to justify the use of a stormwater capture system for irrigation reuse. The project therefore implements High Efficient Biofiltration Systems as the proposed means of stormwater management. Accordingly, project runoff from all on-site drainage areas is directed to planting media where pollutants are filtered, absorbed, and biodegraded by the soil and plants prior to discharge to City storm drains.

Due to the incorporation of the LID Flow-Through Planter BMPs, operation of the project does not result in discharges that cause: (1) pollution which alters the quality of the waters of the State (i.e., Santa Monica Bay) to a degree which unreasonably affects beneficial uses of the waters; (2) contamination of the quality of the waters of the State by waste to a degree which creates a hazard to the public health through poisoning or through the spread of diseases; or (3) nuisance that is injurious to health; affect an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons; and occurs during or as a result of the treatment or disposal of wastes. Furthermore, operation of the project does not result in discharges that cause regulatory standards to be violated. Therefore, impacts to surface water quality are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(c) Cumulative Impacts:

(1) Surface Water Hydrology

The Ballona Creek Watershed is the geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis on surface water hydrology. The project in conjunction with forecasted growth in the Ballona Creek Watershed could cumulatively increase stormwater runoff flows. However, the project has no net impact on stormwater flows. Therefore, the project does not contribute to cumulative impacts to surface water hydrology. Also, in accordance with City requirements, related projects and other future development projects are required to implement BMPs to manage stormwater in accordance with LID guidelines. Furthermore, the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works reviews each future development project on a case-by-case basis to ensure sufficient local and regional infrastructure is available to accommodate stormwater runoff. As such, cumulative impacts are less than significant.

(2) Surface Water Quality

Future growth in the Ballona Creek Watershed is subject to NPDES requirements relating to water quality for both construction and operation. In addition, since the project site is located in a highly urbanized area, future land use changes or development are not likely to cause substantial changes in regional surface water quality. In addition, the project does not have an adverse impact on water quality, and improves the quality of on-site flows due to new BMPs that collect, treat, and discharge runoff from the project site. Also, it is anticipated that the project and other future development projects will be subject to LID SUSMP and/or SWPPP requirements and implementation of measures to comply with total maximum daily loads (TMDLs). Increases in regional controls associated with other elements of the MS4 Permit improve regional water quality over time. Therefore, based on the fact that the project does not have an adverse impact, and given the project's and the related projects' compliance with all applicable laws, rules and regulations, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to surface water quality is not cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts are less than significant.

(3) Groundwater Hydrology

Cumulative groundwater hydrology impacts result from the overall utilization of groundwater basins located in proximity to the project site and the related projects. In addition, interruptions to existing hydrology flow by dewatering operations of underground water have the potential to affect

groundwater levels. Any calculation of the extent to which the related projects extract or otherwise directly use groundwater is speculative. However, no water supply wells, spreading grounds, or injection wells are located within a 1-mile radius of the project site.

The purpose of the project's dewatering operations is to protect both existing and proposed building structures, and groundwater pumping is limited to the top 10 to 15 feet of the groundwater table (based on the historic high groundwater level). As is the case under existing conditions, the dewatering system under the project will not operate at all times and shall only be activated when the level of the water reaches the permitted level that initiates the dewatering operations. While periodic dewatering has the potential to have a minimal effect on groundwater hydrology locally at the project site, dewatering operations at such a localized level do not have the potential to affect regional groundwater hydrology. Furthermore, dewatering operations are already conducted at the project site, and the amount of dewatering does not increase with implementation of the project. Therefore, there is no incremental change in the average volume of groundwater pumped from the project site.

Other proposed projects within the groundwater basin will likely incorporate structural designs for subterranean levels that are able to withstand hydrostatic forces and incorporate comprehensive waterproofing systems in accordance with current industry standards and construction methods. If any of the related projects require permanent dewatering systems, such systems will be regulated by the SWRCB permit requirements. Should excavation for other related projects extend beneath the groundwater level, temporary groundwater dewatering systems will be designed and implemented in accordance with SWRCB permit requirements. Similar to the project, dewatering operations are limited to localized impacts to the groundwater level. Based on the above, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to groundwater hydrology is not cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts are less than significant.

#### (4) Groundwater Quality

Compliance with all applicable existing regulations at the project site prevent the project from affecting or expanding any potential areas affected by contamination, increasing the level of contamination, or causing regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well to be violated, as defined in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15 and the Safe Drinking Water Act. As with the project, the related projects are unlikely to cause or increase groundwater contamination because of compliance with existing statutes and regulations. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to groundwater quality is not cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts are less than significant.

### **G. Land Use and Planning**

#### 1. Community Division, Compatibility and Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

**Community Division and Land Use Compatibility:** As set forth in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project does not physically divide an established community because it is being constructed on a site that has already been developed. The project site is currently occupied by an approximately 42,900 square-foot, single-story supermarket building; an approximate 357,100 square-foot, 17-story office building; and surface parking and circulation areas. The surrounding area is highly urbanized and includes a mix of low- to high-rise buildings containing a variety of land uses. In general, high-density commercial, retail, and office uses front Wilshire Boulevard in the vicinity of the project site, transitioning to lower density multi-family residential neighborhoods to the north and south of the Wilshire Boulevard commercial corridor. No existing streets will be eliminated and no existing residents will be displaced. Thus, the development does not separate the community from those elements that establish the area as a community.

The residential land use proposed by the project is compatible with and complements existing and future development in the project area. While the project increases the density, scale, and height of development on the project site, these changes are not out of character with the surrounding area, which is a highly urbanized neighborhood that is characterized by a varied mix of land uses at various scales of development. In general, high-density commercial, retail, and office uses front Wilshire Boulevard in the vicinity of the project site. The project maintains this pattern of land use distribution by focusing high-density development along Wilshire Boulevard. In terms of land use type and building height, massing, and scale, the proposed high-rise building is similar to and compatible with the three high-rise residential buildings immediately east of the project site across Stoner Avenue. The proposed open space area also complements the surrounding urban environment by providing a publicly accessible destination for passive recreational use for the locale.

The discretionary actions required for the project do not promote development that is incompatible with the surrounding community. The requested zone change from [Q]C2-2-CDO to (T)(Q)C2-2-CDO adds a T classification to the project site's zoning designation and adds new Q conditions that replace the Q conditions that were adopted in 1984 pursuant to Ordinance 159,060, the purpose of which was to specifically guide development of the current site plan (e.g., supermarket and office building). The type of land use proposed by the project is permitted within the C2 Zone. The project's use of a density bonus pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25 (which is permitted by-right and is not a discretionary request) maximizes the opportunity for developing residential uses within an HQTA identified in SCAG's 2012–2035 RTP/SCS. Further, the project also maximizes such opportunities along a Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Street (i.e., Wilshire Boulevard) designated in Mobility Plan 2035 and immediately adjacent to a Mixed-Use Boulevard identified in the General Plan Framework. At approximately 134 dwelling units per acre, the project's density is not out of character with the surrounding area. For example, the property immediately east of the project site is developed with three high-rise residential buildings ranging in height from 161 to 285 feet above grade. The project provides adequate open space to meet the recreational needs of project residents pursuant to Section 12.21G of the LAMC, including an outdoor pool, pool deck, and landscaped terrace that are integrated along the western portion of the residential building, as well as a 2,560 square-foot fitness center, a 1,450 square-foot recreation room, and private balconies. The project also provides an approximately 40,544 square-foot, publicly accessible, privately maintained open space area. With a total of approximately 74,112 square feet of usable open space, the project is compatible with surrounding land uses. The requested 10 percent reduction in the required parking for the existing office building is consistent with local and regional plans to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips and promote the use of public transit, and does not represent a substantial conflict with surrounding uses. The requested reduced setback on Granville Avenue results in a setback of one foot less than the current requirement (15 feet rather than 16 feet), which does not result in an appreciable difference visually or with respect to the relationship between the project site and surrounding land uses. Furthermore, a 15-foot setback is what is currently provided by the existing parking garage, and maintaining the existing 15-foot setback allows the proposed podium level to align properly with existing development. Therefore, the proposed setback on Granville Avenue is not out of character with the surrounding area.

The project will not substantially or adversely change the existing land use relationships between the project site and existing off-site uses, or have a long-term effect of adversely altering a neighborhood or community through ongoing disruption, division, or isolation. Impacts related to land use compatibility are less than significant.

The project's physical characteristics do not prevent or substantially impair existing adjacent land uses to continue their function since the project includes uses compatible with those of the surrounding area. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies: The development of the project is subject to numerous state, regional and City land use plans and policies, such as the 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the Southern California Compass Blueprint Growth Vision, the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, the City General Plan, the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan, the Plan For a Healthy Los Angeles, the Citywide Design Guidelines, the 2013-2021 Housing Element, and City Planning and Zoning Code requirements. The project is substantially consistent with all land use plans and policies.

Specifically, the project is consistent with applicable objectives and policies in the General Plan Framework Land Use Chapter as shown in Table IV.G-1 of the Draft EIR. The project is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies that support the goals of the General Plan Framework's Urban Form and Neighborhood Design Chapter. The project site's location directly adjacent to a Mixed-Use Boulevard, the walkability of the project area, the project's provision of bicycle parking, and the availability of public transit options provide residents with convenient alternatives to vehicle travel, such as walking and biking. The project includes open space and recreational amenities that promote livability for project residents, including an outdoor pool, pool deck, and landscaped terrace, as well as a fitness center and recreation room in the residential building. Furthermore, the project includes an approximately 40,544 square-foot publicly accessible, privately maintained open space area. As discussed in Section IV.A.1, Aesthetics/Visual Quality and Views, of the Draft EIR, the project is designed in a contemporary architectural style that employs design elements to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses. The height of the proposed residential building is generally consistent with other high-rise buildings in the immediate area, including the high-rise office building on the project site, the high-rise office building immediately north across Wilshire Boulevard, and the three high-rise residential buildings immediately east across Stoner Avenue. As such, the project is compatible with existing development in the vicinity.

The project is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies that support the goals of the General Plan Framework's Open Space and Conservation Chapter, which guides the provision, management, and conservation of the City's public open space resources. Although no public open space exists on the project site, the project increases the amount of open space and recreational uses on the project site. Specifically, the project provides approximately 40,544 square feet of open space consisting of a variety of open space features and recreational amenities available to project residents and guests, as well as an approximately 40,544 square-foot, publicly accessible, privately maintained open space area. Private open space recreational amenities available to project residents and guests include an outdoor pool, pool deck, and landscaped terrace that are integrated along the western portion of the residential building, as well as a 2,560 square-foot fitness center and a 1,450 square-foot recreation room in the residential building. The residential units also include private balconies. The publicly accessible open space area includes seating areas, pedestrian pathways, raised planters, and shade trees. All planting areas are designed with a variety of drought-tolerant, low-maintenance plant species. The open space area will be open to the public from approximately 8:00 A.M. until sunset. Landscape planters and hardscape features are distributed throughout the parking and circulation areas and along building perimeters. In addition, the pedestrian plaza at the main entrance to the existing office building is to be retained. The project's landscaped areas and recreational amenities reduce the demand for open space in the project vicinity and improve the visual character of the project site.

The project is also consistent with the relevant objectives and policies that support the goals of the General Plan Framework's Economic Development Chapter, which promotes continued economic development and investment in targeted districts and centers. Specifically, the project focuses new development directly adjacent to a Mixed-Use Boulevard on Wilshire Boulevard, which facilitates the ability of project residents to patronize local businesses.

The project is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies that support the goals of the General Plan Framework's Infrastructure and Public Services Chapter, which calls for monitoring service demands and forecasting the future need for infrastructure improvements, maintaining an adequate system/service to support the needs of population and employment, and implementing techniques that reduce demands on utility infrastructure or services, where appropriate. There are adequate supplies and infrastructure capacity to serve the electricity and natural gas demands of the project. There are adequate supplies and infrastructure capacity to serve the water and wastewater demands of the project, as well as adequate landfill capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste generation during construction and operation. The City's police protection, fire protection, school, library, and parks/recreation services and facilities are able to adequately serve the project's demand for these services with implementation of mitigation measures.

In addition, the project is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies that support the goals of Mobility Plan 2035, which implements the General Plan Framework's Transportation Chapter. Mobility Plan 2035 presents a guide to the further development of a citywide transportation system which provides for the efficient movement of people and goods. Mobility Plan 2035 recognizes that primary emphasis must be placed on maximizing the efficiency of existing and proposed transportation infrastructure through advanced transportation technology, through reduction of vehicle trips, and through focusing growth in proximity to public transit. The project represents an infill development within an existing urbanized area that concentrates new residential and pedestrian-friendly open space uses along a Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Street (i.e., Wilshire Boulevard). Approximately 13 bus lines serve the project vicinity. The project site is located directly adjacent to a Mixed-Use Boulevard identified in the General Plan Framework. The Mixed-Use Boulevard designation encourages pedestrian-friendly uses that enhance the walkability of an area. In addition, the project provides approximately 447 bicycle parking spaces on-site. Therefore, the project provides residents and visitors with convenient access to public transit and opportunities for walking and biking, which facilitate a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

The project is also consistent with applicable objectives and policies in the West Los Angeles Community Plan as shown in Table IV.G-2 of the Draft EIR; the Los Angeles General Plan Housing Element as shown in Table IV.G-3 of the Draft EIR; and the LAMC as shown in Section IV.G (Land Use) of the Draft EIR.

The project's consistency with the applicable goals and principles set forth in the 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Compass Growth Vision is shown in Table IV.G-4 of the Draft EIR.

The project's consistency with the applicable goals and policies set forth in the Regional Comprehensive Plan is shown in Table IV.G-5 of the Draft EIR.

Therefore, the project is substantially consistent with applicable goals, policies, and objectives in local and regional plans that govern development on the project site. The project is not be in substantial conflict with the adopted Community Plan or with relevant environmental policies in other applicable plans. Impacts related to land use consistency are less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts:** There are 26 related projects in the vicinity of the project site. The related projects generally consist of infill development and redevelopment of existing uses, including mixed-use, residential, commercial, office, and institutional developments. As with the project, the related projects are required to comply with relevant land use policies and regulations. The closest related projects to the project site (Related project No. 6 and Related project No. 7) are located approximately three blocks to the west and east of the project site (respectively) on Wilshire Boulevard. These proposed developments comprise a variety of uses, including apartments, retail uses, office, and medical office uses. The project is compatible with the various

developments planned throughout the surrounding vicinity, as well as with existing uses in the immediate area. While the project in combination with the related projects represents a continuing trend of infill development at increased densities, future development inclusive of the project also serves to modernize the project area and provide sufficient infrastructure and amenities to serve the growing population. Such related projects are not expected to fundamentally alter the existing land use relationships in the community, but rather concentrate development on particular sites and promote a synergy between existing and new uses. Furthermore, as analyzed above, the project's proposed residential use and open space is compatible with surrounding land uses. Thus, the project does not have a cumulatively considerable impact on land use compatibility. As such, the combined land use compatibility impacts associated with the project's incremental effect and the effects of other related projects is less than significant.

## H. Noise

### 1. Operational Noise

#### (a) On-Site Stationary Noise Sources

##### (i) Mechanical Equipment

As part of the project, new rooftop mechanical equipment (i.e., HVAC condenser units) will be located at the roof level. Although operation of this equipment generates noise, regulatory compliance ensures that all on-site mechanical equipment comply with the regulations under Section 112.02 of the LAMC, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Therefore, noise impacts from mechanical equipment are less than significant.

##### (ii) Outdoor Spaces

The project includes an outdoor pool deck and landscaped terrace along the western portion of the residential building. The outdoor pool deck and terrace have a height of approximately 25 feet on Granville Avenue. In addition, the pool deck and terrace are set back approximately 20 feet from the alley to the south and approximately 15 feet from Granville Avenue. The project also proposes the development of a publicly accessible open space area at the northeast corner of the project site. The open space area includes seating areas and pedestrian pathways.

For the noise analysis, it is estimated that up to 300 people could gather at the outdoor pool deck and up to 200 people could gather at the open space area. Both of these estimates are conservative and likely overestimate the number of people that are present within either area at any given time. The outdoor pool areas are shielded to off-site receptors by a solid parapet wall (a minimum of approximately 6 feet high) along the perimeter of the pool deck, and the tower portion of the project at the east side. Reference noise levels of 75 dBA and 71 dBA (Leq at 3.3 feet distance) for a male and female speaking in loud voice, respectively, were used for analyzing noise from the use of these areas. In order to analyze a typical noise scenario, it was assumed that up to 50 percent of the people (half male and the other half female) are talking at the same time. The operation hours for the pool and open deck areas are estimated to be from 8:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. The open space area shall be open to the public from approximately 8:00 A.M. to sunset. Draft EIR Table IV.H-15 presents the estimated noise levels from the outdoor gathering areas at the off-site sensitive receptors. As indicated in Table IV.H-15, the estimated noise levels at all off-site locations does not exceed the significance threshold of 5 dBA (Leq) above ambient noise levels. Therefore, noise impacts from outdoor spaces are less than significant.

Under the redesigned site plan, the open space area will be expanded to accommodate additional persons. Thus, the noise levels from people gathering within the open space would increase as compared to the originally proposed project. The noise level from people gathering within the expanded open space would be approximately 64.9 dBA Leq, at the nearest off-site sensitive receptor (the multi-family residential use on the east side of Stoner Avenue), which is similar to the measured daytime ambient noise level of 63.8 dBA. Therefore, given the existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, and the closure of the open space area by sunset, the noise levels from the expanded open space would not increase the existing ambient noise levels at the off-site sensitive receptors by 5 dBA or more. As such, noise levels from the expanded open space area would not result in new significant operational noise impacts.

### (iii) Parking Facilities

The project retains the existing four-level subterranean parking structure, which will be reconfigured to include 1,090 parking spaces. In addition, the existing surface parking lot will be removed to construct the publicly accessible open space area. Sources of noise within the parking areas primarily include car movement (engine noise), doors opening, people talking, and intermittent car alarms. Noise levels within the parking areas fluctuate with the amount of automobile and human activity. Noise levels are highest in the early morning and evening when the greatest number of people enter and exit the project site. Since the subterranean parking levels is fully enclosed on all sides, noise generated within the parking garage is effectively shielded from the off-site sensitive receptors located in the vicinity to the project site so that the ambient noise levels at these receptors do not increase by more than 5 dBA. Furthermore, driveways within the parking garage will utilize non-squeal surface finishes, as specified in Project Design Feature H-4, to further reduce noise. Surface parking area noise levels are lower compared to existing conditions given the removal of the surface parking spaces. The project also introduces a new circular driveway in the central portion of the project site to provide vehicular drop-off and pick-up for the residential building. The circular driveway could be accessed by only a few vehicles at a time for limited durations and will not generate an appreciable increase in noise levels. In addition, as discussed previously, operational-related noise generated by motor driven vehicles within the project site is regulated by Section 114.02 of the LAMC, which prohibits the operation of any motor driven vehicles upon any property within the City in a manner that causes the noise level on the premises of any occupied residential property to exceed the ambient noise level by more than 5 dBA. Thus, noise impacts associated with parking facilities are less than significant.

### (iv) Loading Dock/Trash Collection Areas

New service and loading docks for the residential building will be constructed at the southeast end of the residential building. Access will be provided from Stoner Avenue and the adjacent alley to the south of the project site. Based on measured noise levels from typical loading dock facilities, delivery trucks (while idling at the loading dock) could generate noise levels of approximately 71 dBA (Leq) at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. In accordance with the LAMC, the design of the new loading dock and trash collection areas includes enclosures to provide shielding from off-site noise sensitive receptors. With compliance with existing regulations, noise levels related to typical loading and unloading activities and trash collection is less than significant.

### (b) Off-Site Traffic (Mobile Sources)

#### (i) Future plus Project

Future roadway noise levels were calculated along 16 off-site roadway segments in the vicinity of the project site. The off-site roadway noise levels were calculated using the traffic data provided

in the project's Transportation Study. Under the project, traffic volumes along some of the analyzed roadway segments are reduced when compared with Future without the project conditions as discussed in Section IV.J., Traffic Access and Parking, of the Draft EIR. However, slight increases in traffic volumes occur along some of the analyzed roadway segments due to differences in traffic distribution. This increase in roadway traffic was analyzed to determine if any traffic-related noise impacts results from project operation. Table IV.H-16 of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the off-site roadway noise impact analysis. The calculated CNEL levels are conservative because they are calculated in front of the roadways and do not account for the presence of any physical sound barriers or intervening structures. As shown in Table IV.H-16, the project results in a reduction of up to 0.4 dBA (CNEL) in traffic-related noise levels along Stoner Avenue, due to the overall net reduction in the traffic volumes. Traffic-related noise levels will not increase at any of the studied street segments. Therefore, off-site traffic noise impacts associated with Future plus project conditions are less than significant.

(ii) Existing plus Project

The analysis of off-site traffic noise impacts above was based on the incremental increase in traffic noise levels attributable to Future with project conditions as compared to Future without the project conditions. Additional analysis was made to determine the potential noise impacts based on the increase in noise levels due to project-related traffic compared with the existing baseline traffic noise conditions.

As shown in Table IV.H-17 of the Draft EIR, when compared with conditions with the supermarket in place, the project results in a maximum of a 0.1 dBA (CNEL) increase in traffic noise along Wilshire Boulevard. However, the Existing plus project analysis is conservative, as baseline ambient mobile noise levels are expected to increase by the time the project is completed. Nevertheless, the estimated increase in off-site traffic noise levels as compared to existing conditions is well below the 3 dBA CNEL significance threshold.

(c) Composite Noise Level Impacts from project Operations

An evaluation of the potential composite noise level increase (i.e., noise levels from all noise sources combined) at the analyzed sensitive receptor locations was also performed. Noise associated with the project's off-site traffic is less than Future without project conditions due to the reduction in average daily trips with the supermarket in place; therefore, traffic noise is not added to the overall composite noise impacts.

The overall sound environment at the areas surrounding the project site includes contributions from each on-site and off-site individual noise source associated with the typical daily operation of the project. Principal on-site noise sources associated with the project include mechanical equipment, outdoor areas (i.e., the private pool deck and terrace and the publicly accessible open space area), and parking facilities.

Table IV.H-18 of the Draft EIR presents the estimated composite noise levels in terms of CNEL at the off-site sensitive receptors. As indicated in Table IV.H-18, the project results in an increase of 0.1 dBA (at Location R5) to 2.6 dBA (at Location R3) at off-site receptors in the vicinity of the project site. The maximum increase of 2.6 dBA is below the most stringent 3 dBA significance threshold. Therefore, composite noise level impacts due to the project operations are less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: The project site and surrounding area have been developed with uses that have previously generated, and will continue to generate, noise from a number of community noise sources, including vehicle travel, mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC systems), outdoor activity areas, and intermittent landscaping maintenance activities. Each of the related projects

that have been identified within the general project vicinity also generate stationary-source and mobile-source noise due to ongoing day-to-day operations. All related projects are of a residential, retail, commercial, or institutional nature, and these uses are not typically associated with excessive exterior noise levels. However, each project produces traffic volumes that are capable of generating roadway noise impacts. Due to provisions set forth in the LAMC that limit stationary source noise from items such as rooftop mechanical equipment, noise levels are less than significant at the property line for each related project. In addition, with regulatory compliance and implementation of the proposed project design features presented in this section, noise impacts associated with operations within the project site are less than significant. With regulatory compliance and based on the distance of the related projects from the project site and the noise levels associated with the project after implementation of the proposed project design features, cumulative stationary source noise impacts associated with operation of the project and related projects are less than significant.

The project and related projects in the area produce traffic volumes (off-site mobile sources) that generate roadway noise. Cumulative noise impacts due to off-site traffic were analyzed by comparing the projected increase in traffic noise levels from “Existing” conditions to “Future plus Project” conditions to the applicable significance criteria. Future cumulative conditions include traffic volumes from future ambient growth, related projects, and the project. The calculated traffic noise levels under “Existing” and “Future plus Project” conditions are presented in Table IV.H-19 of the Draft EIR. As shown therein, cumulative traffic volumes result in a maximum increase of 0.8 dBA (CNEL) along Barrington Avenue, between Wilshire Boulevard and Texas Avenue, which is below the most stringent 3 dBA significance threshold. At all other analyzed roadway segments, the increase in cumulative traffic noise is lower. Therefore, cumulative noise impacts due to off-site mobile noise sources associated with the project, future growth, and related projects are less than significant.

## 2. Project Design Features:

The City finds that Project Design Features H-3 and H-4, which are incorporated into the project and are incorporated into these Findings as though fully set forth herein, reduce the potential operational noise impacts of the project. These Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

### I. Public Services and Recreation

#### 1. Police Protection, Fire Protection, Schools, Libraries, and Parks and Recreation

Police Protection (Construction): Pursuant to Project Design Feature I.1-1, the project applicant shall implement temporary security measures, including security fencing, lighting, and locked entry to secure the project site, during construction. With implementation of these measures, potential impacts associated with theft and vandalism during construction activities are less than significant.

Project construction activities could also potentially impact the surrounding roadways and Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) protection services and police response times in the Project. As discussed in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, access to the project site and the surrounding vicinity could be impacted by project-related construction activities, such as temporary lane closures, roadway/access improvements, utility line construction, and the generation of traffic as a result of construction equipment movement, hauling of soil and construction materials to and from the project site, and construction worker traffic. Although construction activities are short-term and temporary for the area, project construction activities could increase response time for police vehicles along Wilshire Boulevard and main connectors due to travel time delays caused by traffic during the construction phase. However, as discussed

in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, most, if not all, of the construction worker and haul truck trips occur outside the typical weekday commuter morning and afternoon peak periods, reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, a construction management plan shall be implemented during project construction pursuant to Project Design Feature J-1 in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking of the Draft EIR, to ensure that adequate and safe access is available within and near the project site during construction activities. Features of the construction management plan shall be developed in consultation with LADOT and may include limiting potential lane closures to off-peak travel periods, to the extent feasible, and scheduling the receipt of construction materials during non-peak travel periods. Appropriate construction traffic control measures (e.g., signs, delineators, etc.) will also be implemented to ensure emergency access to the project site and traffic flow is maintained on adjacent right-of-ways. In addition, construction-related traffic generated by the project do not significantly impact LAPD response times within the project vicinity as emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic.

Implementation of the project design features above and the construction management plan (Project Design Feature J-1) ensure that project construction activities do not result in a demand for additional police protection services that substantially exceed the capability of the LAPD to serve the project site, and that project construction does not cause a substantial increase in emergency response times as a result of increased traffic congestion. Therefore, impacts on police protection services during project construction are less than significant.

#### Fire Protection:

##### (1) Construction

Construction activities have the potential to result in accidental on-site fires from such sources as the operation of mechanical equipment and the use of flammable construction materials. However, in compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Fire and Building Code requirements, construction managers and personnel are trained in emergency response and fire safety operations, which include the monitoring and management of life safety systems and facilities. Additionally, fire suppression equipment (e.g., fire extinguishers) specific to construction will be maintained on-site. Furthermore, project construction shall occur in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous waste. Thus, compliance with regulatory requirements effectively reduces the potential for project construction activities to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials.

Construction of the project could require temporary lane closures along the project site's Wilshire Boulevard, Stoner Avenue, and Granville Avenue frontages to construct trenching associated with utility installation. Construction activities also generate traffic associated with the movement of construction equipment, the hauling of materials by construction trucks, and construction worker traffic. As such, construction activities could increase response times for emergency vehicles due to travel time delays caused by traffic. However, construction worker and haul truck trips are expected to occur outside the typical weekday commuter morning and afternoon peak periods, reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, a construction management plan will be implemented during project construction pursuant to Project Design Feature J-1 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the project site during construction activities. Features of the construction management plan, which shall be developed in consultation with the LADOT, may include limiting potential lane closures to off-peak travel periods, to the extent feasible, and using flag persons to control traffic movement during temporary traffic flow disruptions. In addition, designated truck queuing, equipment staging, and construction worker

parking areas shall be provided. Since emergency access to the project site will remain clear and unobstructed during construction of the project, impacts related to LAFD emergency access are less than significant.

Thus, project construction does not require the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of an existing facility in order to maintain service. Therefore, project-level impacts with regard to fire protection and emergency medical services during construction are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(2) Operation

(a) Facilities and Equipment

The project site is expected to continue to be served by Fire Station No. 37, the “first-in” station for the project site, located approximately 1.2 miles east of the project site. In addition, Fire Stations No. 19 and No. 59 continue to be available to serve the project site in the event of an emergency.

As no housing currently exists on the project site, there are currently no residents on the project site that generate a demand for LAFD fire protection and emergency medical services. The project includes the development of new multi-family dwelling units which generate a new residential population of approximately 703 persons in the service area of Fire Station No. 37. The project’s population increases the demand for LAFD fire protection and emergency medical services. However, the project implements construction and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, building sprinkler systems, helicopter access, etc. Compliance with these requirements shall be demonstrated as part of a plot plan submitted to LAFD for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit in accordance with Project Design Feature I.2-1. The project design feature together with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements ensure that adequate fire prevention features will be provided. Therefore, impacts with regard to LAFD facilities and equipment are less than significant.

(b) Response Distance and Times and Emergency Access

Pursuant to Section 57.507.3.3 of the LAMC, for land uses in the Industrial and Commercial category, which includes the project site, the required response distance from a fire station with an engine is 1 mile and the required response distance from a truck company is 1.5 miles. Fire Station No. 37 is located approximately 1.2 miles away and is equipped with a task force and an ambulance. Therefore, the project falls within the LAFD’s maximum prescribed response distance from a fire station with a truck company, but outside of the maximum prescribed response distance from a fire station with an engine company. As stipulated in the LAMC, when response distances exceed any of these recommendations, all structures must be equipped with automatic fire sprinkler systems and any other fire protection devices deemed necessary by the Fire Chief (e.g., fire signaling systems, fire extinguishers, smoke removal systems). Therefore, each structure shall be equipped with a sprinkler system in accordance with applicable regulations.

Emergency vehicles access the project site directly from Stoner Avenue and Granville Avenue. As discussed in Section IV.J, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, traffic generated by the project does not result in significant impacts to project area intersections, including intersections along the City-designated disaster routes along San Vicente Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard, based on LADOT criteria. Furthermore, the drivers of emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Therefore, project-related traffic is not anticipated to impair the LAFD from responding to emergencies at the project site or the surrounding area.

Overall, impacts with regard to response distance and times and emergency access are less than significant.

(c) Fire Flow

Domestic and fire water service to the project site will continue to be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). Fire flow to the project shall be required to meet City of Los Angeles fire flow requirements. Section 57.507.3.1 of the LAMC establishes fire flow standards by development type. According to the LAFD, the project is required to have a minimum fire flow of 6,000-9,000 gpm from four to six adjacent hydrants flowing simultaneously. Additionally, hydrants must be spaced to provide adequate coverage of the building exterior and must deliver a minimum pressure of 20 psi at full flow. LADWP has indicated that the existing public water system in the vicinity of the project site cannot supply the required fire flow range. Therefore, pursuant to Project Design Feature K.1-2 in Section IV.K.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water, of the Draft EIR, the project applicant shall coordinate with LADWP to ensure that necessary improvements to the off-site fire water system are implemented so that the system is able to provide the required fire flow, as determined by LAFD. All improvements will be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable City standards, including those set forth in the City Plumbing Code. Additionally, on-site fire water lines, mainline connections, and hydrants will be constructed, as necessary, to comply with applicable City requirements regarding fire flows and to provide fire flow service to the project. With implementation of Project Design Feature K.1-2, the project meets the fire flow requirement and impacts are less than significant.

Schools: Schools that serve the project site are Emerson Community Charter School, Brockton Elementary School and University Senior High School. The total net increase of students as a result of the project is approximately 236 students. Based on existing enrollment and capacity data from the Los Angeles Unified School District (“LAUSD”), Emerson Community Charter School and University Senior High School have adequate capacity to accommodate the new students generated by the project. Specifically, with the addition of project-generated students, Emerson Community Charter School has a seating overage of 359 students and University Senior High School has a seating overage of 1,132 students (i.e., existing seating overages reported from LAUSD minus Project-generated students). Based on existing enrollment and capacity data from LAUSD and with the addition of project-generated students, Brockton Elementary School has a seating shortage of 102 students (i.e., existing seating overage reported from LAUSD minus Project-generated students).

Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, the applicant shall be required to pay development fees for schools to the LAUSD prior to the issuance of the project’s building permit. The payment of these fees is considered full and complete mitigation of project-related school impacts. Therefore, the applicable development fees for schools to the LAUSD offset the impact of additional student enrollment at schools serving the project area. Thus, although Brockton Elementary School has a seating shortage, with adherence to existing regulations, impacts to schools are less than significant.

Parks and Recreation: The nearest park and recreation facilities to the project site are the Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center located approximately 0.7 mile from the project site at 11338 Santa Monica Boulevard and the Westwood Recreation Center located approximately 0.77 mile from the project site at 1350 South Sepulveda Boulevard.

The project proposes the construction of an approximately 40,544 square-foot, privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area in the northeast corner of the project site. The open space area consists of landscaping, seating areas, pedestrian pathways, raised planters, and shade trees.

The project's new residential units introduces an estimated residential population of 703 persons. The population increase associated with the project generates additional demand for parks and recreational facilities in the project area.

The residential building includes various amenities to serve the recreational needs of project residents and guests, including a fitness center, residential recreation room, and bicycle storage area. Thus, while the project's estimated 703 residents is expected to utilize off-site public parks and recreational facilities to some degree, the project is not expected to cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of off-site public parks or recreational facilities given the provision of on-site open space and recreational amenities. The estimated six employees associated with the project's residential building result in a negligible indirect demand for parks and recreational facilities. Furthermore, the project shall pay in lieu fees in accordance with Section 17.12 of the LAMC, the City's parkland dedication ordinance enacted under the Quimby Act. In addition, the project's provision of approximately 40,544 square feet of publicly accessible, privately maintained open space directly serves the recreational needs of the project residents and community. Therefore, the project helps meet the demand in the community for quality open space and there is a less-than-significant impact.

Libraries: The nearest library to the project site is the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library. The proposed project's 376 residential dwelling units result in a net increase of approximately 703 residents. According to the LAPL, the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library's current service population is approximately 35,269 persons. Thus, with the addition of the project's 703 estimated residents, the service population of the 13,740 square-foot West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library will be 35,972 persons, and the library will continue to meet the building size recommendations set forth in the 2007 Branch Facilities Plan (i.e., 12,500 square feet for a service population of 45,000 or less) under existing conditions. With regard to future library service, the population of the City of Los Angeles Subregion is projected to grow by a rate of approximately 2.1 percent between 2013 and 2017. Applying this same growth rate to the service area of the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library, the estimated service population in 2017 is 36,010 persons. Thus, with the addition of the project's 703 estimated residents, the service population of the 13,740 square-foot West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library is 36,713 persons, and the library will continue to meet the building size recommendations set forth in the 2007 Branch Facilities Plan (i.e., 12,500 square feet for a service population of 45,000 or less) under future conditions. Furthermore, the LAPL has not indicated that the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library is currently experiencing any service deficiencies. Overall, with the addition of project residents, the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library will continue to meet the library sizing standards recommended in the 2007 Branch Facilities Plan under existing and future conditions.

In addition, the project's residential units will also be equipped to receive individual internet service, which provides information and research capabilities that studies have shown reduce demand at physical library locations. Further, the project does not conflict with or impede implementation of the applicable policies and goals related to libraries in the General Plan Framework or West Los Angeles Community Plan.

The addition of the proposed project residents does not exceed the capacity of the closest local library to adequately serve the existing residential population based on target service populations or as defined by the LAPL, or substantially increase the demand for library services for which current demand exceeds the ability of the facility to adequately serve the population. Impacts on library facilities are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Cumulative Impacts:

Police Services (Construction): In general, impacts to LAPD services and facilities during the construction of each related project will be addressed as part of each related project's

development review process conducted by the City. Due to the proximity to the project site, should project construction occur concurrently with the construction of Related project Nos. 6 and 7 (located approximately four blocks west and three blocks east of the project site on Wilshire Boulevard, respectively), then specific coordination among these multiple construction sites will be required and implemented through the project's construction management plan, which ensure emergency access and traffic flow is maintained on adjacent right-of-ways. In addition, construction-related traffic generated by the project and the related projects will not significantly impact LAPD response times within the project vicinity as emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on emergency response is not cumulatively considerable.

Fire Protection: The geographic context for the cumulative impact analysis for fire protection and emergency medical services are the service areas of Fire Station Nos. 37, 19, and 59. The project, in conjunction with growth forecasted in the City through the project buildout year, cumulatively generate a demand for fire protection service, thus potentially resulting in cumulative impacts on fire protection facilities. Cumulative growth in the greater project area includes 26 known development projects, as well as general ambient growth projected to occur, as described in Section III, Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR. A number of the identified related projects and ambient growth projections fall within the service areas of Fire Station Nos. 37, 19, and 59. The increase in development and residential service populations from the project and related projects result in a cumulative increase in the demand for LAFD services. However, similar to the project, the related projects are located within an urbanized area and will be reviewed by the LAFD to ensure that sufficient fire safety and hazards measures are implemented to reduce potential impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services. Furthermore, each related project will be required to comply with regulatory requirements related to fire protection and emergency medical services.

Each of the 26 related projects is located within a developed, urbanized area and falls within an acceptable distance from one or more existing fire stations. In addition, each related project within the City of Los Angeles will also be subject to the City's routine construction permitting process, which includes a review by LAFD for compliance with building and site design standards related to fire life safety, as well as coordinating with LADWP to ensure that local fire flow infrastructure meets current code standards for the type and intensity of land uses involved. Furthermore, over time, LAFD will continue to monitor population growth and land development throughout the City and identify additional resource needs, including staffing, equipment, trucks and engines, ambulances, other special apparatuses, and possibly station expansions or new station construction that may become necessary to achieve the desired level of service. Through the City's regular budgeting efforts, LAFD's resource needs will be identified and monies allocated according to the priorities at the time.

Thus, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services will not be cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts with regard to fire protection and emergency medical services are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Schools: The project, in conjunction with growth forecasted in the City through the project buildout year, cumulatively generate students, thus potentially resulting in cumulative impacts on schools. Cumulative growth in the greater project area includes 26 known development projects, as well as general ambient growth projected to occur, as described in Section III, Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR. The related projects generally consist of infill development and redevelopment of existing uses, including mixed-use, residential, commercial, office, and institutional developments. A number of the related projects and ambient growth projections fall within the attendance boundaries of the LAUSD and the same schools that serve the project. In particular,

22 of the 26 Related Projects fall into the feeder pattern that ultimately use University Senior High School. However, as with the project, future development, including the related projects, is required to pay development fees for schools to the LAUSD prior to the issuance of building permits pursuant to Senate Bill 50. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of these fees is considered full and complete mitigation of school impacts generated by the related projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts with regard to schools are less than significant.

Parks and Recreation: Cumulative growth in the greater project area includes specific known development projects, as well as general ambient growth projected to occur. The related projects generally consist of infill development and redevelopment of existing uses, including mixed-use, residential, commercial, office, and institutional developments. Twenty-five of the 26 related projects (with the exception of Related project No. 19) and ambient growth projections fall within a 2-mile radius of the project site, the geographic area analyzed for purposes of assessing impacts to parks and recreational facilities. The Community Plan area is currently underserved when considering the desired parkland standards provided in the Public Recreation Plan. As the population continues to grow within a 2-mile radius of the project area, increased demand lowers the existing parkland to population ratio if new facilities are not constructed.

While it is anticipated that the project's provision of on-site open space will meet the recreational needs of project residents, the project will meet some, but not all, of the parkland provision goals set forth in the Public Recreation Plan. Development of the related projects could exacerbate the Community Plan Area's deficiency in parkland per the Public Recreation Plan's standards. Notwithstanding, as previously indicated, the standards set forth in the Public Recreation Plan are Citywide goals and are not intended to be requirements for individual development projects. Furthermore, as with the project, the related projects will undergo discretionary review on a case-by-case basis and be expected to coordinate with the DRP. Future development projects are also required to comply with the park and recreation requirements of Sections 12.21, 12.33, 17.12, and 21.10.3(a)(1) of the LAMC, as applicable. Furthermore, the project will make a positive contribution toward alleviating the open space deficiency in the community through the provision of an approximately 40,544 square-foot, publicly accessible, privately maintained open space area. As such, cumulative impacts to parks and recreational facilities are less than significant.

Libraries: There are 26 related projects located in the project vicinity. Of the 26 related projects, 16 projects are residential in nature or have residential components. The residential population of a library's service area is the primary metric used by the LAPL for assessing the adequacy of library services and planning for future growth. The LAPL has not established any facilities criteria based on employment in a library's service area. Employees generated by the non-residential related projects are more likely to use library facilities near their homes during non-work hours, as opposed to patronizing the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library on their way to or from work or during their lunch hours. Additionally, students and staff generated by the educational-related projects are more likely to utilize library services provided by their educational facility. Therefore, the non-residential related projects will not substantially contribute to the project's cumulative demand for library services.

As shown in Table IV.I.5-2 of the Draft EIR, implementation of the 16 applicable related projects result in the development of 2,952 new residential units and, based on an average household size of 2.02 persons per household, generate a service population of approximately 5,964 residents. Therefore, the related projects and the project add a total of 6,637 persons to the West Los Angeles Regional Branch Library's estimated 2017 service population of 36,010, for a future service population of 42,647 persons. However, this estimate is likely overstated, as it does not consider that much of the growth associated with the project and related projects is already accounted for in the service population projections based on SCAG projections. Residents from the projects and related projects may also utilize the Brentwood and Westwood Branch Libraries. Even assuming that residents from all 16 applicable related projects utilize the West Los Angeles

Regional Branch Library, with a cumulative future service population of 42,647 persons, the 13,740 square-foot library will continue to meet the building size recommendations set forth in the 2007 Branch Facilities Plan (i.e., 12,500 square feet for a service population of 45,000 or less) in the project build-out year. Thus, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to library services is not cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts with regard to library services are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

## 2. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Feature I.1-1, which is incorporated into the project and is incorporated into these Findings as though fully set forth herein, reduces the potential construction police protection services impacts of the Project.

The City finds that Project Design Feature I.2-1, which is incorporated into the project and is incorporated into these Findings as though fully set forth herein, reduces the potential fire protection services impacts of the project.

These Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

## J. Transportation/Circulation

### 1. Construction:

#### (a) Peak-Hour Intersection Impacts

Pursuant to Project Design Feature J-1, construction truck activity is expected to occur outside of peak traffic hours (i.e., between 10:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M.). Construction workers are expected to arrive before 7:00 A.M. and leave before 3:00 P.M. or after 6:00 P.M. Therefore, no construction related traffic activity will occur during either the morning or afternoon peak periods, and traffic impacts from construction related activities are less than significant.

#### (b) Access and Safety Impacts

During project construction, access to the project site will be maintained via the surface driveways along Stoner Avenue and Granville Avenue. In addition, access will be maintained at all times to the public alley south of the project site, which provides access to loading areas, as well as adjacent properties. An approximately 940-square foot area within the curb lane on Stoner Avenue in front of the existing driveway to the subterranean parking garage will be used for construction equipment staging. It is anticipated that pedestrian sidewalks, including the sidewalk along the Stoner Avenue staging area, will be maintained during construction through either the existing sidewalks/facilities or through temporary walkways, as required in the construction management plan, which is implemented pursuant to Project Design Feature J-1. The construction management plan includes measures to ensure pedestrian safety along affected sidewalks and temporary walkways (e.g., use of directional signage, maintaining continuous and unobstructed pedestrian paths, and/or providing overhead covering). Additionally, minor trenching may occur to install utilities on Granville Avenue and Stoner Avenue. Trenching will occur in limited areas and traffic directed around such activities as required. The trenching-related activities are limited and short-term in nature. Any potential temporary lane closures to accommodate utility work shall be addressed as part of the construction management plan, which is implemented pursuant to Project Design Feature J-1.

Pursuant to Project Design Feature J-1, a construction management plan shall be implemented during project construction to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the project site during construction activities. Features of the construction management

plan, which shall be developed in consultation with LADOT, include maintaining existing access for land uses in proximity of the project site, limiting potential lane closures to off-peak travel periods, to the extent feasible, and using flag persons to control traffic movement during the ingress and egress of trucks and heavy equipment from the project site and/or temporary lane closures. Implementation of the construction management plan minimizes potential conflicts between construction activity and pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the project site. With implementation of the construction management plan (Project Design Feature J-1) and haul truck route program (Project Design Feature J-2), construction traffic impacts related to access and safety are less than significant.

(c) Bus/Transit Impacts

No construction-related activities will take place on Wilshire Boulevard. The transit stops located closest to the project site on the corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Barrington Avenue, as well as Wilshire Boulevard and Westgate Avenue, will be maintained. There are no bus/transit routes on Stoner Avenue or Granville Avenue along the project site. Therefore, project construction does not result in a temporary loss of bus stops or rerouting of bus lines and impacts to bus/transit service are less than significant.

(d) Parking Impacts

Construction: Truck and construction equipment staging, as well as construction worker parking, will be accommodated within the project site and within an approximately 940square foot equipment staging area within the curb lane on Stoner Avenue, in front of the existing driveway to the subterranean parking garage. Project construction is not anticipated to require the removal of, or impair access to, on-street parking spaces along Wilshire Boulevard, Stoner Avenue, or Granville Avenue. Therefore, impacts related to on-street parking during construction are anticipated to be less than significant.

Thus, project construction will not: (1) cause substantial delays and disruption of existing traffic flow; (2) require substantial roadway and/or sidewalk closures to the extent that a hazard to roadway travelers and/or pedestrians could occur; (3) result in changes to bus/transit service such that a substantial inconvenience to riders could occur; or (4) result in the substantial loss of on-site and/or off-site parking such that the parking needs of the project area are not met. Therefore, construction-related impacts to traffic, access, and parking are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

2. Operation:

Traffic volume projections were developed to analyze the existing traffic conditions after completion of the project. Potential operational impacts were analyzed in the Draft EIR through the study of six intersections, in two traffic horizon years (Existing Year 2014 and Future Year 2017) using the City Department of Transportation (LADOT), guidelines and methodologies and the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) Methodology for both signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Based on LADOT's Traffic Study Policies and Procedures, when estimating the project's net new trips, trip credits for an existing use is appropriate, if the existing use was active for at least six months during the past two years. Pursuant to the WLA TIMP, LADOT shall grant a credit for each trip generated by the existing use, if the existing use has been in place and operating for at least one year continuously during the four years immediately preceding the application for the project. The existing supermarket was in operation for at least six months during the past two years and for at least one year continuously during the four years immediately preceding the application for the project. As such, the trip generation forecast shown in Table IV.J-4 of the Draft

EIR reflects the project and the removal of the existing supermarket building. As shown in Table IV.J-4, the project is estimated to generate a net reduction of 400 daily trips, including a net increase of 77 trips during the A.M. peak hour (net reduction of 22 inbound trips and 99 outbound trips) and a net reduction of 86 trips during the P.M. peak hour (net reduction of 22 inbound trips and a net reduction of 64 outbound trips). For informational purposes, the Draft EIR contains a traffic impact analysis assuming no existing supermarket trip credits.

(e) Intersection Level of Service

The intersection level of service analyses for the Existing With project and the Future With project conditions are summarized in Table IV.J-5 and Table IV.J-5 of the Draft EIR. Figures illustrating these traffic forecasts are provided in the Appendix J.1 of the Draft EIR. Regarding Existing Conditions, the project results in minor increases or minor decreases in the V/C ratios at the signalized study intersections, but none of the increases exceed the threshold for a significant impact. In addition, based on the analysis of the unsignalized intersection of Stoner Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard (Study Intersection No. 3), the installation of a traffic signal is not warranted under Existing With project Conditions. As such, pursuant to the thresholds of significance stated above, project impacts during Existing With project Conditions are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Regarding Future With project Conditions, the project results in minor increases or minor decreases in the V/C ratios at the signalized study intersections, but none of the increases exceed the threshold for a significant impact. In addition, based on the analysis of the unsignalized intersection of Stoner Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard (Study Intersection No. 3), the installation of a traffic signal is not warranted under Future With project Conditions. Pursuant to the thresholds of significance above that are based on LOS and a sliding scale of project-related V/C ratios that are reduced as the LOS increases, project impacts during Future With Project Conditions are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

While the Transportation Study assumed that the project will commence operations in 2017 (and thus was used as the analysis build-out year), the projected build-out year for the project evolved throughout the course of preparing the Draft EIR and associated technical studies. Based on the anticipated timing of the City's review and entitlement process, as well as current market conditions in the construction industry, the estimated completion and occupancy of the project was re-assessed and anticipated to occur in the year 2020. Therefore, as referenced throughout the Draft EIR, including within Section IV.J, Traffic, Access and Parking, an Extended Horizon Analysis reflecting buildout of the project in 2020 was included in the Draft EIR. The Extended Horizon Analysis also accounts for an updated list of related projects. The analysis concludes that with a buildout year of 2020, impacts at the analyzed intersections and street segments are still less than significant. Therefore, the supplemental Extended Horizon Analysis does not change any of the conclusions in the Transportation Study or Draft EIR.

(f) CMP Freeway Analysis

Based on the project trip-generation estimates shown in Table IV.J-4 in the Draft EIR, the project is expected to generate approximately 77 net new trips in the morning peak hour and a reduction in trips of approximately 86 net trips in the afternoon peak hour. As shown in Figure 9 in the Transportation Study included in Appendix J.1 of the Draft EIR, there will be fewer than 150 A.M. or P.M. peak-hour trips distributed to the freeways in the project area (e.g., the I-405). Therefore, the project's impacts on CMP freeway facilities are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

(g) CMP Arterial Monitoring Station Analysis

As shown in Figure 9 in the Transportation Study, the project is estimated to generate fewer than the 50 trips during the peak hours at the monitoring stations at Santa Monica Boulevard and

Wilshire Boulevard and at Bundy Drive and Santa Monica Boulevard. Therefore, the project's impacts on CMP arterial monitoring stations are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

(h) Caltrans Analysis

The Agreement between City of Los Angeles and Caltrans District 7 on Freeway Impact Analysis Procedures (State of California and City of Los Angeles, revised January 2016) was reviewed to determine the potential study locations on State freeways (e.g., freeway ramp and mainline segments) that may be required for analysis. Based on this review and as demonstrated by the worksheets presented in the Transportation Study, the project does not meet any of the criteria established, and thus, an analysis of freeway ramps or mainline segments is not required.

(i) Street Segment Analysis

As shown in Table IV.J-7 in the Draft EIR, application of the LADOT significant impact criteria to the Existing With project conditions indicates that the project does not result in any significant impacts at any of the street segments. A net decrease in traffic volumes (i.e., up to 4 percent) is anticipated at the study street segments with the development of the project. As the project results in a decrease in ADT volumes, it can be concluded that the project similarly does not result in significant impacts at any of the street segments in the future conditions. Therefore, the project's impacts on street segments are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

(j) Access and Circulation

The intersections nearest the proposed vehicular access points (i.e., the existing vehicular access points to the plaza level and the access ramp to the subterranean parking on Granville, the existing access ramp on Stoner Avenue that would be relocated, and the new service and loading docks for the residential building would be constructed to the south of the residential building with access from Stoner Avenue and the adjacent alley) are Granville Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard and Stoner Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard. As shown in Table IV.J-6 on page IV.J-45, the signalized intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Granville Avenue is projected to operate at LOS A during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours under Future With project Conditions. The unsignalized intersection of Stoner Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard is also projected to operate at acceptable conditions (i.e., LOS E or better) during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours under Future With project Conditions. Therefore, project impacts with regard to access and circulation are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

(k) Public Transit

As shown in Table IV.J-4 of the Draft EIR, the project is expected to result in a net increase of approximately 77 net A.M. peak-hour trips and a net reduction of approximately 86 net P.M. peak-hour trips. Assuming an AVO of 1.4 and mode split of 7 percent, the project results in approximately eight net new transit trips in the A.M. peak-hour and a net reduction of approximately eight transit trips in the P.M. peak hour.

The project site is well served by numerous established transit routes and these trips are spread across the commuter network. With approximately 31 buses during the morning A.M. peak hour serving Wilshire Boulevard adjacent to the project site, the project results in an average increase of less than one transit trip per bus during the A.M. peak hour, which is a negligible increase. Thus, the existing transit service in the vicinity adequately accommodate the project-generated transit trips during the A.M. peak hour. Because the project is estimated to generate a net reduction in P.M. peak-hour trips, the project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the transit system during the P.M. peak hour. Thus, based on the calculated number of generated

transit trips and available transit capacity, impacts on existing and future transit services in the project vicinity are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

(l) Parking

As shown in Table IV.J-8 of the Draft EIR, based on the residential parking requirements set forth in Section 12.22.A25d(1) of the LAMC (commonly referred to as Density Bonus Parking Option 1) and the office parking requirements set forth in Section 12.21.A4 of the LAMC, the project is required to provide 1,090 parking spaces, including 447 residential parking spaces and 643 office parking spaces. The office parking reflects the proposed 10 percent reduction pursuant to Section 12.24Y of the LAMC for sites located less than 1,500 feet from a transit facility. The project proposes to provide a total of 1,090 parking spaces. Even with approval of the 10 percent reduction for the office use, the project still exceeds the applicable parking requirements of the LAMC. In addition, as per Zoning Information File (ZI) No. 2145 and SB 743, parking impacts “shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”

As shown in Table IV.J-8, the project is required to provide 414 bicycle parking spaces for the new residential use. In total, 447 residential bicycle parking spaces will be provided. Thus, impacts related to automobile and bicycle parking are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

(m) Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Vehicular Safety

The project retains the existing vehicular access point to the existing plaza level off of Granville Avenue. The driveway will be 24 feet wide, which provides adequate width for two-way traffic. A new internal circular driveway will be created at the center to provide vehicular drop-off and pick-up for the residential building and access to the parking garage located within the proposed building. The current two access points to the subterranean parking garage from Stoner Avenue and Granville Avenue will remain the same; however, the existing access ramp on Stoner Avenue will be converted for use as a fire lane only and will feature a sliding gate. The trash collection area are enclosed and not be visible from the residential area to the south.

All proposed driveways will operate with unrestricted movements for both inbound and outbound traffic. Project driveways will be located on low volume local streets. Based on a review of the conceptual site plan, the proposed driveways provide adequate depth and storage to allow vehicle circulation without impeding or disrupting traffic flow on local or arterial streets. Furthermore, driveway designs shall be subject to LADOT approval as part of the City’s standard review and permitting process. While the project retains the existing vehicular access point to the plaza level off of Granville Avenue, the existing access ramp on Stoner Avenue will be converted for use as a fire lane, and new service and loading docks for the residential building will be constructed. The new driveway cuts for the parking garage/loading dock on the southeast corner of the project site are not expected to create pedestrian, vehicular, or bicycle conflicts on Stoner Avenue or the alley adjacent to the project site.

Under the project, there will be four pedestrian access points. There will be a gateway to the park on the corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Stoner Avenue. A second entry to the park is located midblock off of Wilshire Boulevard. Pedestrians will also be able to access the project site through sidewalks located at the Granville Avenue driveway. Finally, there will be another access point for pedestrians off of Stoner Avenue adjacent to the northeast corner of the proposed building. As such, the project improves pedestrian flow through and around the project site. Under the project, bicycle access will be provided via each of the pedestrian access points. Thus, as with improved pedestrian access, the project also improves bicycle access. In addition, the project does not result in physical changes that disrupt bicycle access along Stoner Avenue, Granville Avenue, or Wilshire Boulevard. Furthermore, the project access locations are required to conform to City

standards and designed to provide adequate sight distance, sidewalks, and/or pedestrian movement controls that meet the City's requirements to protect pedestrian safety. Therefore, the project does not substantially increase hazards to bicyclists, pedestrians, or vehicles. Impacts related to bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

#### Cumulative Impacts:

##### (a) Construction

The related projects are dispersed throughout the project area and will draw upon a workforce from all parts of the Los Angeles region. Many of the construction workers are anticipated to arrive and depart the individual construction sites during off-peak hours (i.e., arrive prior to 7:00 A.M. and depart by 3:00 or after 6:00 P.M.), thereby avoiding generating trips during the A.M. and P.M. peak traffic periods. In addition, the haul truck routes for the related projects will be approved by the Department of Building and Safety according to the location of the individual construction site and the ultimate destination. The City's established review process takes into consideration overlapping construction projects and balances haul truck routes to minimize the impacts of cumulative hauling on any particular roadway. Furthermore, as stated in Project Design Feature J-1, the project's construction management plan will take into account and be coordinated with other construction management plans that are in effect or have been proposed for other projects in the immediate project vicinity, specifically Related project No. 7 located at 11600–11620 Wilshire Boulevard and Related project No. 16 located at 10955 Wilshire Boulevard. In conclusion, cumulative construction impacts are less than significant.

##### (b) Operation

The traffic models used in the analysis incorporated forecasted traffic increases due to ambient growth, as well as the related projects. Furthermore, the CMP analysis presented above evaluates traffic impacts on a larger, regional scale. Therefore, cumulative impacts on intersections, the regional transportation (freeway) system, street segments, and access as a result of the project are accounted for in the analysis above. Potential cumulative impacts with regard to these issues were found to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

With regard to public transit, similar to the project, the related projects will generate an overall increase in transit riders. The anticipated increased transit ridership associated with the project and related projects is not expected to exceed the capacity of transit systems. The effect is a positive impact and is consistent with City land use and transportation policies to reduce traffic. Thus, cumulative impacts with regard to transit will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

With regard to parking and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety, it is anticipated that future related projects will be subject to City review to ensure that adequate parking and access/circulation will be maintained in the vicinity of the project site. Thus, cumulative impacts with regard to parking and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

## 2. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Feature J-1 and J-2, which are incorporated into the project and incorporated into these Findings as though fully set forth herein, will reduce the potential construction transportation/circulation impacts of the project. These Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

## K. Utilities

### 1. Wastewater, Water, Solid Waste, Energy Usage

Wastewater: Construction activities will result in a negligible and temporary wastewater generation and are not anticipated to have any adverse impact on wastewater conveyance or treatment infrastructure. In addition, most construction impacts associated with the installation of on-site wastewater facilities and off-site connections are expected to be confined to trenching and will be temporary in nature. Therefore, project construction impacts to the wastewater conveyance or treatment system will be less than significant.

It is estimated that the project will generate a net increase in the average daily wastewater flow from the project site of approximately 41,866 gallons per day (gpd) or approximately 0.04 mgd. As set forth in the Errata, the expanded open space area would result in only a nominal increase in wastewater generation. The Hyperion Treatment Plant has a capacity of 450 mgd and current wastewater flow levels are at 362 mgd, resulting in available capacity of 88 mgd. The project's increase in average daily wastewater flow of 0.04 mgd will represent approximately 0.05 percent of the 88 mgd remaining capacity. Therefore, the project-generated wastewater will be accommodated by the existing capacity of the Hyperion Treatment Plant and a less than significant impact will occur.

Based on the current approximate flow levels and design capacities in the sewer system and the project's estimated wastewater flow, the City determined that the existing sanitary sewer lines that serve the project site will have an adequate capacity to accommodate the additional infrastructure demand created by the project. As set forth in the Errata, the expanded open space area will result in a nominal increase in wastewater generation that will be accommodated by existing infrastructure. No upgrades to existing public sewer lines will be required. Therefore, the project will not cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows. Thus, impacts with regards to wastewater generation and infrastructure capacity will be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Water: Consistent with LADWP's methodology, the analysis of the project's impacts relative to water supply is based on a calculation of the project's water demand by applying the sewage generation rates established by the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, which also serve to estimate water demand, to the proposed uses, as provided in Table IV.K.1 5 of the Draft EIR. As shown, it is estimated that the project will result in a net increase in the project site's average daily water demand of approximately 51,418 gpd, or approximately 57.6 acre-feet per year (assuming constant water use throughout the year). As set forth in the Errata, the expanded open space area will increase consumption by 351 gpd, which is a nominal increase when compared with the projected available water supplies documented by LADWP's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. It should be noted that the project's estimated water demand is conservative, as it does not account for water conservation features. Based on LADWP's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan water demand projections through 2035, as shown in Table IV.K.1 of the Draft EIR, the water demand for the City in 2017 during average year hydrological conditions is expected to reach approximately 629,680 acre-feet. During a single-dry year, water demand is estimated to reach approximately 667,460 acre-feet and during a multiple-dry year period, water demand is forecasted to reach approximately 661,200 acre-feet. As concluded in LADWP's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, projected water demand for the City will be met by the available supplies during an average year, single-dry year, and multiple-dry year through the year 2035, which includes the year 2017. The project's estimated net increase in water demand of approximately 57.6 acre-feet per year will comprise approximately 0.01 percent of the water demand for the City in 2017 during an average year, single-dry year, and multiple-dry year period. Therefore, the project will be well within the available and projected water supplies for normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years through the year 2035 and, as such, LADWP will be able to

meet the water demand for the project. The estimated water demand for the project will not exceed the available supplies projected by LADWP. Thus, LADWP will be able to meet the water demand of the project, as well as the existing and planned future water demands of its service area.

Based on a review of construction projects of similar size and duration, a conservative estimate of construction water use will be range from 1,000 to 2,000 gpd, it is anticipated that the temporary construction water use will be substantially less than the net new water consumption of approximately 51,418 gpd compared to the project at buildout. In addition, the increase in water demand associated with project construction will be temporary in nature. Therefore, the project's impacts on water supply will be less than significant.

Water service to the project site will continue to be supplied by LADWP for domestic and fire protection uses. The Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant ("LAAFP") has a remaining capacity of treating approximately 50 to 150 mgd, depending on the season. As shown in Table IV.K.1.5 of the Draft EIR, it is estimated that the project will result in a net increase in the project site's average daily water demand of approximately 51,418 gpd, or approximately 57.6 acre-feet per year (assuming constant water use throughout the year), which represents approximately 0.03 percent to 0.1 percent of the remaining treatment capacity of the LAAFP. Therefore, implementation of the project is not expected to measurably reduce the LAAFP's capacity, and no new or expanded water treatment facilities will be required.

Pursuant to Project Design Feature K.1-2, the project applicant will coordinate with LADWP to ensure that necessary improvements to the off-site fire water system are implemented so that the system is able to provide the required fire flow, as determined by LAFD. All improvements will be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable City standards, including those set forth in the City Plumbing Code. Additionally, on-site fire water lines, mainline connections, and hydrants will be constructed as necessary to comply with applicable City requirements regarding fire flows and to provide fire flow service to the project. With implementation of Project Design Feature K.1-2, local water infrastructure will have adequate capacity to provide the required fire flow to the project, and will have adequate capacity to provide domestic water flow. Therefore, impacts with regard to water infrastructure will be less than significant.

Solid Waste: It is anticipated that construction of the project will generate a total of approximately 8,993.9 tons of demolition debris and 930.9 tons of construction debris, for a combined total of 9,924.8 tons of construction-related waste generation. In accordance with Project Design Feature K.3-1, the project's construction contractor will be required to implement a construction waste management plan to achieve a minimum 75 percent diversion from landfills. The project will dispose of approximately 2,481.2 tons of construction-related waste in the County's inert landfill throughout the construction period. This amount of construction and debris waste will represent approximately 0.004 percent of the Azusa Land Reclamation Landfill's existing remaining disposal capacity of 59.83 million tons (refer to Table IV.K.3-1 on page IV.K.3-14). Thus, the total amount of construction and demolition waste generated by the project will represent a fraction of the remaining capacity at the unclassified landfill serving Los Angeles County. Since the County's unclassified landfill generally does not face capacity shortages, and the County's unclassified landfill will be able to accommodate project-generated waste, construction of the project will not result in the need for an additional disposal facility to adequately handle Project-generated construction-related waste. Also, since construction and demolition waste will be hauled by a private construction contractor permitted by the City, the project will not result in the need for an additional solid waste collection route. Therefore, construction impacts to solid waste facilities will be less than significant.

Operation of the new uses on the project site will generate solid waste. As shown in Table IV.K.3-5 of the Draft EIR, when accounting for the removal of the existing supermarket, operation of the

project will result in a net increase of approximately 607.9 tons of solid waste generated on the project site annually, or 1.67 tons per day. As a passive recreational use, the amount of solid waste generated by the proposed open space area will be negligible. Assuming that all project-related solid waste is disposed at a landfill, which is conservative given the City's current diversion rate of 76 percent (as previously discussed), the net increase in solid waste disposal associated with the project will represent an approximate 0.02 percent increase in the City's annual solid waste disposal quantity based on the 2014 disposal rate of approximately 3.11 million tons.

Project-generated solid waste will be collected by a private solid waste hauler and taken for disposal at one of the County's Class III landfills open to the City of Los Angeles. As shown in Table IV.K.3-1 of the Draft EIR, the estimated remaining capacity for County Class III landfills open to the City of Los Angeles is approximately 93.47 million tons in 2014. Thus, the project's net increase of 607.9 tons of annual solid waste disposal will represent approximately 0.0007 percent of the 2014 estimated remaining Class III landfill capacity available to the City of Los Angeles. In addition, the project's net increase of approximately 1.67 tons of daily solid waste will represent between 0.013 and 0.09 percent of the remaining daily intake capacity for the various landfills available to the City of Los Angeles. Thus, based on the existing available capacities of landfills that serve the City of Los Angeles, the project's solid waste disposal demands could be met without the need for additional landfill capacity.

Energy Usage: During operation of the project, energy will be consumed for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, heating/ventilating/air conditioning (HVAC), refrigeration, lighting, electronics, office equipment, and commercial machinery. Energy will also be consumed during project operations related to water usage, solid waste disposal, and vehicle trips. Annual energy use has been calculated for buildout of the project and is shown in Table VII 2 of the Draft EIR. As shown in Table VII 2, due to the removal of the existing on-site supermarket, the project is expected to result in a net reduction in energy use of approximately 4,586,301 kWh of electricity per year, 49,839 cubic feet of natural gas per month, 18,153 gallons of diesel fuel per year, and 107,921 gallons of gasoline per year. As such, the project will have a beneficial impact with regard to energy consumption.

#### Cumulative Impacts:

Wastewater: Development of the project in conjunction with the related projects will result in an increase in the demand for sanitary sewer service in the Bureau of Sanitation's service area. Assuming that each of the 26 related projects is tributary to some or all of the City sewers serving the project site, forecasted growth from the related projects will generate an average daily wastewater flow of approximately 938,597 gpd or approximately 0.94 mgd, as shown in Table IV.K.2 5 of the Draft EIR. Combined with the project's net increase in wastewater generation of 41,866 gpd (0.04 mgd), this equates to a cumulative increase in average daily wastewater flow of approximately 980,463 gpd, or 0.98 mgd. The project combined with the specific related projects will result in a total cumulative wastewater flow of approximately 500.98 mgd. Based on the existing and future capacity of the Hyperion Service Area of approximately 550 mgd, the Hyperion Service Area is expected to have adequate capacity to accommodate the 500.98 mgd cumulative wastewater flows. Therefore, cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

Water: The estimated water demand of the related projects is shown in Table IV.K.1 6 of the Draft EIR. As shown in Table IV.K.1 6, the related projects will generate a total average water demand of approximately 1,116,837 gallons per day or 1,252 acre-feet annually. The estimate of the related projects' water demand is conservative as it does not account for water conservation measures, such as the mandatory indoor water reduction rates required by the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code. The project in conjunction with the related projects will yield a cumulative average water demand of approximately 1,168,255 gallons per day or 1,309 acre-feet annually. Based on LADWP's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan water demand projections, as shown

in Table IV.K.1 3 of the Draft EIR, the water demand for the City in 2017 during average year hydrological conditions is expected to reach approximately 629,680 acre-feet. During a single-dry year, water demand is estimated to reach approximately 667,460 acre-feet and during a multiple-dry year period, water demand is forecasted to reach approximately 661,200 acre-feet. The estimated annual cumulative water demand of approximately 1,309 acre-feet per year will represent approximately 0.21 percent, 0.20 percent, and 0.20 percent, respectively, of the water demand for the City in 2017 during an average year, single-dry year, and multiple-dry year period. Thus, the total annual cumulative water demand of approximately 1,309 acre-feet associated with the project and the related projects will be within the available and projected water demand of the LADWP's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. In addition, based on the service area reliability assessment conducted by the LADWP in its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, LADWP determined that it will be able to reliably provide water to its customers through the year 2035, as well as the intervening years (i.e., 2017).

Development of the project and future new development in the vicinity of the project site will cumulatively increase demands on the existing water infrastructure system. However, the improvements to the water system that are required pursuant to Project Design Feature K.1-2 will bring the existing system into compliance with LAMC-required fire flows for the area, and will improve the capacity of the system to serve cumulative demand. Furthermore, new development projects will be subject to LADWP review to assure that the existing public utility facilities will be adequate to meet the domestic and fire water demands of each project, and individual projects will be subject to LADWP and City requirements regarding infrastructure improvements needed to meet respective water demands, flow and pressure requirements, etc. LADWP, Los Angeles Department of Public Works, and the Los Angeles Fire Department will conduct ongoing evaluations to ensure facilities are adequate. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the project and related projects on the water infrastructure system will be less than significant.

Solid Waste: Construction of the project in conjunction with forecasted growth in the County (inclusive of the related projects) will generate construction and demolition waste, resulting in a cumulative increase in the demand for unclassified landfill capacity. The project will dispose of approximately 2,481 tons of construction and demolition waste in the County's unclassified landfill after accounting for recycling pursuant to Project Design Feature K.3-1. The Citywide Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance (Ordinance No. 181,519) requires all mixed construction and demolition waste generated within City limits be taken to a City certified construction and demolition waste processor. As such, it is anticipated that future cumulative development will implement similar measures to divert construction and demolition waste from landfills. Furthermore, the unclassified landfill does not face capacity issues and will be expected to have sufficient capacity to accommodate cumulative demand. Therefore, cumulative impacts on the unclassified landfill will be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Operation of the project in conjunction with forecasted growth in the County (inclusive of the related projects) will generate municipal solid waste and result in a cumulative increase in the demand for waste disposal capacity at Class III landfills. As previously stated, the countywide demand for landfill capacity is continually evaluated by the County through preparation of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Reports. Each Annual Report assesses future landfill disposal needs over a 15-year planning horizon. As such, the 2014 Annual Report projects waste generation and available landfill capacity through 2029. Per the 2014 Annual Report, the forecasted 2017 waste generation volume for the County is approximately 23.2 million tons. The Annual Report assumed a 66 percent diversion rate, resulting in a disposal of 7.88 million tons in Class III Landfills and transformation facilities. Given the recent approval of the City's Exclusive Franchise System, which the City expects to start implementing in 2017, waste diversion from City sources will likely be higher than the assumed 66 percent as stated previously. Moreover, the estimated project generation net increase of approximately 607.9 tons of waste per year will represent only a negligible fraction (approximately 0.008 percent) of the cumulative waste

generation in 2017. Thus, the project's contribution to the County's estimated cumulative waste stream in the project buildout year will not be cumulatively considerable.

## 2. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Features K.1-1, K.1-2 and K.3-1, which are incorporated into the project and incorporated into these Findings as fully set forth herein, reduce the potential utilities impacts of the project related to Wastewater/Sewer, Water, Solid Waste, Electrical Usage and Cumulative Impacts. These project design features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

## VII. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION

The following impact area was concluded by the Draft EIR to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures described in the Final EIR. Based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the project, the City finds and determines that mitigation measures described in the Final EIR reduce potentially significant impacts identified for the following environmental impact categories to below the level of significance.

### A. Public Services – Police Protection (Operation)

The project site is served by the West Los Angeles Community Police Station located at 1663 Butler Avenue, approximately 1 mile southeast of the project site. The project will introduce a new residential and visitor population to the project site and increase the service population of the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area. The West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area is supported by 236 sworn officers and a 12-person civilian support staff. As shown in Table IV.I.1 3 of the Draft EIR, the project's estimated net police service population will be 1,015 persons, which will increase the existing service population of the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area from 230,288 persons to 231,303 persons. The officer-per-resident ratio will change from 1.024 to 1.020 per 1,000 residents. However, a change of 0.004 in the officer-to-resident ratio is not a significant difference. The officer-to-resident ratios are lower for this part of the City as they are influenced by demand/crime rates. As discussed in the Section IV.I.1 of the Draft EIR, based on recent data, the crimes per capita within the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area are 34 per 1,000 residents while the crimes per capita citywide are 50 crimes per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the project will not represent a significant change in the officer-per-resident ratio of the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area.

The project will implement Project Design Feature I.1-2, which will include on-site security features such as keycard entry for the proposed residential tower and within the proposed parking structure, as well as private on-site security, and a closed circuit security camera system. Additionally, pursuant to Project Design Features I.1-3 and I.1-4, the project will include appropriate lighting to ensure security and well-lit areas. Pursuant to Project Design Feature I.1-5, the project Applicant will submit a diagram of the project site to the LAPD West Bureau Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response. The project's design features will help offset the project-related increase in demand for police services. Implementation of these measures will integrate CPTED strategies that will create high-visibility areas, and deter criminal activities. However, even with the implementation of the project design features, the officer-to-resident ratio of the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area will still be below the citywide ratio, and the response time still will be above the LAPD set standard time of 7 minutes. The Los Angeles CEQA

Thresholds Guide and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines do not provide a numeric threshold for response times. The response time of 7 minutes is a standard that the City tries to adhere to, but the significance threshold does not include any quantitative criteria. Nonetheless, the LAPD has stated that the project will have the potential to result in a significant impact on police services. Therefore, the project could generate a demand for additional police protection services that will substantially exceed the capability of the LAPD to serve the project site. As such, impacts to police protection services will be potentially significant and mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts: As shown in Table IV.I.1 4 of the Draft EIR, based on the police service population factors provided in the Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, the related projects will generate a population increase of approximately 13,842 persons within the service area of the West Los Angeles Community Police Station. The project will generate approximately 1,015 persons within the service area. Combined with the related projects, a cumulative total service population increase of 14,857 persons will occur. Utilizing the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area crimes per capita rate of 0.034 crimes per capita, the project could result in 35 additional crimes per year and related projects could result in 473 additional crimes per year, for a total of 508 additional crimes per year within the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area. The project will represent approximately eight percent of the cumulative increase in potential crimes. This degree of cumulative growth will substantially increase the demand for LAPD services in the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area. However, although the project will not decrease the current officer-to-resident ratio in the West Los Angeles Community Police Station service area, the LAPD has indicated that the project will have a significant impact on police protection services. In addition to Project Design Features I.1-3 through I.1-5, the project will implement Mitigation Measure I.1-1, which will reduce project-level impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Furthermore, the project site and the related projects are located within a highly urbanized area and it is assumed each of the related projects identified will likewise be developed within an acceptable distance from one or more existing police stations. Similar to the project, each related project will be subject to the City of Los Angeles' routine construction permitting process, which includes a review by the LAPD to ensure that sufficient security measures are implemented to reduce potential impacts to police protection services. The LAPD will continue to monitor population growth and land development throughout the City and identify additional resource needs including staffing, equipment, vehicles, and possibly station expansions or new station construction that may become necessary to achieve the desired level of service. Through the City's regular budgeting efforts, the LAPD's resource needs will be identified and monies allocated according to the priorities at the time. In addition, it is anticipated that the related projects will implement mitigation measures similar to Mitigation Measure I.1-1, which will reduce cumulative impacts to police protection services. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to police protection services will not be cumulatively considerable and, as such, cumulative impacts on police protection services will be less than significant.

#### 1. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Features I.1-3 through I.1-5, which are incorporated into the project and incorporated into these Findings as set forth herein, reduce the impacts related to operation police protection services. These project design features and were taken into account in the analysis of project impacts.

#### 2. Mitigation Measures

The City finds that Mitigation Measures I.1-1, which is incorporated into the project and incorporated into these Findings as set forth herein, reduce the impacts related to operation police

protection services to less than significant. This mitigation measure was taken into account in the analysis of project impacts.

### 3. Finding

With implementation of the Mitigation Measure I.1-1, impacts related to operational police protection services are less than significant. No further mitigation measure is required. With implementation of MM-I.1-1, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to operational police protection services is less than significant.

### 4. Rationale for Finding

The mitigation measure will implement the LAPD's recommendations for the project and reduce project-level impacts to police protection services to a less-than-significant level. While the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to police protection services will not be cumulatively considerable, implementation of Mitigation Measure I.1 1 will further reduce cumulative impacts

### 5. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Public Services – Police Protection, please see Section IV.I.1 of the Draft EIR.

## IX. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

The project results in the following impacts, which are significant and unavoidable.

### A. Noise - Construction

On-site Construction Noise: Noise impacts from project construction activities occurring within or adjacent to the project site will be a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, the location of the equipment, the timing and duration of the noise-generating construction activities, and the relative distance to noise sensitive receptors. Construction activities will generally include demolition, site grading and excavation within the subterranean parking garage, building construction, and landscape installation. Each stage of construction will involve the use of various types of construction equipment and will, therefore, have its own distinct noise characteristics. Demolition generally involves the use of backhoes, front-end loaders, and heavy-duty trucks. Grading and excavation typically requires the use of earth moving equipment, such as excavators, front-end loaders, and heavy-duty trucks. Building construction typically involves the use of cranes, forklifts, concrete trucks, and delivery trucks. Noise from construction equipment will generate both steady-state and episodic noise that could be heard within and adjacent to the project site.

Individual pieces of construction equipment that will be used for project construction produce maximum noise levels (L<sub>max</sub>) of 74 dBA to 90 dBA at a reference distance of 50 feet from the noise source, as shown in Table IV.H-10 of the Draft EIR. These maximum noise levels will occur when equipment is operating under full power conditions (i.e., the equipment engine at maximum speed). However, equipment used on construction sites often operates under less than full power conditions, or on part power. To more accurately characterize construction-period noise levels, the average (hourly Leq) noise level associated with each construction stage is calculated based on the quantity, type, and usage factors for each type of equipment that will be used during each construction stage. These noise levels are typically associated with multiple pieces of equipment operating simultaneously.

Table IV.H-11 of the Draft EIR provides the estimated construction noise levels for various construction stages at the off-site noise sensitive receptors. The estimated noise levels represent the worst-case scenario in which all construction equipment was assumed to operate simultaneously and was assumed to be located at the construction area nearest to the affected receptors. These assumptions represent the worst-case noise scenario as construction activities will, typically, spread out throughout the entire site further away from the affected receptors. Furthermore, since excavation activities will be contained within the subterranean parking garage, noise from these activities will likely be reduced. As indicated in Table IV.H-11, potential construction related noise impacts at receptors R1 and R5 will be less than significant. However, the estimated construction noise levels at the nearby residential uses represented by receptors R2, R3, and R4, which are directly adjacent to the project site, will exceed the significance threshold from 20.2 dBA at receptor R4 to up to 33.4 dBA at receptor R3. Therefore, temporary noise impacts associated with the project's on-site construction activities will be significant.

Off-Site Construction Noise: In addition to on-site construction noise sources, materials delivery, concrete mixing, and haul trucks (construction trucks), and construction worker vehicles will require access to the project site during the construction phase. The major noise sources associated with off-site construction trucks will be associated with delivery/haul trucks. Construction delivery/haul trucks will generally access the project site from I-405 via Wilshire Boulevard. Outbound access to Wilshire Boulevard and inbound access from Wilshire Boulevard will occur via Stoner Avenue or Granville Avenue adjacent to the project site. The peak period with the highest number of construction trucks will occur during the building construction phase. During this phase, there will be a maximum of 75 construction trucks coming to and leaving the project site (equal to 150 total trips) per day. The site demolition and grading phases will have up to 70 construction trucks (140 total trips) per day. There will also be construction trucks during other construction phases of the project (e.g., parking structure upgrade and site landscaping). However, the level of construction-related truck activity will be greatest during the building construction phase, as other construction phases will have a maximum of 10 to 70 construction trucks per day per phase. Therefore, to present a worst-case analysis, the analysis of off-site construction truck traffic noise impacts is based on the construction truck trips during a maximum worst-case day during the building construction phase.

The hourly truck trips were determined based on a five-hour period (between 10 A.M. and 3 P.M.) and a uniform distribution of trips, which will result in a maximum of 30 truck trips per hour. Table IV.H-12 on page IV.H-28 of the Draft EIR presents the estimated construction-related construction truck noise levels along the proposed construction truck routes with noise sensitive receptors (i.e., residential and hospital uses). As indicated on Table IV.H-12, the noise level generated by construction trucks will be below the existing daytime ambient noise level along Wilshire Boulevard between Granville Avenue and I-405. The estimated noise level from construction trucks along Stoner Avenue (between the project site and Wilshire Boulevard) will exceed the existing ambient noise level by 4.9 dBA, which will be below the significance threshold of 5 dBA for construction-related noise. The estimated noise level from haul trucks along Granville Avenue (between the project site and Wilshire Boulevard) will exceed the existing ambient noise level by 12.8 dBA, which will exceed the significance threshold of 5 dBA for construction related noise by 7.8 dBA. As described above, the estimated construction truck noise levels represent the worst-case construction phase (i.e., building construction). During other construction phases, the number of construction trucks will be lower, which will result in lower noise levels. Nonetheless, temporary noise impacts from off-site construction traffic will be significant.

The noise from off-site construction will not combine with on-site construction noise to create a material increase in noise levels on the sensitive receptors. Under a worst-case analysis (i.e., with all construction equipment operating near the off-site receptors), the maximum increase in the calculated noise levels (accounting for both on-site construction and off-site truck traffic) will be 0.2 dBA at receptors R2 and R4, which is considered negligible and will not be perceptible. There

will be no increase at receptor R3, as it is located further from the truck routes. Therefore, the off-site truck traffic will have a negligible increase to the on-site construction noise levels at the off-site receptors. However, as noted, temporary noise impacts from off-site construction traffic is in and of itself significant.

Cumulative Construction Noise: Noise from construction of development projects is typically localized and has the potential to affect areas immediately within 500 feet from the construction site. Thus, noise from construction activities for two projects within 1,000 feet of each other can contribute to a cumulative noise impact for receptors located midway between the two construction sites. With the exception of Related project No. 7, all related projects are located a substantial distance (a minimum of 1,400 feet) from the project site. Related project No. 7 is an Office Building development at 11620 Wilshire Boulevard (approximately 770 feet east of the project site). There are existing apartment buildings located between the related project and the project along the local streets south of Wilshire Boulevard. However, they are shielded from the related project and the project construction sites by intervening development; therefore, contributions from the project to the cumulative construction noise impacts will be minimal and impacts will be less than significant.

#### 1. Project Design Features

The City finds that Project Design Features H-1 and H-2, which are incorporated into the project and incorporated into these Findings as fully set forth herein, reduce the potential construction noise impacts of the project. These Project Design Features were taken into account in the analysis of potential impacts.

#### 2. Mitigation Measures

The City finds that Mitigation Measures H-1, H-2, H-3, and H-4, which are incorporated into the project and incorporated into these Findings as fully set forth herein, reduce the potential construction noise impacts of the project. These mitigation measures were taken into account in the analysis. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures the project could implement to avoid significant construction noise impacts.

#### 3. Findings

The City finds that changes and alterations and mitigation measures were made to the project to reduce the significant construction noise impacts of the project. No additional measures are available to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

#### 4. Rationale for Findings

Noise impacts from on-site construction activities will be significant at receptors R2, R3, and R4. Compliance with the required mitigation measures will reduce noise levels related to on-site construction noise to the extent feasible. In particular, implementation of Mitigation Measure H-1 will reduce the noise generated by on-site construction activities at receptors R2, R3, and R4 by 10 dBA. However, the temporary noise barrier will only be effective in reducing the construction noise at the ground level, and will not be effective at reducing noise levels at the balconies at the apartment buildings at receptors R2, R3, and R4. The estimated construction-related noise reductions attributable to Mitigation Measures H-2 and H-3, although not easily quantifiable, will also ensure that noise impacts associated with on-site construction activities will be reduced to the extent feasible. The minimum 10 dBA noise reduction provided by the prescribed Mitigation Measures is considered a substantial reduction (i.e., reduction of the loudness in half). However, such impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.

## 5. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Noise, please see Section IV.H of the Draft EIR.

### B. Noise – Construction Vibration

The project will generate ground-borne construction vibration during site demolition and excavation/grading activities when heavy construction equipment, such as large bulldozers, will be used. In accordance with the project design features, project construction will not use impact pile driving methods and, as such, impact pile driving vibration is not included in this construction vibration analysis. Table IV.H-13 indicates that vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operations that will be used during construction of the project will range from 0.003 to 0.089 PPV at 25 feet from the equipment. The estimated vibration velocity levels (from all construction equipment) will be well below the significance thresholds of 0.2 PPV (applicable to the multi-story apartment buildings south and west of the project site) and 0.5 PPV (applicable to the office tower to the north of Wilshire Boulevard and the residential towers to the east of the project site). Therefore, vibration impacts associated with potential building damage during construction activities will be less than significant.

With regard to human annoyance, Table IV.H-14 of the Draft EIR indicates that the estimated ground-borne vibration levels from construction equipment will be below the significance threshold for human annoyance at receptors R1 and R5. However, the estimated vibration levels at receptors R2, R3, and R4 will be above the 72 VdB significance threshold. Therefore, temporary vibration impacts on human annoyance during the construction period will be significant.

Construction trucks during the construction phase will generate ground-borne vibration as they travel along the project-designated haul routes. Vibration generated by the construction trucks will be similar to existing trucks (e.g., delivery and trash collection trucks) along the existing roadways. Furthermore, per FTA “it is unusual for vibration from sources such as buses and trucks to be perceptible, even in locations close to major roads.” Therefore, potential impacts associated with vibration from construction trucks traveling along the designated haul routes will be less than significant.

Cumulative construction vibration: Ground-borne vibration decreases rapidly with distance. Potential vibration impacts due to construction activities are generally limited to buildings/structures that are located in close proximity of the construction site (i.e., within 50 feet). The nearest related project is approximately 770 feet from the project. Therefore, due to the rapid attenuation characteristics of ground-borne vibration, there is no potential for a cumulative construction impact with respect to ground-borne vibration, and cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

#### 1. Mitigation Measures

The City finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures the project could implement to avoid the significant construction vibration noise impacts.

#### 2. Findings

Vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance at receptors R2, R3 and R4 will be significant and unavoidable. Impacts will be temporary, intermittent, and limited to during daytime hours when large construction equipment (e.g., large bulldozer) is operating within 80 feet of a sensitive receptor.

### 3. Rationale for Findings

Temporary vibration impacts during construction will be less than significant with respect to the threshold for building damage, but significant with respect to the threshold for human annoyance at receptors R2, R3 and R4. Compliance with the regulatory requirements and implementation of project design features will reduce vibration impacts with respect to human annoyance, and will ensure that vibration impacts with respect to building damage remain less than significant. Additional mitigation measures considered to reduce vibration impacts with respect to human annoyance included the installation of a wave barrier, which is typically a trench or a thin wall made of sheet piles installed in the ground (essentially a subterranean sound barrier to reduce noise). However, wave barriers must be very deep and long to be effective, and there is not sufficient space (e.g., buffer land) to construct wave barriers on the project site.

In addition, constructing a wave barrier to reduce the project's construction-related vibration impacts will, in and of itself, generate ground borne vibration from the excavation equipment, at levels that will likely be higher than those generated by project construction (as the installation area will extend beyond the project construction area and closer to the off-site receptor). Thus, it is concluded that it will be infeasible to build a wave barrier, and that there are no feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the vibration impacts associated with human annoyance to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance will remain significant and unavoidable. Impacts will be temporary, intermittent, and limited to during daytime hours when large construction equipment (e.g., large bulldozer) is operating within 80 feet of a sensitive receptor.

### 4. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Noise, please see Section IV.H of the Draft EIR.

## X. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

In addition to the project, the Draft EIR evaluated a reasonable range of four alternatives to the project. These alternatives are: (1) No Project Alternative – Supermarket Use; (2) Reduced Density Alternative; (3) Alternate Design Alternative; and (4) Office Alternative. In accordance with CEQA requirements, the alternatives to the project include a “No Project” alternative and alternatives capable of eliminating the significant adverse impacts of the project. These alternatives and their impacts, which are summarized below, are more fully described in section V of the Draft EIR.

### A. Summary of Findings

Based upon the following analysis, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15096(g)(2), that none of the alternatives or feasible mitigation measures within its powers would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the project would have on the environment.

### B. Project Objectives

An important consideration in the analysis of alternatives to the project is the degree to which such alternatives would achieve the objectives of the project. As more thoroughly described in the Draft EIR Section II, Project Description, both the City and applicant have established specific objectives concerning the project, which are incorporated by reference herein and discussed further below.

## C. Project Alternatives Analyzed

### 1. Alternative 1 – No Project–Supermarket Use

Under Alternative 1, the existing supermarket building would remain on the project site and would be occupied by a new tenant that would continue to operate it as a supermarket use. No new construction or demolition activities would occur, although it is assumed that minor renovation work would be required to reconfigure the interior of the building to suit the specific layout requirements of the new tenant. No changes to the existing on-site parking or access/circulation areas would occur. For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the hours of operation of this supermarket use would be from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., seven days a week.

Impact Summary: Alternative 1 would avoid all of the project's significant environmental impacts, including impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities. However, because the project's net reduction in daily and P.M. peak-hour trips would not be realized under Alternative 1, this Alternative would result in greater impacts with respect to operational air quality impacts, greenhouse gas impacts, and traffic impacts. Alternative 1 would reduce all of the project's remaining less-than-significant impacts with the exception of the less-than-significant operation noise impacts, which would be similar to project levels.

Findings: Alternative 1 (No project—Supermarket Use) would avoid all of the project's significant environmental impacts, including impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. However, because the project's net reduction in daily and P.M. peak-hour trips would not be realized under Alternative 1, this Alternative would result in greater impacts with respect to operational air quality impacts, greenhouse gas impacts, and traffic impacts. Alternative 1 would reduce all of the project's remaining less-than-significant impacts. Therefore, the No project Alternative is environmentally superior to the project. However, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives or the project's underlying purpose to create a high-density, mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities that accommodate a range of income needs, ample recreational and service amenities for project residents, and publicly accessible open space. It is found, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subsection (a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible the No project Alternative described in the Draft EIR.

Rationale for Findings: No changes to existing land uses or operations on-site would occur under Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives or the underlying purpose of the project. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not meet the objective of maximizing new housing units on the project site to help meet the market demand for new housing in Southern California, particularly in the West Los Angeles Community. Alternative 1 would also not meet the objective to provide an affordable housing component, nor would it meet the objective to encourage pedestrian activity along the Wilshire Boulevard mixed-use corridor by creating a privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area. In addition, Alternative 1 would not meet the objective to increase the amount of publicly accessible open space in the West Los Angeles Community Plan area. Alternative 1 would not meet the objective to ensure that new development complies with the design requirements of the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Design Overlay District. In addition, Alternative 1 would not meet the objective of creating an iconic, highly visible project consistent with existing high-rise development along Wilshire Boulevard. Further, Alternative 1 would not meet the objective to enhance walkability and create a street-level identity for the project site through the introduction of a privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area built to the street frontage, nor would it meet the objective to provide adequate on-site vehicle and bicycle parking. Lastly, Alternative 1 would not meet the objective

to provide a sustainable development consistent with the principles of smart growth, such as sustainable design features, mixed use, infill, proximity to transit, and walkability.

Overall, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives or the project's underlying purpose to create a high-density, mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities that accommodate a range of income needs, ample recreational and service amenities for project residents, and publicly accessible open space to serve the recreational needs of the community.

Reference: For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 1, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

## 2. Alternative 2 – Reduced Density Alternative

The Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 2) would represent a reduction in net new project development by approximately 25 percent. The reduction would occur in the number of residential dwelling units and the size of the privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area fronting Wilshire Boulevard, translating to a total of 282 residential dwelling units in the residential building and a 13,500-square foot open space area. The reduction in residential density would be achieved by reducing the overall height of the residential building by approximately 25 percent and maintaining the same approximate building footprint as that of the project. Thus, the maximum height of the residential building would be approximately 254 feet above grade, or 26 stories. The amount of square footage associated with the outdoor pool deck and the residential amenities and support uses in the ground floor of the residential building would be substantially similar to that of the project. Due to the significant reduction in density, Alternative 2 would not set aside any units as affordable housing. As with the project, Alternative 2 would retain the existing office building and pedestrian plaza in the northwest portion of the project site, with no changes to the existing operations therein. Table V-2 of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the types and sizes of land uses included in Alternative 2. As shown in Table V-2, Alternative 2 would construct approximately 272,358 square feet of new floor area, resulting in an increase of approximately 229,458 square feet of net new floor area on the project site.

Other than building height, the design of Alternative 2's residential building would be similar to that of the project. The architectural, lighting, signage, and landscape elements of Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the project. As with the project, the design of Alternative 2 would be consistent with the design guidelines established in the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Development Overlay CDO. Alternative 2 also would incorporate sustainability features to comply with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code (as amended pursuant to Ordinance No. 182,849) and be capable of achieving at least Silver certification under the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-CS® or LEED-NC® Rating System as of January 1, 2011.

The internal access and circulation scheme for Alternative 2 would be the same as that of the project. Alternative 2 would retain the subterranean parking garage and reconfigure the parking areas to provide parking pursuant to LAMC requirements.

As with the project, Alternative 2 would require demolition of the existing supermarket and partial demolition of the subterranean parking garage to install a pile foundation system for the residential building. Thus, Alternative 2 would require a similar export of demolition materials and soil as the project, as well as a similar amount of imported soil associated with landscape installation. The overall duration of construction would be incrementally reduced compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building construction. However, construction activities during maximum activity days would be similar to those of the project.

Impact Summary: Alternative 2 is included in this alternatives analysis based on its potential to reduce the significant impacts of the project, as well as public input received during the scoping period expressing concerns over the aesthetic impacts attributable to the height of the project's proposed high-rise building, traffic impacts, and air quality impacts. Alternative 2 would reduce but would not avoid the project's significant environmental impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. This Alternative would reduce many of the project's less-than-significant impacts, including impacts associated with views; light and glare; air quality during construction and operation; greenhouse gas emissions; operational noise; public services; traffic; and utilities and service systems. All other impacts would be similar under this Alternative when compared with the project.

Findings: Alternative 2 would reduce but would not avoid the project's significant environmental impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. This Alternative would reduce many of the project's less-than-significant impacts, including impacts associated with views; light and glare; air quality during construction and operation; greenhouse gas emissions; operational noise; public services; traffic; and utilities and service systems. All other impacts would be similar under this Alternative when compared with the project. Alternative 2 would not meet the project's underlying purpose to the same extent as the project. It is found, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subsection (a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible Alternative 2 described in the Draft EIR.

Rationale for Findings: While Alternative 2 would include all of the components proposed by the project, such components would be reduced under this Alternative. Furthermore, due to the significant reduction in density, Alternative 2 would not set aside any units as affordable housing, and, as such, would not be eligible for a density bonus under LAMC Section 12.22.A.25 (SB 1818). As such, Alternative 2 would not meet the project's underlying purpose to create a high-density, mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities that accommodate a range of income needs, ample recreational and service amenities for project residents, and publicly accessible open space to serve the recreational needs of the community to the same extent as the project. In addition, due to the significant reduction in density and housing units, this Alternative would not meet the objective to maximize new housing units on the project site to help meet the market demand for new housing in Southern California, and in particular in the West Los Angeles Community, nor would it meet the objective to provide an affordable housing component to address the City's affordable housing crisis. Additionally, with the reduction in building height, Alternative 2 would not meet the objective to create an iconic, highly visible project consistent with existing high-rise development along Wilshire Boulevard to the same extent as the project.

This Alternative would meet the objective to encourage pedestrian activity along the Wilshire Boulevard mixed-use corridor by replacing a surface parking area with a privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area, but to a lesser extent than the project, due to the reduction in the size of the open space area. In addition, Alternative 2 would meet the objective to increase the amount of publicly accessible open space in the West Los Angeles Community Plan area and provide the community with a destination for passive recreational use, but to a lesser extent than the project. This Alternative would meet the objective to ensure that new development complies with the design requirements of the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Design Overlay District, as well as the objective to provide adequate on-site vehicle and bicycle parking. Overall, Alternative 2 would not meet the project's underlying project objectives to the same extent as the project.

Reference: For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 2, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

### 3. Alternative 3 – Alternative Design Alternative

The Alternate Design Alternative (Alternative 3) provides a reconfigured design for the proposed residential building that would reduce the building's height while maintaining a comparable number of dwelling units by redistributing the building's floor area across a larger floor plate. Thus, in terms of the types and amounts of net new floor area, Alternative 3 would be substantially similar to the project. However, the residential units would be within an L-shaped building at the southeast corner of the project site. The east wing of the building would span approximately half of the project site's Stoner Avenue frontage, while the south wing of the building would span nearly all of the project site's southern/alley frontage. The residential building would include 14 stories on top of a ground floor lobby and amenity level for a total height of 15 stories. Alternative 3 would provide the same type and amount of affordable housing as the project, and as such, would be eligible for a density bonus under LAMC Section 12.22.A.25 (SB 1818). As with the project, Alternative 3 would retain the existing office building and pedestrian plaza in the northwest portion of the project site.

Alternative 3 would include a similar amount of residential open space and amenities in the residential building. However, due to the reduced amount of space available on the podium level deck above the subterranean parking garage, the pool and pool deck would be located on the roof of the residential building. With the elimination of the ground-level open space, Alternative 3 would include surface parking. To offset the reduced height, the footprint of new development under Alternative 3 would be approximately 30 percent larger than that of the project. Because of the additional area that would be needed for the expanded building floor plate, Alternative 3 would not include a publicly accessible open space area.

Alternative 3 would be built in a similar architectural style with lighting and signage as the project. Alternative 3 also would incorporate sustainability features to comply with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code (as amended pursuant to Ordinance No. 182,849) and, like the project, would be capable of achieving at least Silver certification under the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-CS® or LEED-NC® Rating System as of January 1, 2011.

Because of its building frontage on Stoner Avenue, pedestrian access to the plaza level under Alternative 3 would be via the Granville Avenue driveway. Access to the subterranean parking garage would be the same as under the project, with two ingress/egress driveways located in the same locations on Stoner Avenue and Granville Avenue, respectively. Parking would be provided on the remaining portion of the existing surface parking lot and the subterranean parking garage. With the same types and amounts of net new square footage, the LAMC parking requirement for Alternative 3 would be the same as the project's parking requirement (i.e., 1,090 spaces). It is anticipated that Alternative 3 would be able to provide the required number of parking spaces.

As with the project, Alternative 3 would require demolition of the existing supermarket. Due to the increased footprint of the proposed residential building, the amount of demolition in the parking garage and the amount of subterranean work required to install the building foundation system would be greater than that of the project. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a greater volume of exported demolition materials and exported soil compared to the project. The amount of residential open space would be similar to the project; however, due to reconfiguration of the site, the amount of imported soil associated with landscape installation would be incrementally reduced compared to the project. The overall duration of construction would be similar to that of the project.

Impact Summary: Alternative 3 was included in the alternatives analysis based its potential to reduce the shading impacts of the project, as well as public input received during the scoping period expressing concerns over the aesthetic impacts attributable to the height of the project's proposed high-rise building. Alternative 3 would not avoid any of the project's significant environmental impacts, including on-site noise impacts during construction, and human annoyance vibration from on-site construction activities. Alternative 3 would result in greater impacts with regard to construction noise and vibration due to the additional amount of subterranean work required to install the building foundation system. Alternative 3 would also result in greater impacts with regard to aesthetics/visual character. Impacts associated with air quality during construction; greenhouse gas emissions; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; construction traffic; parks/recreation; and solid waste during construction would also be greater under this Alternative. The only impacts that would be reduced would be impacts related to water supply due to elimination of the open space area fronting Wilshire Boulevard, and air traffic patterns and safety, due to the reduction in building height. All other impacts would be similar to those of the project.

Findings: Alternative 3 would not avoid any of the project's significant environmental impacts, including on-site noise impacts during construction, and human annoyance vibration from on-site construction activities. Alternative 3 would result in greater impacts with regard to construction noise and vibration due to the additional amount of subterranean work required to install the building foundation system. Alternative 3 would also result in additional impacts with regard to aesthetics/visual character. Impacts associated with air quality during construction; greenhouse gas emissions; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; construction traffic; parks/recreation; and solid waste during construction would also be greater under this Alternative. The only impacts that would be reduced would be impacts related to water supply, and air traffic patterns and safety. All other impacts would be similar to those of the project. Alternative 3 would not meet the project's underlying purpose and the objectives that support the project's underlying purpose to the same extent as the project. It is found, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subsection (a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible the Reduced Height/Reduced Signage Alternative described in the Draft EIR.

Rationale for Findings: The types and amounts of net new floor area proposed under Alternative 3 would be substantially similar to the project. However, the design, mass, and scale of the building would be out of character with other mid- to high-rise buildings in the vicinity, and would not create a richer pedestrian environment. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would not include a privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area along Wilshire Boulevard. As such, Alternative 3 would not meet the project's underlying purpose to create a high-quality, mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities that accommodate a range of income needs, ample recreational and service amenities for project residents, and publicly accessible open space to serve the recreational needs of the community. In addition, this Alternative would not meet the objective to encourage pedestrian activity along the Wilshire Boulevard. In addition, as evaluated above, this Alternative would not be consistent with some design guidelines established in the West Wilshire Boulevard CDO and, as such, would not meet the objective to ensure that new development complies with the design requirements of the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Design Overlay District. This Alternative would not meet the objective to create an iconic, highly visible project consistent with existing high-rise development along Wilshire Boulevard.

This Alternative would meet the objectives to maximize new housing units on the project site and to provide a sustainable development. Finally, this Alternative would meet the objective to provide adequate on-site vehicle and bicycle parking. Overall, Alternative 3 would not meet the project's underlying purpose and the objectives that support the project's underlying purpose to the same

extent as the project. Moreover, Alternative 3 would not avoid any of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts, would result in new and unavoidable significant impacts and would increase impacts with respect to the impact categories set forth above.

Reference: For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 3, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

#### 4. Alternative 4 – Office Alternative

The Office Alternative (Alternative 4) provides an alternative land use, consistent with the underlying C2 zoning, for the project site where the new high-rise building is an office rather than residential use. The floor area of the proposed high-rise building would be substantially similar to that of the project. The height of the high-rise building would be reduced compared to the project's height of 338 feet, with a maximum height of approximately 290 feet above grade level. However, the footprint would be bigger, and the area west of the high-rise building along the Granville Avenue frontage would be developed with a four-level, above-grade parking structure (rather than a pool deck) to serve a portion of the parking requirements of the new office building (the balance of the parking would be in the existing below-grade garage and at the surface level). Thus, the overall footprint of new development under Alternative 4 would be approximately 40 percent larger than that of the project. Because of the additional area that would be needed for the expanded building floor plate and surface parking to serve the office use, Alternative 4 would not include a publicly accessible open space area. As with the project, Alternative 4 would retain the existing office building and plaza in the northwest portion of the project site, with no changes to the existing operations therein. Table V-4 of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the types and sizes of land uses included in Alternative 4. As shown in Table V-4, Alternative 4 would construct approximately 360,291 square feet of new floor area, resulting in an increase of approximately 317,391 square feet of net new floor area on the project site.

In general, Alternative 4's high-rise structure would be designed in a similar, contemporary architectural style as the project. However, some design elements would be different (e.g., Alternative 4 would not include private balconies). Signage under Alternative 4 would be characteristic of other high-rise office buildings in the area. Open space under Alternative 4 would include planters, perimeter landscaping, and streetscape, but would be reduced in comparison to the project due to the increased footprint of new development, the increased parking, and the elimination of the publicly accessible open space area and residential open space amenities. Additionally, the new office use would not require the setbacks on Stoner Avenue and the alley that are provided by the project.

Vehicular access to the project site would be the same as under the project, with one driveway on Stoner Avenue (to the subterranean garage) and two driveways on Granville Avenue (one to the motor court and one to the subterranean garage). Access to the above-grade parking garage would be provided via the motor court.

As with the project, Alternative 4 would require demolition of the existing supermarket. Due to the increased footprint of new development, the amount of demolition in the parking garage and the amount of subterranean work required to install the building foundation system and secure the above-grade parking garage would be greater than that of the project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in a greater volume of exported demolition materials and exported soil. Due to the reduction in ground level landscaped open space areas, the amount of imported soil associated with landscape installation would be incrementally reduced. The overall duration of construction would be incrementally increased compared to the project due to the construction of the above-grade parking garage.

Impact Summary: Alternative 4 is included in this alternatives analysis based on the existing zoning designation of the project site, as well as public input received during the scoping period expressing concerns over impacts to public services and utilities. Alternative 4 would not avoid any of the project's significant environmental impacts, including impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. Alternative 4 would result in greater impacts to the project's significant environmental impacts related to on-site noise and vibration impacts during construction. Alternative 4 would also result in additional significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality during construction and traffic intersection capacity. Additionally, impacts associated with aesthetics/visual character; operational air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; operational noise; police and schools; and traffic during construction would be greater under this Alternative. All other impacts would be similar to or less than those of the project.

Findings: Alternative 4 would not avoid any of the project's significant environmental impacts, including impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. Alternative 4 would result in greater impacts to the project's significant environmental impacts related to on-site noise and vibration impacts during construction. Alternative 4 would also result in additional significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality during construction and traffic intersection capacity. Additionally, impacts associated with aesthetics/visual character; operational air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; operational noise; police and schools; and traffic during construction would be greater under this Alternative. All other impacts would be similar to or less than those of the project. Alternative 4 would not meet the objectives related to housing. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subsection (a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible the Reduced Density Alternative described in the Draft EIR.

Rationale for Findings: Alternative 4 would meet the objective to ensure that new development complies with the design requirements of the West Wilshire Boulevard Community Design Overlay District. This Alternative would also meet the objective to create an iconic, highly visible project. The alternative would meet the objectives to provide adequate on-site vehicle and bicycle parking, and a sustainable development.

Alternative 4 provides an alternative land use for the project site in which the new high-rise building is an office use rather than a residential use. As such, Alternative 4 would not meet the project's underlying purpose to create a mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities that accommodate a range of income needs, ample recreational and service amenities for project residents, and publicly accessible open space to serve the recreational needs of the community. Furthermore, this Alternative would not meet the objective to maximize new housing units on the project site to help meet the market demand for new housing in Southern California, and in particular in the West Los Angeles Community. This Alternative would not meet the objective to encourage pedestrian activity along the Wilshire Boulevard mixed-use corridor because it would not replace a surface parking area with a privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area. Alternative 4 would also not meet the objective to increase the amount of publicly accessible open space in the West Los Angeles Community Plan area and provide the community with a destination for passive recreational use. In addition, this Alternative would not meet the objective to enhance walkability through the creation of a privately maintained, publicly accessible open space area built to the street.

Overall, while it would meet some objectives, Alternative 4 would not meet the objectives related to housing that support the project's underlying purpose. Moreover, Alternative 4 would not avoid

any of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts, would result in new and unavoidable significant impacts, and would increase impacts with respect to the impact categories set forth above.

Reference: For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 4, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

#### **D. Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible**

In addition to the four alternatives listed above, three other alternatives were considered and rejected.

Alternative Site: The results of a search to find an alternative site on which the project could be built determined that suitable similar locations are not available to meet the project objectives to create a high-density, mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities, ample recreational and service amenities, and publicly accessible open space to serve the recreational needs of the community. The project site is located along a segment of Wilshire Boulevard that is already developed with high-rise buildings. Other portions of Wilshire Boulevard that are comprised of sites that are predominantly developed with high-rise buildings include the Westwood Regional Center and, to a lesser extent, the area surrounding the Wilshire Boulevard/Centinel Avenue intersection. It is not expected that the Applicant can reasonably acquire, control or have access to an alternative site within these locations that would provide for the uses and square footage proposed by the project. Other locations along the Wilshire Boulevard commercial corridor in the project area are not considered suitable for project development because the proposed high-rise building would be incompatible with surrounding development, would not meet the project objective to create an iconic, highly visible project consistent with existing high-rise development along Wilshire Boulevard, and would likely result in significant impacts with respect to aesthetics and land use.

Furthermore, given the densely developed nature of the project area, development of the project at an alternative site would be unlikely to avoid the project's significant noise impacts, which are associated with proximity to adjacent noise-sensitive receptors. As such, if there were a suitable alternative site available to accommodate the project, it is probable that the project's significant noise impacts would simply be transferred to another location.

Based on the above, an alternative site is not considered feasible, as it is not expected that the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or have access to a suitable alternative site that would provide for the uses and square footage proposed by the project. In addition, development of the project within other locations along the Wilshire Boulevard commercial corridor that are not currently developed with high-rise buildings would be incompatible with surrounding development, would not meet the project objectives, and would likely result in new significant impacts. Further, a suitable alternative site would not be likely to avoid the significant impacts of the project. Thus, in accordance with Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

Alternatives to Eliminate Shading Impacts: The analysis in Section IV.A.2, Light, Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR conservatively concluded that the project would result in a significant shading impact on Sensitive Receptor 1 during the winter solstice absent the application of ZI 2145 and SB 743, which provide that aesthetic impacts "shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment." An analysis was performed to determine the extent to which the building setbacks would need to be adjusted or the height would need to be reduced in order to eliminate the shading impact. It was determined that the impact could be eliminated if the height of the proposed high-rise building is reduced by over 50 percent to 15 stories or less. Such a limitation on project development would result in a development that is unable to meet the basic

project objectives, including: to maximize new housing units on the project site to help meet the market demand for new affordable housing in Southern California, and in particular in the West Los Angeles Community; to provide an affordable housing component to address the City's affordable housing crisis; and to create an iconic, highly visible project consistent with existing high-rise development along Wilshire Boulevard. Furthermore, due to the presence of the existing office building and limited space available on-site for new development, it was determined that the proposed high-rise building could not be relocated within the project site so as to avoid the shading impact. As such, there is no feasible design alternative to eliminate the project's shading impact on Sensitive Receptor 1 during the winter solstice.

Alternatives to Eliminate Significant Noise and Vibration Impacts During Construction: Alternatives were considered to eliminate the significant short-term construction noise and vibration impacts of the project. As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of the Draft EIR, significant noise and vibration impacts would occur during project construction for limited durations from the operation of construction equipment and vehicles on-site. Based on the thresholds upon which the construction noise and vibration analysis is based, the average noise levels generated by common pieces of construction equipment, and close distance between the project site and the nearest sensitive receptor (i.e., approximately 20 feet), it would not be technically feasible to reduce the construction noise level to a level below the significance threshold (i.e., 5 dBA above the ambient noise level), which translates to a reduction of 33 dBA. Furthermore, the major source of noise during construction would be the demolition of the existing supermarket, which would be required for any feasible development on the project site to meet the project objectives. Lastly, any reduction in the intensity of the project's daily construction activities would actually increase the overall duration of the construction period. Based on the above, alternatives to eliminate the project's short-term noise and vibration impacts during construction were rejected from further consideration.

## **E. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a project shall identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines also state that should it be determined that the No project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR shall identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the remaining alternatives.

Table V-1 of the Draft EIR provides a summary matrix that compares the impacts of associated with the project with the impacts of each of the analyzed alternatives. A more detailed description of the potential impacts associated with each alternative in Section V (Alternatives) of the Draft EIR. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to "avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" of the project.

Alternative 1 (No project—Supermarket Use) would avoid all of the project's significant environmental impacts, including impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. However, because the project's net reduction in daily and P.M. peak-hour trips would not be realized under Alternative 1, this Alternative would result in greater impacts with respect to operational air quality impacts, greenhouse gas impacts, and traffic impacts. Alternative 1 would reduce all of the project's remaining less-than-significant impacts. However, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives to create a high-density, mixed-use development that provides new housing opportunities that accommodate a range of income needs, ample recreational and service amenities for project residents, and publicly accessible open space. Furthermore, as stated above, the CEQA Guidelines require the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative other than a No project Alternative.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Alternative 2 (Reduced Density Alternative) would reduce the greatest number of project impacts and have the fewest significant and unavoidable impacts. On this basis, Alternative 2 is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. As described above, Alternative 2 would reduce, but would not avoid, the project's significant environmental impacts related to on-site noise impacts during construction and vibration impacts from on-site construction activities with respect to human annoyance. Additionally, this Alternative would reduce many of the project's less-than-significant impacts, including impacts associated with views; light and glare; air quality during construction and operation; greenhouse gas emissions; operational noise; public services; traffic; and utilities and service systems. All other impacts would be similar under this Alternative. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would not result in additional significant and unavoidable impacts. However, Alternative 2 would not meet the project objectives to the same extent as the project.

## XI. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

### A. Growth Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This includes ways in which a project will foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The project will result in the construction of up to 376 new residential apartment units. As such, the project will increase the residential population of the City of Los Angeles. According to SCAG's 2012–2035 RTP/SCS, between 2014 and 2017, population in the Los Angeles subregion will grow by approximately 59,790 persons, housing will increase by approximately 42,711 households, and employment will increase by approximately 44,237 jobs. The project is projected to result in a net increase of approximately 703 new residents, or approximately 1.2 percent of the total population growth projected for the subregion. The project's 376 units will account for approximately 0.9 percent of the total housing growth projected for the subregion. The project is also projected to result in a net increase of approximately six estimated employees associated with the residential building, or approximately 0.01 percent of the total employment growth projected for the subregion. Therefore, the project's population, housing, and employment generation will be well within SCAG's respective projections for the Subregion. As such, the project will not cause an exceedance of SCAG's population, housing, or employment projections, nor will it induce substantial indirect population or housing growth related to project-generated employment opportunities.

Construction workers will not be expected to relocate their households' places of residence as a direct consequence of working on the project as the work requirements of most construction projects are highly specialized so that construction workers remain at a job site only for the time in which their specific skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process. Therefore, given the availability of construction workers, the project will not be considered growth inducing from a short-term employment perspective.

The area surrounding the project site is already developed with residential, commercial, and institutional uses, and the project will not remove impediments to growth. While the project may require local infrastructure upgrades to maintain and improve sewer, electricity, and natural gas lines on-site and in the immediate vicinity of the project site, such improvements will be intended primarily to meet project-related demand, and will not necessitate regional utility infrastructure improvements that have not otherwise been accounted for and planned for on a regional level.

Water infrastructure improvements will include upsizing mainlines adjacent to the project site and installing new mainline connections and hydrants within the project site. These improvements will bring the existing fire water system into compliance with LAMC-required fire flows for the area, and will not create substantial surplus infrastructure capacity that could foster indirect growth. In addition, the project will not require any major roadway improvements, and access improvements will be limited to driveways necessary to provide immediate access to the project site.

Overall, the project will be consistent with the growth forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion, and will be consistent with regional policies to reduce urban sprawl, efficiently utilize existing infrastructure, reduce regional congestion, and improve air quality through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, growth-inducing impacts will be less than significant.

## **B. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes**

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines provide an EIR is required to address any significant irreversible environmental changes that will occur should the proposed project be implemented. The types and level of development associated with the project will consume limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources. This consumption will occur during construction of the project and will continue throughout its operational lifetime. The development of the project will require a commitment of resources that will include (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site.

Building Materials and Solid Waste: Solid waste generation during construction and operation of the project is addressed in Section IV.K.3, Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste, of the Draft EIR. Construction of the project will require consumption of resources that do not replenish themselves or which may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources will include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), and petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics).

During construction of the project, a minimum of 75 percent of the non-hazardous demolition and construction debris will be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse in accordance with project Design Feature K.3-1. In addition, during operation, the project will provide a designated recycling area for project residents to facilitate recycling in accordance with the City of Los Angeles Space Allocation Ordinance (Ordinance No. 171,687). Thus, the consumption of non-renewable building materials such as lumber, aggregate materials, and plastics will be reduced.

Water: Consumption of water during construction and operation of the project is addressed in Section IV.K.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water, of the Draft EIR. As evaluated therein, the water demand generated by construction activities for the project will be substantially less than the net new water consumption of the project at buildout, and will be temporary in nature. In addition, the project's operational water demand will fall within the projected water supplies for average, single-dry, and multiple-dry years, and LADWP will be able to meet the water demand for the project in addition to the existing and planned water demands of its future service area. Furthermore, pursuant to project Design Feature K.1-1, the project will implement a variety of water conservation features including, but not limited to, the use of: drought-tolerant plants and indigenous species for landscaping, high-efficiency plumbing fixtures and appliances, and weather-based irrigation. Thus, as evaluated in Section IV.K.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply, of the Draft EIR, while project operation will result in the irreversible consumption of water, the project will not result in a significant impact related to water supply.

Energy Consumption and Air Quality: During ongoing operation of the project, non-renewable fossil fuels will represent the primary energy source, and thus the existing finite supplies of these resources will be incrementally reduced. Fossil fuels, such as diesel, gasoline, and oil, will also

be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment. Construction activities for the project will not require the consumption of natural gas, but will require the use of fossil fuels and electricity. As the consumption of fossil fuels will occur on a temporary basis during construction, impacts related to the construction consumption of fossil fuels will be less than significant.

Project consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels for energy use during project operation is addressed in the Initial Study included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. As evaluated therein, the project's increase in electricity and natural gas demand will be within the anticipated service capabilities of the LADWP and the Southern California Gas Company, respectively. In addition, the estimated net new electrical and natural gas consumption are conservative estimates and do not factor in reductions in consumption from the implementation of energy conservation features. Specifically, the project will comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable, and, in accordance with project Design Feature C-1 in Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR, new buildings will be designed to be environmentally sustainable and to achieve at least Silver certification under the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-CS® or LEED-NC® Rating System as of January 1, 2011. Therefore, with the implementation of energy conservation features, energy will not be used in a wasteful manner, and long-term impacts associated with the consumption of fossil fuels will not be significant.

Environmental Hazards: The project's potential use of hazardous materials is addressed in Section IV.E, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As evaluated therein, the types and amounts of hazardous materials that will be used in connection with the project will be typical of those used in residential developments (e.g., household cleaning solvents, pesticides for landscaping, painting supplies, and petroleum products). Construction of the project will also involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, paints, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all potentially hazardous materials will be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Any associated risk will be adequately reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. As such, compliance with regulations and standards will serve to protect against significant and irreversible environmental change that could result from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

Project construction and operation will require the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources, which will limit the availability of these resources and the project site for future generations or for other uses. However, the consumption of such resources will not be considered substantial and will be consistent with regional and local growth forecasts and development goals for the area. The loss of such resources will not be highly accelerated when compared to existing conditions and such resources will not be used in a wasteful manner. Therefore, although irreversible environmental changes will result from the project, such changes are concluded to be less than significant.

### **C. CEQA Considerations**

1. The City, acting through the Department of City Planning is the "Lead Agency" for the project, evaluated the EIR. The City finds that the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR for the project, that the Draft EIR which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment and that the Final EIR and the Errata reflect the independent judgment of the City.

2. The EIR evaluated the following potential project and cumulative environmental impacts: Aesthetics; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Noise; Population, Housing and Employment; Public Services;

Transportation; and Utilities. Additionally, the EIR considered Growth Inducing Impacts and Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes. The significant environmental impacts of the project and the alternatives were identified in the EIR.

3. The City finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision- makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period.

4. Textual refinements and the Errata were compiled and presented to the decision- makers for review and consideration. The City staff has made every effort to notify the decision-makers and the interested public/agencies of the Errata and of each textual change in the various documents associated with project review. These textual refinements arose for a variety of reasons. First, it is inevitable that draft documents would contain errors and would require clarifications and corrections. Second, textual clarifications were necessitated in order to describe refinements suggested as part of the public participation process.

5. The Department of City Planning evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Department of City Planning prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned response to the comments. The Department of City Planning reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the EIR.

6. The Final EIR and the Errata document changes to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR and Errata provide additional information that was not included in the Draft EIR. Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, the Errata, and in the administrative record, as well as the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines regarding recirculation of Draft EIRs, the City finds that there are no new significant impacts, substantial increase in the severity of a previously disclosed impact, significant information in the record of proceedings or other criteria under CEQA that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR, or preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR.

Specifically, the City finds that:

a. The Responses To Comments contained in the Final EIR fully considered and responded to comments claiming that the project would have significant impacts or more severe impacts not disclosed in the Draft EIR and include substantial evidence that none of these comments provided substantial evidence that the project would result in changed circumstances, significant new information, considerably different mitigation measures, or new or more severe significant impacts than were discussed in the Draft EIR.

b. The City has thoroughly reviewed the public comments received regarding the project and the Final EIR as it relates to the project to determine whether under the requirements of CEQA, any of the public comments provide substantial evidence that would require recirculation of the EIR prior to its adoption and has determined that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

c. None of the information submitted after publication of the Final EIR, including testimony at the public hearings on the project, constitutes significant new information or otherwise requires

preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. The City does not find this information and testimony to be credible evidence of a significant impact, a substantial increase in the severity of an impact disclosed in the Final EIR, or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative not included in the Final EIR.

d. As demonstrated in the Errata, the proposed increase in the size of the publicly accessible open space following publication of the Final EIR will not result in a new significant impact, a substantial increase in the severity of an impact disclosed in the Final EIR, or otherwise require recirculation of the Draft EIR, or preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR.

7. The mitigation measures identified for the project were included in the Draft and Final EIRs. As revised, the final mitigation measures for the project are described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP). Each of the mitigation measures identified in the MMP is incorporated into the project. The City finds that the impacts of the project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the MMP.

8. CEQA requires the Lead Agency approving a project to adopt a MMP or the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the EIR as certified by the City as adopted by the City serves that function. The MMP includes all of the mitigation measures and project design features adopted by the City in connection with the approval of the project and has been designed to ensure compliance with such measures during implementation of the project. In accordance with CEQA, the MMP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts the MMP.

9. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth herein as conditions of approval for the project.

10. The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's decision is based is the City Department of City Planning.

11. The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

12. The City is certifying an EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the EIR as comprising the project.

13. The EIR is a Project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of the project. A Project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decisions regarding the Project by the City and other regulatory jurisdictions.

14. The City finds that none of the public comments to the Draft EIR or subsequent public comments or other evidence in the record, including any changes in the project in response to input from the community and the Council Office, include or constitute substantial evidence that would require recirculation of the Final EIR prior to its certification and that there is no substantial evidence elsewhere in the record of proceedings that would require substantial revision of the Final EIR prior to its certification, and that the Final EIR need not be recirculated prior to its certification.

## XII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final EIR identified the following unavoidable significant impacts: 1) Noise – construction noise; and 2) Noise – construction vibration. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decisions of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts identified in the Final EIR that are not substantially lessened or avoided, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. Article I of the City's CEQA Guidelines incorporates all of the State CEQA Guidelines contained in Title 15, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 *et seq.* and thereby requires, pursuant to Section 15093 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines, that the decision-maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects identified in the Final EIR cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. These findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the Final EIR, the source references in the Final EIR, and other documents and material that constitute the record of proceedings.

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the project, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the project against the project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that the each of the project's benefits, as listed below, outweighs and overrides the significant unavoidable impacts of the project.

Summarized below are the benefits, goals and objectives of the project. These provide the rationale for approval of the proposed project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the significant unavoidable impacts of the project and justify the approval, adoption or issuance of all of the required permits, approvals and other entitlements for the project and the certification of the completed Final EIR. Despite the unavoidable noise and vibration impacts caused by the construction of the project, the City approves the project based on the following contributions of the project to the community:

- Providing new housing units on the project site to help meet the market demand for new housing in Southern California, and in particular in the West Los Angeles Community. Providing 16 units for Very Low Income households to address the City's affordable housing crisis;
- Increasing the amount of much-needed open space in the West Los Angeles Community Plan area and provide the community with a destination for recreational use by providing approximately 40,544 square feet of publicly accessible, privately maintained open space;
- Reducing vehicle miles travelled by redeveloping an infill site with high-density housing within walking distance of jobs, retail amenities, and public transit in furtherance of the goals and objectives of local and regional land use plans related to reductions in air quality and greenhouse gas emissions; and
- Improving the jobs/housing balance by adding housing in the vicinity of a number of large scale commercial office buildings, including one on the project site.

Finding: For all the foregoing reasons, the City finds that the benefits of the project, as approved, outweigh and override the significant and unavoidable impacts identified above.